



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 2023

No. 69

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, send Your peace into our hearts. Hasten the day when nations will live in friendship with each other, united by their allegiance to You.

May the Members of this body seek to build with You a world without dividing walls. Keep our lawmakers faithful in their efforts to unite our Nation and world. Lord, strengthen them to work together for the common good, as You place Your peace that passes all understanding in their hearts. Empower our Senators to set country above party and place Your will above all else.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joshua David Jacobs, of Washington, to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF JOSHUA DAVID JACOBS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm Joshua Jacobs to serve as Under Secretary for Benefits at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Jacobs is an exceptionally qualified pick to fill this role, who will work day in and day out to make sure our Nation lives up to its obligation to take care of its veterans. I should know because that is exactly what he did when he worked in my office.

Joshua came to work every day focused on Washington State veterans and their families and helped to prepare the VA for an influx of veterans, to expand clinics and facilities, and to ensure veterans had the services they needed to transition to civilian life, especially when it comes to employment. That track record is why I was thrilled to have him return to work for me as deputy staff director on the Veterans Affairs Committee later, when I became chair, and why I was so excited to join my colleagues on the committee earlier this year to advance this nomination in a bipartisan way.

When I was chair, Mr. Jacobs helped lead the efforts to get veterans more mental health services, expand and support services for women veterans, and ensure veterans had a seamless transition from the DOD to the VA,

where too often our servicemembers and veterans faced too much redtape and the VA faced too little accountability.

Given his drive back then, it is no surprise to me that the work he has done since shows his deep commitment to serving those who served our Nation and why he is such a strong fit and trusted choice for this role.

When Mr. Jacobs was a Senior Advisor to the Office of the VA Secretary under President Obama, he was awarded the Secretary's Meritorious Service Award. When President Biden was elected, he was chosen to serve on the incoming administration's VA transition team. After Mr. Jacobs returned to the Department as a Senior Advisor in 2021, he improved its decision-making process by establishing and leading the new Evidence-based Policy Council and developing a new interagency policy development process to coordinate and implement more than 50 interagency policy efforts.

As a Senior Advisor for Policy who carried out the responsibilities of the Under Secretary for Benefits, Mr. Jacobs has taken on the enormous task of coordinating a team of 25,000 people and 56 regional offices, processing centers, and headquarters as they worked to manage over \$100 billion in benefits and to make good on our promise to millions of veterans and their families.

He knows full well how important a smoothly functioning VA is to the Americans who are relying on the benefits our Nation promised them. I have no doubt he will go to work every day determined to make sure our Nation lives up to those promises.

I know Mr. Jacobs, who is a Washington State native and graduate of the University of Washington, will do great work for America's veterans as Under Secretary for benefits.

I am proud to support his nomination. I look forward to working with him once he is confirmed.

I yield the floor.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1321

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for over 2 years, the Biden administration has failed to attend to some of the most basic governing duties. Stable prices, secure borders, and safe streets are three of the most fundamental responsibilities that any government owes its people.

But Washington Democrats neglected the basics for their pet priorities. They spent trillions of dollars on government goodies that nobody asked for, triggered the worst inflation in 40 years, and turned a blind eye to the border crisis and a crime wave, all occurring on their watch.

They caused the damage on party-line votes, without any input from the Republican side. In response, the American people flipped the House and chose a closely divided Senate. The voters dialed up the checks and the balances. The people went to the ballot box and demanded the Democrats start negotiating and compromising.

But the President is refusing to engage. Even as his own advisers say the debt ceiling is approaching fast, the White House is totally MIA. His position has been no negotiation, no reforms.

It is such an absurd position that even fellow Democrats are not buying it. The senior Senator from West Virginia, a Democrat, has publicly called on the President to sit down with Speaker MCCARTHY and negotiate.

Listen to the House Democrats: "Get to work and get it done for the sake of the country," says one. "They've got to do it soon," says another.

Just a few years ago, the Democratic leader said debt limit talks were an "opportunity for bipartisanship."

And what about President Biden himself? Here is what then-Vice President Biden said about the debt ceiling back in 2011. "Some of them are still unwilling to budge . . . taking an absolute position: my way or no way. . . . That's not governing," said the Vice President in 2011.

My goodness, that is harsh criticism for the 2023 version of President Biden from the 2011 version of Vice President Biden.

The Democrats' reckless policies have already dealt far too much damage to our country. This administration's inflation has hammered working families' budgets. Their anti-energy policies have raised gas prices and utility bills. Their attempt to reinvent cash welfare without work requirements hurt small businesses by worsening labor shortages and hurt families by promoting dependence.

So the working people of this country have already paid a heavy enough price for Democrats' failures. We should not even come within a mile of flirting with a Democratic debt default on top of all the rest.

It is time for President Biden to stop the partisan stubbornness, join Speak-

er MCCARTHY at the grownups' table, and get talking.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

REMOVING THE DEADLINE FOR THE RATIFICATION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 3, S.J. Res. 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 3, S.J. Res. 4, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 3, S.J. Res. 4, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Charles E. Schumer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Richard Blumenthal, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine, Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Cory A. Booker, Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Brian Schatz, Mazie Hirono, Amy Klobuchar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 22.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony Devos Johnstone, of Montana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 22, Anthony Devos Johnstone, of Montana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Lujan, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Debbie Stabenow.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, April 25, be waived.

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

DEBT CEILING

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, for months, the American people have demanded House Republicans stop their hostage-taking and show us a plan to avoid default.

Last week, House Republicans failed in their assignment yet again. Speaker MCCARTHY rolled out a wish list straight out of the Freedom Caucus playbook. It might as well be called the "Default on America Act" because that is exactly what it is: DOA.

Instead of doing what both sides have done many times before—avoiding default without preconditions—Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans want to force working Americans to accept either a punch to the gut or a blow to the head. Either the United States defaults on national debt for the first time in American history or MAGA Republicans get their way and America defaults on everything else—on our future and our security, on our promise to care for veterans and law enforcement and the American middle class. Either way, Republicans are promising real pain for American families when they bring their Default on America Act to the House floor this week. According to one study by Moody's Analytics, the DOA could send us into a damaging recession.

So let me say it one more time. What Republicans released last week was not so much a plan as it was a threat to default on America. Either we default on the national debt or we default on everything else through extreme cuts that will harm millions of people. That is so unpopular with the American people that the Republican House has had to hide it.

For all of the GOP's lipservice about public safety, the House DOA Act defaults on America's law enforcement and first responders. Nearly 30,000 law enforcement jobs across the country would be cut under the Republicans' DOA Act. Over \$8 billion in funding for the DOJ would be eliminated. Donald Trump called for Republicans to defund law enforcement, and now it looks like House Republicans are following through.

But that is just the start. The House Default on America Act would also spell disaster for American families and American healthcare. Parents who struggle affording childcare would see over 100,000 childcare slots eliminated under the GOP proposal, preventing moms and dads from getting a job or finishing their education since they can't afford to pick up their kids in daycare. Over 21 million Americans would be at risk of losing their health coverage—21 million Americans losing health coverage—while hospitals would see billions in funding disappear. Hospitals, patient groups, doctors—you name it, they are all coming out in droves to oppose this measure.

We just endured a global pandemic that claimed the lives of over 1 million Americans, and House Republicans want to cut funding for healthcare and hospitals? Utterly revolting.

But the damage isn't just limited to American families. The Republican DOA Act would cripple America's ability to stay ahead of the Chinese Communist Party.

After all the work we did last year on CHIPS and Science, the Republican bill would slash billions—billions—from cutting-edge research and prevent us from fully implementing CHIPS and Science. The damage would be measured in countless jobs lost and billions in squandered private investment. That is the last thing we can afford as President Xi and the CCP work to outcompete America on the world stage—squandering all that great private investment that is now coming to America.

Let's not forget, should this Republican DOA bill go into effect, taxes will go up for small businesses that no longer benefit from the green energy tax credits Democrats passed last year. Many of these green tax credits support job creation in Republican districts—jobs that Republicans are happy to take credit for while working behind the scenes to destroy them. It is the dictionary definition of "hypocrisy."

Finally, the House Default on America Act would break America's promise to our veterans, gutting funding for new VA facilities, funding for housing and food security and addiction treatment, and even endangering 81,000 jobs across the Veterans' Administration. How could House Republicans possibly think it is OK to cut funding for our veterans in exchange for lifting the debt ceiling? What kind of message does that send to our military families, our servicemembers?

If MAGA Republicans want to sell their cuts to the American people, they should not do so in the middle of discussions to avoid default. That discussion properly belongs in conversations about the budget, not here. And we will be happy to discuss those cuts with them, oppose them, as we might, in the budget—not as a prelude to default.

In the meantime, I urge Speaker MCCARTHY to stop wasting any more time on this DOA—dead on arrival—bill. Time is running out for Congress to work together to avoid catastrophe.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. President, now Senate business and the ERA. The Senate is set to have a very busy week on the floor.

Later this afternoon, we will begin with a cloture vote on the nomination of Joshua Jacobs to serve as VA Under Secretary for Benefits. Mr. Jacobs comes before the Senate at a critical moment for the VA, as he will be the one responsible for overseeing the implementation of PACT Act benefits. To date, the VA has already completed 191,000 PACT claims, 80 percent of which have been granted, I am proud to say. As senior adviser, Mr. Jacobs has already done great work at the VA pushing these benefits out the door, and he is clearly the right man for the position.

Later today, I will also file cloture on Anthony Johnstone, an outstanding nominee to serve a lifetime appointment as circuit court judge for the Ninth Circuit. I want to thank Senator TESTER for championing this strong nominee. The Senate will take it up later this week.

Finally and importantly, a few moments ago, I took the first procedural step for the Senate to take up a monumental resolution regarding the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. The Senate will vote to take up this historic ER measure on Thursday.

It has been exactly 100 years since the first Equal Rights Amendment was proposed here in Congress. Despite the progress America has made in the advancement of women's rights, we have yet to take one fundamental step: ratification of the ERA to guarantee gender equality under the Constitution. The Senate has a chance this week to bring our country one step closer to equal justice under the law by passing this bipartisan ERA resolution.

Three-quarters of the States have already ratified the ERA, just not in the requisite time set decades ago. The resolution would remove the arbitrary deadline and formally recognize that 38 States—the number required under the Constitution—have ratified the ERA.

Anyone who thinks the ERA isn't necessary at a time like this is not paying attention to the terrible things happening in this country. In the past year alone, the Supreme Court has eliminated the protections of *Roe v. Wade*, our courts have targeted drugs like mifepristone, and we have seen over a dozen hard-right States enact near-total bans on abortions. We need the ERA more than ever, ever before.

I want my daughters and grand-daughter to live in a country where they never have to worry about being discriminated against simply because of their gender. While, sadly, that is not the case today, we have a great opportunity to make significant progress on ERA ratification this week so we can enshrine the rights of generations of women to come.

I want to thank Senator CARDIN, who has spearheaded this, along with Senator MURKOWSKI—it is bipartisan—and thank them for championing this ERA resolution, and I look forward to advance its voting this Thursday.

Finally, in a few minutes, my colleague from Massachusetts will take the floor to ask unanimous consent that some of our brave military leaders get the promotions they deserve. It is absolutely outrageous that the Senator from Alabama is playing with the security of America—playing with the lives of these military leaders, whose lives are being disrupted by his harsh action.

He believes strongly that women in the military shouldn't have the right to abortion. Almost all Americans disagree with him. But no matter how strongly he feels, to hold up the promotion of military leaders, many of whom—most of whom have dedicated decades of their lives to protecting our country, and now leaving those positions vacant, risking our security, is one of the most abominable and outrageous things I have seen ever done in this Chamber, witnessed by the fact that no one has ever had the temerity, the gall to do this before.

So I salute the Senator from Massachusetts for bringing these names up. Everyone in this Chamber should exalt them. Members of this Chamber from the other side should go plead with the Senator from Alabama to stop this headstrong, nasty, and unneeded action.

I again thank our Senator from Massachusetts, who is chair of the subcommittee that is relevant, for bringing this issue to floor and showing America what the Senator from Alabama is exactly doing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to thank the leader for his strong words about the importance of making sure we advance our military leaders when they have been approved for promotion and pay increases.

You know, most people are aware that the Senate votes on nominees who have been appointed by the President to occupy top roles in almost all parts of the Federal Government—Cabinet Secretaries, judges, Ambassadors. Less well known is the fact that the Senate must also vote to approve thousands of military promotions every year. So if a colonel has done well on the job and their service's promotion board decides they are ready to be a brigadier general, the Senate must vote to approve

this promotion before it can go through.

Now, typically, this vote is a formality. These promotions are processed in big batches rather than one at a time, and they usually happen without even taking a recorded vote. But right now, the Senator from Alabama has imposed a hold on all, every single senior military nomination and promotion. That means that one Senator is personally standing in the way of promotions for 184 of our top-level military leaders. One Senator is holding up pay raises for men and women in uniform. One Senator is blocking key senior military leaders from taking their posts. One Senator is jeopardizing America's national security.

Think for a minute about what this looks like. These holds deprive military families of the pay increases they have earned, because the nominee's new pay cannot take effect until the promotion goes through. Without formally being assigned to a change of duty, families can't make decisions right now about moving or enrolling kids in a new school for the next school year.

The Chief of Staff of the Army has said: What it really does, it affects the families and some of the kids. And they are trying to figure out where they are going to school, where they are going to move. And all those things kind of come into the readiness of the force. For families with special needs, there may be even more significant delays to access important services.

Secretary Austin has stated that this delay "creates a ripple effect through the Force that makes us far less ready than we need to be."

So why is one Senator—one Senator—punishing 184 dedicated men and women who actively serve in our military, all because he personally disagrees with a single policy decision from the Pentagon?

Now, look, it is no secret that I disagree with a lot of policy decisions from the Pentagon. As Senators, we have a lot of tools to shape and influence government policies—tools that we can use without putting our national defense at risk. We can pass laws. We can conduct oversight. We can meet with administration officials. We can hold hearings. Occasionally, a Senator may object to an individual nomination, usually to indicate opposition to that appointment or to insist on answers to questions from a Federal Agency. I have done this myself in the past, as have many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. But that is not what the Senator from Alabama is doing. Instead, he is blocking every single top military leader from advancing indefinitely. He snared all 184 top-level servicemembers who are currently slated for advancement, and he stopped every single one of them dead in their tracks.

Like me, the Senator from Alabama serves on the Senate Armed Services Committee. As a consequence, he has

many more opportunities than most Senators to influence DOD policy. He has many more opportunities to question witnesses, many more opportunities to receive briefings, and many more opportunities to influence the annual Defense bill that Congress passes every single year to govern Pentagon operations. He has many opportunities that do not actively threaten our national security. He has not raised any individual objections to the 184 servicemembers whose promotions are now held up in the Senate, and he has not raised any objections to the process by which these men and women were vetted and nominated. No. The Senator is blocking 184 top military promotions because he disagrees with the Department of Defense policy to help servicemembers and their families access needed healthcare—specifically, to travel to access abortion care. I disagree with the Senator on that issue, but if he wants to press for votes to reverse DOD's healthcare policies, he can do that. I will oppose him. But if I lose and if Congress changes the law, then DOD will change its policies. That is how democracy works.

Holding up the promotion of every single military nominee isn't democracy; it is extortion, and that kind of extortion has serious consequences for our national defense. These holds pose a grave threat to our national security and to our military readiness. They actively hurt our ability to respond quickly to threats around the world.

Just take a look at the list of 184 people who have already been approved for promotions. The 184 people whom the Senator from Alabama has blocked so far include nominations for the next commander of the U.S. Fifth Fleet in the Middle East, nomination for the next commander of the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific, our next military representative to NATO, and the current Director of Intelligence for U.S. Cyber Command. It includes our next Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Integration for the Air Force. It includes a top official in Birmingham's Army Reserves. And it includes the former Chief of Staff for Operation Warp Speed, a program the Senator from Alabama has repeatedly credited for saving millions of American lives.

In fact, the Senator from Alabama is singlehandedly holding up 11 three-star commanders, three recipients of Silver Stars, and three Purple Heart recipients. These are brave servicemembers who deserve better than to be stuck in an administrative hell, waiting for a single Senator to release them to the promotions and the assignments and the pay increases that their military leaders determined that they have already earned.

The Department of Defense has warned that these blanket holds are making the United States more vulnerable to threats from foreign actors like China, North Korea, and Iran. In the coming months, approximately, 80 three- and four-star generals and admi-

als, including the leaders of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, will reach the end of their current terms, and new nominees will be slotted to replace them.

In addition, if the Senator's reckless hold is not lifted and if the Senate cannot confirm a new Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President may be without a principal military adviser. By the end of this year, we could have 650 generals and flag officers waiting for Senate confirmation.

The Senator from Alabama's response to his actions is to say that he will keep these holds in place "until hell freezes over" unless DOD changes its healthcare travel policy. I sincerely hope that is not true because holding hostage nearly the entire military leadership of the U.S.A. at a time when we are facing military threats around the world and our allies are literally engaged in war in Europe is dangerous; it is reckless; and it needs to stop right now.

As chair of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Personnel, I care deeply about protecting our servicemembers and the integrity of our promotion system. These holds are depriving families of pay raises that they have earned. We are talking about grocery money for families. These servicemembers are being treated disrespectfully—people who should be treated with dignity and respect. And unless there is some specific problem with an individual nominee, those who have been nominated for a new rank or a new post should get the advancement that the Pentagon has already recommended for them.

No more politics. I am here today to respectfully ask my colleague from Alabama to let these promotions move forward and to find other ways to continue advocating for the policy changes that he wants to see. I am hopeful that he will set aside politics and do what is the right thing and allow these servicemembers to carry out their responsibilities to our Nation.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 90. If confirmed, this nominee would be America's military representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Military Committee. This Boston University graduate was the first woman to serve as president of the Naval War College. At this critical juncture of Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine, we need her leadership in NATO now more than ever.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 90; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I want to start by reminding everyone why this is happening. It is not about abortion. It is not about the Dobbs decision. This is about a tyrannical executive branch walking all over the U.S. Senate and doing our jobs.

In November, I got word that the Pentagon was thinking about spending taxpayer dollars to facilitate elective abortions. This goes beyond what the law—which was passed here—the law allows. The law only allows the Department of Defense to facilitate and fund abortions in the cases of rape, incest, and the life of the mother.

Now, I warned Secretary Austin that if he did this and changed this, I would put a hold on his highest level nominees. Secretary Austin went through with the policy anyway in February of this year. So I am keeping my word. This was Secretary Austin's choice, not mine. He knew the consequences for several months. Nothing in the law allows Secretary Austin to facilitate elective abortions. In fact, the law just says the opposite. So this was Secretary Austin's choice.

Secretary Austin thought abortion is more important than his highest level military nominations. Secretary Austin could end the policy today, and I would lift my hold. Secretary Austin has chosen not to do that.

This is the fourth time the Democrats have come to the floor to try to break this hold. I will come down here as many times as it takes.

The Senator from Massachusetts claims that my hold on the Pentagon nominations is affecting readiness and so have the other Senators who have come to this floor. Senator SCHUMER said last week on this floor multiple times that it was affecting readiness. Several other Senators have said the same thing. Democrats keep repeating the same talking points and the same opinion, but not one of them has cited any facts—not one.

I even asked the Pentagon to explain to me how this affects readiness. All I have heard is opinions like we just heard from Senator WARREN. The senior Senator has been asking questions from the Pentagon.

On April 6, the senior Senator sent this letter to Mr. Austin. The full letter may be found at <https://www.warren.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2023.04.06%20Letter%20to%20DoD%20on%20Tuberville%20Holds.pdf>.

The letter asks about the effects of my hold on military readiness. I will answer right now. My hold has no effect on readiness, none.

In an Armed Services Committee hearing last week, Senator REED asked two of the military top combatant commanders what impact would my hold have on readiness. ADM John Aquilino said: "No impact." John Paul LaCamera agreed. There is no impact on readiness or operations.

Experts have known for more than a decade that the military is topheavy. We do not suffer from a lack of generals. Democrats are concerned with promotions of generals but have shown very little to no concern about our historic recruitment crisis—and it is a crisis. Right now, the military is missing more than 20,000 enlisted soldiers from last year's short on recruiting. That is in addition to another 8,000 that President Biden, for some reason, kicked out of the military over vaccine mandates.

So we are missing 28,000 enlisted troops right now, and the Democrats are panicking about 180 generals and admirals.

Last week, a report showed that the Army, Navy, and Air Force—all of them are preparing to miss their recruitment goals this year, and nobody is talking about it. They will miss their goals by thousands and thousands of new servicemembers. Yet I don't hear Democrats say a word about it. They are worried about 180 top-level generals and admirals. We have plenty of generals.

When my dad served in World War II, we had one general for every 6,000 troops. Think about that—1 for every 6,000. Now we have 1 general for every 1,400 enlisted servicemembers. That is more than four times the ratio of generals to troops. That is a lot of money. We won plenty of wars with a lower ratio. Again, bipartisan experts have shown this for more than a decade.

Let me mention a few examples. Here is an article from Ben Freeman of the Project of Government Oversight from 2011. It is entitled: "The Most Top-Heavy Force in U.S. History," found at <https://www.pogo.org/analysis/2011/11/todays-military-most-top-heavy-force-in-us-history>.

The author talks about testifying before the Senate on this issue. He also mentioned a nearly 25-percent increase in three-star and four-star generals in the previous decade. Over the same time, the increase in enlisted members was just 2 percent—2 percent. People who actually do the work.

I have a report from Third Way from 2013, which may be found at <https://www.thirdway.org/report/star-creep-the-costs-of-a-top-heavy-military>.

Here is what this centrist organization said in their report 10 years ago. It is called "Star Creep: The effects of the top-heavy military."

The story says:

America's armed forces have far too many generals and admirals—a situation that wastes money and creates a drag on military effectiveness. Although the U.S. military is 30% smaller now than it was at the end of the Cold War, it has almost 20% percent more three and four-star officers. [Twenty percent.] The layers of bureaucracy to support them have grown as well, slowing down decision-making and burdening the warfighter.

We need to trim the fat, which will make our military both leaner and more effective.

That was 10 years ago.

Here is another article. This one is from the Washington Times in 2016,

which may be found at <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/apr/5/ash-carter-says-us-military-too-top-heavy-aims-cut>.

The title of the article: "Ashton Carter says U.S. military too 'top heavy,' aims to cut ranks of generals and admirals."

Ash Carter was President Obama's Department of Defense Secretary. He felt the military was also topheavy. Both of President Obama's Secretaries of Defense agreed with that. The late Senator John McCain agreed with that statement. Again, this has been common knowledge in military circles for a decade. Yet now my Democratic colleagues have selective memories.

Finally, I will just mention one more article from the Washington Times from this past January. It is called "Top Heavy: U.S. military bloated by brass as officer-to-enlisted ratio dwarfs Cold War era," which may be found at <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2023/jan/29/top-heavy-us-military-bloated-brass-officer-enlist>.

Here are a few numbers from the article. In World War I, we had one officer for every 15 enlisted. In World War II, it was one of every ten. Today the ratio is 1 to 4.

Today we have more admirals than we have ships. Let me repeat that: We have more admirals in our military than we have ships.

Yet the Democratic side of the aisle is in panic that we don't have enough admirals; it just doesn't make sense. In the first century of this Nation, we only had a handful of three-star generals ever. George Washington and Ulysses S. Grant were the first two three-star generals in our history. Today we have more than 160 three-star generals. Overall, there are more than 650 generals today. "Star creep" is putting this very mildly.

This hysteria on the other side of the aisle has absolutely no basis in fact. They have complained about my holds for weeks, but they still haven't shown me one single fact.

So I am looking forward to Secretary Austin's response to Senator WARREN. I can't wait to read it. In the meantime, I am not going to budge. I will come down here as many times as it takes day and night to vote. I am not afraid to vote. We are working a 3-day week this week. We just took a 2-week recess earlier this month. And if Democrats are so worried about the military readiness, then why are we taking days off? Let's vote. We can vote these. I mean, it is not like I am holding them and they can't be confirmed.

We can vote on every one of these people. Just call them up on the floor. We can vote on them. Everybody needs to vote. I am not afraid to work. I will stay here as long as it takes. And let me remind my colleagues that we just voted—and confirmed—last week a military nominee, the way we are supposed to do it, instead of a hundred at a time.

Clearly, we are capable of voting on military nominees and promotions. We

could also be voting on legislation that expands the DOD's abortion policy. We can bring it right here and vote. That is our job—instead of the Secretary of Defense playing Congress and doing bills on his own. That is not how this place is supposed to work. In fact, that is how this should be done in a democracy.

So, finally, let me remind my Democratic colleagues again: I gave the Pentagon fair warning. I told them if they imposed this policy on our country, then I would hold these nominees. They chose to go forward with this policy anyway. They forced my hand. This was the Biden administration's choice. All I am doing is keeping my word, and that is why I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, let's be clear what is at issue here. The Department of Defense has said if a servicemember requires reproductive healthcare for themselves or for a member of their family, care that is not available in the location where the member is currently stationed, the member can request time away from the base to travel elsewhere for treatment.

As Pentagon leaders have testified, military commanders respect the privacy of servicemembers and do not request information about the specific medical treatment or who it is for.

The Senator from Alabama doesn't like that. He is worried that a servicemember might—might—be seeking an abortion for themselves or for a family member. And he doesn't think the Department of Defense should participate in that in any way. Fine.

The Senator from Alabama can advocate for a bill to invade the medical privacy of every single servicemember. He can advocate for a bill that requires every commanding officer to do what no private employer can do, and that is to rifle through a servicemember's personal medical information. The Senator from Alabama can seek to change Federal law so that a commanding officer interrogates a servicemember with questions like: Do you need time off because you are having trouble getting pregnant? Has your wife had a miscarriage? How many weeks pregnant are you? Was your daughter raped?

These are not questions that commanding officers want to ask, nor should they be authorized or required to ask them.

Now, Senator TUBERVILLE can push for a vote on the bill he cosponsors to ban the Department from providing paid leave or transportation to access reproductive care. Frankly, I don't think the Senator has enough support in Congress to pass any bill like that.

And I understand the Senator's frustration. Many of us have proposals to change Pentagon policies that don't have enough support in Congress to pass, but that is not an excuse to jeopardize our active military operations all around the world.

I confess, I am a little stunned by the Senator from Alabama's argument here. I had not been aware that it was a controversial view that our military needs officers in charge of the Fifth Fleet or the Seventh Fleet, our fleets in the Pacific and in the Middle East.

It is pretty alarming to hear the Senator suggest that we don't need leaders running the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Every President since World War II would probably disagree that there is no need for a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Now, look, if the Senator from Alabama thinks that there should be fewer high-level leaders in the Armed Forces, he could advance legislation to reform our leadership structures. But blocking leaders from taking the jobs to which they have been assigned is reckless.

Not only that, these delays are felt throughout the ranks since this creates, as Secretary Austin described it, a ripple effect throughout the military. It is cruel to our servicemembers. Just because you are not going to run the Army does not mean that your promotion does not matter. As Army Chief of Staff McConville recently testified to the Senate Armed Services Committee, these delays affect both the families and some of the kids. They are trying to figure out where they are going to school, where they are going to move.

I think back to my own three brothers. All three of them served in the military. My oldest brother was career military. I cannot imagine a circumstance where he had worked, he had put his life on the line, he served in combat off and on for 6 years, and yet to be told that although the Air Force thought he was ready, had served, had been an exemplary member of the military, that he could not have his promotion, he could not have his pay increase, he could not go to his next assignment all because one Senator decided to hold it up over a different discussion about policy.

I would urge my colleague from Alabama to find another way to press for the policy changes that he wants at the Department. I heard him say that he had read the letter that I had sent to Secretary Austin asking about the impact on our military. Secretary Austin has already spoken to that, but I hope he will be responding soon to my letter.

But I hope that these words from the Senator, that he is looking forward to Secretary Austin's response, have at least opened the door, that if Secretary Austin says: This has an effect on our military readiness, that the Senator from Alabama will be prepared to lift his objection and let what are, currently, 184 members of the military go forward and the ones who need to go forward in the future.

So I hope he has left the door open for that. The Senator from Alabama and I fundamentally disagree on the issue of abortion. We disagree on Department of Defense policies. But all of

us should be able to agree that a blockade of the promotion of every single senior member of our Nation's military creates unacceptable risks to our national security, and it needs to stop right now.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 94. Collectively, these 37 nominees in Calendar No. 94 have served in the Army for nearly a thousand years.

This list includes a commanding officer stationed in South Korea, the head of plans for central command, and the deputy chief of staff in the fight against ISIS. The list also includes the deputy provost marshal general for the Office of the Provost Marshal General, which is responsible for all—all—of the Army's policing functions.

There is also a graduate of Auburn University, where the Senator from Alabama was once head coach. And I am sure that this servicemember never expected that his promotion would be blocked by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I renew my request with respect to Calendar No. 94.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I stand here before my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama. He stands in opposition, as do I, to the plan of the Department of Defense to use Federal funds to facilitate the performance of abortions.

Now, let's remember what we are looking at here. This has been in place for a long time. Congress enacted a law. Codified 10 USC section 1093. Let's just brief that here.

1093 part (a) says:

Restriction on use of funds. Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

Part (b) reads as follows:

No medical treatment facility or other facility of the Department of Defense may be used to perform an abortion except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term or in a case in which the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

Look, this policy has been in place for a long time—for decades, in fact. It is accompanied by other policies restricting the use of Federal funds on issues related to abortion.

You know, the American people, yes, are divided on questions, many questions, regarding abortion. There are a lot of gradations of that. Some would put restrictions here; others restrictions there; others would insist on no restrictions whatsoever.

But one thing that does tend to unite Americans, more than any other topic within the area of abortion, is that we don't want the use of Federal taxpayer dollars going to facilitate or fund abortions. We don't want that.

Overwhelmingly, that holds really, really well. Democrats and Republicans

alike believe that it is unfair, understand that it is unjust, especially on an issue that is as divisive as abortion is.

To take money at the point of a gun, which is what we do when we collect tax revenue, essentially. You know, that if you don't pay your taxes, at some point people with guns will show up, and you have got to do what they say.

So when you are taking money at the point of a gun—as you do when you are collecting tax revenue—you have a sacred responsibility to handle that well. And if the American people don't want it, that is why they enacted a Congress that has put this in law, that we don't use Federal funds to fund abortion.

So along comes Secretary Austin and the current Department of Defense, and they decide, well, we really want to do this. And so I can only imagine how this conversation must have gone internally. Obviously, I wasn't part of those conversations. I was not made privy to them. They didn't invite me to them, we will just say.

But I would imagine they more or less went something like this, hey, what can we do to, you know, help people get abortions using Federal funds. And I am sure someone brought up, well, 10 USC section 1093 prohibits that. So they said, what could we do that arguably could circumvent that, something that Congress may not have specifically identified.

And at some point, someone said, well, there is nothing in here that directly categorically prohibits the use of travel funds or the availability of leave time for people seeking abortions.

So, bingo, they came up with this idea. Let's just give people who want abortions, women who want abortions in the military 3 weeks of paid leave and an expense account to handle out-of-state travel during that 3-week period, and that circumvents, technically speaking, the restriction. This is, of course, a major policy change, and it is a policy change on a topic that many Americans feel passionately about—and, by many Americans, I mean not just Republicans. Republicans and Democrats don't like the idea that U.S. taxpayer dollars should be used for abortions, and they have put this in place—this being a major policy change, a major policy change affirmatively at odds with the spirit, if not also the letter, of various provisions of Federal law. Respect for the Constitution itself, for the separation of powers, and for the sacred role of the legislative branch to make laws should have commanded that the burden of making this policy change should be on those who would want Congress to act, and that we not give special privilege to an executive branch Department—here, the U.S. Department of Defense—to undertake such a major policy change that they knew they could never get past the Congress. They couldn't. It wouldn't pass. There is not a chance it would get past the House. It wouldn't

get past the Senate either. They knew this, and that is why they did it by executive action—just executive fiat.

If Secretary Austin, the Secretary of Defense—if he wants to make law, he should run for Congress. He should run for the House. He should run for the Senate. I would welcome him here as a colleague or as a counterpart, down the hall in the House. I genuinely would. Then he would be in a position to do this. But he may not and must not be allowed to legislate from the E-Ring of the Pentagon. That is not how we do things in this country.

Now, as you look at the arguments that have been exchanged today, we have talked about military readiness. I agree with my colleague from Alabama. I haven't seen anything indicating that military readiness commands this, much less commands it in a way that justifies departing from the spirit, if not the letter, of Federal law.

I have also heard the argument made, quite counterintuitively, that if the Senator from Alabama, Senator TUBERVILLE, wants to change the law, he should run legislation to that effect. He should be required to pass a statute.

That is not how our system works. We have got laws. This is a major departure from established policy set in existing law. The burden is not on Senator TUBERVILLE.

You see, it is this body that gets to change laws, to change policy. We are the policymaking organ of the Federal Government, and to pass a law—any law—article I, section 1, and clause 1, the very first operative provision of the U.S. Constitution, right after the preamble and all the initial language, it says that “all legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.”

Article I, section 7, makes it clear how you make a Federal law, and it is not made by the Secretary of Defense or any other executive branch official. It is made, under article I, section 7—the only way you can make a Federal law—when the House of Representatives and the Senate both agree on the same legislative text, then presents that legislation to the President of the United States, who may sign it or acquiesce to it—after 10 days, if he acquiesces, it becomes law—or he can veto it. If he vetoes, it can become law only after two-thirds of both Houses have overridden that veto. Those are the only ways you can change Federal law.

The onus is not on those of us opposing this policy. Nor should the onus be on Senator TUBERVILLE to establish that he is not the one impacting military readiness. This is untrue. It is unproven. It is contrary to fact. But even if it were not so, this is not on him. You see, because to whatever degree this is impacting military readiness, that argument goes right back on Secretary Austin in a heartbeat. It goes right back on him because he doesn't have to impose this policy. He

doesn't have to force this change in policy amounting to a hostile act against the spirit, if not the letter, of this law. He doesn't have to do that. He could and should allow Congress to make this determination in due course, as Congress does. And it just so happens that we are coming up, in the coming weeks and months, on an opportunity to do precisely that, through a committee—through legislation that comes through a committee—on which both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Alabama serve, the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This legislative vehicle of which I am speaking, of course, is the National Defense Authorization Act. It is an opportunity that we use every year, for many, many decades, to make policy decisions involving the Pentagon.

So, if this issue is so important to military readiness, let Secretary Austin and those around him come to Congress and ask us to approve that, to make that policy choice—recognizing, as they should have done already without having to be told, that it is wildly inappropriate for them to make this policy change so wildly in conflict with the spirit, if not also the letter, of existing statute.

So that is what he could do. He can come to us and make that argument in connection with the National Defense Authorization Act. If he can persuade enough Members of the House and enough Members of the Senate to get it passed, it would be done.

In the meantime, unless or until such time as he can do that, especially to the degree that this is impacting military readiness—these objections—then, what he should do is abundantly clear: Suspend implementation of these policies until such time as Congress acts to change them. That is not an unreasonable demand—not in the slightest.

Look, it is also apparent that Secretary Austin and the Department of Defense have become hostile toward female members of the military who choose to have children. That is the message this sends—undeniably, unequivocally. When you tell people: You know, you are pregnant, and it sure would be convenient for us if you didn't have this baby—so inconvenient, in fact, that we will give you 3 weeks of paid leave and a travel account so that you can go somewhere else, you know, so that you cannot have that child—think about what that does. That creates a hostile work environment for our female servicemembers, and I find it repugnant, and so do the American people.

That is why we have a prohibition in law.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. So, Mr. President, I have great respect for the Senator from Utah. I appreciate that he is very careful about citing law and often comes to

this body to talk about reading the actual words of a statute. And so he read to us 10 U.S.C. 1093(a), which prohibits Federal funds—and he should look back at the verb—“to perform” abortion. It also, in section (b), prohibits using military facilities—bases, hospital rooms, clinics—to perform abortions.

Now, I appreciate that the Senator from Utah read those words because it is pretty clear from those words that DOD policy here does not violate congressional prohibitions on the Federal Government paying for abortions or permitting them to happen in Federal facilities other than the exceptions noted in the statute. All that is happening in this particular bill is clarifying that servicemembers who need to travel out of State to access any kind—and I want to underline “any kind”—of reproductive healthcare that is not available where they are stationed, can request time off and go get that care for themselves or a family member.

Servicemembers remain personally responsible for bearing the full medical cost for abortions that fall outside the narrow exceptions provided by law.

Now, I will say it again as clearly as I can: I oppose congressional restrictions on funding for basic medical care. I would like Congress to end those restrictions, but that hasn't happened, and I am not about to hold up every major military promotion in the United States and hold them hostage to try to force it to happen.

Any one Senator has the right to hold up every military promotion, but it is irresponsible, and it endangers our national security.

Now, the Senator from Utah suggested that somehow the Department of Defense did not already have authority to do that.

The Department of Defense clearly has the authority to carry out the policy in question. Multiple statutes have provided the Secretary of Defense with broad statutory authority to pay for the travel and transportation expenses of servicemembers and other authorized travelers. It has been in place for a long time and has been used repeatedly.

I want to make another point here, though. Limiting the authority to do that should be considered very, very carefully if we don't want to endanger the ability of the Department to respond to unexpected threats.

Again, if the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Alabama thinks that the DOD has exceeded its authority or that the authority didn't exist in the first place, then that Senator can conduct oversight or seek to change the law. The place for that debate is through the legislative and oversight process, not in blocking the promotions of every single military official in this country.

I am shocked to hear the Senator from Utah repeat the argument that somehow it doesn't matter if 184 leaders in the military are blocked from going to their next posts, are blocked

from receiving their promotions, are blocked from receiving their pay increases. I would remind, with respect, both of my colleagues that we are talking about here the next commander of the Fifth Fleet in the Middle East. We are talking about the next commander of the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific. We are talking about our next military representative to NATO. We are talking about the current Director of Intelligence for U.S. Cyber Command, and on and on and on. Taking hostages like this does not promote the national security. It endangers our national security.

I just want to say that the argument that the Senator from Utah has used that somehow by providing the full range—access to the full range—of reproductive healthcare services means that the military is trying to tell women not to have babies is downright insulting. First of all, reproductive healthcare services include efforts to get pregnant. It also includes enough privacy that nobody—no commanding officer—is asking about your current circumstances on whether you are trying to get pregnant, whether it is succeeding, how much trouble you are having, what kind of services you have used, and why you want to go somewhere else to get them.

It means treating people with respect, and treating people with respect means treating them like grownups to make their own decisions. And if they can't get the services they need because they are stationed in a place where those services are not available, they don't have the choice to pick a different place to work. They go where their commanders tell them. What this policy says is that they have the right to ask their commanding officer, without additional information, for an opportunity to leave the area and go somewhere else where they can get access to the services they need. I believe that that is the way we show respect for people who have babies.

I also want to say, if the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Alabama are hard on the question of supporting people in our military, women having more babies, then, by golly, join us in the fight to put more money into pre-K and more money into DOD schools, more money into flexible spending accounts to cover childcare costs, more money into promoting new parental leave policies to provide 12 weeks of paid leave when a woman has a baby.

As the Senator from Utah has acknowledged, DOD's travel policy covers people who are doing more than having abortions. Travel policy is not a vacation. Servicemembers, under this policy, are limited to—and I will read the words—“the minimum number of days essential to receive the required care and travel” as quickly as possible.

The message this policy sends is that the Department of Defense, unlike the Senator from Utah and unlike the Senator from Alabama, supports women in

making their own healthcare decisions. This policy was based on conversations and support groups and focus groups with servicemembers. This is what servicemembers said they needed. This is the support they want.

I am much more troubled by the signal sent by Republican Senators who are holding up the Department of Defense from protecting women's healthcare.

I look forward to working with the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Alabama in order to work on more policies to support military families.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 84. If confirmed, this nominee would command the Fifth Fleet, which operates in the Middle East.

Unless the Senator from Alabama thinks that the Fifth Fleet doesn't matter, I would remind him that, last year, the Fifth Fleet prevented an Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps navy vessel from confiscating a Fifth Fleet unmanned surface vessel in the Arabian Gulf. If we want to ensure that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard doesn't take other U.S. assets in the region, we cannot possibly support leaving this command post vacant.

Mr. President, I renew my request with respect to Calendar No. 84.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, first of all, my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, a moment ago, referred to the Pentagon's policy as a bill. Perhaps this was a Freudian slip, but one way or another, it was an acknowledgment of the fact that it is a change in policy—a change in policy that is in conflict with the spirit if not also with the letter of Federal law. So, as a bill—and I think it is fair to characterize it as such—it ought to have to be passed through Congress.

Now, my friend from the State of Massachusetts has used the language of the text of statute 10 U.S.C., section 1039 in much the same way. I would imagine, that Secretary Austin and his advisers parsed it and cribbed it and manipulated it in their development of this policy.

But let's remember the reason I say that it violates the spirit if not also the letter of it. It is that there is an argument to be made here that it is. Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be used to support abortions. How is this money being used? Well, with the extra leave time that you wouldn't get in the absence of this and with the travel to another State, it is for the purpose of an abortion. It is conditioned on your getting an abortion.

My friend and colleague from Massachusetts points out that it is also there with respect to fertility treatments—IVF or otherwise. Well, all that may be the case, and I have a couple of responses to that.

No. 1, I do not and would never object to that if that is what this were. In fact, I would relinquish my objections altogether if this policy were about helping military women gain access to fertility treatments. There is no provision in Federal law—not in title 10 and not anywhere else that I am aware of—that prohibits the Secretary of Defense from doing that. That would, moreover, not amount to a major departure from established policy. So, if that is really what is on the table here, I wouldn't object to that at all.

But it is the part about abortion. The Senator is conditioning the use of these funds—the receipt of additional leave time, the receipt of an expense account, and 3 weeks off—to go have an abortion. That is using Federal funds to get an abortion, to fund an abortion, because that is part of that.

Moreover, the suggestion that this applies evenhandedly, equally—that it was equally intended to promote access by military women to fertility treatments—is at odds with and belied by the fact that the President, ever since the Dobbs opinion was released at the end of the last term of the Supreme Court, has been calling this an all-of-government cause—an all-of-government cause—to make sure that they can get around Dobbs in any way that they possibly can. This is, was, always has been, and always will be about abortion.

Like I say, the rest of it would be unobjectionable. I wouldn't raise any objection to it. I can't imagine my friend and colleague from Alabama would anyway. So that is a bit of a red herring, and it is a bit of a smoke-screen to say that this is about fertility treatment. It is not about that.

With respect to the readiness component of it, look, I get it. As for the hard-working men and women of the military, for whom I have deep respect, in having gained promotions, we want to be able to promote them and approve their promotions. Yes, that needs to happen. And to the extent that any one of those people really needs to be processed and approved very quickly, there are ways to do that. We could tick these off one after the other. Senator TUBERVILLE mentioned that we took care of one just in the last week or so on the floor. We could be doing that right now. If you want to see where the Senate's legislative priorities are, they are not with this. They are with other things. If this really were a priority, we would, through the leadership of the Democratic majority leader, be in a position to do that. He has chosen different priorities and not this one.

Look, at the end of the day, this thing—you could dress it up any way you want, but this is a major change in policy that is utterly at odds with the spirit if not also the letter of Federal law. As such, changing it should require a change in statute. If he wants to push for that, he is free to do so. If it doesn't pass, then he is stuck with

that. If he is not content with being able to advocate for it from the outside, he should run for the House, or he should run for the Senate. He must not be allowed to legislate from the E-Ring of the Pentagon.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I listen to the Senator from Utah as he works mightily to twist the language of the statute, which is entirely clear: The Federal Government cannot perform abortions. Federal money cannot be used to "perform." That is the relevant verb here. Under this policy from the Department of Defense, the individual who gets an abortion or whose family member gets an abortion is responsible for all of the costs of the performance of that abortion. That part is clear.

But I am very troubled by what the Senator from Utah said about fertility treatments. He said he would be glad to remove all objections if he knew that someone were going to get a fertility treatment or fertility treatments but just not if someone were going to get an abortion. I would like to suggest, with respect, a couple of things here.

The first one is, you may want to understand the science a little bit better because one of the consequences of many fertility treatments is that it doesn't work and results in an abortion, in which case, someone who goes for fertility treatments knows that they may be signing up down the line for an abortion because, although they very much wanted to have a baby, it did not work out. This is where they find themselves medically and is the decision that they want to be able to make for themselves—a decision that the Senator from Utah wants to take away from them.

I also want to make the point about—we asked this in committee, the Senator may remember, in the Senate Armed Services Committee hearings, to the commanders to the military commanders, the commanding officers: Do they want to ask these questions? And the answer was, across the board, no, they don't want to be in the business of asking why it is that you need reproductive healthcare services and then making the careful calculation about whether or not your wife is in the middle of what appears to be a miscarriage and she needs to go somewhere where she can get treatment because she can't get it where the base is located. That is a stunningly intrusive question to ask—one that, by the way, no private employer could ask.

If the Senator from Utah and if the Senator from Alabama want to change the law and say that it should be the job of commanding officers to ask each woman who says, "I need time to travel elsewhere for reproductive services," and to inquire into detail about their healthcare needs and substitute their own decisions about what is the appropriate healthcare response, they could

try to promote a bill for that. I don't think the Senators are going to get the votes in the U.S. Senate.

Put it up if that is what you want to do, but you don't get to do it through the backdoor by saying, when it now turns out that servicemembers find out they need reproductive care that is not available near the bases where they have been stationed by their military command, that they cannot travel elsewhere for that care.

The Senator talks about the spirit of the law. The spirit of the law is that we respect our servicemembers and that we respect the women of the military to make their own healthcare decisions. That is what this rule from the Department of Defense is all about.

So, in a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 49. This is a person who was the Chief of Staff for Operation Warp Speed, one of the greatest achievements of the Trump administration to rapidly develop tests and distribute lifesaving COVID vaccines. We should all be grateful for his leadership, not hold up his promotion to play political games.

I will also be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 113. If confirmed, this would be the commander for the Naval Sea Systems Command, which manages 150 acquisition programs and billions of dollars in foreign military sales. This role is crucial to making sure the Navy gets the ships it needs on time and on cost, and holding it up only hurts great power competition with China.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 82. These 27 Air Force nominees have collectively served their country for over 600 years. Among the nominees is a NASA astronaut who received his master's degree from MIT and commanded NASA's third longest duration commercial crew mission.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 85. If confirmed, this nominee would command the Seventh Fleet, which operates in the Pacific and is the Navy's largest forward-deployed fleet. If our country wants to check Chinese aggression, we must ensure this post is filled with strong and capable leadership.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 47. If confirmed, this nominee would be the commanding general for the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command and the U.S. Army Forces Strategic Command. This nominee has held air and missile defense assignments throughout the Middle East, the Indo-Pacific, and Europe. America needs someone with this kind of experience to be confirmed for this post.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 97. Collectively, these 60 nominees have served in the Navy for more than 400 years. Among these nominees is an MIT graduate who served as the commander of the USS Gerald Ford—the

first new aircraft carrier class we have built in over 40 years. He has logged 2,600 hours in 22 different aircraft. He is eager to serve his country, and he is being held up by one man in the U.S. Senate.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 46. This nominee studied at the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama. He currently serves as commander of the 10th Medical Group and commands surgeons at the U.S. Air Force Academy. Leaders like her ensure the health and readiness of our military.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 83. This nominee studied at the Squadron Officer School at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama, as well as the Air Command and Staff College and the Air War College in Alabama. Alabama has invested a lot in her. She is now capable and ready to serve as the Chief of Staff for the Air Mobility Command at Scott Air Force Base in Illinois. She should be confirmed.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 48. If confirmed, she would serve as Deputy Chief of Staff for the Army's G-4, which is responsible for the Army's strategy policy plans and programming for logistics and sustainment. If we want to be ready to fight, we need to confirm her position.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 50. Collectively, these two women—two women—have served the Army for over 60 years. They deserve to be promoted.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 51. If confirmed, he would serve as Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration for the Air Force. As we contend with Russia's reckless threats to use nuclear weapons against Ukraine and China rising as a nuclear power, we need sober and expert advice to keep Americans safe from the threat of nuclear weapons. We need to confirm him.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 52. If confirmed, this nominee would be the Military Deputy and Director for the Army Acquisition Corps. The Army is not only leading and modernizing our own forces, they are playing an essential role in making sure Ukraine has all of the munitions and weapons for victory against Russia. We cannot—cannot—allow this post to become vacant.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 86. Collectively, these 11 nominees have served over 275 years in the Air Force. Among these nominees is the commander of the 439th Airlift Wing at Westover Air Reserve Base in Massachusetts, the largest Air Reserve base in our Nation.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 87. Collectively, these two nominees have

served the Air Force for over 55 years. One of the nominees currently serves as mobilization assistant to the command surgeon for Air Combat Command, which is responsible for the health of 81,000 Active-Duty and civilian personnel.

The holds imposed by the Senator from Alabama are punishing the people who make sure that those who serve are healthy enough to combat any threat to U.S. national security.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 88. Collectively, these 10 nominees have served over 280 years, with nearly 20,000 flying hours of experience. These nominees include a Special Operations forces commander, a mobilization assistant to the commander responsible for training 293,000 students a year, and another mobilization assistant to the commander of Space Operations Command.

I know how important space operations are to the Senator from Alabama. I cannot believe he is willing to jeopardize these essential missions to train and lead our forces.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 89. This nominee is currently commanding the largest Army command in the Caribbean. That promotion was particularly significant for him personally because he is from Puerto Rico. During his promotion ceremony, he said that he assumed the command "fully aware of the dire consequences to our Nation and to our freedom if we fail to sustain a high level of readiness in a world in which security challenges are becoming more complex." Blocking his promotion only exacerbates those security challenges.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 91. This nominee is currently serving in Birmingham, AL, as the Chief of Staff, United States Army Reserve Deployment Support Command. This is a constituent of the Senator from Alabama who cannot receive the promotion he deserves.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 92. This nominee is currently the Director for Joint Reserve Intelligence Support Element for Europe and Eurasia for the Defense Intelligence Agency, helping to make sure Ukraine and our allies in Europe have the critical national security information they need to be victorious on the battlefield. Yet she can't receive the promotion she deserves because the Senator from Alabama is playing politics with women's healthcare.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 93. This nominee is currently the deputy commander for support for providing security assistance to Ukraine. He is doing everything he can to make sure Ukraine defeats Russia. Yet the Senator from Alabama is making sure he doesn't advance to the promotion he has clearly earned.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 95. Collectively, these eight nominees have served in the Marine Corps for over 200 years. They deserve their promotions.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 96. Collectively, these nominees have served the Navy for over 55 years. Both are currently serving in the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, making them responsible for the health and safety of our sailors, our marines, and their families. The pandemic has already driven so many skilled healthcare professionals out of the workforce. We need to retain and promote these kinds of professionals to continue to protect the readiness of our forces.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 98. Collectively, these two nominees have served the Navy for 55 years. Both nominees are making sure the Navy has the supplies needed to be ready, including one currently serving as the Chief of Staff for Navy logistics who supports our fleet in the Pacific. A mother of three, she has fought to make sure the Navy is supporting other mothers who serve.

The Department has done the right thing to support women's rights, while the Senator from Alabama is fighting to take those rights away.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 99. These two nominees have collectively served the Navy for over 60 years. Both nominees have extensive experience managing our major weapons programs, and this promotion would place one of them in charge of aircraft carrier programs. Making sure our weapons work and enhance security is one of the most important missions, and we need to retain that experience if we want to keep our Nation safe. The Senator from Alabama's actions threaten to drive people like these nominees out of the military.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 100. This nominee is currently serving as the Director of Health and Training at the Defense Health Agency and is a recognized member of the American Board of General Dentistry. If he is confirmed, he will be the Deputy Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. Our servicemembers deserve the best healthcare we can deliver, and promoting people like this nominee ensures that we uphold the highest standards of care.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 101. If confirmed, this nominee would be the commander of Naval Supply Systems Command, which makes sure the Navy has everything they need to serve all around the world.

The rear admiral who helped Americans understand the importance of naval power to national security put it best when he said that logistics was "as vital to military success as daily food is to daily work."

The Senator from Alabama's actions deprive our Navy of the leadership the Navy counts on so that they will reliably have the tools they need to succeed militarily.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 102. These 13 nominees have collectively served in the Navy for over 400 years. These nominees include multiple commanders of carrier strike groups, including one born in Springfield, MA. Another nominee is the Deputy Director of Special Operations and Counterterrorism for the Joint Staff. If confirmed, one nominee would command the Naval Surface Force, which is responsible for manning, training, and equipping the entire surface force. If my colleagues want to protect the seas and fight terrorists, they should not stand in the way of these promotions.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 103. This nominee is currently the executive assistant for the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency. If we want to continue to make sure the United States has the best information about current and future threats, we should confirm people like this, not hold up the promotions they have already earned.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 104. These two nominees have collectively served the Navy for over 55 years. One nominee is currently serving as information warfare commander for Carrier Strike Group 5 in Yokosuka, Japan. The other is the Chief of Staff for U.S. Fleet Cyber Command and the Tenth Fleet. As we continue to see warfare expand to the information and cyber domains, we need to promote Navy captains like this.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 105. These four nominees have collectively served the Navy for over 100 years. They include a Boston University graduate managing the Navy's new frigate program and the commander of America's shipyard in Norfolk. The Senator from Alabama knows better than most how much work we need to do to reach the Navy's shipbuilding goals. Blocking the promotions of the very people working to make sure we have the ships we need to protect the global commons only endangers our national security.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 106. Collectively, these two nominees have served the Air Force for 65 years. One of the nominees earned her nursing degree at Boston College, to rise to become the chief nurse of the entire Air Force. Go get 'em. The other nominee currently serves as commander for the Air Force Medical Readiness Agency, making him responsible for leading over 44,000 personnel at 76 military treatment facilities. These nominees are providing critical care and leadership to keep our forces healthy, and they should not be punished because

the Senator from Alabama thinks he knows more about healthcare than medical professionals do.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 107. Currently serving as the commanding general for Marine Corps forces in Japan, he would be the Deputy Commandant for Plans, Policies, and Operations for the Marine Corps if confirmed. As we approach competition with China, we need leaders with experience in the region to be promoted, not to have their careers stopped by politics.

In a moment, I will be asking the Senate to confirm Calendar No. 110. Collectively, these 23 nominees have served over 620 years of service in the Air Force. These nominees include the Director for Strategic Capabilities on the National Security Council, which makes him the principal adviser to the President on how to avoid a nuclear war, and it includes the adviser to the National Nuclear Security Administration, protecting the safety and reliability of our nuclear stockpile. Another nominee makes sure that we provide all the air and space power necessary to promote U.S. interests in the Pacific. The current Director of Intelligence of the U.S. Cyber Command is also held up by the Senator's antics.

Let me assure the Senator from Alabama: We do not want to play nuclear football.

Look, we have been at this for almost an hour and a half now, but these nominees—these 184 nominees—have been waiting for months. Holding them up and declaring that we just don't need people in these positions is an insult to them, and it undermines the safety and security of the United States of America.

If we want to be able to recruit the very best and the very brightest our country has to offer, we need to treat those people with a little respect. That means that when we are in it on politics, we do not drag 184 of our most able leaders into the middle of it and say: Your promotion, your pay, your next duty station are all on hold until one Senator gets his way on one DOD policy.

That is an incredibly dangerous approach, and the Senator from Alabama, as much as I respect him, I believe is acting in ways that are irresponsible and put our national defense at risk. I urge him to release his holds immediately and allow these senior military officers to get the promotions they have earned.

I renew my request with respect to each Calendar number I have raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I want to make something very, very clear here. None of these positions the Senator from Massachusetts has men-

tioned will go unfilled. Each role has its commander in place until the relief is confirmed. That is how the military works.

Mr. President, one thing very important to me and to our country is our military. There is only one thing more important, and that is our Constitution that they protect. For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have two statements for the RECORD that I want to enter into the RECORD, but I would like to say my debt of gratitude to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Members of the Senate go to parades and salute the military, and we give speeches on the floor about how much we appreciate them and their sacrifice. This is an illustration of the Senate at its worst. We should be standing behind these men and women who have given their lives to our country, who will risk their lives for our country, some earning Bronze Stars, Purple Hearts for doing it.

Listen, I want to tell you, if we are respecting these men and women, we should give them the promotions they have worked their whole lives to achieve and, in so doing, keep our military the strongest in the world. I respect these men and women, and I think what is happening on the floor of the Senate is not only dangerous but it is insulting. That is the only word that can be used for one Senator to hold up 184 men and women and their promotions in the military. I never thought I would see that day in the U.S. Senate.

Whatever the reason, it is time to bring the charade to an end. We can debate the policy in the committee and on the floor, wherever we wish; but when it comes to these individuals, do not hold these men and women in the military hostage to the political debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for raising these issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Leader SCHUMER said since last week that he intends to introduce a resolution purporting to support law enforcement.

In 2020, "defund the police" became the rallying cry of the radical left. Every day for the next 2 years, officers reported to duty despite a campaign saying that they didn't deserve money for even bulletproof vests; and 1,146 of those officers died protecting Americans. I don't remember Democrats taking to this floor to defend law enforcement back then. Instead, they blocked resolutions that condemned attacks against officers.

By April of 2021, antipolice protests and Democrat silence were all but routine. And we know what happened: Police morale plummeted.

Still, officers rushed toward danger that those of us in Congress should thank God that we never have to face. Iowa Sergeant Jim Smith was one of those officers. On a Friday night in April 2021, he got a call for backup. It took him to the house of Michael Lange. Lange had just assaulted another police officer and barricaded himself inside with a shotgun.

Sergeant Smith led the entry team. They had just cleared the basement and were about to reach the main floor when Lange ambushed them. Lange fired two shots into Sergeant Smith's chest. Then he gloated to the other officers, and this is what he said:

I'll kill you like I killed your buddy.

All Sergeant Smith ever wanted was to be a police officer. When the antipolice rioters came, he and his tactical team guarded the Iowa State Capitol. They were spat on and insulted. They had frozen water bottles and rocks thrown at them. But they held the line. And when the time came, Sergeant Smith laid down his life holding a thin blue thin.

He never got to see this pro-FBI resolution. He didn't witness the uptick in police popularity as blue cities descended into violent crime. But I would imagine that the folks who loved Officer Smith must be wondering where this all was back then and why the FBI seems to matter more than State and local officers.

Of course, this isn't to say that there aren't good FBI employees. There are plenty of them. I and my Republican colleagues have made our support for law enforcement clear time and again. I would, however, like to know where our Democratic colleagues have been with respect to the blatant political bias in the leadership of the FBI and the Department of Justice.

On March 1 of 2023, Senator GRAHAM and I wrote to Attorney General Garland and Director Wray regarding the more than 130 attacks on Catholic churches since the Supreme Court decision in *Dobbs* and the fact that the FBI has largely failed to investigate those violent attacks by leftist extremist groups. Instead, as we wrote to Director Wray, elements of the FBI have labeled Catholics as extremists and lumped them together with violent White supremacists with no justification.

There is nothing extreme or suspicious about worshipping God according to the dictates of your conscience.

Our letter also pointed out that the Biden Department of Justice has aggressively targeted pro-life advocates for selective prosecution. This includes the Department's political prosecution of Mark Houck for allegedly violating the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act. He had an altercation with an abortion clinic volunteer who allegedly verbally harassed his 12-year-old son.

Even though local authorities declined to press charges, Mr. Houck was arrested—arrested at gunpoint—by the

FBI in front of his terrified family. He was eventually found not guilty by a jury after a very short deliberation.

Let's also not forget that, for many years, our Democratic colleagues politically weaponized the FBI against my and Senator JOHNSON's Biden family investigation. On July 13, 2020, then-Minority Leader SCHUMER, Senator WARNER, then-Speaker PELOSI, and then-Chairman SCHIFF sent a letter with classified attachments to the FBI. The letter targeted the Grassley-Johnson Biden family investigation to try and falsely tie it to Russian disinformation.

On July 16, 2020, mere days after the July 13 letter, then-Ranking Members WYDEN and PETERS wrote a letter to me and Senator JOHNSON asking for a briefing from the FBI's Foreign Influence Task Force. The FBI did the bidding of our Democratic colleagues and briefed us, accordingly, on August 6, 2020.

The contents of the FBI briefing were later leaked to the Washington Post, even though the FBI promised us confidentiality. The leak was just another act in a long line of efforts to falsely label the Grassley-Johnson good government oversight work as—you guessed it—Russian disinformation.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board hit the mark with their piece that they entitled "The FBI's Dubious Briefing: Did the bureau set up two GOP Senators at the behest of Democrats?"

As I noted in the last Congress, protected whistleblower disclosures to my office make clear that the FBI has within its possession very significant, very impactful, and very voluminous evidence with respect to potential criminal conduct by members of the Biden family. Based on protected whistleblower allegations, I know the FBI falsely labeled that evidence as Russian disinformation to bury it.

To date, the Biden Justice Department and the FBI haven't challenged the accuracy of these allegations. They can't because my staff has independently reviewed records to support the allegations.

And you can't forget the now-debunked Steele dossier, a document funded and created by Democrats and the Clinton campaign, a document that was actually subject to Russian disinformation. The FBI's willing and disastrous use of it to investigate candidate and then-President Trump sent our country into a tailspin for years.

So let's not kid ourselves right here, right now, as we are talking about a resolution to back law enforcement. The facts bear out that it is our Democratic colleagues who have consistently used Federal law enforcement to their political benefit, and, in the process, they have degraded the trust the American people once placed in Federal law enforcement.

Accordingly, this resolution offered by my Democratic colleagues reeks of political gamesmanship. It is not a se-

rious effort. Let's truly honor the heroes in law enforcement and the daily sacrifices they make for the American people by offering more than a tone-deaf political resolution that further divides the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator COLLINS and I are allowed to complete our remarks before the vote that is scheduled for 5:30.

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

INSULIN ACT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am really pleased to be able to come to the floor today with my cochair in the Diabetes Caucus and friend and colleague Senator COLLINS to discuss an issue that is near and dear to both of us and to the entire Diabetes Caucus, and that is what Congress can do to improve the lives of those living with this chronic disease.

More than 37 million Americans live with diabetes, and millions more are at risk for developing it. I think most people in this Chamber probably know someone who has been affected by this chronic disease, and they get a chance to see very briefly the challenges that those with diabetes face every day.

I understand those personal struggles all too well because my granddaughter Elle was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes in 2007, shortly after her 8th birthday. As a type 1 diabetic, she needs daily access to insulin. Maintaining healthy glucose levels is a worry that has kept her and her mother—her whole family—up too many nights. Without insulin, Elle would not be here because there is no alternative treatment.

There is no cure that can free her from those daily injections. Insulin truly is a lifesaving drug, and it has been for over 100 years. The 100th anniversary of insulin was 2 years ago.

When the Canadian researchers who discovered insulin realized what they had—a drug that would turn a death sentence into a manageable, chronic condition—they decided to sell the patent for \$1 each.

They knew the drug they had was revolutionary, and they chose not to chase profits over the good of humankind. Unfortunately, that is not the reality that we live with today. Over the last several decades, insulin prices have skyrocketed beyond the reach of too many Americans.

I hear from far too many people about how they have to ration their needed insulin until the next paycheck or until their insurance coverage kicks in.

Let's be clear about what this means. Americans are literally risking their lives to stretch their insulin as far as possible because the costs are so great. And the cost burden is even heavier for uninsured Americans who have to pay fully out of pocket.

These costs quickly number into the thousands of dollars. The challenges

aren't new, but, fortunately, we are making some progress. Congress last year capped Medicare beneficiaries' insulin costs at \$35 a month. And, recently, the three largest insulin manufacturers announced they will finally lower their list prices.

Now, Senator COLLINS and I have commended those manufacturers for finally taking steps to make their insulins more affordable. But until patients are given true financial security and certainty with insulin pricing, the work remains unfinished. Those manufacturers could, at any time, decide again to raise the price of insulin.

There have to be mechanisms in place to systemically address the full scope of this issue. We need to lower costs, and we need to be able to keep those costs down. Insulin costs must be addressed across the board. We must address the root causes of the high cost of insulin.

That is what brings me to the floor today, to discuss legislation that Senator COLLINS and I recently introduced: the Improving Needed Safeguards for Users of Lifesaving Insulin Now—or INSULIN—Act.

First, I want to thank my friend and colleague Senator COLLINS for her longstanding partnership and leadership. Senator COLLINS and I cochair the Diabetes Caucus, but it was Senator COLLINS who founded the caucus in 1997, years before I got here, and there is no more fearless and relentless advocate for those living with diabetes than Senator COLLINS.

We began working on the INSULIN Act in 2019, recognizing that without a comprehensive bill to address the root causes of skyrocketing insulin prices, patients would never have long-term relief. At that time, unfortunately, there weren't a lot of people in Congress who were advocating for comprehensive insulin pricing reforms.

Since then, more and more Members of Congress have begun pressing for insulin reform legislation. That is encouraging. And it is a message of the commitment in this Chamber to finally get something done on this issue.

I am glad the issue is finally getting the attention it deserves, because we are long past time for Congress to act. Our INSULIN Act takes an across-the-board approach to insulin pricing.

First, our bill caps insulin out-of-pocket costs at \$35 or 25 percent of list price monthly. That means that a patient could see monthly costs capped for as little as \$15 to \$20.

And that provision, which we did for Medicare last year, was actually something that has been promoted by the diabetes community, the JDRF—Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation—and other diabetes advocacy groups.

Second, our bill addresses one of the root causes of insulin price increases—ever-growing rebates collected by pharmacy benefit managers, or PBMs. Our bill mandates that PBMs pass 100 percent of rebates negotiated on the plan sponsors. So that benefits patients by lowering premiums.

Finally, our bill takes several steps to increase biosimilar competition, which is proven to lower list prices and improve patient access to their medications.

That includes legislation that I have championed for several years, the Ensuring Timely Access to Generics Act, which is designed to prevent pharmaceutical manufacturers from gaming the FDA's citizen petition process to delay generic drug approvals.

Now, Senator COLLINS and I have developed what we believe is a good piece of bipartisan legislation, and it has been done in consultation with drug-pricing experts and with the diabetes advocacy community.

Since 2019, we have been working on this. Last year, we invited input from lawmakers, stakeholders, and advocates, including the members of this Chamber.

This bipartisan bill is the product of countless conversations and negotiations to produce a bill that will be the most effective in lowering costs and keeping them there. And it will entice, we believe, the broadest coalition of lawmakers to get behind it.

In particular, I want to thank the American Diabetes Association, the JDRF, and the Endocrine Society for their input and for their endorsement of our legislation.

I look forward to working with the diabetes community, with Senator COLLINS, and with the rest of the Members of this Chamber and Congress to finally pass this comprehensive bill to give financial relief to all Americans living with diabetes. There is no more time to waste. And I urge the HELP Committee and Senate leadership to bring this bill to the floor as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise this evening with my colleague and dear friend Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN to discuss the compelling need to lower the cost of insulin for Americans with diabetes by reforming the system for getting the drug from the manufacturer to the consumer and by capping the out-of-pocket price.

I want to commend Senator SHAHEEN for her longstanding devotion and hard work on this issue. For her, this is both a matter of policy and personal, as she has described. And I could have no better cochair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus than my colleague from New Hampshire.

We are focused on policies that will improve the lives of those who are living with diabetes. Building on our past efforts, we have introduced a new bill, the Improving Needed Safeguards for Users of Lifesaving Insulin Now—or the INSULIN—Act of 2023.

A little background may be useful. As my colleague from New Hampshire has mentioned, when a team of three scientists at the University of Toronto

first isolated insulin in 1921, they sold the patent for \$1 each to the university—an act intended to ensure that those in need of insulin would always have an affordable access.

They explicitly stated that profit was not their goal nor their motive. And yet in recent years, the cost of insulin has soared, and insulin costs have become unaffordable for far too many individuals with diabetes.

Between 2007 and 2018, the average list price of insulin increased by 262 percent. In 2019, nearly 9 percent of patients with private insurance paid, on average, \$403 per month for their insulin.

This shows the huge increase in the list price between 2012 and 2021. This is the net price. I will explain that in a moment.

Tens of millions of Americans rely on insulin as part of their daily treatment. For children, teens, and adults with type 1 diabetes, insulin is not optional. It is literally a matter of life and death. About 20 percent of those with type 2 diabetes rely on insulin.

I have heard far too many stories from people in my State and from across the country who, because of the escalating cost, have had to ration their insulin—an extremely dangerous practice. These drastic measures can result in major risks that can compromise their health and even jeopardize their lives.

Let me share one such story. Recently, I met with Bek Hoskins of Chelsea, ME, through her advocacy with JDRF. Bek was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes at age 10. When we discussed insulin affordability, Bek shared her insulin story. As a young adult, shortly after she was no longer covered by her parents' insurance, Bek was forced to ration her insulin to make it last longer because she simply could not afford the exorbitant price.

In one profoundly memorable instance, Bek pushed her body's limit too far. Her husband, Barrett, rushed her through a snowstorm to an emergency room as she was in excruciating pain. Bek nearly died because she tried to go without her lifesaving, fast-acting insulin for 2 days.

The situation that Bek faced, sadly, is not an isolated example. We simply must address this problem.

Senator SHAHEEN and I have long led action in the Senate to improve the lives of those living with diabetes and to reduce insulin prices. We spearheaded the bipartisan INSULIN Act last Congress to comprehensively reform the system that determines the cost of this lifesaving drug. And I am pleased that the market has been responding to our efforts.

The recent decisions by the three major manufacturers of insulin to cut list prices is certainly encouraging, but there is more work to be done. We need legislation to reform the fundamental factors that distort the insulin market, including a purchasing system that is rife with perverse incentives, conflicts

of interest, and very limited biosimilar competition.

And we have introduced legislation to do just that. It would guarantee out-of-pocket limits for patients with commercial insurance, encourage biosimilar development to lower list prices through competition and reform the practices of Pharmacy Benefit Managers. That would improve the insulin market, giving patients long-term benefits.

First, our bill would limit cost sharing to no more than \$35, or 25 percent of the list price per month, starting in 2024, for at least one insulin in each type or dosage form. Under our bill, insurers and Pharmacy Benefit Managers, known as PBMs, would be prohibited from placing utilization obstacles—such as prior authorizations or step therapy—on products with capped costs. These important protections deliver immediate out-of-pocket relief.

Second, our bill would tackle the perverse incentives that encourage the high list prices. Many people wonder why price variations of a product that has been available for more than 100 years has increased dramatically, and the answer is that the market is rife with conflicts of interest and lacks transparency. What happens is the PBMs negotiate discounts from the list price to the net price of insulin.

Well, what happens to the money that is in between? There is an incentive for the pharmacy benefit manager to select the high-cost insulin because they are paying based on a percentage of the cost in many cases. So that is what you see here. A lot of the benefit of this lower net price that has been negotiated does not reach the consumer.

In 2018, as chair of the Senate Aging Committee, I held a hearing that examined the role of PBMs and rebates and the insulin supply chain and their effect on the increasing insulin prices. At the hearing, an American Diabetes Association expert displayed this chart that I am showing on the Senate floor, which is called “Insulin Supply Chain: A Complex System.” I think that understates the situation. This is so convoluted and lacks transparency that no wonder we end up with a system that is rife with conflicts of interest.

One thing is clear: The way that the rebate functions in the current market is a key factor, not in lowering the cost to the consumer but in driving up insulin costs. The way the rebate system works encourages PBMs to select a higher priced insulin for an insurer's formulary. PBMs often choose the highest cost insulin because, as I mentioned, their compensation in the form of sharing part of the rebates is based frequently on percentage of the list price.

Let me now give you one case study that involves biosimilars. Biosimilar products are generic forms of biologics like insulin. And like generics, they are lower costs. But the PBM incentive structure can be stacked against them.

For example, Sanofi manufactures a popular product called Lantus. In 2021, Viatrix launched two identical versions of its interchangeable biosimilar for Lantus. One was a branded interchangeable product with a high list price. The second was an unbranded interchangeable biosimilar with a low list price. The higher priced version of the exact same insulin-interchangeable drug was selected for formularies that are run by the insurers, while the lower price one was not.

Think about that.

This proves the perverse incentives in the system. No major formulary preferred the lower list price version, even though it is the exact same product and costs less. That is how this system operates. Rebating practices have slowed biosimilar adoption, and lower priced products are still struggling to compete. To date, no major formulary prefers the lower list price versions of the branded products.

Insulin rebates average between 30 and 50 percent and can reach as high as 70 percent for the most commonly used insulin products, significantly higher than the average rebate for other types of drugs.

Our INSULIN Act addresses the current distortions in the market that decrease affordability for patients by requiring PBMs to pass through 100 percent of the insulin rebates. By removing the PBM share of the rebate, the INSULIN Act would eliminate the incentive for PBMs to choose the higher list price product.

Finally, our bill takes a number of steps to promote biosimilar competition. More choices in the insulin market would drive down prices by creating competition.

The INSULIN Act would create a new expedited FDA pathway to promote biosimilar competition. This provision is modeled after a successful law I authored with former Senator Claire McCaskill in 2017 to improve competition for generic drugs. According to the FDA, nearly 200 products have benefited from the process we created. Let's extend that to biosimilars as the Shaheen-Collins bill would do.

The INSULIN Act would take similar steps to enhance that regulatory certainty for biosimilar drug companies. It is ironic that there is a biosimilar insulin available in Canada and Europe right now that cannot be produced for U.S. distribution because the FDA has taken nearly 10 months to reinspect the safety of the facility where the drug is being manufactured. What we want to do is expedite the regulatory process.

We know regulatory barriers are not the only challenge for biosimilars. The incentives in the current insulin market for PBMs often prohibit biosimilars from securing fair formulary placement as indicated by the example I described earlier.

One other step that our bill would take to ease some of the access challenges for biosimilar drugs is to pro-

vide CMS with the authority to approve midyear Medicare Part D formulary changes when a biosimilar enters the market.

The INSULIN Act of 2023 would address the fundamental issues facing the insulin market: convoluted and opaque rebates pocketed by PBMs, a lack of biosimilar competition, and patient affordability.

Like Senator SHAHEEN, I am so pleased that our bill has been endorsed by the American Diabetes Association, JDRF, and the Endocrine Society. I thank them for their support of this bipartisan legislation. I encourage our colleagues to join us in supporting these much needed reforms.

NOMINATION OF JOSHUA DAVID JACOBS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will vote no on the nomination of Joshua Jacobs to be Under Secretary for Benefits at VA. I will do so for reasons I have already stated publicly in the RECORD when I paused consideration of his nomination last month. I placed that hold to bring attention to serious ethical lapses and the VA's complete stonewalling of my inquiry into those issues.

Veterans Affairs, for 2 years, has chosen the path of inattention and disrespect, not just to this Senator from Iowa, but more importantly to the Senate, the people I represent, and all Americans who believe in honest government.

I began my inquiry 2 years ago into serious conflicts of interest at the VA, concerns that it had failed to protect sensitive and confidential information about publicly traded companies, and the shocking and potentially illegal—and fully documented—termination of a person the VA suspected of being a whistleblower. The VA failed to cooperate on all counts.

These are matters that are in the VA's own best interest to resolve. It doesn't do the VA or anyone else any good, and it certainly does no good for our veterans, for these serious matters to be swept under the rug.

At my request, VA's inspector general investigated the serious allegations I raised of potentially criminal conflicts of interest and confirmed them to the extent possible. However, he wasn't able to finish his investigation and determine whether criminal activity occurred because the subjects refused to cooperate. The conflicts of interest were known to senior VA officials, who did nothing to stop them and instead assured the conflicted official they would make the issue go away, and they did, until I raised my inquiry. Documents show a VA official berated the whistleblower, removed their key duties, and then fired them.

VA did not cooperate with my investigation, and that has left serious questions unanswered. It waited nearly 9 months and after four letters to respond at all, and even then, it was only to refuse to provide answers. After 2 years, we are still waiting for those answers.

And if you think this is all old news, just last month, I raised new allegations obtained by my office about potential contract irregularities at VA. It appears from public records that the VA has awarded lucrative contracts to former VA officials who resigned under ethical clouds. We need answers to that and all the other questions I have raised, and I will not stop pushing for those answers. My staff counts over 30 questions that VA to date has not fully responded to, after six oversight inquiries from my office and multiple attempts to gain their cooperation.

Mr. Jacobs, the nominee before us today, served as a senior adviser to various VA Secretaries and was there as the VA obstructed my inquiry. He had a front row seat at VA through a string of failures and crises, from the Phoenix wait list scandal, to VA's failures in processing claims for victims of sexual trauma, veterans' claims backlogs, delays in the GI Bill modernization initiative, and a host of challenges and scandals.

Mr. Jacobs has never adequately explained his role in these matters or what potential role he may have played in VA's lack of responsiveness to congressional inquiries. In addition, for reasons I explained in my public hold statement on his nomination March 14, I found his responses to my questions for the record to be woefully inadequate and evasive. Where is the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee in making sure the VA and this nominee are held accountable? After 2 years of that same pattern from the VA, the Senate should not confirm this nominee. VA can and must do better in responding to congressional inquiries and fulfilling its role of serving veterans and the American people. I will vote no.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 64, Joshua David Jacobs, of Washington, to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Charles E. Schumer, Raphael G. Warnock, Ben Ray Lujan, Tammy Duckworth, Jeff Merkley, Tim Kaine, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Jon Tester, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Angus S. King, Jr., Mazie Hirono, John W. Hickenlooper, Margaret Wood Hassan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Joshua David Jacobs, of Washington,

to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. McCONNELL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 22, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 95 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Baldwin	Graham	Padilla
Bennet	Hassan	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Hickenlooper	Romney
Boozman	Hirono	Rosen
Britt	Hoeven	Rounds
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Budd	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Capito	Kelly	Sinema
Cardin	Kennedy	Smith
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Cassidy	Lujan	Thune
Collins	Manchin	Tillis
Coons	Markey	Tuberville
Cortez Masto	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cotton	Menendez	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Cruz	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Welch
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young

NAYS—22

Braun	Lankford	Schmitt
Cornyn	Lee	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Daines	McConnell	Sullivan
Ernst	Mullin	Vance
Fischer	Paul	Wicker
Grassley	Ricketts	
Hawley	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—6

Barrasso	Feinstein	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). On this vote, the yeas are 72, the nays are 22.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from New Jersey.

DIVERSITY IN BROADCASTING

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to highlight what I consider to be a grave injustice, and I urge us to do something about it. I do so because I remain deeply concerned about an issue that often flies under the radar, which is our Nation's severe lack of diversity when it comes to broadcast station ownership.

Three years ago, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights published a report titled "The Abysmal State of Media Ownership Diversity in America." That is an apt title, especially because, according to the Federal Communications Commission—the Agency responsible for regulating broadcasters—minorities in America make up less than 3 percent of all

broadcast station owners. For women, the numbers aren't much better. They account for less than 6 percent of all station owners.

These abysmal figures from the FCC—consistently in the single digits—are unacceptable. They are an affront to the incredible diversity that makes America the exceptional Nation that it is. And simply put, we do ourselves an enormous disservice when the vast majority of TV and radio stations in America are predominantly owned by White men. This lack of diversity in broadcasting is a problem that materially affects the people I represent in New Jersey.

Even as trusted sources of local news continue to be decimated, broadcast media stations play a crucial role in educating the public. They are an invaluable source of information, a safe harbor, particularly for minority communities at a time when new consumers continue to be bombarded with misinformation and disinformation.

Very often—speaking in one element of the Hispanic community—radio is what the community turns to in the case of an emergency. During the pandemic, it is where they turned to to get trusted information about how to take care of themselves and their families. In storms, tornadoes, and hurricanes, they are the preferred entity.

So all of us in this Chamber have a duty to be responsible stewards of the public airwaves, and we do this by ensuring that the ownership of stations reflects the audiences they reach. When minority communities turn on the radio and the television, the programming should be about events in their community, very possibly in a language they understand, speaking about a culture they know, and addressing issues they care about the most. We can only achieve this by having broadcast station leaders with similar life experiences to their listeners and viewers alike.

Make no mistake, if we hope to raise the appalling numbers of minority-owned broadcast stations in America, it starts with seizing every opportunity in front of us to increase their ranks.

It is long past time that the regulators at the Federal Communications Commission prioritize diversity in broadcast ownership.

Right now, the FCC has before it the case of Soo Kim, a Korean-American entrepreneur who has applied to acquire TEGNA Broadcasting. Should the deal go through, it would make TEGNA the largest minority-owned broadcast station group in the country. However, for more than a year, this deal has been in limbo.

I am not here to speak about all the details of this deal or the pros and cons of its merits, but basic fairness dictates that the FCC should make a decision one way or another and not just veto it through, in essence, inaction. That is not the American way. A vote is a fair shot and a way to see how the Commission will react to diversity issues when they become available.

Diversity, for me, means the fullness of diversity. It means African Americans. It means Hispanic Americans. It means women. It means LGBTQ Americans. And, yes, it means Asian Americans.

We need the FCC Commissioners to commit to increasing diversity in media ownership not just in words but with actions. I, for one, will not support nominees for the FCC if they are unwilling to support diversity, including by acting in a way that denies a vote to a diverse applicant. They cannot argue that broadcast station owners should reflect their audiences, publicly saying—this is the FCC—“We need to do better.” Well, that is great. Then you miss the opportunities to expand diversity in broadcasting when it is before you.

In the past, I have tried to address this issue head on through legislation. I will continue to follow that route as well.

Last Congress, alongside Senator PETERS, I introduced a bill, the Broadcast VOICES Act, that would help address the lack of diversity in the industry through innovations in our Tax Code. Through a Federal tax incentive, our bill would ensure that women- and minority-owned stations can compete on a level playing field to provide a benefit to audiences.

It would reestablish a program in order to reincentivize broadcast ownership. I say “reincentivize” because Congress has actually done this before. During the nearly two decades that this tax incentive as outlined in the Broadcast VOICES Act was active, minority ownership and diversity in the broadcast media industry grew fivefold. It grew fivefold. So think about where it was when I referred to the earlier percentages and where we are today. This tax provision helped increase it from virtually nothing to fivefold. That is right—the number of minority owners quintupled when the incentive was in place.

So make no mistake, the task in front of us is clear. Government regulators at the FCC have identified that there is a diversity problem in broadcast ownership. As I have said, there are steps this body can take to address it through the Broadcast VOICES Act, but the FCC has its share of the burden as well. It must more than talk the talk; it must walk the walk on the issue of diversity in media ownership.

I pushed for diverse candidates at every Agency. I will continue to do so. I am hopeful that the administration seizes the opportunity before them to nominate a diverse candidate to the Federal Communications Commission because part of taking proactive steps on industry diversity is ensuring that the regulator itself is more diverse.

My first question to any FCC nominee I meet will be “What actions will you take, if confirmed, to expand diversity in broadcast ownership?” If they are a present FCC Commissioner seeking to be reestablished at the Com-

mission, voted on again to return to the Commission: “What actions have you taken to expand diversity in broadcast ownership?”

Only if we as Members press this issue will things change. It is time to afford our communities the representation in media they deserve, not just representation that others think they deserve.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JEANNE KOHL-WELLES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and congratulate Mrs. Jeanne Kohl-Welles on her retirement following 30 years of work in elected office. Jeanne retires from Washington’s King County Council, where she has served as vice chair of the council and chair of the committee of the whole and been an extraordinary asset to our State and the greater Seattle-King County region for the last 30 years.

Under Jeanne’s leadership, King County Council was able to address countless issues facing King County and its communities. From supporting our communities through the COVID pandemic by leveraging the 13 budgets she passed as budget chair, to leading the creation of the King County Regional Homeless Authority, Jeanne has been dauntless in facing down tough challenges, tackling complex problems head on to make meaningful progress for King County and its communities.

Jeanne’s devotion to King County and the State of Washington as a whole started long before her tenure on the county council. Jeanne spent over two decades in the Washington State Legislature, first in the house and then in the senate. For many of her 20 years in the Washington State Senate, Jeanne chaired the senate higher education and labor and commerce committees and led legislative efforts to legalize medical marijuana and same-sex marriage, tackle income and gender inequality, and address human trafficking and child sexual abuse. Before that, she was an early advocate for addressing hate crimes and homelessness in Seattle.

A constant theme in Jeanne’s work has been her tireless dedication to truly representing her constituents. Jeanne has organized many Women’s History Month panels; expanded access to ballot drop boxes; implemented crucial investments in youth education; and worked with constituents count-

less times to introduce legislation that matters to them, like when she worked with middle-schoolers on legislation to regulate puppy-mills. Jeanne has shown a truly exceptional ability to champion what is important to those she represents. Whether it was pushing for the construction of the current stadium for our Seattle Seahawks, sponsoring legislation to make transit safe and available to all, or securing funding for the preservation of Washington State history—from Pike Place Market to the National Historic Landmark vessel S.S. *Virginia*—time and again, Jeanne has fought for the rights, needs, and histories of Washington State and King County communities.

Being a woman in politics isn’t always easy; when I first got to the Senate, there wasn’t even a women’s bathroom off the Senate floor. Every day, we are having to fight for our most basic rights, even as we advocate for all of our constituents. But every day, women like Jeanne are setting an example for young girls that with hard work, they can follow their dreams and make a real difference. Jeanne’s retirement won’t be a quiet one; she has plans to not only spend more time with her family and travel, but also to pursue other passions.

It has been a great privilege to work with Jeanne, a true trailblazer, over the last three decades. And it is my honor to thank her for her lifetime of dedicated service to people in King County, the State of Washington, and the entire country. I wish her the very best during her well-earned retirement.

TRIBUTE TO JOE McDERMOTT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor and congratulate Mr. Joe McDermott on his retirement following 22 years of public service. Joe retires from Washington’s King County Council, where he has represented King County’s eighth district and been an extraordinary asset to our State and the greater Seattle-King County region for his many years in both the Washington State Senate and House of Representatives.

Upon joining the State legislature in 2001, Joe marked the first time more than one openly gay legislator would serve in it. During his time, he contributed to unprecedented progress for the LGBTQ+ community through the addition of sexual orientation and gender identity to our State’s antidiscrimination statutes and protections for transgender persons to our hate crime statutes, as well as recognition to domestic partnerships for same-sex couples. Joe’s contributions have forever broadened the civil rights bill and paved the way to marriage equality.

Joe has also been a pivotal leader in safeguarding public safety. As a councilmember, Joe responded to the public health crisis of gun violence by recognizing the necessity of responsible firearm policy with the 2018 King County Gun Safety Action Plan. As

chair of the King County Board of Health, Joe established the first producer-paid Secure Medicine Return Program in Washington State and second in the Nation, addressing the opiate crisis and ensuring the safe disposal of unused medicines throughout King County. In just 5 years before the program became statewide and thanks to Joe's drive and commitment, 198 drop boxes were provided across the county, and over 115 tons of drugs destroyed.

As a sponsor of the original and 2021 renewal of Executive Dow Constantine's Best Starts for Kids Levy, Joe has played a momentous role in serving more than half a million King County children, youth, young adults, and families in partnership with 500 community-based organizations. He understands, as I do, that our young people are the future and our early investments in their lives will have growing returns for years to come.

The host of community-based proposals and progress throughout his career reflect Joe's extraordinary skills in developing compromise and recognizing individualized needs, even in the most difficult of circumstances. As a champion of the Health through Housing initiative to house 1,600 of the most challenged people facing homelessness and leader for support on long range hotel motel tax revenue allocation for affordable housing and public infrastructure, Joe has never wavered from the deep responsibility and value he holds for King County's low-income people.

Joe's work has been all-encompassing. From the expansion of the light rail service and the guarantee of its equitable fare enforcement, to the addition of new water taxis to meet higher passenger capacities, to the review and approval of King County's public participation in an arena proposal for NBA basketball and NHL hockey, the lengths to which Joe will provide for our communities seem endless.

It has been a great privilege to learn and collaborate with Joe over the last two decades, and it is my honor to thank him for his dedicated service to the people of King County, the State of Washington, and across the entire country. I wish him the very best during his well-earned retirement.

FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if you thought the dangerous theatrics of the Trump years were behind us, I have some bad news. This week, Speaker MCCARTHY plans to gamble with the paychecks of millions of families, as well as the stability of our Nation's economy.

Instead of accepting one of the most basic duties of government—avoid default—Speaker MCCARTHY is choosing high stakes risk. He is threatening to default on America's debt for the first time in history unless Democrats agree

to slash funding for working families, veterans, law enforcement, and small businesses across the country.

Now it goes without saying: This proposal is going nowhere in the Senate. And KEVIN MCCARTHY knows that. So the fact that he is still moving forward with it shows that he does not know the damage he could inflict on the American people. He is willing to hold our entire economy—and the fate of millions of Americans—hostage because, as long as he keeps the most radical fringes of his party happy, KEVIN MCCARTHY has nothing to worry about. But for everyone else, a Federal debt default would be disastrous.

It would wipe out trillions of dollars in household savings; it would lead to millions of Americans losing their jobs and businesses grinding to a halt; and it would crater our economy, likely throwing us into a recession.

Now all this chaos and destruction could be avoided today, if we wanted. Congress could pass a clean bill to pay our debts on time and uphold the full faith and credit of the United States. But of course, with the MAGA majority in the House, it is never that simple. Instead of sitting down with lawmakers across the aisle to find a sensible path forward, Speaker MCCARTHY is manufacturing a crisis. And really, he is giving the American people two unacceptable options: Either suffer the consequences of a disastrous debt default, or face devastating cuts to the services and programs millions of people rely on every day.

Just look at the proposal House Republicans will vote on this week. It is nothing more than a MAGA wish list that leaves every American behind, except the top 1 percent. To start, Speaker MCCARTHY's proposal would decimate funding for our Nation's veterans. It would cut hundreds of millions of dollars for expanding veteran's care, right after we just passed the PACT Act. And it would threaten housing and food security for our Nation's heroes.

And they are not alone because Speaker MCCARTHY's proposal would also gut funding for police officers and first responders. It would wipe out nearly 30,000 law enforcement jobs within the Justice Department alone. And it would require the government to furlough every single Border Patrol agent.

Can you imagine that? For years, Republicans have been saying Democrats want to defund the police and open our borders. And yet, here they are, supporting a proposal to abandon law enforcement and weaken border security.

Additionally, Speaker MCCARTHY's proposal would ship thousands of manufacturing jobs overseas, to countries like China. And perhaps worst of all, it would punish working families who are already struggling to get by. This Republican proposal would jeopardize healthcare coverage for 10 million Americans. And it could eliminate food assistance for more than 1 million families—including children—who are at risk of going hungry.

Now, this MAGA wish list is not bad news for everyone. In fact, there is one group of people in particular who would benefit from it. Can you guess who it is? I will tell you: the ultrawealthy. Speaker MCCARTHY's proposal would actually increase our deficit by allowing billionaires to avoid paying their fair share in taxes.

And it is not like they need any help. Today, there are a thousand billionaires in America who pay an average tax rate of 8 percent. Think about that. That is a lower tax rate than most school teachers and firefighters. Then again, it shouldn't be any surprise that Speaker MCCARTHY is siding with billionaires over working families.

After all, where was he just over a week ago? Was he meeting with working families and small business owners on Main Street who are worried about keeping their doors open? No. He was on Wall Street, meeting with wealthy traders and executives of big banks. And he personally assured them that Republicans will do everything they can to cut funding for hard-working families trying to make ends meet.

Now, here is the bottom line: We can—and should—have a debate on America's tax policy and Federal budget priorities. It is a debate Democrats win because we believe in investing in working families and ensuring the wealthy pay their fair share. Plain and simple. But now is not the time nor place for this debate because in the next several weeks, we have one responsibility: avoiding debt default—and the economic calamity that would follow. That is our obligation to the American people. And it is an obligation we have never once failed to meet in 230 years.

But today, sadly, many Americans are concerned that Speaker MCCARTHY is in over his head. Frankly, I share those concerns. He is leading a caucus that traffics in chaos and brinksmanship. And it is not clear that he can control the chaos.

So here is our promise, on behalf of congressional Democrats: We are ready to get to work. Let's avoid a disastrous debt default—as we always do. And then, let's engage in a fulsome debate on Federal spending priorities. The sooner we prevent a debt default, the sooner we can come together in good faith to work on behalf of the American people.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we do a lot to protect our identity and financial security from scammers and thieves. We guard our PIN numbers and passwords. We shred bills and financial documents. We are on guard for phishing attacks and cyber scams.

But there is another, growing threat to our financial safety that many Americans are unaware of. Across the country, we are seeing a surge in armed robberies of letter carriers. In many of the attacks, the robbers steal

an “arrow key.” That is a master key that unlocks the blue collection boxes you drop your mail into, as well as cluster mailboxes in subdivisions and other multi-unit mailboxes. With an arrow key, a robber can open mailboxes and steal whatever is in there, including packages and prescription medications. And often, they steal checks. This can lead to identity theft, financial fraud, and other serious crimes.

Here is how it works: The robbers use the dark web and messaging apps to sell the stolen checks. The cyber criminals who buy the stolen checks then use nail polish remover to wash and rewrite the checks for any amount they choose. A \$15 check to your doctor can become a \$15,000 check to someone you have never heard of.

Listen to these figures from the U.S. Postal Inspection Service: Between 2018 and 2021, robberies of letter carriers more than tripled, and robberies involving a gun more than quadrupled.

And between March 2020 and February 2021, the Postal Inspection Service received 299,000 reports of mail theft, a 161-percent increase in mail thefts in just 1 year. And the problem is getting worse. In Chicago, at least a dozen postal carriers were robbed at gunpoint between early March and early April this year. Police say the robbers were armed with semi-automatic handguns. I have met with letter carriers in Chicago. They tell me they are fearful about what is happening. They worry that they could be next. And the looming threat of armed robbery is making it even harder to fill letter carrier vacancies.

And this is not just a Chicago problem. Last year in Orlando, FL, two men were caught on video approaching a letter carrier at a condo complex. The postal worker was found robbed and beaten with a severe head injury. In January of this year, a 66-year-old letter carrier was kidnapped and robbed in Charlotte, NC. The list goes on and includes nearly every State in the country. These are not simply random attacks. Police say organized crime groups and gangs appear to be driving the increase in letter carrier robberies.

We have seen something like this before. In 2011, after a similarly disturbing trend, I urged the former Postmaster General to implement a rapid alert system to inform letter carriers of any crimes committed in their vicinity. The alerts were a warning to letter carriers to be vigilant, and they helped. But now, the alerts have stopped. Now, I have serious concerns about many decisions by the current Postmaster General, but this decision seems especially wrong-headed.

Yesterday, I met in Chicago with members of the National Association of Letter Carriers' Illinois chapter. I told them that I was sending a letter to both Postmaster General Louis DeJoy and Attorney General Merrick Garland. I am asking the U.S. Postal Service and the Department of Justice to

work together to prevent robberies of letter carriers—and punish those who commit the robberies. They also need to crack down on the cyber thieves who buy and sell checks, arrow keys, and other property stolen from the Postal Service.

And the Postal Service can act right now to reduce this surge in robberies by making some simple changes on its own. They should restart crime alerts to letter carriers. USPS also can reduce the financial motivation driving many of these robberies by investing in new technology that would enable two-factor authentication for dropboxes and cluster mailboxes.

Letter carriers are proud of their long tradition of braving rain, snow, and sleet to deliver the mail. But they cannot brave this threat on their own. USPS and DOJ must step up to better protect letter carriers and the tens of millions of American families and businesses that depend on the U.S. Postal Service.

NATIONAL INFERTILITY AWARENESS WEEK

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate National Infertility Awareness Week, which since 1989 has honored the people, doctors, researchers, and others for their work in destigmatizing infertility and raising awareness of the challenges many people face when trying to start a family.

Creating life and starting and nurturing a family are, of course, foundational experiences that bring challenges, rewards, and great joy. For millions of people, however, infertility is a barrier to having children, affecting approximately one in five Americans. Thanks to the extraordinary efforts of doctors, scientists, and researchers though, our country has made great strides in helping better understand infertility and provide treatments and support for people who are struggling to start a family. Tens of thousands of children were born last year alone thanks to IVF. And organizations like Resolve: The National Infertility Association have been instrumental in supporting people who struggle with infertility, as well as raising awareness about this critical issue. Unfortunately, many couples still face financial and other barriers to using this procedure, and I urge my colleagues to consider ways that we can make it easier and more affordable for people to start a family in this way.

If we believe that everyone in our country counts and should be free to reach their full potential, then we need to do more to ensure that more Americans are able and free to start a family, so they too can partake in one of life's most rewarding journeys.

NATIONAL EDUCATION AND SHARING DAY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today, along with Senator MURKOWSKI,

to bring awareness to National Education and Sharing Day U.S.A., which we recognized on April 2, 2023. On this day, we acknowledged the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Schneerson's global campaign to educate youth about our responsibility to be a moral and compassionate society.

Education and Sharing Day is observed each year on the Rebbe's birthday in recognition of his outstanding and lasting contributions toward the improvement of education, morality, and acts of charity around the world. It is a day to pause and reflect on our responsibility to ensure our youth have the foundation necessary to lead lives rich in purpose and fulfillment through service and good works.

This year's National Education and Sharing Day coincided with the 121st birthday of the Rebbe, one of the most significant Jewish leaders of the 20th century. The Rebbe was a global spiritual leader and leading advocate for the advancement of education. He stressed that a moral and ethical education empowers every individual to develop their full potential in making the world a better place. This year's Education and Sharing Day has even greater significance as this year is also a year of “Hakhel,” a biblical event of unity, education, and spiritual growth emphasizing how every person is crucial to perfecting the world.

The basis for the continuity of any society is education, and in the great State of Alaska, the education of our youth is a priority. We recognize that in order to achieve its highest goals, education must not only impart knowledge but also help our youth learn how to live meaningful lives by strengthening their moral character to make a better life for themselves as individuals and for society as a whole. Such education can nurture the unity of diverse peoples by encouraging increased acts of goodness and kindness, imbued with the awareness that even a single positive act of an individual can change the world.

We strongly affirm the purposes of National Education and Sharing Day U.S.A. and encourage educational institutions, businesses, community and civic associations, and all people of the United States to celebrate and promote National Education and Sharing Day U.S.A.

RECOGNIZING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. GREEN BUILDING COUNCIL

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 30th anniversary of the U.S. Green Building Council—USGBC—founded in April 1993. This member-led, nonprofit organization has helped schools, businesses, cities, and even countries build and operate better buildings that transform lives. USGBC's LEED certification program, short for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, has grown to become the world's most acclaimed and

widely used green building system, with 105,000 projects in more than 185 countries.

In the United States, over 400,000 housing units and more nonresidential projects have applied this system to achieve LEED certification. In Vermont, we have achieved more than 120 certifications, and at least 91 professionals have LEED credentials. These sustainable projects include K-12 schools and higher education, offices, multifamily housing, retail, manufacturing, and additional building types. More than 5 million square feet of space have received LEED certification.

As Americans contend with rising prices and energy costs, more green buildings mean more dollars back in the pockets of small business and families. That is because research has repeatedly found that energy-efficient, lower-waste green buildings benefit the bottom line. LEED-certified buildings reduce day-to-day costs year-over-year while benefiting our climate. They help building owners lower vacancies. Plus, they improve staff well-being and productivity.

When USGBC started, there was no agreement in the marketplace on what constituted "green building," let alone any kind of accepted, codified mechanism to certify it. Now, 30 years later, USGBC has primed the market to value better-performing buildings that lower costs and waste, mitigate climate impacts, and improve health.

Congratulations to this incredible, member-led organization. Here is to another impactful 30 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CAPRI SALAAM

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to outstanding educator Capri Salaam, the 2023 Arkansas Teacher of the Year.

As a social studies teacher at North Little Rock Middle School, since 2015, Capri has become known for her innovative teaching practices, her ability to connect with students, and her efforts to stay involved in their lives even after they leave her classroom. She reflects her love for education and her students in the unique ways she connects with her class and engages with history. She also demonstrates extraordinary compassion and support beyond her classroom by investing in their well-being, ensuring students have access to ACT preparation programs, financial aid workshops, and tutoring programs in high school. As a teacher to seventh and eighth graders, she appreciates seeing students grow emotionally, physically, and mentally during this critical age as they become young adults.

Capri's dedication to the field of education is not only evident in her teaching styles, but also in her passion for continuing to learn. In addition to re-

ceiving a bachelor of arts in English from the University of Central Arkansas, Capri has a master of arts in teaching in middle school education and a master of science in special education. She is also working on earning a learning systems technology education graduate certificate from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock and is licensed to teach social studies along with English and special education.

Outside of the classroom, Capri also continuously finds ways to be involved in her community. She is a member of the Junior League of North Little Rock and volunteers for Special Olympics, the Fellowship Baptist Church Special Needs Clothes Closet, and the North Little Rock Ole Main Clean-up.

Arkansas is fortunate to have an exceptional teacher like Capri representing the many great teachers in our State, as well as serving as a role model to future generations of educators. Capri demonstrates what it means to go above and beyond for her students. I congratulate her for this achievement and the positive impact she is making on the community and the entire State. Her passion and commitment offer an excellent example for others to follow. I am confident her efforts are inspiring future generations in the classroom and beyond.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 734. An act to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of such Act in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC-1085. A communication from the President of the United States to the President

pro tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to an operation to evacuate United States personnel and others from Khartoum, Sudan, in response to the deteriorating security situation in Sudan, received during adjournment of the Senate on April 23, 2023; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 829. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to clarify a provision relating to certain contents of registrations under that Act (Rept. No. 118-13).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1256. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require certain air carriers to provide reports with respect to maintenance, preventative maintenance, or alterations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1257. A bill to authorize a new type of housing choice voucher to help achieve the goals of ending homelessness among families with children, increasing housing opportunities, and improving life outcomes of poor children; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1258. A bill to require the Director of the Office of management and Budget to submit to Congress an annual report on projects that are over budget and behind schedule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 1259. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal assistance to transit and rail projects with significant cost overruns and that are projected to lose money, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 1260. A bill to release the reversionary interest of the United States in certain non-Federal land in Salt Lake City, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. BUDD):

S. 1261. A bill to clarify the treatment of 2 or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 1262. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require Federal employee

health benefit plans to include assisted reproductive treatment benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1263. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KING, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1264. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen the drug pricing reforms in the Inflation Reduction Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1265. A bill to provide the United States District Court for the District of Columbia with original and exclusive jurisdiction over civil actions with a nationwide effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. COTTON, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1266. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BENNET, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1267. A bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1268. A bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 to strengthen research in adult education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1269. A bill to reduce the price of insulin and provide for patient protections with respect to the cost of insulin; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide funding, on a competitive basis, for summer and year-round employment opportunities for youth ages 14 through 24; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. REED):

S. 1271. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to trafficking of illicit fentanyl and its precursors by transnational criminal organizations, including cartels, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for examination and disclosure with respect to Presidential income tax returns, to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1273. A bill to require a study on Holocaust education efforts of States, local educational agencies, and public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1274. A bill to permanently exempt payments made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 1275. A bill to impose limitations on attorney fees for Federal causes of action relating to water at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit for certain youth employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1277. A bill to modify the boundary of the Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 1278. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 985 Michigan Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the "Rosa Parks Federal Building", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1279. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics to submit to Congress a report relating to individuals granted bail and pretrial release in State courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

S. 1280. A bill to require coordinated National Institute of Standards and Technology science and research activities regarding illicit drugs containing xylazine, novel synthetic opioids, and other substances of concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 1281. A bill to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1282. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a grant program to support efforts to provide fare-free transit service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1283. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to conform to the intent of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-206), as set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-599, that the National Taxpayer Advocate be able to hire and consult counsel as appropriate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. THUNE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1284. A bill to improve forecasting and understanding of tornadoes and other hazardous weather, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 1285. A bill to direct the National Center for Education Statistics to produce an annual report on indicators of school crime and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 1286. A bill to amend the Siletz Reservation Act to address the hunting, fishing, trapping, and animal gathering activities of the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

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

S. 1287. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to address the hunting, fishing, trapping, and animal gathering activities of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

S. 1288. A bill to ensure that contractors of the Department of Agriculture comply with certain labor laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. MORAN):

S.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Adverse Effect Wage Rate Methodology for the Temporary Employment of H-2A Nonimmigrants in Non-Range Occupations in the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 170. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 171. A resolution congratulating the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers women's basketball team for winning the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Tournament Championship; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 172. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on Ukrainian victory; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 173. A resolution recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 82

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to protect social security benefits and military pay and require that the United States Government to prioritize all obligations on the debt held by the public in the event that the debt limit is reached.

S. 106

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 106, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to States to improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 132, a bill to require a pilot program on activities under the pre-separation transition process of members of the Armed Forces for a reduction in suicide among veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 138

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 138, a bill to amend the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 to modify certain provisions of that Act.

S. 141

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from

Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 141, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for home and community based services for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 154

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 154, a bill to prevent the theft of catalytic converters and other precious metal car parts, and for other purposes.

S. 185

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 185, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the program for direct housing loans made to Native American veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 229

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 229, a bill to require SelectUSA to coordinate with State-level economic development organizations to increase foreign direct investment in semiconductor-related manufacturing and production.

S. 234

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 234, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 305

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 305, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the United States Marine Corps, and to support programs at the Marine Corps Heritage Center.

S. 326

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 326, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a study and clinical trials on the effects of cannabis on certain health outcomes of veterans with chronic pain and post-traumatic stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 359

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as

a cosponsor of S. 359, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 380

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 380, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish the distribution of fentanyl resulting in death as felony murder.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 453, a bill to prohibit the implementation of new requirements to report bank account deposits and withdrawals.

S. 537

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 537, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes.

S. 547

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 547, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 596, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for neighborhood revitalization, and for other purposes.

S. 663

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 663, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 775

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to provide for

increased transparency in generic drug applications.

S. 785

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 785, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid Vapor Pressure under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 866, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax benefits for research activities.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for the purchase of certain new electric bicycles.

S. 886

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 886, a bill to authorize the location of a monument on the National Mall to commemorate and honor the women's suffrage movement and the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution, and for other purposes.

S. 967

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 967, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to limit the ability of Federal Reserve banks to issue central bank digital currency.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to address the impact of climate change on agriculture, and for other purposes.

S. 1027

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1027, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to the People's Republic of China if the People's Liberation Army initiates a military invasion of Taiwan.

S. 1077

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1077, a bill to establish a home-based telemental health care demonstration program for purposes of increasing mental health and substance use services in rural medically underserved populations and for individuals in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations.

S. 1111

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1111, a bill to enhance United States civil nuclear leadership, support the licensing of advanced nuclear technologies, strengthen the domestic nuclear energy fuel cycle and supply chain, and improve the regulation of nuclear energy, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to identify obstacles to identifying and responding to reports of children missing from foster care and other vulnerable foster youth, to provide technical assistance relating to the removal of such obstacles, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to reauthorize and update the Project Safe Childhood program, and for other purposes.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to improve financial stability, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1183, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of mental or physical disability in cases of organ transplants.

S. 1194

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1194, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out certain activities to improve recycling and composting programs in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to reform the labor laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1204

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1204, a bill to

allow veterans to use, possess, or transport medical marijuana and to discuss the use of medical marijuana with a physician of the Department of Veterans Affairs as authorized by a State or Indian Tribe, and for other purposes.

S. 1206

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1206, a bill to amend the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 to protect civil rights and otherwise prevent meaningful harm to third parties, and for other purposes.

S. 1220

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1220, a bill to establish the position of Special Envoy to the Pacific Islands Forum.

S. 1237

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1237, a bill to restore the exemption of family farms and small businesses from the definition of assets under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S.J. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 15, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Commerce relating to "Procedures Covering Suspension of Liquidation, Duties and Estimated Duties in Accord With Presidential Proclamation 10414".

S.J. RES. 22

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 22, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Waivers and Modifications of Federal Student Loans".

S. RES. 74

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 74, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of the Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 128, a resolution condemning the Russian Federation's kidnapping of Ukrainian children.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1268. A bill to amend the Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002 and the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 to strengthen research in adult education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I am pleased to introduce the bipartisan Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act with my colleague, Senator Young. We are in urgent need of identifying and disseminating innovative and effective methods for supporting adult learners. Our legislation will ensure that there is a strong research base to improve educational programs for adults seeking to advance their literacy, numeracy, and digital and information literacy skills.

The most recent data from the Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies show an urgent need for action in adult education, with an estimated 18 percent of adults ages 16 to 65 in the United States performing at the lowest levels of literacy; 28 percent at the lowest levels of numeracy; and 23 percent at the lowest levels of digital problem solving. This is a dire situation. These are essential skills for postsecondary education and the workplace. Beyond their value in the labor market, these skills are also correlated with health and civic participation, making adult education critically important to the health and well-being of our people, our economy, and our democracy.

In Rhode Island, it is estimated that more than 84,000 working-age adults have less than a high school education. Nearly 65,000 have limited English proficiency. Yet we are reaching just over 5,000 through the current adult education program. Clearly, we need more resources and innovative, research-based ways to reach more people.

The Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act will provide a critical foundation for improving the effectiveness and reach of adult education programs by ensuring that adult education is included in our national education research priorities. Specifically, the Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act will amend the Education Sciences Reform Act to require the Institute for Education Sciences and the National Center for Education Statistics to collect data and carry out research on successful State and local adult education and literacy activities, the characteristics and academic achievement of adult learners, and access to and opportunity for adult education, including digital and information literacy skills development, in communities across the country. It will also ensure that the Institute of Education Sciences draws on the expertise of adult educators when developing policies and priorities. Finally, the legislation will require that at least one research center focus on adult education.

These straightforward amendments to the Education Sciences Reform Act

will go a long way to strengthening the research base that will support the improvement of adult education across the country. I was pleased to work with the adult education community and particularly the Coalition on Adult Basic Education and the National Coalition for Literacy in developing this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support the Strengthening Research in Adult Education Act and to work with me to ensure that its provisions are included in the reauthorization of the Education Sciences Reform Act.

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

S. 1270. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide funding, on a competitive basis, for summer and year-round employment opportunities for youth ages 14 through 24; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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. 1270

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 “Assisting in Developing Youth Employment Act” or the “AID Youth Employment Act”.

SEC. 2. YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES.

Title I of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subtitle E (29 U.S.C. 3241 et seq.) as subtitle F; and

(2) by inserting after subtitle D (29 U.S.C. 3221 et seq.) the following:

“Subtitle E—Youth Employment Opportunities

“SEC. 176. DEFINITIONS.

“In this subtitle:

“(1) ELIGIBLE YOUTH.—The term ‘eligible youth’ means an individual who—

“(A) is not younger than age 14 or older than age 24; and

“(B) is—

“(i) an in-school youth;

“(ii) an out-of-school youth; or

“(iii) an unemployed individual.

“(2) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The terms ‘Indian tribe’ and ‘tribal organization’ have the meanings given the terms in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(3) IN-SCHOOL YOUTH; OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH.—The terms ‘in-school youth’ and ‘out-of-school youth’ have the meanings given the terms in section 129(a)(1).

“(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001). (A)

“(5) MARGINALIZED.—The term ‘marginalized’, used with respect to an individual, includes individuals who are homeless, in foster care, involved in the juvenile or criminal justice system, or are not enrolled in or at risk of dropping out of an educational institution and who live in an underserved community that has faced trauma through acute or long-term exposure to sub-

stantial discrimination, historical or cultural oppression, intergenerational poverty, civil unrest, a high rate of violence, or a high rate of drug overdose mortality.

“(6) SUBSIDIZED EMPLOYMENT.—The term ‘subsidized employment’ means employment for which the employer receives a total or partial subsidy to offset costs of employing an eligible youth under this subtitle.

“(7) TRIBAL AREA.—The term ‘tribal area’ means—

“(A) an area on or adjacent to an Indian reservation;

“(B) land held in trust by the United States for Indians;

“(C) a public domain Indian allotment;

“(D) a former Indian reservation in Oklahoma; and

“(E) land held by an incorporated Native group, Regional Corporation, or Village Corporation under the provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.).

“(8) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term ‘tribal college or university’ has the meaning given the term ‘Tribal College or University’ in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).

“(9) TRIBALLY DESIGNATED HOUSING ENTITY.—The term ‘tribally designated housing entity’, used with respect to an Indian tribe (as defined in this section), has the meaning given in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

“SEC. 176A. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

“(a) ALLOCATION.—Of the funds appropriated under section 176E that remain available after any reservation under subsection (b), the Secretary may make available—

“(1) not more than \$1,800,000,000 in accordance with section 176B to provide eligible youth with subsidized summer employment opportunities; and

“(2) not more than \$2,400,000,000 in accordance with section 176C to provide eligible youth with subsidized year-round employment opportunities.

“(b) RESERVATION.—The Secretary may reserve not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated under section 176E to provide technical assistance and oversight, in order to assist eligible entities in applying for and administering grants awarded under this subtitle.

“SEC. 176B. SUMMER EMPLOYMENT COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) GRANTS.—Using the amounts made available under 176A(a)(1), the Secretary shall award, on a competitive basis, planning and implementation grants.

“(2) GENERAL USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall award the grants to assist eligible entities by paying for the program share of the cost of—

“(A) in the case of a planning grant, planning a summer youth employment program to provide subsidized summer employment opportunities; and

“(B) in the case of an implementation grant, implementation of such a program, to provide such opportunities.

“(b) PERIODS AND AMOUNTS OF GRANTS.—

“(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—The Secretary may award a planning grant under this section for a 1-year period, in an amount of not more than \$250,000.

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The Secretary may award an implementation grant under this section for a 3-year period, in an amount of not more than \$6,000,000.

“(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a planning or implementation grant under this section, an entity shall—

“(A) be a—

“(i) State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization, that meets the requirements of paragraph (2); or

“(ii) community-based organization that meets the requirements of paragraph (3); and

“(B) meet the requirements for a planning or implementation grant, respectively, specified in paragraph (4).

“(2) **GOVERNMENT PARTNERSHIPS.**—An entity that is a State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization referred to in paragraph (1) shall demonstrate that the entity has entered into a partnership with State, local, or tribal entities—

“(A) that shall include—

“(i) a local educational agency or tribal educational agency (as defined in section 6132 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7452));

“(ii) a local board or tribal workforce development agency;

“(iii) a State, local, or tribal agency serving youth under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system;

“(iv) a State, local, or tribal child welfare agency;

“(v) a State, local, or tribal agency or community-based organization, with—

“(I) expertise in providing counseling services, and trauma-informed and gender-responsive trauma prevention, identification, referral, and support (including treatment) services; and

“(II) a proven track record of serving low-income vulnerable youth and out-of-school youth; and

“(vi) if the State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization is seeking an implementation grant, and has not established a summer youth employment program, an entity that is carrying out a State, local, or tribal summer youth employment program; and

“(vii) an employer or employer association; and

“(B) that may include—

“(i) an institution of higher education or tribal college or university;

“(ii) a representative of a labor or labor-management organization;

“(iii) an entity that carries out a program that receives funding under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) or section 212 of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17532);

“(iv) a collaborative applicant as defined in section 401 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11360) or a private nonprofit organization that serves homeless individuals and households (including such an applicant or organization that serves individuals or households that are at risk of homelessness in tribal areas) or serves foster youth;

“(v) an entity that carries out a program funded under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.), including Native American programs funded under section 116 of that Act (20 U.S.C. 2326) and tribally controlled post-secondary career and technical institution programs funded under section 117 of that Act (20 U.S.C. 2327);

“(vi) a local or tribal youth committee;

“(vii) a State or local public housing agency or a tribally designated housing entity; and

“(viii) another appropriate State, local, or tribal agency.

“(3) **COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION PARTNERSHIPS.**—A community-based organization referred to in paragraph (1) shall demonstrate that the organization has entered into a partnership with State, local, or tribal entities—

“(A) that shall include—

“(i) a unit of general local government or tribal government;

“(ii) an agency described in paragraph (2)(A)(i);

“(iii) a local board or tribal workforce development agency;

“(iv) a State, local, or tribal agency serving youth under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system or criminal justice system;

“(v) a State, local, or tribal child welfare agency;

“(vi) if the organization is seeking an implementation grant, and has not established a summer youth employment program, an entity that is carrying out a State, local, or tribal summer youth employment program; and

“(vii) an employer or employer association; and

“(B) that may include one or more entities described in paragraph (2)(B).

“(4) **ENTITIES ELIGIBLE FOR PARTICULAR GRANTS.**—

“(A) **ENTITIES ELIGIBLE FOR PLANNING GRANTS.**—The Secretary may award a planning grant under this section to an eligible entity that—

“(i) is preparing to establish or expand a summer youth employment program that meets the minimum requirements specified in subsection (d); and

“(ii) has not received a grant under this section.

“(B) **ENTITIES ELIGIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may award an implementation grant under this section to an eligible entity that—

“(I) has received a planning grant under this section; or

“(II) has established a summer youth employment program and demonstrates a minimum level of capacity to enhance or expand the summer youth employment program described in the application submitted under subsection (d).

“(ii) **CAPACITY.**—In determining whether an entity has the level of capacity referred to in clause (i)(II), the Secretary may include as capacity—

“(I) the entity's staff capacity and staff training to deliver youth employment services; and

“(II) the entity's existing youth employment services (as of the date of submission of the application submitted under subsection (d)) that are consistent with the application.

“(d) **APPLICATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an eligible entity desiring to receive a grant under this section for a summer youth employment program shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including, at a minimum, each of the following:

“(A) With respect to an application for a planning or implementation grant—

“(i) a description of the eligible youth for whom summer employment services will be provided;

“(ii) a description of the eligible entity, and a description of the expected participation and responsibilities of each of the partners in the partnership described in subsection (c);

“(iii) information demonstrating sufficient need for the grant in the State, local, or tribal population, which may include information showing—

“(I) a high level of unemployment among youth (including young adults) ages 14 through 24;

“(II) a high rate of out-of-school youth;

“(III) a high rate of homelessness;

“(IV) a high rate of poverty;

“(V) a high rate of adult unemployment;

“(VI) a high rate of community or neighborhood crime;

“(VII) a high rate of violence; or

“(VIII) a high level or rate on another indicator of need;

“(iv) a description of the strategic objectives the eligible entity seeks to achieve through the program to provide eligible youth with core work readiness skills, which may include—

“(I) financial literacy skills, including providing the support described in section 129(b)(2)(D);

“(II) sector-based technical skills aligned with employer needs;

“(III) skills that—

“(aa) are soft employment skills, early work skills, or work readiness skills; and

“(bb) include social skills, communications skills, higher-order thinking skills, self-control, and positive self-concept; and

“(IV) (for the marginalized eligible youth) basic skills like communication, math, and problem solving in the context of training for advancement to better jobs and postsecondary training; and

“(v) information demonstrating that the eligible entity has obtained commitments to provide the non-program share described in paragraph (2) of subsection (h).

“(B) With respect to an application for a planning grant—

“(i) a description of the intermediate and long-term goals for planning activities for the duration of the planning grant;

“(ii) a description of how grant funds will be used to develop a plan to provide summer employment services for eligible youth;

“(iii) a description of how the eligible entity will carry out an analysis of best practices for identifying, recruiting, and engaging program participants, in particular the marginalized eligible youth;

“(iv) a description of how the eligible entity will carry out an analysis of best practices for placing youth participants—

“(I) in opportunities that—

“(aa) are appropriate subsidized employment opportunities with employers based on factors including age, skill, experience, career aspirations, work-based readiness, and barriers to employment; and

“(bb) may include additional services for participants, including core work readiness skill development and mentorship services;

“(II) in summer employment that—

“(aa) is not less than 6 weeks;

“(bb) follows a schedule of not more than 20 hours per week;

“(cc) pays wages at rates not less than the applicable Federal, State, or local minimum wage rate; and

“(dd) for employment involving construction, pays wages at rates not less than those previously on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Davis-Bacon Act’); and

“(v) a description of how the eligible entity plans to develop a mentorship program or connect youth with positive, supportive mentorships, consistent with paragraph (3).

“(C) With respect to an application for an implementation grant—

“(i) a description of how the eligible entity plans to identify, recruit, and engage program participants, in particular the marginalized eligible youth;

“(ii) a description of the manner in which the eligible entity plans to place eligible youth participants in subsidized employment opportunities, and in summer employment, described in subparagraph (B)(iv);

“(iii) (for a program serving the marginalized eligible youth), a description of workplaces for the subsidized employment

involved, which may include workplaces in the public, private, and nonprofit sectors;

“(iv) a description of how the eligible entity plans to provide or connect eligible youth participants with positive, supportive mentorships, consistent with paragraph (3);

“(v) a description of services that will be available to employers participating in the youth employment program, to provide supervisors involved in the program with coaching and mentoring on—

“(I) how to support youth development;

“(II) how to structure learning and reflection; and

“(III) how to deal with youth challenges in the workplace;

“(vi) a description of how the eligible entity plans to offer structured pathways back into employment and a youth employment program under this section for eligible youth who have been terminated from employment or removed from the program;

“(vii) a description of how the eligible entity plans to engage eligible youth beyond the duration of the summer employment opportunity, which may include—

“(I) developing or partnering with a year-round youth employment program;

“(II) referring eligible youth to other year-round programs, which may include—

“(aa) programs funded under section 176C or the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.);

“(bb) after school programs;

“(cc) secondary or postsecondary education programs;

“(dd) training programs;

“(ee) cognitive behavior therapy programs;

“(ff) apprenticeship programs; and

“(gg) national service programs;

“(III) employing a full-time, permanent staff person who is responsible for youth outreach, followup, and recruitment; or

“(IV) connecting eligible youth with job development services, including career counseling, resume and job application assistance, interview preparation, and connections to job leads;

“(viii) evidence of the eligible entity’s capacity to provide the services described in this subsection; and

“(ix) a description of the quality of the summer youth employment program, including a program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential.

“(2) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—An eligible entity that is an Indian tribe or tribal organization and desires to receive a grant under this section for a summer youth employment program may, in lieu of submitting the application described in paragraph (1), submit an application to the Secretary that meets such requirements as the Secretary develops after consultation with the tribe or organization.

“(3) MENTOR.—For purposes of subparagraphs (B)(iv), (B)(v), and (C)(iv) of paragraph (1), a mentor—

“(A) shall be an individual who has been matched with an eligible youth based on the youth’s needs;

“(B) shall make contact with the eligible youth at least once each week;

“(C) shall be a trusted member of the local community; and

“(D) may include—

“(i) a mentor trained in trauma-informed care (including provision of trauma-informed trauma prevention, identification, referral, or support services to youth that have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma), conflict resolution, and positive youth development;

“(ii) a job coach trained to provide youth with guidance on how to navigate the workplace and troubleshoot problems;

“(iii) a supervisor trained to provide at least two performance assessments and serve as a reference; or

“(iv) a peer mentor who is a former or current participant in the youth employment program involved.

“(e) AWARDS FOR POPULATIONS AND AREAS.—

“(1) POPULATIONS.—The Secretary shall reserve, from the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(1)—

“(A) 50 percent to award grants under this section for planning or provision of subsidized summer employment opportunities for in-school youth; and

“(B) 50 percent to award such grants to plan for planning or provision of such opportunities for out-of-school youth.

“(2) AREAS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In awarding the grants, the Secretary shall consider the regional diversity of the areas to be served, to ensure that urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas are receiving grant funds.

“(B) RURAL AND TRIBAL AREA INCLUSION.—

“(i) RURAL AREAS.—Not less than 20 percent of the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(1) for each fiscal year shall be made available for activities to be carried out in rural areas.

“(ii) TRIBAL AREAS.—Not less than 5 percent of the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(1) for each fiscal year shall be made available for activities to be carried out in tribal areas.

“(f) PROGRAM PRIORITIES.—In allocating funds under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to eligible entities—

“(1) who propose to coordinate their activities—

“(A) with local or tribal employers; and

“(B) with agencies described in subsection (c)(2)(A)(i) to ensure the summer youth employment programs provide clear linkages to remedial, academic, and occupational programs carried out by the agencies;

“(2) who propose a plan to increase private sector engagement in, and job placement through, summer youth employment; and

“(3) who have, in their counties, States, or tribal areas (as compared to other counties in their State, other States, or other tribal areas, respectively), a high level or rate described in subsection (d)(1)(A)(iii).

“(g) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may use the grant funds for services described in subsection (d).

“(2) DISCRETIONARY USES.—The eligible entity may also use the funds—

“(A) to provide wages to eligible youth in subsidized summer employment programs;

“(B) to provide eligible youth with support services, including case management, child care assistance, child support services, and transportation assistance; and

“(C) to develop data management systems to assist with programming, evaluation, and records management.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—An eligible entity may reserve not more than 10 percent of the grant funds for the administration of activities under this section.

“(4) CARRY-OVER AUTHORITY.—Any amounts provided to an eligible entity under this section for a fiscal year may, at the discretion of the Secretary, remain available to that entity for expenditure during the succeeding fiscal year to carry out programs under this section.

“(h) PROGRAM SHARE.—

“(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—The program share for a planning grant awarded under this section shall be 100 percent of the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(A).

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The program share for an implementation grant awarded under this section shall be 50 percent of the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(B).

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Secretary—

“(i) may increase the program share for an eligible entity; and

“(ii) shall increase the program share for an Indian tribe or tribal organization to not less than 95 percent of the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(B).

“(C) NON-PROGRAM SHARE.—The eligible entity may provide the non-program share of the cost—

“(i) in cash or in-kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services; and

“(ii) from State, local, tribal or private (including philanthropic) sources and, in the case of an Indian tribe or tribal organization, from Federal sources.

“SEC. 176C. YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) GRANTS.—Using the amounts made available under 176A(a)(2), the Secretary shall award, on a competitive basis, planning and implementation grants.

“(2) GENERAL USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall award the grants to assist eligible entities by paying for the program share of the cost of—

“(A) in the case of a planning grant, planning a year-round youth employment program to provide subsidized year-round employment opportunities; and

“(B) in the case of an implementation grant, implementation of such a program to provide such opportunities.

“(b) PERIODS AND AMOUNTS OF GRANTS.—The planning grants shall have the periods and amounts described in section 176B(b)(1). The implementation grants shall have the periods and grants described in section 176B(b)(2).

“(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a planning or implementation grant under this section, an entity shall, except as provided in paragraph (2)—

“(A) be a—

“(i) State, local government, or Indian tribe or tribal organization, that meets the requirements of section 176B(c)(2); or

“(ii) community-based organization that meets the requirements of section 176B(c)(3); and

“(B) meet the requirements for a planning or implementation grant, respectively, specified in section 176B(c)(4).

“(2) YEAR-ROUND YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any reference in section 176B(c)—

“(A) to a summer youth employment program shall be considered to refer to a year-round youth employment program; and

“(B) to a provision of section 176B shall be considered to refer to the corresponding provision of this section.

“(d) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an eligible entity desiring to receive a grant under this section for a year-round youth employment program shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including, at a minimum, each of the following:

“(A) With respect to an application for a planning or implementation grant, the information and descriptions specified in section 176B(d)(1)(A).

“(B) With respect to an application for a planning grant, the descriptions specified in section 176B(d)(1)(B), except that the description of an analysis for placing youth in employment described in clause (iv)(II)(bb) of

that section shall cover employment that follows a schedule—

“(i) that consists of—

“(I) not more than 15 hours per week for in-school youth; and

“(II) not less than 20 and not more than 40 hours per week for out-of-school youth; and

“(ii) that depends on the needs and work-readiness level of the population being served.

“(C) With respect to an application for an implementation grant, the descriptions and evidence specified in section 176B(d)(1)(C)—

“(i) except that the reference in section 176B(d)(1)(C)(ii) to employment described in section 176B(d)(1)(B) shall cover employment that follows the schedule described in subparagraph (B); and

“(ii) except that the reference to programs in clause (vii)(II)(aa) of that section shall be considered to refer only to programs funded under the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.).

“(D) With respect to an application for an implementation grant—

“(i) a description of how the eligible entity plans to provide mental health services, as needed, to eligible youth participants; and

“(ii) a description of how the eligible entity plans to address barriers to participation among eligible youth, including providing transportation and child care.

“(2) INDIAN TRIBE; TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—An eligible entity that is an Indian tribe or tribal organization and desires to receive a grant under this section for a year-round youth employment program may, in lieu of submitting the application described in paragraph (1), submit an application to the Secretary that meets such requirements as the Secretary develops after consultation with the tribe or organization.

“(3) MENTOR.—For purposes of paragraph (1), any reference in subparagraphs (B)(iv), (B)(v), and (C)(iv) of section 176B(d)(1) to a mentor shall be considered to refer to a mentor who—

“(A) shall be an individual described in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 176B(d)(3);

“(B) shall make contact with the eligible youth at least twice each week; and

“(C) may be an individual described in section 176B(d)(3)(D).

“(4) YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, any reference in section 176B(d)—

“(A) to summer employment shall be considered to refer to year-round employment; and

“(B) to a provision of section 176B shall be considered to refer to the corresponding provision of this section.

“(e) AWARDS FOR POPULATIONS AND AREAS; PRIORITIES.—

“(1) POPULATIONS.—The Secretary shall reserve, from the amounts made available under section 176A(a)(2)—

“(A) 50 percent to award grants under this section for planning or provision of subsidized year-round employment opportunities for in-school youth; and

“(B) 50 percent to award such grants to plan for planning or provision of such opportunities for out-of-school youth.

“(2) AREAS; PRIORITIES.—In awarding the grants, the Secretary shall—

“(A) carry out section 176B(e)(2); and

“(B) give priority to eligible entities—

“(i) who—

“(I) propose the coordination and plan described paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 176B(f), with respect to year-round youth employment; and

“(II) meet the requirements of section 176B(f)(3); or

“(ii) who—

“(I) propose a plan to coordinate activities with entities carrying out State, local, or tribal summer youth employment programs, to provide pathways to year-round employment for eligible youth who are ending summer employment; and

“(II) meet the requirements of section 176B(f)(3).

“(f) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may use the grant funds—

“(1) for services described in subsection (d);

“(2) as described in section 176B(g)(2), with respect to year-round employment programs;

“(3) as described in section 176B(g)(3), with respect to activities under this section; and

“(4) at the discretion of the Secretary, as described in section 176B(g)(4), with respect to activities under this section.

“(g) PROGRAM SHARE.—

“(1) PLANNING GRANTS.—The provisions of section 176B(h)(1) shall apply to planning grants awarded under this section, with respect to the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(A).

“(2) IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.—The provisions of section 176B(h)(2) shall apply to implementation grants awarded under this section, with respect to the cost described in subsection (a)(2)(B).

“SEC. 176D. EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

“(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish performance measures for purposes of carrying out annual reviews under subsection (b) and of developing and implementing a system of continuous quality improvement under subsection (c).

“(2) COMPONENTS.—The performance measures for the eligible entities shall consist of—

“(A) the indicators of performance described in paragraph (3); and

“(B) an adjusted level of performance for each indicator described in subparagraph (A).

“(3) INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The indicators of performance shall consist of—

“(i) the percentage of youth employment program participants who are in education or training activities, or in employment, during the second quarter after exit from the program;

“(ii) the percentage of youth employment program participants who are in education or training activities, or in employment, during the fourth quarter after exit from the program;

“(iii) the percentage of youth employment program participants who obtain a recognized postsecondary credential, or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent (subject to subparagraph (B)), during participation in or within 1 year after exit from the program; and

“(iv) the percentage of youth employment program participants who, during a program year, are in a youth employment program that includes an education or training program that leads to an outcome specified by the Secretary, which may include—

“(I) obtaining a recognized postsecondary credential or employment; or

“(II) achieving measurable skill gains toward such a credential or employment.

“(B) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), youth employment program participants who obtain a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted as meeting the criterion under such subparagraph only if such participants, in addition to obtaining such diploma or its recognized equivalent, have obtained or retained employment or are in a youth employment program that includes an education or training program leading to a

recognized postsecondary credential within 1 year after exit from the program.

“(4) LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each eligible entity, there shall be established, in accordance with this paragraph, levels of performance for each of the corresponding indicators of performance described in paragraph (3).

“(B) IDENTIFICATION IN APPLICATION.—Each eligible entity shall identify, in the application submitted under subsection (d) of section 176B or 176C, expected levels of performance for each of those indicators of performance for each program year covered by the application.

“(C) AGREEMENT ON ADJUSTED LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE.—The eligible entity shall reach agreement with the Secretary on levels of performance for each of those indicators of performance for each such program year. The levels agreed to shall be considered to be the adjusted levels of performance for the eligible entity for such program years and shall be incorporated into the application prior to the approval of such application.

“(b) ANNUAL REVIEW.—The Secretary shall carry out an annual review of each eligible entity receiving a grant under this subtitle. In conducting the review, the Secretary shall review the performance of the entity on the performance measures under this section and determine if the entity has used any practices that shall be considered best practices for purposes of this subtitle.

“(c) CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in addition to conducting the annual review, develop and implement a system of continuous quality improvement designed to improve the quality of activities carried out under this subtitle.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—In implementing the system, the Secretary shall carry out activities including—

“(A) using the performance measures established under this section, to assess the quality of employment programs funded under sections 176B and 176C and providing the eligible entities carrying out those programs with continuing feedback on their performance on those measures;

“(B) creating improvement plans to address quality issues concerning the employment programs;

“(C) providing targeted support (including technical assistance and training) to staff of the eligible entities on improving the quality of the employment programs in areas where the system demonstrates that improvements are needed; and

“(D) publishing and disseminating information on the quality of the employment programs.

“(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) PREPARATION.—The Secretary shall prepare a report on the grant programs established by this subtitle, which report shall include a description of—

“(A) the eligible entities receiving funding under this subtitle;

“(B) the activities carried out by the eligible entities;

“(C) how the eligible entities were selected to receive funding under this subtitle;

“(D) an assessment of the results achieved by the grant programs including findings from the annual reviews conducted under subsection (b); and

“(E) a description of the development and implementation of, and outcomes from, the system of continuous quality improvement described in subsection (c).

“(2) SUBMISSION.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the AID

Youth Employment Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report described in paragraph (1) to the appropriate committees of Congress.

“(e) APPLICATION TO INDIAN TRIBES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary may issue regulations that clarify the application of all the provisions of this subtitle to Indian tribes and tribal organizations.

“SEC. 176E. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated—

“(1) to carry out section 176B, \$375,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2028; and

“(2) to carry out section 176C, \$500,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2028.”.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) REFERENCES.—

(1) Section 121(b)(1)(C)(ii)(II) of the Workforce Investment and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)(C)(ii)(II)) is amended by striking “subtitles C through E” and inserting “subtitles C through F”.

(2) Section 503(b) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3343(b)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: “(as such subtitles were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act)”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking the item relating to the subtitle heading for subtitle E of title I and inserting the following:

“Subtitle E—Youth Employment Opportunities

“Sec. 176. Definitions.

“Sec. 176A. Allocation of funds.

“Sec. 176B. Summer employment competitive grant program.

“Sec. 176C. Year-round employment competitive grant program.

“Sec. 176D. Evaluation and administration.

“Sec. 176E. Authorization of appropriations.”.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 1275. A bill to impose limitations on attorney fees for Federal causes of action relating to water at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 1275

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 “Protect Access to Justice for Veterans Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEY FEES FOR FEDERAL CAUSE OF ACTION RELATING TO WATER AT CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA.

Section 804 of the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022 (Public Law 117–168; 28 U.S.C. 2671 note prec.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) ATTORNEY FEES.—

“(1) LIMITATIONS.—No legal representative of an individual who brings an action under subsection (b) or who presents a claim under section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, pursuant to subsection (h) shall charge, demand, receive, or collect for services ren-

dered in bringing such action or presenting such claim, fees in excess of—

“(A) 20 percent of an award, compromise, or settlement made or reached within 180 days after presenting a claim under section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, pursuant to subsection (h); and

“(B) 33.3 percent on a claim that is resolved by settlement, compromise, or judgment after the initiation of an action.

“(2) TERMS FOR PAYMENT OF FEES.—Any judgment rendered, settlement entered, compromise made, or other award made with respect to an action brought under subsection (b) or a claim presented under section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, pursuant to subsection (h) by a legal representative of an individual shall require the following:

“(A) All funds from the judgment, settlement, compromise, or other award shall be deposited into an account held in trust for the individual in accordance with all applicable provisions of State law.

“(B) The legal representative shall—

“(i) once any funds described in subparagraph (A) have been deposited into an account pursuant to such subparagraph, notify the individual of such deposit; and

“(ii) promptly deliver to such individual such amount of such funds as the individual is entitled to receive.

“(C) That no funds shall be paid from the account described in subparagraph (A) to a legal representative of the individual as compensation for services rendered to such individual until the relevant funds from such account have been disbursed to the individual in accordance with subparagraph (B).

“(3) PENALTIES.—

“(A) FEE LIMITATIONS.—Any legal representative who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with an action under subsection (b) or a claim under section 2675 of title 28, United States Code, pursuant to subsection (h), any amount in excess of that allowed under paragraph (1) of this subsection, if recovery be had, shall be fined not more than \$5,000.

“(B) TERMS FOR PAYMENT.—Failure of a legal representative subject to paragraph (2) to comply with a requirement of such paragraph shall be punishable consistent with the penalties provided in section 2678 of title 28, United States Code.

“(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to annul, alter, affect, or exempt any person from complying with the laws of any State or locality with respect to the practice of law, except to the extent that those laws are inconsistent with any provision of this subsection, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.”.

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

S. 1276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the work opportunity credit for certain youth employees; to the Committee on Finance.

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. 1276

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 “Helping to Encourage Real Opportunities (HERO) for Youth Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF WORK OPPORTUNITY CREDIT FOR CERTAIN YOUTH EMPLOYEES.

(a) EXPANSION OF CREDIT FOR SUMMER YOUTH.—

(1) CREDIT ALLOWED FOR YEAR-ROUND EMPLOYMENT.—Section 51(d)(7)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking clauses (i) and (iii) and redesignating clauses (ii) and (iv) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(B) in clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “(or if later, on May 1 of the calendar year involved).”;

(C) by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) (as so redesignated) and inserting “, and”; and

(D) adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) who will be employed for not more than 20 hours per week during any period between September 16 and April 30 in which such individual is regularly attending any secondary school.”.

(2) INCREASE IN CREDIT AMOUNT.—Section 51(d)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subparagraph (F) of section 51(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “summer”.

(B) Paragraph (7) of section 51(d) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “summer” each place it appears in subparagraphs (A);

(ii) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking “subparagraph (A)(iv)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)(ii)”; and

(iii) by striking “SUMMER” in the heading thereof.

(b) CREDIT FOR DISCONNECTED YOUTH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 51(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (I), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (J) and inserting “, or”, and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) an disconnected youth.”.

(2) DISCONNECTED YOUTH.—Paragraph (14) of section 51(d) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(14) DISCONNECTED YOUTH.—The term ‘disconnected youth’ means any individual who—

“(A)(i) is certified by the designated local agency as having attained age 16 but not age 25 on the hiring date, and

“(ii) has self-certified (on a form prescribed by the Secretary) that such individual—

“(I) has not regularly attended any secondary, technical, or post-secondary school during the 6-month period preceding the hiring date,

“(II) has not been regularly employed during such 6-month period, and

“(III) is not readily employable by reason of lacking a sufficient number of basic skills, or

“(B) is certified by the designated local agency as—

“(i) having attained age 16 but not age 21 on the hiring date, and

“(ii) an eligible foster child (as defined in section 152(f)(1)(C)) who was in foster care during the 12-month period ending on the hiring date.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to individuals who begin work for the employer after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1277. A bill to modify the boundary of the Mammoth Cave National Park in

the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. 1277

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 “Mammoth Cave National Park Boundary Adjustment Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

Section 11 of the Act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 319, chapter 341; 16 U.S.C. 404c–11), is amended—

(1) in the second paragraph, by striking “the sum of not to exceed” in the first sentence and all that follows through the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting “such sums as are necessary.”; and

(2) by inserting after the second paragraph the following:

“The Secretary of the Interior may acquire approximately 980 acres of the land and any interests in the land generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Mammoth Cave National Park Proposed Southern Boundary Expansion Edmonson and Barren Counties, Kentucky’, numbered 135/177, 967, and dated April 28, 2022, for inclusion in the Mammoth Cave National Park.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 170—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF WORLD MALARIA DAY

Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 170

Whereas April 25 of each year is recognized internationally as World Malaria Day;

Whereas malaria is a leading cause of death and disease in many developing countries, with nearly ½ of all cases globally occurring in only 4 countries, despite being preventable and treatable;

Whereas, at the end of 2021, there were an estimated 247,000,000 malaria cases in 84 endemic countries and 619,000 deaths from malaria;

Whereas young children and pregnant women are particularly vulnerable to, and disproportionately affected by, malaria, with children younger than 5 years of age accounting for 76 percent of malaria deaths each year;

Whereas, between 2019 and 2021, an estimated additional 13,400,000 cases of malaria were attributed to disruptions during that period of the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas malaria was once a leading cause of death in the United States;

Whereas fighting malaria is in the national interest of the United States because reducing the risk of malaria protects members of the Armed Forces and other people of the United States serving overseas in malaria-endemic regions, and reducing malaria deaths helps to lower risks of instability in less developed countries;

Whereas the support of the United States for efforts to fight malaria—

(1) is in the diplomatic and moral interests of the United States;

(2) generates goodwill toward the United States; and

(3) highlights the values of the people of the United States through the work of governmental, nongovernmental, and faith-based organizations of the United States;

Whereas, between 2000 and 2021, global investments made in malaria intervention programs averted an estimated 2,000,000,000 malaria cases and 11,700,000 malaria deaths;

Whereas the Government of the United States has played a leading role in the recent progress made toward reducing the global burden of malaria, particularly through the President’s Malaria Initiative and the contribution of the United States to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2021, the President’s Malaria Initiative protected nearly 100,000,000 individuals by providing them with insecticide-treated bednets, more than 21,000,000 individuals by providing them with indoor insecticide spraying, more than 8,000,000 children by providing them with seasonal preventive treatments, and more than 5,000,000 women by providing them with preventive treatments in pregnancy;

Whereas the United States is the largest donor to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, and every \$1 contributed by the United States leverages an additional \$2 from other donors, as required by law; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is pursuing a comprehensive approach to ending malaria deaths through the President’s Malaria Initiative and the United States Agency for International Development, with assistance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of State, the Department of Health and Human Services, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, and private sector entities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day;

(2) recognizes the importance of reducing malaria prevalence and deaths to improve overall child and maternal health, especially in sub-Saharan Africa;

(3) commends the recent progress made toward reducing global malaria morbidity, mortality, and prevalence, particularly through the efforts of the President’s Malaria Initiative and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria;

(4) commends the efforts and achievements of endemic countries in preventing and treating malaria at home, with locally-driven programs;

(5) welcomes ongoing public-private partnerships to research and develop more effective and affordable tools for malaria prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and vaccination;

(6) recognizes the goals, priorities, and authorities to combat malaria set forth in the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–293; 122 Stat. 2918);

(7) supports efforts to reduce malaria case incidence and malaria mortality rates by not less than 90 percent by 2030;

(8) supports continued leadership by the United States in bilateral, multilateral, and private sector efforts to combat malaria and to work with developing countries to create long-term strategies to increase ownership over malaria programs; and

(9) encourages other members of the international community to sustain and increase

their support for, and financial contributions to, efforts to combat malaria worldwide.

SENATE RESOLUTION 171—CONGRATULATING THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY FIGHTING TIGERS WOMEN’S BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2023 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I WOMEN’S BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 171

Whereas, on Sunday, April 2, 2023, the Louisiana State University (referred to in this preamble as “LSU”) Fighting Tigers women’s basketball team won the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as “NCAA”) National Championship, defeating the University of Iowa Hawkeyes by a score of 102 to 85;

Whereas the LSU Fighting Tigers won their first NCAA Division I Women’s Basketball National Championship in LSU history;

Whereas during the NCAA Championship game—

(1) the LSU Fighting Tigers scored 102 points, becoming the first team to score more than 100 points in a NCAA Division I women’s college basketball championship game;

(2) Jasmine Carson scored 21 points in the first 20 minutes to open up a 17 point lead;

(3) Alexis Morris, the only starter for the LSU Fighting Tigers returning from the 2021–2022 season, scored 21 points and a game-high 9 assists; and

(4) LaDazhia Williams scored 20 points, along with 5 rebounds and 3 steals;

Whereas head coach Kim Mulkey became the third coach with 4 or more national championships in NCAA Division I women’s college basketball history, and the first to win a championship as a head coach of multiple programs;

Whereas the LSU Fighting Tigers finished the season with 34 wins and only 2 losses, including 15 wins and 1 loss in the Southeastern Conference (referred to in this preamble as “SEC”);

Whereas 4 LSU Fighting Tigers players earned All-SEC Season Awards, awarded only to the premier players in the SEC, including—

(1) Angel Reese, who earned First Team All-SEC and SEC All-Defensive Team honors;

(2) Alexis Morris, who earned First Team All-SEC honors;

(3) Flau’Jae Johnson, who earned SEC All-Freshman Team honors; and

(4) Sa’Myah Smith, who earned SEC All-Freshman Team honors;

Whereas Angel Reese was named most outstanding player of the NCAA Division I Women’s Basketball Tournament Final Four;

Whereas Angel Reese set an NCAA record for most double-doubles in a single season, with 34;

Whereas Flau’Jae Johnson was named SEC Freshman of the Year, becoming the fourth in school history to achieve that recognition;

Whereas the LSU Fighting Tigers demonstrated incredible teamwork and tenacity, with 9 freshman or transfer players playing in their first season for the LSU Fighting Tigers;

Whereas the LSU Fighting Tigers showed incredible sportsmanship and teamwork throughout the entire season; and

Whereas the LSU Fighting Tigers have made the entire State of Louisiana proud: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Louisiana State University Fighting Tigers for winning the 2023 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Women's Basketball Tournament Championship;

(2) recognizes the many achievements of the coaches, players, and staff of the Louisiana State University women's basketball team;

(3) recognizes the fans and the entire State of Louisiana for their dedication and support; and

(4) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the head coach of the Louisiana State University women's basketball team, Kim Mulkey;

(B) the associate head coach, Bob Starkey;

(C) assistant coach, Daphne Mitchell;

(D) assistant coach, Gary Redus II;

(E) the president of Louisiana State University, William F. Tate IV; and

(F) the athletic director of Louisiana State University, Scott Woodward.

SENATE RESOLUTION 172—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON UKRAINIAN VICTORY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 172

Whereas Ukraine regained its independence in 1991 after three centuries of Moscow's imperial rule;

Whereas the United States encouraged Ukraine to abandon its arsenal of nuclear weapons, the third largest in the world at the time, in exchange for security assurances in the Budapest Memorandum of 1994;

Whereas the 2004 Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity in 2014 demonstrated the commitment of Ukrainians to shared ideals of democracy and freedom and their desire for Euroatlantic integration;

Whereas the 2008 Bucharest North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit Declaration states that "NATO welcomes Ukraine's and Georgia's Euro-Atlantic aspirations for membership in NATO. We agree today that these countries will become members of NATO.";

Whereas the initial Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2014 demonstrated the Russian regime's imperial fixation on controlling Ukraine, as well as the determination of the Ukrainian people to preserve their sovereignty and independence;

Whereas the Russian Federation launched a full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, grossly violating international norms, costing hundreds of thousands of people their lives, and displacing millions;

Whereas, in 2014, 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2022, the United Nations General Assembly affirmed the territorial integrity of Ukraine, and in November 2022, called on member states to create a mechanism for reparations to be paid to Ukraine;

Whereas, on February 18, 2023, the United States issued a finding that officials of the Russian Federation have committed crimes against humanity;

Whereas the threat to United States interests, European security, and global peace would greatly increase should Ukraine be un-

able to prevail against the invasion, by emboldening the Russian Federation and other autocratic states to engage in aggression against other states;

Whereas previous attempts to accommodate the Russian Federation's imperialism have resulted only in increasingly ruinous wars of aggression, anything short of victory for Ukraine would be an intolerable outcome for international peace, human rights, and democracy; and

Whereas United States interests, European security, and the cause of international peace depend on ensuring continued, robust, and longstanding United States support for Ukraine and all free nations from wars of aggression by Russia and its proxies, allies, or other autocratic states: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that it is the policy of the United States to see Ukraine victorious against the invasion and restored to its internationally recognized 1991 borders;

(2) holds that the peace brought by Ukrainian victory must be secured by integrating Ukraine into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other Euroatlantic institutions, as consistent with longstanding United States policy; and

(3) declares that the United States must work with its allies and partners to ensure that—

(A) the Russian Federation pays reparations to Ukraine;

(B) the global community helps to rebuild Ukraine;

(C) the leaders of the Russian Federation are held accountable for this war of aggression; and

(D) there is justice for victims of crimes committed by the Russian Federation during its invasion.

SENATE RESOLUTION 173—RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO CREATE A GREEN NEW DEAL

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 173

Whereas the October 2018 report entitled "Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C" by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the November 2018 Fourth National Climate Assessment report found that—

(1) human activity is the dominant cause of observed climate change over the past century;

(2) a changing climate is causing sea levels to rise and an increase in wildfires, severe storms, droughts, and other extreme weather events that threaten human life, healthy communities, and critical infrastructure;

(3) global warming at or greater than 2 degrees Celsius beyond preindustrialized levels will cause—

(A) mass migration from the regions most affected by climate change;

(B) more than \$500,000,000,000 in lost annual economic output in the United States by the year 2100;

(C) wildfires that, by 2050, will annually burn at least twice as much forest area in the western United States than was typically burned by wildfires in the years preceding 2019;

(D) a loss of more than 99 percent of all coral reefs on Earth;

(E) more than 350,000,000 more people to be exposed globally to deadly heat stress by 2050; and

(F) a risk of damage to \$1,000,000,000,000 of public infrastructure and coastal real estate in the United States; and

(4) global temperatures must be kept less than 1.5 degrees Celsius above preindustrialized levels to avoid the most severe impacts of a changing climate, which will require—

(A) global reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from human sources of 40 to 60 percent from 2010 levels by 2030; and

(B) net-zero global emissions by 2050;

Whereas, because the United States has historically been responsible for a disproportionate amount of greenhouse gas emissions, having emitted 20 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions through 2014, and has a high technological capacity, the United States must take a leading role in reducing emissions through economic transformation;

Whereas the United States is currently experiencing several related crises, with—

(1) life expectancy declining while basic needs, such as clean air, clean water, healthy food, and adequate health care, housing, transportation, and education, are inaccessible to a significant portion of the United States population;

(2) a 4-decade trend of wage stagnation, deindustrialization, and antilabor policies that has led to—

(A) hourly wages overall stagnating since the 1970s despite increased worker productivity;

(B) the third-worst level of socioeconomic mobility in the developed world before the Great Recession;

(C) the erosion of the earning and bargaining power of workers in the United States; and

(D) inadequate resources for public sector workers to confront the challenges of climate change at the Federal, State, and local level; and

(3) the greatest income inequality since the 1920s, with—

(A) the top 1 percent of earners accruing 91 percent of gains in the first few years of economic recovery after the Great Recession;

(B) a large racial wealth divide amounting to a difference of 20 times more wealth between the average White family and the average Black family; and

(C) a gender earnings gap that results in women earning approximately 80 percent as much as men, at the median;

Whereas climate change, pollution, and environmental destruction have exacerbated systemic racial, regional, social, environmental, and economic injustices (referred to in this preamble as "systemic injustices") by disproportionately affecting indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, and youth (referred to in this preamble as "frontline and vulnerable communities");

Whereas climate change constitutes a direct threat to the national security of the United States—

(1) by impacting the economic, environmental, and social stability of countries and communities around the world; and

(2) by acting as a threat multiplier;

Whereas the Federal Government-led mobilizations during World War II and the New Deal created the greatest middle class that the United States has ever seen, but many members of frontline and vulnerable communities were excluded from many of the economic and societal benefits of those mobilizations; and

Whereas the Senate recognizes that a new national, social, industrial, and economic

mobilization on a scale not seen since World War II and the New Deal era is a historic opportunity—

(1) to create millions of good, high-wage jobs in the United States;

(2) to provide unprecedented levels of prosperity and economic security for all people of the United States; and

(3) to counteract systemic injustices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) it is the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal—

(A) to achieve the greenhouse gas and toxic emissions reductions needed to stay under 1.5 degrees Celsius of warming, through a fair and just transition for all communities and workers;

(B) to create millions of good, high-wage union jobs and encourage collective bargaining agreements to ensure prosperity and economic security for all people of the United States;

(C) to invest in the infrastructure and industry of the United States to sustainably meet the challenges of the 21st century;

(D) to secure for all people of the United States for generations to come—

(i) clean air and water;

(ii) climate and community resiliency;

(iii) healthy food;

(iv) access to nature; and

(v) a sustainable environment; and

(E) to promote justice and equity by stopping current, preventing future, and repairing historic oppression of indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, and youth (referred to in this resolution as “frontline and vulnerable communities”);

(2) the goals described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1) (referred to in this resolution as the “Green New Deal goals”) should be accomplished through a 10-year national mobilization (referred to in this resolution as the “Green New Deal mobilization”) that will require—

(A) building resiliency against climate change-related disasters, such as extreme weather, including by leveraging funding and providing investments for community-defined projects and strategies;

(B) repairing and upgrading the infrastructure in the United States, including—

(i) by eliminating pollution and greenhouse gas emissions as much as technologically feasible;

(ii) by guaranteeing universal access to clean water;

(iii) by reducing the risks posed by climate impacts; and

(iv) by ensuring that any infrastructure bill considered by Congress addresses climate change;

(C) meeting 100 percent of the power demand in the United States through clean, renewable, and zero-emission energy sources, including—

(i) by dramatically expanding and upgrading renewable power sources; and

(ii) by deploying new capacity;

(D) building or upgrading to energy-efficient, distributed, and “smart” power grids and ensuring affordable access to electricity;

(E) upgrading all existing buildings in the United States and building new buildings to achieve maximum energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort, and durability, including through electrification;

(F) spurring massive growth in clean manufacturing in the United States and removing pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from manufacturing and industry as much as is technologically feasible, including by ex-

panding renewable energy manufacturing and investing in existing manufacturing and industry;

(G) working collaboratively with farmers and ranchers in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the agricultural sector as much as is technologically feasible, including—

(i) by supporting family farming;

(ii) by investing in sustainable farming and land use practices that increase soil health; and

(iii) by building a more sustainable food system that ensures universal access to healthy food;

(H) overhauling transportation systems in the United States to remove pollution and greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector as much as is technologically feasible, including through investment in—

(i) zero-emission vehicle and non-motorized alternative modes of transportation infrastructure and manufacturing;

(ii) clean, affordable, and accessible public transit; and

(iii) high-speed rail;

(I) mitigating and managing the long-term adverse health, economic, and other effects of pollution and climate change, including by providing funding for community-defined projects and strategies;

(J) removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere and reducing pollution by restoring natural ecosystems through proven low-tech solutions that increase soil carbon storage, such as land preservation and afforestation;

(K) restoring and protecting threatened, endangered, and fragile ecosystems through locally appropriate and science-based projects that enhance biodiversity and support climate resiliency;

(L) cleaning up existing hazardous waste sites and abandoned sites and ensuring economic development and sustainability on those sites;

(M) identifying other emission and pollution sources and creating solutions to remove them; and

(N) promoting the international exchange of technology, expertise, products, funding, and services, with the aim of making the United States the international leader on climate action and to help other countries achieve a Green New Deal;

(3) a Green New Deal must be developed through transparent and inclusive consultation, collaboration, and partnership with frontline and vulnerable communities, labor organizations, worker cooperatives, civil society groups, academia, and businesses; and

(4) to achieve the Green New Deal goals and mobilization, a Green New Deal will require—

(A) providing and leveraging, in a way that ensures that the public receives appropriate ownership stakes and returns on investment, adequate capital (including through community grants, public banks, and other public financing), technical expertise, supporting policies, and other forms of assistance to communities, organizations, Federal, State, and local government agencies, and businesses working on the Green New Deal mobilization;

(B) ensuring that the Federal Government takes into account the complete environmental and social costs and impacts of emissions through—

(i) existing laws;

(ii) new policies and programs; and

(iii) ensuring that frontline and vulnerable communities shall not be adversely affected;

(C) providing resources, training, and high-quality education, including higher education, to all people of the United States, with a focus on frontline and vulnerable communities, so that all people of the United

States may be full and equal participants in the Green New Deal mobilization;

(D) making public investments in the research and development of new clean and renewable energy technologies and industries;

(E) directing investments to spur economic development, deepen and diversify industry and business in local and regional economies, and build wealth and community ownership, while prioritizing high-quality job creation and economic, social, and environmental benefits in frontline and vulnerable communities, and deindustrialized communities, that may otherwise struggle with the transition away from greenhouse gas intensive industries;

(F) ensuring the use of democratic and participatory processes that are inclusive of and led by frontline and vulnerable communities and workers to plan, implement, and administer the Green New Deal mobilization at the local level;

(G) ensuring that the Green New Deal mobilization creates high-quality union jobs that pay prevailing wages, hires local workers, offers training and advancement opportunities, and guarantees direct replacement of lost wages, health care, retirement, and other benefits for workers affected by the transition;

(H) guaranteeing a job with a family-sustaining wage, adequate family and medical leave, paid vacations, and retirement security to all people of the United States;

(I) strengthening and protecting the right of all workers to organize, unionize, and collectively bargain free of coercion, intimidation, and harassment;

(J) strengthening and enforcing labor, workplace health and safety, antidiscrimination, and wage and hour standards across all employers, industries, and sectors;

(K) enacting and enforcing trade rules, procurement standards, and border adjustments with strong labor and environmental protections—

(i) to stop the transfer of jobs and pollution overseas; and

(ii) to grow domestic manufacturing in the United States;

(L) ensuring that public lands, waters, and oceans are protected and that eminent domain is not abused;

(M) obtaining the free, prior, and informed consent of indigenous peoples for all decisions that affect indigenous peoples and their traditional territories, honoring all treaties and agreements with indigenous peoples, and protecting and enforcing the sovereignty and land rights of indigenous peoples;

(N) ensuring a commercial environment where every businessperson is free from unfair competition and domination by domestic or international monopolies; and

(O) providing all people of the United States with—

(i) high-quality health care;

(ii) affordable, safe, and adequate housing;

(iii) economic security; and

(iv) clean water, clean air, healthy and affordable food, and access to nature.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 11

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 326, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 11 and that it be in order for Senator FISCHER to make a motion to proceed to S.J.

Res. 11; further, that at 4 p.m., the Senate vote on the motion to proceed; that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, the Senate immediately vote on passage of the joint resolution without any intervening action or debate; and that the time used related to the joint resolution count against the postcloture time on the motion to proceed to S. 326.

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

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 117-263, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the National Commission on the Future of the Navy: Ms. Mackenzie Eaglen of Virginia.

The Chair, on behalf of the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 117-263, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the National Commission on the Future of the Navy: Mr. Mitchell Waldman of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2023

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 26; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Jacobs nomination postcloture; that all cloture time be considered expired at 12 noon; that the Senate recess following the confirmation vote until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings; that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 32, S. 326; further, that if the Jacobs nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I am advised by Leader SCHUMER that for the information of the Senate, there will be one rollcall vote at noon, one at 2:15 p.m., and at least one vote at 4 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 26, 2023, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

JEFFERY MARTIN BARAN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2028. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TOBIN JOHN BRADLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA.

MARGARET L. TAYLOR, OF MARYLAND, TO BE LEGAL ADVISER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, VICE JENNIFER GILLIAN NEWSTEAD, RESIGNED.

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

BETTY Y. JANG, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2029. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

TANYA J. BRADSHAW, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE DONALD MICHAEL REMY, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTINE B. OLIVARES

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

GILBERTO DELEON, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRADLEY M. MRAVIK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JUSTIN L. PURVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JOHN J. ADAMS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

BRADLEY B. KELLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

NICHOLAS B. STAITON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

BRYCE D. ABBOTT

PATRICK T. ACKER

JOSEPH H. ADAMS II

KYLE A. ADUSKEVICH

DOMINICK ALBANO

WILLIAM H. ALBERT

JOSHUA M. ALES

ROBEN E. ALFONSO

DOUGLAS W. ALLEY

ERIC R. ANDREWS

LARRY J. ARBUCKLE

ALEXANDER P. ARMATAS

ANDRES J. AVILES

ANDREW K. BARNETT

MATTHEW H. BEACH

ADAM T. BEAN

MICHAEL S. BEATY

SCOTT C. BEATY

MICHAEL A. BENDER

ALBERT L. BENOIT III

DAVID M. BIGAY

DEREK W. BINTZ

MEGHAN L. BODNAR

BRANDON M. BOOHER

VICTOR J. BOZA

BRADLEY C. BOZIN

JERMAINE B. BROOMS

ZACHARY R. BROWN

JEFFREY S. BRUNER

JASON C. BUDDE

WILLIAM S. BUFORD

THOMAS W. BULLOCK

THOMAS R. BUTTS, JR.

TIMOTHY L. CAMPBELL

JONATHAN B. CANTOR

AARON J. CARLSON

WILLIAM D. CARMACK

WILLIAM L. CARR

CHRISTOPHER M. CARREON

CHRISTOPHER J. CARTER

BRALYN E. CATHEY

KEVIN M. CHAMBLEY

ROBERT H. CHANDLER

STEPHEN D. CHIVERS

RICHARD M. CHRISTOFF

JOHN H. CIGANOVICH

STEVEN J. COBOS

CRAIG H. CONNOR

BENJAMIN J. COOPER

JOSHUA P. CORBIN

DAVID M. CRESCITELLI

NICHOLAS F. CUNNINGHAM

MATTHEW E. CURNEN

BRYAN S. DAHLQUIST

ROGER A. DAVIS

JAMIE L. DELCORE

RONALD A. DRAKE

TIMOTHY A. DROSINOS

MICHAEL S. DWAN

BRETT E. ELKO

RODNEY C. ERLER, JR.

HARRY C. EVANS III

JAMES L. EVANS

JEREMY R. EWING

JONATHAN J. FARACO

MATTHEW A. FAY

JOHN E. FITZPATRICK

SEAN C. FLANAGAN

ERIN E. FLINT

SYLVESTER R. FOLEY IV

DANIEL A. FOLLETT

MICHAEL K. FONTAINE

MARC E. FOREMAN

BRIAN A. FORSTER

BENJAMIN W. FOSTER

ROBERT L. FRANKLIN III

CHRISTOPHER A. GAHL

MARK P. GALLAGHER

RAYMOND J. GAMICCHIA

MATTHEW K. GARCIA

BRYAN E. GEISERT

PRESTON W. GILMORE

JASON N. GLAB

MATTHEW D. GLEASON

BENJAMIN F. GRANT

RICHARD B. GRANT

SEAN P. GRAY

WILLIAM M. GUHEEN III

JOHN M. HAESLER

BRIAN J. HASSE

RYAN C. HEINEMAN

COURTNEY S. HERDT

NICHOLAS S. HILL

WILBUR R. HINES, JR.

DAVID C. HOLLON

JOEL I. HOLWITT

JASON R. HORNING

MATTHEW G. HORTON

ERIC C. HUI

BRANDON C. HUNTER

TIMOTHY P. HURLEY

JACOB D. HURT

DEREK C. JASKOWIAK

BRANDON L. JENKINS

ERIC R. JOHNSON

JOSHUA L. JONES

JUSTIN M. KAPER

ERIK A. KASSE

JAMES W. KAUBER

JOHN M. KILLILA

MICHAEL G. KING

ANDREW J. KOPACZ

MATTHEW I. KRULL

DANIEL D. KUITU

GEORGE G. KULCZYCKI

JOSEPH M. LAHER

DAVID J. LATTI

JASON A. LAUTAR

JEFFREY B. LAVERY

JIMMY L. LAWTON

MATTHEW D. LETCHER

TODD S. LEVANT

RICHARD B. LITCHFIELD

KELLY J. MAFFAY

ALAN T. MARDECIAN

KEVIN M. MARSH

BENJAMIN J. MARTIN

MATTHEW L. MARTIN

CARLOS F. MARTINEZ

ANTHONY S. MASSEY

RYAN T. MATTTSON
RICHARD T. MCCANDLESS
NEVIN A. MCCHESENEY
TAMMY S. MCCREARY
ROBERT J. MCDOWELL, JR.
JOHN K. MCGEE
DANIEL J. MCNAB
NICHOLAS A. MEYERS
MARK J. MILLER
MICHAEL V. MINERVINI
MICHAEL L. MINUKAS
TRAVIS A. MONTPLAISIR
NATHAN K. MOORE
JEFFERY J. MURAWSKI
KELECHI R. NDUKWE
ELIZABETH A. NELSON
SEAN M. NEWBY
PAUL W. NICKELL
JOHN P. NILLES
MATTHEW W. NOLAND
CHRISTOPHER M. NORRIS
COREY D. ODOM
DANIEL K. OHARA
PATRICK C. ONEILL
ELI C. OWRE
JASON N. PAPADOPOULOS
JOSHUA J. PETERS
JEREMIAH N. PETERSEN
CHRISTOPHER W. PETRO
CHARLES W. PHILLIPS
MICHAEL E. PIANO
THOMAS P. PICKERING
BRYAN S. PINCKNEY
JOSEPH J. PISONI
CORY D. POPE
DEREK A. RADER
JEREMIAH N. RAGADIO
BRIAN J. REITTE
ANDREW P. RIVAS
COLIN M. ROBERTS
MATT W. RODGERS
SCOTT J. ROSE
EMILY Y. ROYSE
EDISON C. RUSH
FRANK C. SANCHEZ
HOUSSAIN T. SAREINI
DANIEL J. SCHLESINGER
BRYAN W. SCHNEIDER
JEFFREY R. SCHWAB
ERIC D. SEVERSON
MICHAEL J. SIMPSON
ADAM C. SOUKUP
KIRK A. SOWERS
DONALD E. SPEIGHTS
JOHN W. STIGI
GARTH W. STORZ
JARROD W. STUNDAHL
MICAH T. SYBOR
JASON S. TARRANT
DANIEL J. THOMAS
MARTY D. TIMMONS
JAMES G. TUTHILL III
CLIFF J. UDDENBERG
THOMAS J. UHL
THOMAS H. VANHOOZER III
STEVEN E. VITRELLA
ROBERT A. WALLS
SEAN M. WELCH
STEVEN S. WHITWORTH
NICHOLAS A. WILLET
SHAWN T. WILLIAM
WILLIAM L. WILLIAMS, JR.
MICHAEL A. WITHERILL
CHRISTOPHER W. WOLFF
ROBERT E. WOODARDS
MATTHEW A. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

EDWARD A. CARLTON
JUAN L. CARRASCO
BRIAN D. DOHERTY
TERRA A. GRAY
JASON R. GROSE
CHARLES R. HARMON
JEANINE A. LANG
BRANDI S. MCGEHEE
CHRISTOPHER C. MULLER
ROGER D. PHELPS, JR.
ERIC L. POND
DAMON R. SUMERALL
GENEVIEVE G. UBINA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ANDREA H. CAMERON

DAVID P. DURKIN
STANFORD E. FISHER III
GARY L. LAZZARO
MICHAEL A. NORTON
WARREN W. TOMLINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MYLENE R. ARVIZO
MOLLIE A. BILY
JOHN M. BISHOP
JASON A. HICKLE
JUSTIN C. HLAVIN
NICHOLAS D. LEVINE
DAVID A. MCGLONE
COLIN S. MONK
PAUL W. MURCH
ANGELA C. OWENS
BRIAN K. RYGLOWSKI
BARTHOLOMEW J. SIEVENPIPER
DANIEL SORIA
ASHLEY S. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

SARAH E. ABBOTT
STACY J. G. ARENSTEIN
LINDSEY C. BUZZELL
DAVID L. CALHOUN
DEAN B. FARMER II
MITCHELL P. GRANT
SCOTT G. JOHNSON
TODD M. KEITH
ROBERT J. MCMILLAN
JOHN A. WALSH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CURTIS BROWN
KYLE A. CALDWELL
SHAWN T. RUMBLEY
GARY M. SHELLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MARK K. CORBLISS
OMAR A. HAIR
ANTOINE D. THORNTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

HANNAH L. BEALON
JAYSON L. BEIER
JASON B. BLACKMON
DANNY R. BOUE
NATHAN W. CONGER
JONATHAN D. DIETER
ANTHONY E. DOBSON
JOHN E. FALLON
CRAIG M. GILKEY
JOSEPH A. HOUSER
AARON M. MASSEY
JIMMIE L. NELSON
SEAN M. NELSON
RYAN A. RIPPEON
OSCAR W. SIMMONS IV
CARLTON B. SUMMERVILLE
BRIAN K. TYLER
STANLEY C. WARE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CAMERON M. BALMA
MATTHEW R. BLANCHETTE
JOSEPH P. BOBROWSKI
JACOB B. CATALOGNA
BART M. DANGELO
BRIAN E. HARPUDER
JOHN D. HEAVRIN
SHANE P. JACOBS
ROBERT W. JOHNSTON
MELISSA S. MECCA
WALTER PAULI
STEPHANIE L. PHILLIPS
JONATHAN C. RAIA

MELINDA K. SCHRYVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ALAN M. BRECHBILL
DAVID J. TEBBE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROSS M. ANDERSON
PHILIP L. GESAMAN
CHAD M. HAMM
ROGER D. HORNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

HOMER F. HENSY
JAMES J. HORNEF
KURTIS J. KRUG
GREGORY F. NOTARO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TOMMIE G. CRAWFORD
WILLIAM J. GRAY
ANDRES V. PICO
JAMES L. RORER
SHANNON P. THOMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JOHN E. FAGE
SARAH M. FLAHERTY
ZACHARY F. HARRELL
REBECCA L. REBARICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

GAVIN H. CLOUGH
JEREMY D. CRESTETTO
TIMOTHY M. DERBYSHIRE
BARBARA E. JONAS
JOHN E. KRUSE III
JADA E. LIGHTNING
PETER A. MALLORY, JR.
ANDREW C. OCONNOR
BENJAMIN F. VISGER
MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JENNIFER J. LANDRY
DAVID R. MARINO
DOUGLAS W. PEARMAN
JONATHAN A. SAVAGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

BRADLEY H. ABRAMOWITZ
BRIAN C. BROADWELL
JEFFERY L. BURKE
CHARLES Y. CHA
DEREK J. DYE
HENRY T. GILBERT IV
ERIC K. GRAEWERT
ERIC L. KIRK
COLIN G. LARKINS
MICHAEL K. MEADOR
KURT L. PODRAZIK
SHAWN D. TEASLEY
ERIC A. WEISS
CHELSEY L. ZWICKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

CHARLES G. EMOND, JR.