



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2025

No. 45

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, March 10, 2025)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O God, our Father, speak to us today that here, in Your presence, we may find knowledge of what You want us to do. Guide our Senators so that they clearly understand Your desires, and give them the wisdom to strive to do Your will. Lord, provide them with daily strength to live honorably for Your glory. Give them the ambition to please You with faithfulness and humility.

Come with Your great power, O God, and rescue our Nation and world. Deliver us from the fear and trembling that seek to overwhelm our efforts to please You.

We pray in Your merciful 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Steven Bradbury, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

LITHUANIA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 35 years ago today, the freely elected Parliament of Lithuania declared that country was restoring its independence after about 50 years of Soviet occupation. This started the breakup of the Soviet Union. The end of that evil empire made the world safer and millions of people freer. So I say: Thank you, Lithuania—or I should say, in their language, “*aciu*.”

Lithuania didn't become a country just in the 1990s, however. It is a very old country. In fact, it was a significant regional power in the Middle Ages. The modern Republic of Lithuania was born on February 16, 1918. The United States has maintained continuous diplomatic relations with Lithuania for now 103 years, going back to 1922.

As an American, I am proud that our country never recognized the Soviet annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, just as we don't recognize Russia's annexation of any part of Ukraine to this very day.

Today, Lithuania is free, and Lithuania is prosperous. Lithuania is a close U.S. ally and a beacon of Western values on the frontlines of freedom. I thank Lithuania for its friendship, for its important contribution to the NATO alliance, and for its vocal defense of our shared values.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. 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.

HALT FENTANYL ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Zach Didier was a good student, an athlete, and a musician. He was an Eagle Scout, star of the school play, and he was hoping to attend Stanford University. But 2 days after Christmas, in 2020, Zach's dad found him dead in his bedroom of fentanyl poisoning. He was 17.

Zach and his friends had gone to the mall to meet a drug dealer they had found through social media. He bought what he thought was Percocet, but it wasn't. The counterfeit pills he bought contained fentanyl, and what was a bad decision became deadly.

Zach was one of the more than 90,000 Americans who died of an overdose in 2020, many of those deaths from fentanyl poisoning. He was one of countless victims of fake pills being peddled on our streets, pills that too often find their way into the hands of young people and steal their futures.

Courage Minten's is another tragic story. Adopted from Ghana, Courage was pursuing his dream of becoming an airline pilot. He had attended flight school and interviewed for a job, just days before he died, at age 23. Courage's parents found him on their couch after a night out with friends, seemingly asleep, until he stopped breathing. As they later found out, Courage had taken a pill with two times the lethal dose of fentanyl in it.

Ashley Romero, a 32-year-old mother, took half of what she thought was a

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1641

painkiller, but that half a pill contained a deadly dose of fentanyl. The dealer who had supplied Ashley's boyfriend with the pill that took her life is believed to have sold pills that killed several other people.

One of those individuals was Jonathan Ellington. Jonathan had become addicted to OxyContin when it was prescribed to him for a high school soccer injury. He got clean and stayed clean for about a decade, until another injury and another prescription got him back on it. When his prescription ran out, he bought some pills from an acquaintance. It only took one pill with a lethal dose of fentanyl to take Jonathan's life.

Mr. President, these are just a few of the stories that families have shared with the Judiciary Committee in support of the HALT Fentanyl Act. Unfortunately, there are many more like them; lives lost, futures destroyed, families changed forever.

One in three Americans know someone who has died of a drug overdose. We are losing young people, teenagers, young parents, and people with bright lives ahead of them. When the Trump administration temporarily classified all fentanyl analogs as schedule I substances, law enforcement gained a critical tool to combat fentanyl and go after people who are bringing this poison into the United States.

Congress has extended this temporary classification several times because it works. Now we need to make it permanent by passing the HALT Fentanyl Act.

I was very pleased at the strong bipartisan vote this bill received last Thursday, and I hope the vote on final passage will be equally robust.

As I said, classifying all fentanyl analogs as schedule I substances gives law enforcement a critical tool to go after the criminals bringing this poison into our country and selling it on our streets, and it joins other efforts to end the fentanyl crisis in our country.

President Trump is taking significant steps to halt the supply of drugs flowing across our borders. Senator BLACKBURN has done great work bringing attention to the role of social media, which is often the link between teenagers and drug dealers. And the Senate will continue working to stop fentanyl from taking more American lives.

Fentanyl has caused too many tragedies. I am grateful to the families who have lost loved ones to this deadly drug for sharing their stories. The HALT Fentanyl Act is moving forward due in no small part to their support.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, Elon Musk confirmed what many of us have been warning about for a long time: Republicans are getting ready to gut Social Security and Medicare.

Let me repeat that. Elon Musk confirmed what many of us have warned about: Republicans are getting ready to gut Social Security and gut Medicare.

Here is what he said during an interview with FOX Business. The richest man on Earth repeated again a bevy of lies that entitlement programs that tens of millions of people rely on are riddled with fraud and abuse. That is a pretext to slashing, but it is false.

He added that "most of the Federal spending is entitlements"—that is true—"so that is the big one to eliminate," meaning Social Security.

Let me quote Elon Musk again: "That is the big one"—Social Security—"to eliminate." It is rare to hear Republicans tell the truth about their plans so directly.

What Elon Musk is saying is that sooner or later, Republicans are going to target people's Social Security and Medicare benefits.

The outrage that the richest man in the world would tell millions of seniors who depend on those checks each month that it is fraud, that it is waste, is outrageous. He doesn't have any idea the harm it would do, and it isn't fraud. Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and Republicans know that the math on their billionaire tax cuts will not work without going after these benefits, and all they care about is cutting their taxes further—outrageous.

As America begins to hear this, America is going to realize what a bad bargain Donald Trump was in the election. It is another awful reminder that under Donald Trump and Elon Musk and Republicans, billionaires win, American families lose.

There is something truly rotten about the Republican agenda when a multibillionaire—the richest man in the world—is allowed to lie so casually about one of America's most sacred programs in order to justify taking benefits away from hard-working Americans. Few programs have done more good, have helped more people, have been more popular than Social Security has for nearly a century. Few programs are as beloved by Americans as Social Security. Americans, of course, support eliminating waste, but they do not want to see their Social Security benefits get taken away.

How is Elon Musk trying to do this? He is using the oldest trick in the book: shamelessly lying about Social Security—just as Donald Trump did in his State of the Union Address, where he listed hundreds of people who were born 120 years ago and couldn't show a single one was getting Social Security.

Musk is shamelessly lying about Social Security, claiming it is riddled with fraud, in order to justify taking benefits away from seniors and retirees. He ignores the very bold, plain fact that the Federal Government already conducts an audit of Social Security every year. It is a legit audit, not a partisan audit. It has been done during Trump's Presidency and Biden's Presidency. What did it find? Less than 1 percent—1 percent—less than 1 percent of all payments from 2015 to 2022 were made in error.

That, Mr. Musk, is not what fraud looks like.

He cherry-picks data to suggest that tens of millions of dead people are getting checks. This is a lie.

To be sure, this isn't just about Elon Musk's rhetoric. The assault on Social Security is taking shape in practice. DOGE has already taken over the Social Security Administration Agency and has free access to the private data and benefits of tens of millions of Americans. The Trump administration has already begun to fire 7,000 staffers, which means local offices will shut down, customer service wait times will explode, and the risk of delayed benefits will skyrocket.

So I ask my Republican colleagues: Are you all fine with this?

Are they fine with Musk calling Social Security one giant scam? Let's find a single person here on the Republican side who starts rebutting Musk once and for all when they know he is doing what the American people hate and is not telling the truth.

Do our colleagues agree with Musk's lie that hundreds of billions of dollars in outright fraud has compromised Social Security?

Mark my words, if Elon Musk and DOGE continue their attacks against Social Security, if the President continues his attacks, which he made in the State of the Union, sooner or later, benefits are going to be delayed, mistakenly halted, and the political uproar from Americans from one end of the country to the other—red, purple, and blue—will be immense.

And more trouble for the Trump administration—the Trump economy. Donald Trump promised Americans a golden age on day one. Well, today is day 50, and Americans are wondering, scratching their heads, where is this golden age? You can't find this golden age in the inflation numbers because inflation has gone up under Donald Trump, from groceries, to retail, to cars. He campaigned prices will begin going down on day one. That is by the wayside, that is for sure.

You can't find this golden age in the stock market either. We know the stock market is Donald Trump's favorite measuring stick. But right now, because of him—his actions, his erraticness—his own actions have plunged markets and therefore people's retirement accounts into chaos. Yesterday, the Dow fell by almost 900 points, 2 percent. The S&P 500 plunged

2.7 percent. The NASDAQ Composite fell by 4 percent.

Why is this happening? One of the reasons is the President's tariffs on Canada and Mexico, but the other is pure chaos—no stability, no certainty for businesses, total confusion in the economy. One thing businesses tell us: They want certainty, and they want stability. One thing they are getting from Donald Trump: uncertainty and chaos.

By starting this foolish and chaotic trade war—on again one day, off again the next day—Donald Trump has singlehandedly poured a bucket of ice water on the economy. Trump thinks he can just yak: Oh, I am for it, and then the next day, I will say I am not for it. But businesses can't plan that way. If they think there is a chance he will come back and do it, they don't plan, they don't buy, they don't go forward.

Businesses right now are in a state of total confusion. They have no idea what Trump is going to do next. Is he going to impose tariffs today? tomorrow? next month? How big will they be? What countries? What products? Every day, you hear a different answer on something that is so important to the American economy and the world economy.

American consumers are also anxious. If you don't know what tomorrow will bring, you are going to spend less today.

Donald Trump himself knows that tariffs will hurt working families. When asked on FOX Business about the possibility that his tariffs could trigger a recession, he refused to even downplay the possibility it could happen. This was a rare moment of truth from Donald Trump. He said: Yeah, my tariffs can cause a recession. And then he seemed to say with his body language: Who cares? Amazing. The guy who said he would lift the economy not only is beginning to cause the beginnings of an economic downturn, but he seems to be proud of it. Wow. Is that what America bargained for? I don't think so.

When Donald Trump says there is a "period of transition," it is just gibberish. What Donald Trump means when he says "period of transition" is that "I will hurt you slowly, not all at once." It means "Yes, my tariffs will raise prices on the American people." Donald Trump knows his tariffs could wreck the economy, but he is doing it anyway, all so he can use the income from tariffs to pay for tax cuts for billionaires—his North Star.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor having just listened to the minority leader of the Senate come to the floor, and I listened to what he had to say.

You know, it has been 10 weeks now that Republicans have been in the majority and the Democrats have been in the minority after the historic victory

in November. The contrast is pretty significant. Senate Republicans made promises to the American people. We promised to get the country back on track. We are keeping that promise. We are hitting the ground running, and we are not turning back.

Most importantly for our successes, it has been because Republicans have remained united. As a result, we have a list of accomplishments as opposed to what we just heard the minority leader talk about.

First, the Senate has now confirmed all 21 members of President Trump's Cabinet, and we did it at a record pace—a faster pace than the Democrats were able to do for Obama in 2009 and faster than they were able to do it for President Biden in 2021. The pace with which Republicans have confirmed President Trump's nominees to the Cabinet—as POLITICO pointed out today—all completed before the Senate has taken a break. That is where we are today. Historic speed.

With his team in place early, President Trump is able to execute effectively and efficiently the popular agenda for which he was elected. The Senate has prioritized confirming the President's national security team. We saw the horrific attack in New Orleans on New Year's. We continue to see chaos around the world. We need a national security team in place, we have prioritized that, and we have done it.

The Senate also passed the Laken Riley Act. It is now law, signed by the President. It is the first significant piece of immigration enforcement law signed in decades and just in the first number of weeks. It is actually the first bill that President Trump signed into law as the 47th President of the United States. It is going to save lives. It is going to prevent human tragedy like we saw happen in Georgia to that young nursing student.

I am very grateful to Senator KATIE BRITT of Alabama and Senator TED BUDD of North Carolina for their leadership in finding a bipartisan way to get this bill passed.

We have also focused on our shared agenda with the House and with the President to move quickly to pass a budget that is focused on border security, energy security for our Nation, as well as America's peace through strength. The Budget Committee—LINDSEY GRAHAM, who is chairman of the committee, and the members of the committee did groundbreaking work, all focused on making America stronger, better, more secure.

Senate Republicans are working with the House on a path forward now and working closely with Senator MIKE CRAPO of the Finance Committee, who is leading the charge to make sure we are not facing a \$4 trillion tax increase, which is what the Democrats want. They want Americans to suffer the pain of \$4 trillion in additional taxes. This is very important work to keep taxes low for hard-working families and continue to stimulate the economy.

I heard a lot from the minority leader about 5 minutes ago. He was talking about the future of Medicaid and of Medicare. I am a doctor and work closely with patients on all of those programs. But what I heard Senator SCHUMER do as he stood right there—it sounded to me like he is threatening to shut down the government. He sounds like somebody who is going to tell his Members: Vote against keeping the government open. We are so distraught about the fact that President Trump has been elected, so mad at the voters because they elected a Republican House and a Republican Senate, as well as sent President Trump back to the White House, that we just want to say: The heck with you; we are going to shut down the government.

It costs money to shut down the government. It costs money to reopen the government. It impacts services for the American people.

Democrats are so mad—you saw it last week when the President made his speech to Congress, to the joint session, his address to the Nation, the way they acted during that statement by the Commander in Chief—those are people that are just mad at the voters.

The American public liked what the President had to say that night. Overwhelmingly, those who saw the speech saw it as very positive, are happy with the direction of the country, happy with the leadership of the President. He is focused. He is forceful. He is effective, energetic, getting the job done.

That is not what I heard from the Senate minority leader just a few minutes ago. He sounded like somebody who is going to command the troops: Hey, shut down the government because we are mad, and we are going to take it out on the American people.

Let me set the record straight, because Republicans support Medicaid, and Republicans support Medicare. Just the other night, we passed Senator DAN SULLIVAN's amendment to protect and preserve Medicaid and Medicare. Not a single Democrat joined us.

These programs are in trouble today. Why? Because of the previous administration. Joe Biden weakened them by making them available for scammers, and that is what has happened. People are sucking money out of these programs who don't deserve to be doing it and are taking the care needed from hard-working American families.

Republicans want to protect and preserve and strengthen Medicare and Medicaid. We want to do it for the people these vital programs were originally intended for—not for the scammers. Stopping scamming is a big part of this.

Additionally, when I take a look at some of the things we have done over the last several weeks, one is that we have reaffirmed our friendship with Israel. Intelligence Committee Chairman TOM COTTON of Arkansas and Foreign Relations Committee Chairman

JIM RISCH of Idaho introduced bipartisan legislation to impose severe sanctions on something called the International Criminal Court.

It is an illegitimate kangaroo court that targets Israel and does the bidding of Iran. Sanctioning the ICC would have sent a very strong message to the world—the message, of course, being “America stands with Israel.” Senate Democrats filibustered it; 45 Democrat Senators chose to abandon our closest ally.

Senate Republicans also successfully blocked destructive Democrat legislation attacking American energy production. Democrats actually tried to reverse President Trump’s national energy emergency. America clearly faces an energy emergency. Energy prices went up 31 percent during the last 4 years under the Democrats’ administration of punishing American energy. Well, led by Chairman MIKE LEE of Utah, Republicans are taking the handcuffs off American energy. Look, we know unleashing American energy will help kick-start our economy.

Senate Republicans also voted to protect girls and women in sports. Senator Coach TOMMY TUBERVILLE of Alabama has been a champion of women’s sports in the Senate. His legislation was common sense to over 80 percent of Americans. It said: Biological men should not be allowed to compete in women’s sports against our daughters, our sisters—simple as that. Democrats filibustered it. They are completely out of touch with the American people, the Democrats are. And they are putting our female athletes in harm’s way.

Senate Republicans also have erased some burdensome Biden regulations. We are cutting through the redtape, cutting redtape most significantly on American energy production. At the same time, we are also protecting America’s financial freedom.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY of Louisiana led efforts to end a Biden regulation on energy production on the Gulf of America. Senator JOHN HOVEN of North Dakota led efforts to cut \$7 billion in natural gas taxes on our energy producers. Senator PETE RICKETTS of Nebraska led the efforts to rein in unaccountable bureaucrats from snooping in your digital wallet. Democrats wanted to spy on everything you buy or do on Apple Pay, on Venmo, Zelle, with other apps. Senator TED CRUZ of Texas led efforts to push back against IRS attacks on crypto currency.

Each of these resolutions passed the Senate, in spite of Democrat opposition. By reversing these heavyhanded rules, Republicans are making life more affordable for American families.

And this week, the Senate is moving to pass lifesaving legislation that is called the HALT Fentanyl Act. Approximately 70,000 Americans are poisoned or killed by illicit fentanyl each year in the United States. It is the No. 1 killer of Americans between the ages of 18 and 45.

The HALT Fentanyl Act will aid efforts to crack down on drug dealers and

criminal cartels that smuggle the poison into our country and into our communities. I am grateful that Leader THUNE is putting this bipartisan legislation up for a vote.

You can sum up these early weeks in the Republican-led Senate in three words: fast, forceful, and effective. We aren’t wasting time. We are not wasting time. We are just getting started.

Working together, Republicans are going to deliver for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today stands out as a critical moment for the country, the Supreme Court, and the Constitution.

In recent weeks, Trump administration officials and allies have made statements and engaged in troubling conduct that threatened judicial independence and our very system of government.

Elon Musk, a senior adviser to President Trump, has repeatedly called for the impeachment of Federal judges whose decisions he disagrees with, and he has questioned the lifetime appointment of Federal judges that is enshrined in article III of our Constitution.

In a social media post, Vice President JD VANCE falsely asserted that:

Judges aren’t allowed to control the executive’s legitimate power.

This is merely the latest in a long line of claims by the Vice President that a President of the United States can defy the orders of the court. In 2021, Mr. VANCE went so far as to say he would suggest to President Trump that “when the court stops you, stand before the country like Andrew Jackson did and say, ‘The chief justice has made his ruling. Now let him enforce it.’” This was an obvious reference to the apocryphal story about President Andrew Jackson suggesting he would defy the Supreme Court ruling.

And President Donald Trump himself recently posted:

He who saves his Country does not violate any Law.

Let me repeat that post, personal post, by the President:

He who saves his Country does not violate any Law.

Those 10 words are a rationale for tyranny and are an assault on our Constitution.

This disregard for judicial review has not been limited to words alone. In multiple cases, administration officials have dragged their feet or failed to comply with Federal court orders.

The administration has also nominated individuals to senior positions at the Department of Justice who seem to have little regard for separation of powers.

One Trump nominee recently testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee and said:

There is no hard and fast rule about whether, in every instance, a public official is bound by a court decision.

Fortunately, my colleague, Republican Senator JOHN KENNEDY of Louisiana, admonished this nominee, and he said:

Don’t ever, ever take the position that you’re not going to follow the order of a federal court. Ever. Now, you can disagree with it. Within the bounds of legal ethics, you can criticize it. You can appeal it, or you can resign.

And it isn’t only the executive branch that is threatening the independence of the judiciary. In the past month, three members of the House of Representatives have introduced articles of impeachment against Federal judges for no reason other than they ruled against this administration.

These actions and comments constitute a clear and present danger to the separation of powers and our Constitution. Instead of favorably quoting the apocryphal words of Andrew Jackson, our political leaders and their allies should reference the words of Chief Justice Marshall in *Marbury v. Madison*, an 1803 decision. As we all learned in law school, Judge Marshall said:

It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.

There has been a broad, bipartisan consensus on that point for more than two centuries. When it comes to interpreting and applying the law, the judiciary has the final word.

Last week, on this floor, I tried to pass an S. Res. simply affirming the rule of law and finality of judicial review. I thought and hoped every Senator would support it. Regrettably, a Republican Senator objected, and the Senate missed an opportunity to say with one voice that we support the Constitution and judicial branch.

Thankfully, the judicial branch has demonstrated its independence, even without the support of the other branches of government. Judges have carefully considered the cases before them and, in some cases, provided a check on the administration when it overstepped. For that, I commend the judiciary.

Alexander Hamilton called the article III judiciary, the courts, “the least dangerous branch” because it has neither soldiers nor money to enforce its decrees. That is why the courts’ legitimacy in the eyes of the American people is so critical to its continued vitality, and that is why I continue to support an enforceable code of conduct for the Supreme Court.

Recent efforts by the Trump administration and its allies to intimidate and impeach Federal judges have been based on those judges’ decisions and the President who appointed them. In contrast, an enforceable code of conduct would apply to all Justices equally, no matter who appointed them and no matter how they rule on a particular matter.

I first proposed that the Court adopt an enforceable code of conduct 13 years

majority and prior to many of its controversial decisions.

The fact that many sitting Justices have publicly endorsed an enforceable code of conduct underscores that it does not pose a threat to the independence of the judicial branch. An enforceable code of conduct would bolster public confidence in the judicial branch.

And by ensuring the judiciary is held to high regard, we can assure that so-called least dangerous branch of government maintains a position of strength now and in the future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF ABIGAIL SLATER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon, we will vote on the nomination of Gail Slater to serve as Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division. I support her nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Antitrust is as important to me as it is to most Senators. I have long been concerned about market concentration and anticompetitive practices in industries that impact Iowans whether it is agriculture or healthcare or technology. These issues don't get the most attention around the U.S. Senate, but they still impact millions of Americans. Family farmers and independent producers deserve fair prices for their products. Seniors deserve affordable prescription drugs. Children deserve to be safe from predatory behavior on dominant tech platforms. All of these are antitrust issues.

Attorney General Bondi told me during her confirmation process that she shares my interest in these issues and that she would work with me and the Antitrust Division to address these issues. There is no better person to help her in this project than Gail Slater. Ms. Slater has the right qualifications for this job.

She spent several years practicing antitrust law in private practice before spending a decade at the Federal Trade Commission, handling antitrust investigations and litigation. In these roles, she learned the nuts and bolts of antitrust enforcement.

Ms. Slater also understands antitrust and economics from a policy perspective. She served in President Trump's first administration on the National Economic Council, and she served now-Vice President VANCE as his economic policy adviser and as a member of his Senate staff. So Ms. Slater has numerous accomplishments in the antitrust space.

I am not the only one who thinks Ms. Slater is the right person for the job. She has received letters of support

from nine previous heads of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. These men and women were appointed by Presidents of both political parties. They wrote:

Ms. Slater has the experience, intelligence, judgment, and leadership skills necessary to serve as an excellent Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division.

Another bipartisan coalition letter commands her "unique ability to collaborate on a bipartisan basis with stakeholders across the political spectrum, building coalitions toward common goals."

And it might surprise you that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters announced that they support her nomination.

In a rare sign of unity on the Judiciary Committee I share, where we don't get a lot of unity, Ms. Slater was advanced out of committee by 20 yes votes to 2 negative votes. I hope for a similarly strong bipartisan vote here on the floor.

The Antitrust Division will flourish under Ms. Slater's strong leadership, and I am proud to support her. She is ready to serve our country, and we need to get her confirmed quickly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Donald Trump and "Copresident" Elon Musk are shutting down the Federal Government one piece at a time: shutting down the Agency that stops banks and payday lenders from cheating working people; shutting down children's cancer research; shutting down key parts of the Department of Transportation, the Agency responsible for keeping people safe when they are flying airplanes; even shutting down parts of the Social Security Administration.

Now Republicans in Congress are laying out their blueprint to shut down the entire Federal Government. A budget is a reflection of our values, and this proposal makes clear where the Republicans' values lie. After months of bipartisan talks, they are walking away from the negotiating table and offering a nonstarter House bill that forces us to the brink of a full government shutdown. Who would be hurt the most? Working people. Billionaires win; families lose. Republicans' values are clear.

Their shutdown bill does two terrible things. First, it wipes out the guardrails that Congress wrote for how to spend taxpayer money. That means that "Copresidents" Trump and Musk can hold everyone under their magic spell. They can spend taxpayer money or they can shut off taxpayer money

exactly how they want. Perhaps Trump and Musk want to shovel \$75 million of ALS treatment funding to anti-vaccine research instead. That would be OK under the Republican deal—or maybe they want to shift \$300 million or more from the FAA's telecommunications funding bucket toward contracts to Elon Musk's Starlink. The budget the Republicans have sent over would permit that as well. And if Trump and Musk decide to fire another 25,000 Americans or kick a million old people out of nursing homes, this package from House Republicans would say: Sure.

In addition to giving "Copresidents" Trump and Musk the power to spend taxpayer money wherever they want, House Republicans also propose general cuts—cuts from programs that help families put food on the table, afford childcare, and keep our communities safe; cuts from local communities for projects like improving hospitals, teaching facilities, and childcare centers—dollars that the House and the Senate had already agreed to.

But the House Republican package isn't just about cutting out veterans and old people. No. It is also about spending more money. Republican House Members want to pour an extra \$6 billion over the next 6 months—yes, that is \$1 billion a month—directly to the Pentagon, with no explanation and no justification of why this money is needed. Nope. There are cuts everywhere else in government, but there is a funding increase for the one government Agency that has never, never passed an audit. That Agency, the Department of Defense, gets \$1 billion a month.

House Republicans want to give 6 billion more dollars to make sure that defense contractors continue to get their fat paychecks.

Look, Republicans in Congress don't care whether the government shuts down because they don't care about hurting working families. All they care about is getting back to jamming through their true agenda—\$4.6 trillion worth of tax handouts for millionaires, billionaires, and giant corporations, paid for by gutting healthcare for millions of people.

Donald Trump looked Americans in the eye and said he would "lower costs on day one." Those were his words. And now we are 7 weeks in, and he has done the exact opposite. He is raising costs for families. More people are losing their jobs—sky-high childcare, housing, and food costs. And it is open season right now for banks and credit card companies and shady student loan outfits to scam the American people.

The Republican shutdown playbook is dangerous, and it will hurt working families. Democrats are right to oppose the House bill, and people all across this country are right to expect us to stand up and fight back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF STEVEN BRADBURY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to speak in opposition to the nomination of Steven Bradbury. He is nominated to be the Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

When it comes to transportation safety, we don't measure success in dollars saved. We measure success in lives protected and tragedies prevented.

Last week, I met with the parents of Sam Lilley, the first officer of the American Airlines plane that fatally collided with a U.S. Army Black Hawk helicopter at DCA Airport. Sam's father happens to be a commercial pilot now, and before that, he flew Black Hawk helicopters in the military. He expressed his concern about reports that the Black Hawks are regularly being operated in this busy airspace without the Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast, commonly known as ADS-B, turned on.

We know that the Black Hawk in the January 29 collision wasn't transmitting. We hope that we will find out later today in the NTSB report what we need to do to fix this problem.

We know that during Mr. Bradbury's first tenure at DOT, he let the FAA create exemptions to permit military aircraft to operate without this key safety technology transmitting. And guess what? The military knew that they had been granted a loophole, but they said it would not be used all the time—only to find out later that the military said they were using the exemption 100 percent of the time.

My heart goes out to the Lilley family and to all the families of the victims of this tragic accident. It didn't need to happen. That is why, last week, I wrote Secretary Hegseth to ask about the Army's letter from 2023 stating that 100 percent of its helicopters fly in the DC area with this ADS-B technology not activated.

We can't afford another light-touch approach at the Department of Transportation when it comes to safety. We cannot. It simply does not matter if you are saving dollars if you are not saving lives. Unfortunately, I believe the President's nominee to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Transportation, Steven Bradbury, has shown more interest in a light-touch approach that benefits industry, than being a champion for safety.

During his nomination hearing, I questioned Mr. Bradbury about his record as previous general counsel for the Department of Transportation during the first Trump administration. In this capacity, Mr. Bradbury played a key role in orchestrating the rollback of multiple, multiple safety requirements under the guise of advancing a reform agenda.

For example, under his watch, he prevented requirements for truck drivers. There was a fatigue prevention requirement for truck drivers, which he loosened. Vehicle safety recall investiga-

tions reached an alltime low, and meanwhile, road fatalities increased.

Under his watch, there were a number of rail safety requirements that were also waived. The Department of Transportation withdrew its two-person crew rule. This was a rule that people had recommended after derailments in the United States and in Canada, including a runaway oil train in Quebec in 2013 that derailed and killed 47 people. And during this same time period, the main line derailment rate increased, all during Mr. Bradbury's tenure.

Perhaps, though, the most troubling of all, is Mr. Bradbury's watch during the rulemaking on what is called a safety management system for aviation manufacturers like Boeing. Just 9 days after the first 737 MAX crash in 2018, which resulted in 189 deaths, there was a rule that said—being proposed—that the safety management system should be a mandatory requirement—not voluntary. Don't tell an industry that has to manufacture planes, "It's okay, you can voluntarily comply with some of these rules." No, no, we need requirements that manufacturers must meet.

As my colleagues on the Commerce Committee know, a safety management system rule for aviation manufacturers would have instituted a comprehensive process for analyzing, predicting, and ultimately mitigating risk. The safety management system is considered the gold standard now around the world. If you want to have safety, you have a safety management system. It is a more robust process.

And I question how Mr. Bradbury, at DOT, after the Indonesian 737 MAX crash, didn't see or understand the need for critical information and analysis that a safety management system would have put in place, particularly because the FAA continued to let the MAX plane fly, and part of the process in question is whether they considered the critical analysis that Boeing had done to allow the plane to fly and what the FAA's role was.

So following the tragedies of both 737 MAX crashes, the Commerce Committee, led by then-Chairman WICKER, launched an investigation into the crashes to find solutions and prevent the disaster from happening again. But what did Mr. Bradbury do? Did he work with the committee to improve safety for the flying public? No. No, he did not.

He basically thwarted Senator WICKER and the committee's efforts to get the information about what the FAA had done. Make this clear here today: Our colleagues need to hold the FAA accountable. If you don't hold the FAA accountable as the oversight body, fat chance the FAA is going to continue to do its job as aggressively as it needs to.

So Senator WICKER's office said, "Mr. Bradbury intentionally withheld relevant information requested by the committee." He made our investiga-

tion very hard. In fact, Senator WICKER later said, "He deliberately attempted to keep us in the dark. And by that I mean our investigations, our staff, our committee, and me."

Now, I have great respect for my colleague Senator WICKER, but the Bradbury findings, in stymieing us as a committee to do our oversight job, gives me serious questions about his level of transparency.

The families of the 737 MAX crashes wrote to Chairman CRUZ last month to express their concerns about Mr. Bradbury's role in obstructing the committee's investigation into the crashes that took their loved ones' lives. They also voiced concern about Mr. Bradbury's role that led to the delays in holding Boeing accountable to implementing a true mandatory safety management system.

Now, during his hearing, Mr. Bradbury suggested that the rule ready to be proposed by the previous Trump administration that made it mandatory for manufacturers to have a safety management system was held up because some small businesses didn't want to meet that requirement.

Do we not believe that businesses are going to object to some rules? They do. They do all the time. But that doesn't mean scrapping the rule altogether, which is exactly what happened as far as the mandatory requirement.

Well, lucky for the consumer, our committee, in the aftermath of these two crashes, got legislation passed that said, "Yes, you have to have a mandatory safety management system, and you have to, FAA, put that rule out."

Now, Mr. Bradbury was still serving as general counsel and acting Deputy Secretary of the Department. You would have thought now that he has gotten a directive by Congress to put out this rule, he would have said, "Hey, we have one. We have been debating it for a while, but now we have had two crashes. It is really clear that the safety culture needs to be upgraded. Everybody agrees, all experts, this is the great system. Let's implement it."

But he didn't. He didn't move forward, even after Congress mandated it. And after Mr. Bradbury's confirmation hearing in front of the Commerce Committee last month, the families of the 737 MAX crashes released a statement saying his testimony purporting to prioritize aviation safety, "Shows a complete disregard for the 84 people who died in plane crashes in the United States in the last month."

Mr. Bradbury's troubling record doesn't stop just with transportation. During his time at the Department of Justice during the Bush administration, Mr. Bradbury authored what we know now as the widely known torture memos, justifying the use of waterboarding and other torture techniques.

The Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility reviewed these memos and raised doubts about "the objectivity and reasonableness" of

these legal analyses. DOJ also found evidence that Mr. Bradbury's legal analyses "were written with the goal of allowing the ongoing CIA program to continue."

Mr. Bradbury, then, at the Department of Justice, was writing rules that fit the outcome that he wanted, instead of looking objectively at what the American people needed. These legal opinions were contrary to what this Nation stands for.

Later, the Senate refused to confirm Mr. Bradbury as Assistant Attorney General during the Bush administration, and Congress passed the McCain-Feinstein amendment to the 2016 NDAA, codifying the illegality of those torture methods—those very torture methods that Mr. Bradbury said were okay.

We passed a law to basically change what this guy's legal opinion was because it was so bad. And so now, when the Senate is asked to provide advice and consent on Mr. Bradbury's nomination to be Deputy Secretary of the Transportation Department, I think you should look back at what happened then. Two of our Republican colleagues voted against his nomination because of the torture memos. They rightly concluded that he was not right to fit in the Department of Justice role.

I am saying today, what do you need to know? He didn't fight for strong safety rules at the Department of Transportation before; he is not going to fight for them now. It is really clear that our aviation safety system needs strong leadership at the FAA, not someone who is going to write the rule to fit business, but write the rule to fit safety.

As if these issues weren't concerning enough, there is another issue. During his confirmation hearing, I asked Mr. Bradbury, "What about the conflicts of interest that appear to be mounting between Elon Musk and the FAA?"

I thought, a smart lawyer could really give guidance to the Secretary of Transportation, give guidance to the FAA Administrator, the acting one, and could say, "These are the ways in which Elon Musk should not pass go, would be a conflict of interest, would be a problem at the FAA, given that there are already issues that are really clearly in front of us."

So I said, "Tell us. Tell us. Where do you think those conflicts of interest exist?" Of course, at the hearing, he kind of demurred, and I said, "You know what, Mr. Bradbury, you can give me for the record where exactly do you think there's a conflict of interest?"

But he didn't just evade my questions; he basically said that he thought that it was an excellent idea to have Elon Musk and SpaceX making changes to the FAA air traffic control system. In fact, he said that he didn't "see the potential for a conflict" with the SpaceX employees having access to the FAA.

Of course, we know now that three SpaceX engineers were recently hired

as special government employees at the FAA and were immediately granted conflict of interest waivers by the Trump administration so they could work on matters at the FAA. Why? Because they had "direct and predictable effects upon the financial interests of SpaceX."

So in other words, the Trump administration conceded that conflicts of interest do exist, and they are going to let them happen anyway, and they went to get a waiver. The conflicts of interest for Mr. Musk and SpaceX at the FAA is obvious.

Let me just say, though, first, you can have all sorts of broadband solutions, including satellite solutions. But when you are talking about the air traffic controller system, that kind of system is inferior to fiber. Why? Because of speed, capacity, cost, weather, all sorts of issues. And when there is chaos, we need certainty and predictability.

So we are seeing a conflict play out right before our eyes. According to a Bloomberg report, one of SpaceX's engineers who was granted a conflict of interest waiver recently told the FAA that SpaceX planned to send 4,000 Starlink terminals to the Agency. For what? We are still trying to find out.

The FAA already entered into a \$2 billion contract with Verizon in 2023 to upgrade its telecommunications network. But Mr. Musk's own tweet suggests he wants to cancel the FAA's contract with Verizon. He is saying that they are failing. He wants them to use his product instead.

And yet, Mr. Bradbury apparently doesn't even see the potential—he doesn't even see the potential for the conflict of interest.

It doesn't stop with Starlink as a broadband supplier. Just last week, SpaceX's Starship heavy lift rocket malfunctioned and broke apart over the Caribbean before it reached orbit. Dangerous debris fell from the sky. The FAA smartly halted flights in the area to ensure safety, and thankfully, no one was injured. The FAA initiated an immediate investigation into SpaceX to determine what happened. The investigation presents another clear conflict of interest.

As we know, Mr. Musk doesn't think FAA safety rules should apply to him. Last September, the FAA fined Mr. Musk and SpaceX for failing to comply with specific requirements in its launch license. Afterwards, after getting fined, Mr. Musk made a spectacle, calling for the firing of the FAA Administrator.

That is right, the FAA fined him, and then he called for the FAA Administrator—oh, wait, wait 1 second, the FAA Administrator that passed this body 98-0, because everybody here thought he was going to do a great job.

But Mr. Bradbury doesn't think Elon Musk has a conflict of interest, but Elon Musk can basically say to the President of the United States, "Fire the FAA Administrator that we all said we thought would do a good job."

Now, we all know Mr. Whitaker wasn't going to stick around without being backed up for the safety work that he was doing. And now, we don't have a Senate-confirmed head of the FAA. Why? Because Mr. Whitaker didn't want to stay around if everybody was going to let Donald Trump do whatever the heck he wanted when it came to the FAA. All this because Musk got fined for violating safety rules.

So I really don't understand what Mr. Bradbury doesn't understand that he can't write down on a piece of paper where real conflict of interest exists.

We need new leadership in the Department of Transportation so that we can continue to stand up to safety issues. I do not believe Mr. Bradbury is that person.

Mr. Bradbury sees bureaucratic hurdles when other people see safety safeguards. He sees redtape where we see lifesaving protections. He sees the objective of having a light-touch FAA, and we see the objective of having safety be the primary purpose—because you can't win at aviation if you don't win at aviation safety first.

Ask the people of the Pacific Northwest. The catastrophes of the MAX crashes not only lost lives; they cost billions of dollars. So not adhering to safety is hardly a winning economic solution.

So Mr. Bradbury hasn't shown us the leadership on safety. He has not shown the fidelity of upholding the law, or even respecting Congress. He has not shown us the courage that it takes to stand up and make sure that safety is implemented. And the consequences of putting the wrong person in place are measured in human lives, not dollars—human lives.

The Boeing 737 MAX families know this—yesterday was the sixth anniversary of the Ethiopian Airlines crash that claimed 157 lives—family members like Javier de Luis and Nadia Milleron, who have now oriented their lives around making aviation safer. I so appreciate their advocacy, but the people at the FAA should be doing the same.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the nomination of Steven Bradbury.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

MR. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

MR. CORNYN. Mr. President, it is another week in Washington and I think maybe the 52nd day since President Trump was inaugurated, and we are seeing the compliant mainstream media continue to spread falsehoods about the work of the Department of Government Efficiency and Elon Musk.

As I have said before, the Federal Government has a spending problem, and, like with any addiction, getting

clean and solving that problem is not necessarily easy or comfortable, but it is long overdue and absolutely necessary. With the national debt at \$36.2 trillion and counting, we have to start somewhere, and little things add up. What better place to start than the waste, fraud, and abuse that DOGE is identifying?

This has long been a bipartisan issue—I can think of everything dating back to the Grace Commission, where waste, fraud, and abuse was a bipartisan target—but apparently not with President Trump in the office and not with Elon Musk in charge of the effort to identify the spending.

If you take a look at most things that the Federal Government is cutting at the recommendation of DOGE, it becomes harder and harder to become a DOGE skeptic unless you are just blind to what they are doing.

Last week, I mentioned the waste that DOGE had identified with subscriptions and software licenses. People may think, well, that is no big deal, but there is no reason taxpayers should be footing the bill for expensive subscriptions that go unused.

DOGE uncovered the potential for massive fraud with an audit they conducted of government credit cards. At the beginning of the audit, there were 4.6 million active government credit cards—4.6 million. After 2 weeks, DOGE identified nearly 150,000 credit cards that were thankfully unused or unneeded and closed both down. I am sure there is more to be done with 4.6 million active credit cards.

There is no reason for so many government employees to have direct access to spending taxpayer money at the click of a button or the swipe of a credit card. This is basic and would never happen in the private sector or in our individual lives, but in the Federal Government, before this administration and before DOGE, this was commonplace and has been overlooked for way too long.

There are some instances of fraud that we have known about for some time, but it has taken the Trump administration and DOGE to identify and fix them. For example, the Government Accountability Office submitted a report to Congress last April estimating that the Federal Government loses between \$223 billion and \$521 billion every year as a result of improper payments. The Federal Government is making improper payments and spending potentially up to half a trillion dollars. Naturally, this was an opportunity for DOGE to identify this waste of taxpayer dollars.

DOGE found payments to illegal immigrants using multiple Social Security numbers to submit Medicare claims, something for which they are not legally entitled.

They found \$57,000 in Medicare payments in 2020 for a patient who actually was recorded to have died 14 years earlier. It is amazing you can continue to charge for Medicare payments 14 years after your death.

In one particularly egregious instance, an illegal immigrant with a warrant out for her arrest was receiving more than \$100,000 in loans from the Small Business Administration, but the waste and abuse of tax dollars goes beyond mere inefficiencies.

Some of the other line items on the DOGE cutting floor are so patently absurd it would make your blood boil. For example, last week, the National Institutes of Health canceled more than a half billion dollars in grants for transgender experiments on mice. You can't make this stuff up. It is stranger than fiction.

In a similar vein, NIH also canceled millions in woke grants ranging from promoting healthy relationships among transgender youth to delivering transgender services via telehealth. I think if you ask most taxpayers how they would like their money to be spent, these programs would not make the cut, but that is not all.

NIH is also canceling research grants that were going to universities in China. They canceled a grant for \$1.7 million going to the Peking University in Beijing for the "China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study."

Once again, I think American taxpayers would prefer to focus on the things here at home, including their own retirement savings rather than sending millions of dollars to China to study health and retirement security in a country which is our chief geopolitical rival, but that is not all.

The list goes on. A group called the Inter-American Foundation has been significantly reduced after DOGE found egregious misuse of tax dollars, including over \$900,000 going toward alpaca farming in Peru. That is on top of \$800,000 for vegetable gardens in El Salvador and more than \$700,000 to improve the marketability of mushrooms and peas in Guatemala.

I know that children frequently squirm at the dinner table when they are told they have to eat their vegetables, but I don't think this is an area where most people think our tax dollars should be spent. Unfortunately, this waste doesn't stop at the vegetable aisle.

This foundation also spent more than \$600,000 to expand the sales of fruit and jam in Honduras as well as nearly half a million dollars on improving the production of artisanal salt in Ecuador—artisanal salt in Ecuador.

Well, thank goodness the Department of Government Efficiency and Mr. Musk were key to identifying these egregious abuses of the taxpayer, but they have been going on for a long time until the Trump administration came along. So I am grateful that now some of these outrageous expenditures of tax dollars are being exposed and dealt with.

As I said earlier, Washington, DC, has a spending problem. And like any addiction, it is hard to kick the habit, especially after you become adjusted to it, but it is time for a little cold turkey

when it comes to this addiction. Many people who benefit from this gravy train don't want it to end.

So, naturally, many of our colleagues on the other side are concerned about DOGE, and they want to suggest that everything the Federal Government does is absolutely perfect. They wouldn't change a thing. But they don't really have any real substantive response to these outrageous examples that I am mentioning here. They wouldn't change a thing.

They see these stats, and they tell you don't believe your lying eyes. But those of us who have looked into it, who have taken the time to study what has been exposed, know otherwise: The government is not infallible.

We have an unsustainable level of Federal debt that threatens our economy and our national security, and the truth is, the Trump administration and Republicans are hard at work trying to address it to make the government more efficient and more affordable for American families.

So, once again, I would like to do something that you don't hear very often here in DC these days and thank Elon Musk for his service to our country in performing this essential and long overdue role.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Bradbury nomination.

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

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. 26, Steven Bradbury, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

John Thune, Jim Justice, Bill Cassidy, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd, Tom Cotton, Jon Husted, Tim Sheehy, Deb Fischer, Ron Johnson, John Kennedy, Markwayne Mullin, Steve Daines, Ashley Moody, Ted Cruz, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Eric Schmitt.

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 Steven Bradbury, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mrs.

DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Blackburn	Grassley	Mullin
Boozman	Hagerty	Murkowski
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Husted	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Rosen
Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	Kelly	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lujan	Hassan
Coons	Markey	Smith
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Fetterman	Murray	Warnock
Gallego	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Paul	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Justice	Slotkin
-----------	---------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:51 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BRITT).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON BRADBURY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bradbury nomination?

Mr. TILLIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Blackburn	Grassley	Mullin
Boozman	Hagerty	Murkowski
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Husted	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Rosen
Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	Kelly	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Paul	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Justice	Slotkin
-----------	---------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Wyoming.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Slater nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 28, Abigail Slater, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

John Thune, Jim Justice, Bill Cassidy, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd, Tom Cotton, Jon Husted, Tim Sheehy, Deb Fischer, Ron Johnson, John Kennedy, Markwayne Mullin, Steve Daines, Ashley Moody, Ted Cruz, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Eric Schmitt.

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 Abigail Slater, of the District of Co-

lumbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, 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. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Ex.]

YEAS—77

Alsobrooks	Gallego	Murkowski
Baldwin	Graham	Padilla
Banks	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hagerty	Ricketts
Bennet	Hassan	Risch
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Husted	Schiff
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sheehy
Collins	Kim	Smith
Coons	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Tuberville
Cramer	Lummis	Warnock
Crapo	Marshall	Warren
Cruz	McConnell	Welch
Curtis	McCormick	Whitehouse
Daines	Moody	Wicker
Durbin	Moran	Wyden
Ernst	Moreno	Young
Fischer	Mullin	

NAYS—19

Blumenthal	Markey	Sanders
Blunt Rochester	Merkley	Schatz
Fetterman	Murphy	Schumer
Gillibrand	Murray	Van Hollen
Heinrich	Ossoff	Warner
Hirono	Paul	
Lujan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth	Justice
Hawley	Slotkin

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 19.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Abigail Slater, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if House Republicans don't think they need us when writing a bill, why should they expect us to support that bill, especially when it comes to taking funding away from our families who depend on it and hurting our communities and giving away Congress's power over key funding decisions?

Instead of working with Democrats to invest in working people all across our country and make sure our constituents have their voices heard in

government funding, Speaker JOHNSON abandoned talks and rolled out a bill that includes major cuts. It cuts non-defense discretionary funding by \$15 billion in total in 2025 and hands a blank check to Trump and Elon Musk to pick winners and losers and steal from our constituents.

Make no mistake, the entire bill the House is voting on today is House Republicans' own doing, and it is a dumpster fire, so I am here to sound the alarm about that fire before it spreads. But, first, I need everyone to understand: The choice is absolutely not dumpster fire or shutdown. I should know. I introduced another option yesterday. It is a short-term CR that would give us the time to finish doing our job and negotiate bipartisan, full-year bills. There is no reason we cannot do that, and there is every reason that every single one of us should prefer actual bills that we write to help people over the bill that just empowers two billionaires who are running our government into the ground and our economy into a recession.

I really want to make sure all of my colleagues understand how bad this bill is. So if anyone thinks this bill from House Republicans is going to avoid chaos or avoid pain for our country, listen up because it is only going to add to the chaos.

This is not a "clean CR," as some Republicans claim. It cuts programs our communities rely on, and that includes a major 44-percent cut to Army Corps projects that help mitigate against floods and hurricanes and much else.

It cuts medical research into diseases and conditions affecting servicemembers and their families by more than \$1 billion. That is over 40 percent.

It leaves a massive \$280 million shortfall in NIH's budget, and that is a big cut to research that saves lives.

It leaves a shortfall for housing programs. We are talking about 32,000 fewer vouchers. And that is just scratching the surface.

It also completely lacks the basic guardrails we include in all of our funding bills, on a bipartisan basis, each and every year, to make sure that our States and our communities are taken care of and not just subject to the whims of the Trump administration or any administration to pick winners and losers.

House Republicans are not trying to responsibly fund the government; they are trying to turn it into a slush fund for Trump and Musk to wield as they see fit so that they can shift their focus entirely to tax cuts for billionaires.

Right now, we—Congress—have the power of the purse. We have that power to fight for our States, to fight for our families, to bring Federal dollars back home and build bridges and feed families and care for veterans and fight fentanyl—whatever our communities tell us they need.

We should not cede that power with this bill. That is really worth sitting with for a minute.

We all chose to be here, to be here in Congress. We chose to take on this role so we can advocate for causes and communities that we care about and work in a bipartisan manner to reach compromise, to make sure that our causes and our communities get the support they need.

House Republicans' full-year CR would instead pass the buck to Elon Musk and unelected political appointees to decide who gets funded and who doesn't. Is that not why each and every one of us was actually elected, to fight for our States and to fight for our communities as the people who know them best?

I certainly know that is true for me. I have worked for years with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make sure that people back home who trusted us when we said we would fight for them always know Congress has their back.

So really think about that before you vote to make your voice mean less for the rest of this fiscal year because it is terrifying to think of what unelected political appointees would do.

We have already gotten an alarming preview of how Trump will threaten to cut off States and cities that might disagree with him, and Elon will totally work the government to benefit his companies and hurt his competitors.

I have to say, our bipartisan appropriations process is not always easy, but it is a heck of a lot better than handing over our decision making to this or to any administration. Voting against this bill is about standing for communities and families who actually rely on the funding and for our ability—every one of us—to be a voice for our constituents in Congress because what is going to happen when, perhaps, medical research funding gets sucked away from cancer and Alzheimer's all because a scientist worked somewhere previously and said that vaccines are safe and all of a sudden the funding is gone?

What happens when you can't get a bridge replaced because the political appointees at DOT don't like the policies your mayors advocated for?

What happens when they reduce staffing at national parks in your backyard because your Governor won't deny climate change?

The bipartisan directives we provide—we, Congress, provides—each year with our funding bills help guard against that kind of thing for any administration. And all of that is missing from this disastrous slush fund CR.

Through bipartisan compromise, we make sure our communities have a voice at the table, and our taxpayer dollars have a return on their taxes. We should reject this bill. We should pass a short-term CR to avoid a shutdown, and then we should do our job and work on full-year spending bills like we were sent here to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am scheduled to be part of a colloquy here in just a couple minutes, but I wanted to make a comment about what the Senator from Washington has shared.

I am going to use a term that maybe some people are not familiar with. We are in a "Morton's fork"—a Morton's fork. We have heard about a fork in the road. Some people know what a Hobson's choice is. But a Morton's fork is a choice between two equally unpleasant alternatives. And if this isn't where we are right now, ladies and gentlemen, I don't know what is.

As Senator MURRAY has outlined, a long-term CR—a long-term CR—when we have already done our appropriations work and we are not able to get to that work and instead we basically give the administration the ability to direct within the funding levels but direct as they will see fit through the end of September is something that I think many of us—certainly this appropriator—do not really feel comfortable with.

I spent a lot of time within my Appropriations subcommittee, working very hard with the Department of the Interior, to make sure that we knew, whether it was funding for wildland firefighters or what we were doing within the VA or within any of the other Agencies—that we did what people asked and expected us to do. We did those bills, and I think we did a pretty good job.

Mine moved out of full committee unanimously, and then they didn't advance. So here we are sitting at a place where we have to take either the choice of a long-term CR and basically give up the work that we have done as a Congress or we move to a government shutdown, an equally untenable and equally unpleasant alternative and one that, quite honestly, we should not be in this position. We should not be in this place where we have two bad choices for our government and for the people of this country.

We can do better. I wish—I agree, Senator MURRAY—I wish that what we were able to advance was a short-term CR that would allow us to move to finish up our appropriations bills, do our work, and then start moving on to fiscal year 2026. I don't know whether it is possible between now and the end of day on March 14, but I, for one, am at a place where I am just beside myself that we are in a place where we feel that we have no good alternatives. We are in a Morton's fork.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UKRAINE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to come to the floor today to support Ukraine. I am especially pleased that we have colleagues from both sides of the aisle who are here to support the Ukrainians in this unjust war against Russia.

Now, I understand and appreciate the desire for peace in Ukraine, and I understand why we should end the senseless killing of innocent people. I think if you ask Ukrainians, they want this war to end too. They are watching how this war is destroying their country, but the best way to make a deal here is to give Ukraine as much leverage as possible.

I am pleased to hear today that there is the potential for a cease-fire; that as part of that, U.S. intelligence sharing would be turned back on. I think we should also keep sanctions on Russia. I think NATO membership should be on the table for Ukraine because Vladimir Putin only understands strength.

When he invaded Crimea in 2014, a lot of people, including myself, didn't think our response was strong enough. We were concerned that Vladimir Putin couldn't be trusted to abide by negotiated agreements, and 3 years ago, of course, Putin proved us right when he directed his forces to attack Ukraine again in a full-scale invasion.

His missiles struck kindergartens and maternity wards, and they continue to strike innocent civilians. His soldiers carried out massacres in places like Bucha, where just a few weeks ago, I saw firsthand, along with Senators Bennet and Tillis, the lingering effects of trauma of what Vladimir Putin and the Russians did in Bucha.

We heard about the indiscriminate murdering of civilians, the rape and the torture of innocent bystanders. Well, Russian soldiers rushed into Ukraine from the north, from the south, and from the east. Many predicted that the country would fall within weeks, if not days. But as we stand on the floor today, Ukraine is still standing. That is thanks, in no small part, to the strong bipartisan support that Ukraine has enjoyed here in Congress.

I think that support—that strong bipartisan support—has been there because we understand that this is a fight for democracy. This is the fight to stop the overturning of the international rules-based order, to stop a dictator like Vladimir Putin from going into a country and thinking just because he wants to take it over, he can.

We know that not only are our allies watching what happens here, but so are our adversaries. North Korea is already fighting on Russia's side against the Ukrainians. Iran is providing missiles. China is providing support. They are watching what America does here.

We understand, as Republican and Democratic Senators, that to have a lasting peace in Ukraine, we need to make sure that Russia is accountable, and that we have security guarantees.

Now, there are a number of ways to do that, and they don't necessarily mean U.S. troops on the ground or even NATO troops on the ground. Europe is working through different options.

As I said, Senator TILLIS and I were recently in Ukraine, along with Senator BENNET, and we saw firsthand that

despite Russia's advantages in size and manpower, that Ukrainians are not giving up. Ukraine now has one of the most advanced militaries in the world, the most advanced in Europe.

I came away impressed by their ingenuity, their ability to innovate in the face of Russian aggression. Ukrainians are sharing those lessons from the battlefield with our U.S. military. They are helping us prepare for the wars of the future, and it is not just something that we understand in Congress is important, but my constituents in New Hampshire understand how important it is that we support the Ukrainians.

I brought with me today a poster from a community effort in New Hampshire that has raised \$4 million to support the people and children, particularly, in Ukraine. They provided 3 million-plus pounds of food, 10,000 sleeping bags, hundreds of generators, and 900 children are in trauma counseling because of their effort. They raised over \$4 million from New Hampshire to support the Ukrainians.

Americans across this country understand why this fight is important to us. It is why we are here on the floor today to reiterate that we stand with Ukraine, and I urge all of my colleagues who support Ukraine, Republicans and Democrats alike, to join us—join us in speaking up for Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity; join us in pushing to strengthen Ukraine's place at the negotiating table; join us in calling on Moscow to withdraw from the Ukrainian territory that it has seized.

Thousands of Ukrainians have given their lives in this fight. They have been on the frontlines for all of us. As a group of women in the Ukrainian military said to me in the first year of the war: Give us the equipment; give us the arms so that we can fight the Russians so that you in America don't have to.

Well, they have been on the frontlines for all of us defending the international order that has served American interests since the end of World War II. I hope we will continue to support them in that effort.

Mr. President, I yield to my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased to be on the floor today with the Senator from New Hampshire as well as other colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Ukraine. We are now more than 3 years into Russia's unprovoked brutal war against Ukraine.

I think we are encouraged by the news that we are seeing advance this afternoon with the talks in Saudi Arabia between the United States and Ukrainian officials as they talk about the potential for a cease-fire and potential for the United States to restore military support and intelligence sharing. These are promising developments.

I think we all want to—we all want to—arrive at a place where we see

peace. But when we talk about how the peace is gained, I think, again, the discussions that are had on this floor—those of us who have had an opportunity to go to Ukraine and see the situation on the ground ourselves, to speak with so many engaged in this effort—the stakes are not only about Ukraine's sovereignty. The stakes also include our values, our security, and our credibility as the leader of the free world.

This is not just a regional conflict on the edge of Europe. It is a global test. It is a test of whether the international community will allow borders to be redrawn by force, a test of whether democracies will continue to stand together when authoritarian regimes literally try to rewrite the rules, and, yes, it is a test; it is a test of American leadership in the 21st century.

As was stated, the Ukrainian people are not asking us to fight their war. They are doing the fighting. It is their sons, it is their daughters that are dying. What they are asking of us as the world's leading democracy is to help us with the tools, help us with the arms, the ammunition, the logistical support; help them protect them; help them with the intelligence that can be provided through satellite imaging; help them so that they can protect themselves.

I think we should be proud. We should be proud as Americans that we have helped to make a difference. We have helped Ukraine push back the Russian advance. It has prevented Kyiv from falling to Russia. It continues to help Ukrainian defenders hold the line there.

So every weapons system, every round of ammunition and radar and drone that we have helped to provide—these aren't just supplies; these are literally lifelines to the people.

When you think about the people, I think it is important to also recognize another way that we have helped in this country. Senator SHAHEEN showed a picture of the Ukrainian families and the people in her State. In Alaska, we have welcomed, we have embraced, we have helped situate Ukrainian families who have sought refuge, who are here in a place like Alaska, in a place like New Hampshire, because where they call home is not safe to be.

So how we can support them is important because when we support Ukraine, we are not just helping a nation in need, we are protecting and we are preserving the rules-based international order that has helped keep the peace for generations.

If we falter, others are watching. Others are watching the situation in Moscow, in Beijing, in Tehran, Pyongyang. So if it is seen that we are walking away from Ukraine, if we embrace appeasement, we embolden every aggressor around the globe.

More than that, it is our allies, it is our friends, our partners—they are watching this, and they are asking the question: Is the United States a country that can be depended on? Are we

seeing this alliance that we have had, that we have worked to nurture and build for 80 years—are we seeing that fray?

I understand absolutely the cause for restraint in our support—that war costs too much, that we need to be focusing on issues here at home—but, again, the fight is bigger than that. It is significant, yes, for Ukraine, but it is about democratic values and standing up for democratic values; it is about stopping the expansionist ambitions of authoritarian regimes.

I think we have to be honest here. Look at history. Russia is not going to stop at Ukraine. In 2005, in a state of the nation address, Putin said:

The demise of the Soviet Union was the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century.

He has never hidden his ambitions from that statement. When Putin says that the “ongoing collapse of Western hegemony is irreversible,” he means us. He means our allies and the broader narrative about the decline of Western influence. He wants NATO to be divided, and he wants the United States isolated. This works to his advantage. He just probably didn’t expect that America was going to do it for him.

Now, as an Alaskan, I get geography. I am acutely aware of the threat a more aggressive Russia poses just across the Bering Sea. Two miles separate the United States—Alaska’s Little Diomed and Russia’s Big Diomed. We see Russia’s military buildup when we see the Russian bombers that are flying in our area, when we see the Russian and the Chinese naval forces out in our waters. But we also know and have long known that a destabilized Europe means a more dangerous world for the United States. This conflict may seem like a continent away, a long way away, but the consequences are anything but distant.

We all want this war to end, but it cannot end on Russia’s terms. If it does, we should expect nothing more than a temporary respite before the resumption of hostilities. Why are we going to start trusting and believing Putin’s word now given his track record? We have seen this before. History doesn’t lie, and the appeasement of tyrants does not bring peace.

Russia started this conflict, and it is critical for us to stand with Ukraine to end it—not just because it is right but because it is necessary.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, thank you, and I thank my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, for coming to the floor today in support of our continued support for Ukraine.

I was heartened to hear today that President Zelenskyy is on board with the U.S. ceasefire proposal. That is good news. It does highlight that President Zelenskyy has shown time and again that he is always willing to negotiate for peace. Putin has always been

the aggressor. And that is why I believe we must stand with Ukraine.

You know, the question before us today—whether we will continue to stand with Ukraine—has immense implications for the security of the United States, of our European allies, and of world peace.

These are critical questions to get right: Should the United States stand by our 80-year-old security commitments in Europe? Should the United States stand behind the rules-based order established in the aftermath of the catastrophic World War II or should we abandon those rules despite the fact that they have served our national security interests for so long? Those are the questions.

You know, in the aftermath of the horrors of World War II, in which more than 80 million people died, the United States did establish alliances and security commitments in Europe and determined that this was the way to avoid a World War III—investments in NATO, Armed Forces in Europe, and European democracy and economic prosperity. We did not want to repeat what happened after World War I, where none of this was done, and it created the conditions for a Second World War.

Perhaps most importantly, America asserted that it would defend a Europe so borders are not changed by force, where nations cannot invade weaker neighbors with impunity.

Was that effort worth it in these past 80 years? Yes. Since some are now suggesting otherwise, I would like to mention a few of the reasons why the post-World War II order in Europe, led by the United States and enacted by a treaty in this U.S. Senate, was a success in keeping the peace.

No conflict. Europe has avoided a major war for 80 years.

The end of the U.S.S.R. Europe weathered the storm of the breakup of the Soviet Union, ushering in new countries committed to democratic values of freedom and democracy.

Yugoslavia. Europe and NATO weathered the conflict and breakup of the former Yugoslavia, demonstrating unprecedented EU-NATO cooperation and commitments in the Balkans to Western democratic values.

Our European allies have always been there for us, including in the aftermath of 9/11.

Economic values. Our commitments also ushered in the fall of communism and a vibrant European Union that is peaceful and democratic—a club that the Balkans, Eastern Europe, and now Ukraine want into.

It is a testament to the success of the painstaking efforts that Republican and Democratic administrations and Republican majority and Democratic majority of the U.S. Senate adhere to.

But these commitments to European security, to NATO, and to protecting territorial integrity weren’t only good in the past. To say that these alliances and commitments are tired or worn out says that we are tired, that we are

worn out of peace and tired of maintaining peace for our citizens here in the United States. That is a fatigue we can never succumb to—ever. Those values are needed today to protect Ukraine in Europe and the United States from a rampant, unlawful, invasive Russia.

You know, since the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine, along with the rest of Eastern Europe and the Balkan States, has moved rapidly to reorient its politics and policies towards the European Union, toward democracy, toward freedom. It was, in fact, Ukraine’s pursuit of a closer relationship with the EU that Putin the autocrat used as an excuse to interfere in Ukraine’s internal affairs.

The invasion of Ukraine also demonstrated the resilience of America’s security relationships with Europe and NATO. Never has the European Command of the U.S. Armed Forces—designed and built to defend Western Europe against a Soviet invasion—been called upon to coordinate the actual defense of European sovereign borders from an invasion from the east. Today, that is a reality. Europe also—very much our partner—saw the threat and rose to the occasion.

In part—and I want to acknowledge President Trump’s insistence on this—European countries have begun to increase their defense spending, as they should and as they must. They have done so, and they have stepped up by providing materiel, as we have—advanced missiles, drones, and other military technology—for Ukraine. In fact, as a percentage of the gross domestic product, Europe has given more to Ukraine in support and weapons than the United States. We are doing it together.

We cannot take for granted that we have had this peace in Europe for 80 years. We cannot take for granted that we did that. It was the result of that sustained commitment of Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and of Presidents of both parties. Our duty is to keep that alliance united at this stressful time.

If Ukraine fails, we should not assume that European security and our alliances there will survive. World War II ended 80 years ago. We have to keep it 80 more.

The Senators that ratified the establishment of NATO and our American-European commitments to peace and security on the European continent—they understood that our European alliances are critical to our own security. They would be rightly proud of their success story—of 80 years of peace, of democracy, of freedom in Europe—but they would be horrified at the threat that Putin now poses to Europe, threatening everything that we and those who came before us have worked for.

Ukraine's integration with the rest of Europe, their own right to self-determination, Ukraine's battlefield courage, and Ukraine's political commitment to democracy and freedom validate the 80 years of America's commitment to creating structures that can enforce and protect peace. Turning away from Ukraine now when it needs us most could mean the end of that 80-year success story.

We must stand by Ukraine and against that unlawful invasion by Mr. Putin. We must stand by our European allies. And we must reaffirm our continued dedication to the work of those who served here before us to build the alliances and to sustain the alliances that have preserved the peace in Europe. Their future and ours depend on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I begin my formal remarks, let me thank my neighbor from New Hampshire for organizing this bipartisan display of support for Ukraine.

On February 24, 2022, without justification, without provocation, Russia launched a full-scale, brutal invasion of its democratic neighbor Ukraine with missiles, air assaults, and army divisions.

As John Adams said, "Facts are stubborn things," and the facts of what happened on that terrible day are undeniable. It was Russia that started the war.

Many thought that Ukraine had no chance against the perceived might of the Russian armed forces. However, the Ukrainians fought so bravely against that initial onslaught and, since then, the West has come together with speed and clarity of purpose to support Ukraine.

Senator MCCONNELL stated it best last week by saying:

Russia's horrible invasion of Ukraine has had a unifying effect on the world's democracies.

As a result of the invasion, two nations, Sweden and Finland, joined NATO; Eastern Europe is completing a pivot away from Russia's energy sources; and NATO allies are surging to the 2 percent GDP goal for defense spending.

As for the brave Ukrainians, they pushed back the initial Russian invaders and are now doing their best to hold the line in eastern Ukraine, despite Russian soldiers, ammunition, and UAVs far outnumbering their Ukrainian counterparts. Ukraine decimated the Russian Black Sea Fleet and has forced Russia to augment its forces with North Korean soldiers and Iranian weapon systems.

But despite the successes in the past 3 years, the war drags on with devastating consequences: 390,000 Ukrainians have been wounded, with more than 46,000 deaths so far. Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian families have been displaced, and estimates are that

approximately 29,000 civilian Ukrainians have lost their lives. In many cases, they were targeted by the Russians.

It is not American troops who are dying on the Ukrainian frontlines. It is the Ukrainians who are courageously defending their country, their democracy, their way of life. And their defenses directly connect to our efforts in NATO and the defense of Eastern Europe.

If Vladimir Putin is allowed to succeed in Ukraine, as several of my colleagues have pointed out, he will not stop there. He will continue to pursue his dream, his goal, of recreating the former Soviet Union. He has made that crystal clear. In my judgment, he would most likely seize Moldova next; again, invade Georgia, as he did in 2008; threaten the Baltic States; and menace Poland and Finland.

The best way to ensure that the United States is not drawn into a larger regional war in Europe, which would directly threaten American troops, is by helping Ukraine defend itself against this unprovoked invasion.

The national security supplemental appropriations package that was signed into law last year included \$15.4 billion to help Ukraine purchase American-made weapons. It is strengthening our military readiness, rebuilding our industrial base, and assisting our partners and allies at a volatile and dangerous time in world history.

For the past 3 years, we have heard repeatedly the myth that somehow the European countries were not doing their part in helping to equip Ukraine, but let's take a look at the facts. As a percentage of GDP, the United States ranks 17th—17th—in support for Ukraine. The top three countries include Denmark, Estonia, and Latvia. These NATO nations are all in on supporting Ukraine's defenses because they understand that the stakes are so high. Furthermore, NATO allies have committed \$185 billion to buy weapons and defense systems produced right here in the United States, which helps us sustain good jobs and strengthens the industrial base.

Both the Biden administration's slow-walking of the delivery of weapons to Ukraine and the Trump administration's pausing military aid and intelligence sharing sent the wrong signal to an aggressive Russia. The decision this afternoon to restart U.S. military aid and intelligence sharing are welcome steps to strengthening Ukraine's position in negotiations. With the tentative cease-fire signed by Ukraine and now up for Russia's concurrence, resumed aid and intelligence sharing with our ally Ukraine allows that country to be in a much stronger position moving forward.

History is filled with examples of well-intentioned leaders who sought to avoid war but who actually made war more likely by refusing to recognize the evil with which they were confronted. Neville Chamberlain declared

"peace in our time," trying to appease Germany before World War II. We should not make the same mistake today by appeasing Russia.

We cannot avert our eyes. We cannot leave an ally to fend for itself, and we must show resolve to deter possible future aggression by China, Iran, and North Korea.

Our adversaries are watching closely our response in Ukraine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, Putin will only stop when we stop him. That piece of wisdom was shared with me on a trip to Europe by a former colleague, Senator McCain, and it seems to me to predict what has now unfolded over the last 3 years.

Three years ago, I was in Europe with colleagues, visiting American troops training with NATO allies and partners in Poland and Lithuania, on the day that the Russians began their illegal, unjustified, full-spectrum invasion of Ukraine. As more than 100,000 combat troops poured over the border, missiles flew in the air, and jets bombed, the world recoiled in horror and watched, expecting that the Ukrainians would be overrun in just 3 days.

Instead, President Zelenskyy, the elected President of a democracy, stood firm and stayed fast and defended his country. When offered a last-minute evacuation by America, he said: I don't need a ride. I need ammunition.

And I am thrilled to be on the floor today with a bipartisan group of my colleagues. Thank you to my colleague from New Hampshire for organizing this, and to my colleague from Maine for her words, which I will agree with from beginning to end. We must deter Russia's aggression in Ukraine.

If you look at who has joined the fight alongside Russia—Iran, North Korea—this is not a team America should be on. And if we look at who has come to the defense and aid of Ukraine, it is democracies from throughout Europe and the world—more than 50 countries—that, in combination, have done more than we have, significantly, to welcome Ukrainian refugees; to support the recovery of their economy; and to arm them in this ongoing, desperate, and critical fight for freedom in Ukraine.

Who is Vladimir Putin? He is a brutal and aggressive dictator. He is a war criminal. He is someone who has used every ounce of power and resource at his grasp to shatter the peace of Europe that has lasted decades since the Second World War and to attempt to drive a wedge between the United States and our European partners and allies.

The bravery, the determination, the skill, and the capacity of the Ukrainian people to stand and fight is breathtaking. And all of us who have had the honor of visiting Kyiv, of visiting Ukraine, of spending time with those who, behind the frontline, support

their troops and those who have served and sacrificed have been forever changed.

I had the opportunity, with our former colleague and friend Senator Portman, to go to Kyiv and to present the Liberty Medal from our National Constitution Center to President Zelenskyy. And to travel through a city shattered by war and to visit with people determined to continue their fight was as inspiring to me as I know it has been to many of my colleagues who have made that same trip.

We are here today to ask: Who are we and what will we do?

We are Americans. We have stood alongside and fought alongside those who have pursued democracy, those who have stood up for liberty, for decades, around the world, and we should not shrink from this fight. We can and should insist on a just and lasting peace.

We would all like to see this brutal war come to an end. We would all like to see the suffering stop. But to force on Ukraine a cease-fire that is really a surrender masked as a cease-fire would be to betray the sacrifice and service of so many. Asking Ukraine to willingly give up conquered territory and recognize Russian sovereignty, asking Ukraine to give up its desire for security and for integration into the West, to ask Ukraine to agree to limits on its military and its capacity to be prepared for what is a likely renewed Russian assault in the future—all of these would lead to not a neutral Ukraine but a neutered Ukraine.

We know what happens next. What happens next is that the world will look at whatever peace we can secure for Ukraine and ask: Are we reliable? Is the United States a reliable ally and partner?

Putin has already suffered a strategic defeat. NATO has already been expanded. The border between NATO and Russia has doubled. Our partners throughout the world have come to this fight, and they are committing even more, in recent weeks, as Europe has stepped up to pledge hundreds of billions of dollars more.

If we are to restore deterrence, if we are to sustain the peace, if we are to be the indispensable Nation that we have worked and fought so long to be, we must finish the job. We must deter Putin from future aggression by demanding that Ukraine be secured by a just and lasting peace.

The news today that intelligence and security cooperation has restarted is encouraging, but we have a resolution cosponsored by all the Members on the floor today that makes clear where we stand: We stand with Ukraine. We stand with democracy. We insist on a just and lasting peace in this instance, and we stand for Ukraine. "Slava Ukraini."

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, my views on America's interest in Ukraine

are well known. I spent the better part of the last 3 years, here on this floor, pointing out the glaring connections between European security and the security of America's interest all across the globe—core national security interests that determine our prosperity.

Ukraine's victory and stability in Europe is squarely in the interest of the United States—our interests. Europe is our largest trading partner. Russia is a thuggish autocracy with an economy smaller than Italy's. The Russian economy is smaller than Italy's. There is simply no equivalence. There is no grand realignment opportunity that has gone unnoticed.

So let me start with this. The most harmful possible outcome of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, for U.S. interests, would be this headline: Russia wins; America loses.

Russia wins; America loses.

We can't let that be how this ends, but look at where we are right now:

On one side, fellow members of the most successful military alliance in world history, with a combined GDP of more than \$17 trillion, are openly—openly—planning for a world in which America does not call the shots and where our word no longer carries any weight. These are the closest allies and partners who have worked hand in glove with America, bought American equipment, and taken America's lead. But, if America turns its back on them, they will look elsewhere for guidance, for coordination, for weapons, and even for trade.

On the other side is Putin's Russia and its \$2 trillion GDP, where Kremlin officials now say that America's current "foreign policy configurations" now "largely align with our vision" and that hiccups in the U.S.-Ukraine relations are "useful" because they drive a wedge between America and our European allies. That is how the Russians look at this.

Well, it is not hard to imagine why they look at it that way. Freezing lethal assistance and intelligence support to Ukraine made Russia's job a lot easier. It was easier to hit Ukraine's defenders along with its schools, hospitals, and nurseries; and after 3 years of immense progress toward a stronger and more capable Transatlantic Alliance, with greater commitments to burden-sharing and European leadership, the West that had resolved to check Putin's neo-Soviet ambitions is now in danger of being consumed by internal recrimination.

What welcome news for an autocrat whose grip on power depends on the endurance of a wartime economy.

The will to force Putin to make serious concessions in the interests of lasting peace is fragmented, and too many on this side of the Atlantic seem to believe, foolishly, that his appetite will be satisfied in eastern Ukraine. His appetite will be satisfied in eastern Ukraine. This is the same mistake made by the architects of the Minsk I and Minsk II agreements. The cir-

cumstances are not crying out for a Minsk III.

Somehow, this doesn't sound like the makings of a successful deal for America. Somehow, these don't seem like the conditions for advancing America's interests in European peace and security, let alone pretending to mediate a dispute between equals.

Russia wins; America loses. It is not too late to avoid that outcome, but it will require that America and our allies operate from the same set of facts. So let's talk about actual facts.

First, the dollars and cents: America's total Ukraine-related spending comes in at \$175 billion—not \$350 billion but half that much. As a share of GDP, 11 European countries have allocated more Ukraine-related spending than the United States. In real terms, total European aid is twice—twice—U.S. spending, with more military aid than America, more budgetary assistance than America—period. Those are the actual facts.

Our allies' increasing investments have been good news for American security and the strength of our alliance. They have meant expanding arsenals and industrial capacity along with bigger defense budgets for buying American for now.

But what if—what if—even in having established the correct math, you think it is still too much to spend on helping to degrade a major American adversary without putting a single American servicemember in harm's way—not a single American servicemember in harm's way? What if you still think, somehow, we are getting a raw deal?

Consider where most of the Ukraine-related spending—\$120 billion—has actually gone: to investing in U.S. capabilities and expanding our own defense industrial capacity. We are already \$120 billion closer to restoring the sort of forces and capacity we will need to deter conflict in the Indo-Pacific than we were 3 years ago; or consider—consider—the value of the operational and tactical lessons the U.S. and our allies are drawing from Ukraine's battlefield experience. The conflict in Ukraine is a battle lab—a glimpse at the future of warfare—and our Ukrainian partners are innovating faster than American industry is often able to. Concerned about the next major conflict? We are learning how to prepare better for it. U.S.-made systems are literally feeding performance data back to us.

The American people are not getting fleeced. I am going to say it again. The American people are not getting fleeced—far from it—but if we mistake surrender for peace, we will be risking far worse.

China is watching what we do. So are America's allies and partners in Asia. To believe that we can torch our credibility in one region and not tarnish it in another is foolish. When we treat withholding assistance from Ukraine like a cudgel and insist that the victim of aggression is the side that has to

make concessions, what should we expect other partners to conclude?

Now, I have heard that Ukraine needs to be prepared to “do difficult things.” I am curious which difficult thing our frontline partners haven’t been doing for the past 3 years, like defending besieged towns and cities, like burying their sons and daughters. Will Russia be expected to do difficult things as well, like ending its onslaught? By what means are we prepared to compel them? War is hell, and the worst consequences are always borne by innocent civilians in flight and by brave soldiers holding the line.

Ending the war in Ukraine is a noble aim—preventing war, even more so. But peace is different than surrender, and being honest about who is to blame doesn’t hinder lasting peace; it enables it. Why should we be less willing to call Russia out for its brutal aggression than we are to call Hamas or Hezbollah out for theirs? Would we be afraid to call Iran out if it had nuclear weapons? Is that the lesson we want the world to draw from this conflict?

Ronald Reagan epitomized peace through strength, not by just saying the words but by action. He called the Soviet Union an Evil Empire at the same time as he dealt productively with Gorbachev.

In July of 1983, he spoke to the people of the captive nations of the Soviet Union and communist regimes.

He said:

[T]o every person trapped in tyranny, whether in the Ukraine, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Cuba, or Vietnam, we send our love and support and tell them they are not alone. Our message must be: Your struggle is our struggle, your dream is our dream, and someday, you, too, will be free.

In the fall of the Soviet Union, Ukraine got its chance at freedom. Putin intends to extinguish it. Ukraine is serious about a just and stable peace. How do we know? We know because the Ukrainians preferred it overwhelmingly until their neighbor chose war instead again and again.

I will reserve my skepticism, my disdain, and my condescension of the authoritarian thug who treats the slaughter of innocent children like a sport, and anyone who cares about not getting played for a sucker should do the same. In the face of our hesitation, Putin has escalated. He has insulted the sincere pursuit of peace. It is a crystal-clear reminder that what he is after isn’t an end to the bloodshed. America cannot afford to get played. So let’s not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 6 minutes, Senator TILLIS for up to 10 minutes, and Senator SANDERS for up to 20 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I would like to thank Senator MCCONNELL for his constancy over the last 3 years. We have been out on the floor together many times to speak about the need to support Ukraine.

I also want to thank my colleague Senator SHAHEEN from New Hampshire, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for organizing this bipartisan gathering.

Senator TILLIS from North Carolina is here as well. It is nice to be here in a bipartisan way with people from both sides of the aisle to work on something of this critical importance to my State of Colorado, to the country, and to the world.

Senator MCCONNELL, not surprisingly today, talked about that very, very famous lesson that Ronald Reagan taught all of us, and that was his pursuit of peace through strength. I was on the floor talking about that last week. Today we have a corollary to Ronald Reagan’s rule of peace through strength from Senator MCCONNELL, which is, don’t mistake surrender for peace. Don’t mistake surrender for peace.

The lesson Ronald Reagan was teaching when he said “peace through strength” was a lesson that history had taught him and history had taught the free world.

Dust off your reliable 10th-grade Western civics textbook and look up President Woodrow Wilson’s attempts to achieve “peace without victory” for either side—that is how he described it—as an example of the failure that weakness invites, the kind of weakness that Leader MCCONNELL was talking about.

Before the United States even had entered World War I, President Wilson tried to force both sides to accept a peace deal they didn’t want by depriving them of weapons and depriving them of funds.

In 1916—again, before the United States was directly aiding the allies—financiers from the United States were financing the UK, which was at war, and also funding their allies in mainland Europe. So Wilson’s government cautioned U.S. investors against issuing short-term bonds to the UK and to France.

This Presidential expression of disapproval had the effect of cutting off U.S. private assistance to Europe altogether, and the record is painfully clear. President Wilson’s decision created a financial crisis in the United Kingdom, but it did nothing to end the war. Instead, Germany, in 1917, only escalated their attacks on civilian shipping from the United States, prompting Congress finally to declare war and approve a \$3 billion loan to France and to England.

By the way, just to amplify what the leader has already said this morning, that \$3 billion loan was about \$81 billion in today’s dollars, when you think about the roughly \$120 billion that we have invested in Ukraine.

In 1938, British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain even more famously than Wilson tried to appease Hitler with the infamous Munich Agreement, through which the UK, France, and Italy allowed Nazi Germany to annex part of peaceful Czechoslovakia. As our history textbooks show, Hitler never stopped in Czechoslovakia but continued his war throughout Europe.

Just as Wilson and Chamberlain failed, friends of freedom in Ukraine and around the world should not pressure Ukraine into accepting an unjust peace that will never, ever last. Only with security guarantees from Europe and the United States can we have some assurance that Putin will not invade Ukraine again at a moment when he thinks the world is not watching. That is a guarantee. That is a guarantee.

I visited Ukraine last month with my friends Senator SHAHEEN and Senator TILLIS, who are both here today. We saw the courage of the Ukrainian people up close. We saw the courage they have forged to save their country and the suffering they have endured—43,000 deaths and another almost 400,000 casualties—not just on behalf of Ukraine but on behalf of Europe, the West, democracy, freedom, our national security.

In cemeteries all across Ukraine, fresh graves are piled high with dirt and flowers, testifying to the Ukrainian people’s sacrifice. To put it in American terms, Coloradoan terms, there is not a county in the entire country where somebody hasn’t lost somebody to this war.

But the Ukrainian people have not had to fight this fight alone. The American people have steadfastly and generously backed this fight to the tune of, as I mentioned, \$125 billion.

I won’t go through all the reasons why that has been good for the United States, as Senator MCCONNELL said—and that is a lot of money, but it is just about 0.53 percent of our GDP. That is about \$365 an American.

Our European allies and far-flung ones, like Australia and Japan, have stepped up as well because they know that supporting Ukraine means standing with people willing to do anything to fight for their country. They know that with American weapons and those of our allies, the American people have literally kept Putin’s army at the gates of Europe while forcing him to squander more than \$200 billion and staggering casualties of 700,000 people.

We learned while we were in Ukraine that the Ukrainians are killing more Russians today than they were 6 months ago.

We all want this war to end, which is why I was glad to see the United States commit today to resuming intelligence sharing and security assistance to Ukraine as part of the potential U.S.-brokered, 30-day cease-fire with Russia. But for the sake of Ukraine and the rest of the free world, we must not pressure Ukraine to silence their guns

unless Russia commits to doing the same. We cannot force Ukraine to accept an end to this war that is anything other than a just and enduring peace.

This requires that the United States, our allies, and Ukraine continue working together to establish terms of the peace and negotiate with Putin while the Ukrainians continue their brave fight. They are not asking to be relieved of this terrible burden.

I couldn't even imagine the other day when we were in Kyiv how cold it must have felt to people who were on the frontlines of that war. It was cold enough just in the streets of Kyiv. It was cold enough just getting on the train from Poland to go to Kyiv. But they are embracing their responsibility because they know that any cease-fire without credible security guarantees will allow Putin to rebuild his army and attack again, and they know that how this war ends will determine whether Putin sets his sites on our NATO allies like Poland and the Baltics.

To conclude that any other result is possible is to completely ignore history, is to completely ignore what Putin has said and whether dictators like China's Xi Jinping test our resolve by invading Taiwan, whether the post-World War II international order the United States and our allies created persists, and whether the United States continues to provide the leadership our parents and grandparents supplied since the end of that war. That is what Senator MCCONNELL calls on us to remember.

Throughout history, it has been too easy for some to ignore the moral responsibility we have to people who are sacrificing their lives a continent away on behalf of our shared values and interests. It is harder in these moments but important and, I would say, necessary for the living to stand for freedom and democracy and those willing to give their last breaths to make those values eternal.

We in this Chamber have to demand moral and strategic clarity by continuing to support Ukraine's fight to secure a truly just peace through strength because, as the Ukrainian-born author Vasily Grossman wrote nearly 70 years ago, "In the cruel and terrible time in which our generation has been condemned to live on this earth, we must never make peace with evil. We must never become indifferent to others or undemanding of ourselves."

With that, I thank my bipartisan colleagues again. I look forward to the day when we are out here not with 8 Senators but 80 Senators in support of freedom and in support of the fight Ukraine is leading.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, last night, I had someone reach out to me and say they heard I was going to

speak again on Ukraine on the floor, and they asked me what I was going to talk about. I said to reinforce that Ukraine needs our help, that Europe needs to step up, and that Vladimir Putin is the personification of evil. I am going to try to accomplish all of that in less than 10 minutes so we can get on with the vote.

Everybody needs to remember how this war started. Just to show you—you can believe me when I tell you that you know when Putin is lying: when his lips are moving.

Let's go back to October, before the invasion in February. He said he was just putting troops together on a training mission—thousands of troops just coincidentally near the Ukrainian border but a training mission. Then it became a military exercise. Now it has become an illegal invasion of a sovereign, democratic nation that has experienced 80,000 dead servicemembers, more than 13,000 dead civilians, 400,000 wounded servicemembers, and 30,000 injured civilians.

Let me tell you a little bit about those civilians. They are 16-year-olds who had their legs blown off because Vladimir Putin ordered the launching of dumb bombs into residential areas. He allowed drones to hit children's hospitals that we visited.

This is the carnage that the Ukrainian people are experiencing every single day—24/7, 365—since the invasion 3 years ago.

Vladimir Putin is a murderer. He has not only allowed his servicemembers—some estimated 800,000—lose their lives on the battlefield, but he has gone so far as to engage mercenaries—the Wagner Group that he had down in Africa—in Ukraine, murdering indiscriminately anybody who moves.

If you want to see the best example of that, you need to go to Bucha and hear the story we heard when we were there. Bucha is a community of a couple of hundred thousand people just outside of Kyiv. Shortly after they invaded and it was clear they weren't to achieve their objectives, they decided that they were going to invoke terror in the minds of those who were fighting and the civilians in Ukraine, so they decided to go into a community that would be similar to going to Northern Virginia. So imagine Kyiv is Washington, DC, and they go out in Northern Virginia, and they just indiscriminately start murdering people. They killed over 500 people in 33 days, all of them civilians. This isn't like urban legend; this was caught on video—people riding a bicycle, walking a dog, being murdered. Vladimir Putin ordered that. Vladimir Putin allowed that.

Ladies and gentlemen, the surprise to Vladimir Putin was that he had no earthly idea of the strength democracy and freedom have in the hearts and minds of human beings. The Ukraine people, in spite of overwhelming odds—numbers and weapons—they defended it. They have been defending it for 3 years. So we have to help them.

There is good and evil here. There is no kind of "Putin is just misunderstood." This man is a murderer. This man is a rapist. He is a rapist by virtue of allowing systematic rapes to happen in places that he invades. That is how he operates. He is evil.

Ukraine needs help. Before I talk more about that help, I want to talk about Europe having to step up.

I really appreciated what Senator COLLINS put together in terms of the contribution to the Ukraine effort. I know, Senator SHAHEEN and I—and I thank Senator SHAHEEN for having this colloquy today—spend a lot of time tracking NATO countries. Let's make sure that, on one hand, we thank Europe for stepping up and doing its part in supporting this effort, but let's not forget that our NATO partners have come up short in satisfying their obligation in NATO to the tune of over \$2 trillion over the last 20 years.

The mind races. What would have happened if all that money had been spent and that our NATO alliance was even stronger if everybody had just met the bare minimum for NATO support? Two more trillion dollars would have been spent over the last 20 years.

Would that have been enough to possibly dissuade Putin from invading Ukraine? We will never know. But what I do know is that I want Europe to not just get credit for supporting Ukraine, but Europe also has to shoulder some responsibility for NATO being more vulnerable by not living up to their commitment over the last 20 years.

Let's just get that right, folks, so that we don't have the distraction and the American people get confused between NATO members not stepping up and doing their fair share.

So why are you asking for more money for Ukraine?

The reason we are asking for more money for Ukraine is because Vladimir Putin has a plan, and we could play right into it. People need to understand: Ukraine is a doormat to Europe. It is how he gets from Russia into countries that are trying to democratize and come closer to the West. If he succeeds in Ukraine, he will move into Moldova. He is already actively causing problems in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As a matter of fact, Senator SHAHEEN, I don't know if you are aware, but tomorrow the Republika Srpska legislature is going to consider a resolution to separate from BiH. That is Bosnia and Herzegovina. That has got Vladimir Putin all over it. He is already getting his chess pieces around the board. If he feels like he can get some level of success in Ukraine, he is going to march right through there, folks. It is going to happen.

And then, finally, I had somebody ask me: Why are you so animated over Ukraine? Why are you so concerned with Russia?

I give them a one-word answer: China. China is supporting Putin, at

least economically. There is even an argument that ammunitions and other things are going their way.

Does anybody really believe that North Korea would send people to the battlefield—they have lost a few thousand since they have been there—unless China was OK with it?

And then we have Iran. Iran is sending drones to Russia to kill innocent civilians and military personnel in Ukraine.

They are the “axis of evil,” and now they have regenerated themselves. We can’t let Putin have a win in Ukraine, ladies and gentlemen. We have to step up and make sure that the American people know that it is in our national interest to support Ukraine.

And we also have to let Vladimir Putin know that we do owe him thanks in one way: Thanks for waking up Europe in understanding the grave, existential threat that he represents. Thanks for actually getting Finland and Sweden into NATO and adding 800 miles of border on the Russian border. Thank you for that.

And now I want to thank him for receding back into the cave that he should live the rest of his life in and let democratic nations be free—and free from his threats. And until we are sure of that, we should not relent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 939

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, my office and I suspect all Senate offices are getting a whole lot of calls from senior citizens who are experiencing a great deal of fear and anxiety with all of the confusion and chaos that is currently going on here in Washington.

When we have the President and my Republican colleagues talking about cutting Medicaid by some \$880 billion—let us be clear—they are not just talking about throwing millions of children and others off of the health insurance they have; they are also talking about cuts to community health centers, which receive about 43 percent of their funding from Medicaid and where millions of seniors go to get their primary care. So cutting Medicaid impacts primary care.

At a time when we have a major crisis in nursing home availability—I know that is true in Vermont; I expect it is true in almost every State in the country—let us understand that Medicaid provides approximately two out of three seniors with the funding they need to live in nursing homes. Make drastic cuts in Medicaid, and it is going to be harder for your mom, your dad to get into a nursing home or to stay in a nursing home. Cuts in Medicaid would be a disaster for seniors in nursing homes.

But it is not just Medicaid cuts that worry seniors. At a time when the Social Security Administration is already understaffed—and again, for years, I have been hearing in my office—I expect other Senators have been hearing in their offices—from seniors who tell

us they are calling up Social Security, they have got a problem, and they are not getting a response. And the result of that is that some 30,000 people a year die—die—waiting for their Social Security disability benefits.

And in the midst of all of that, in the midst of a crisis where Social Security is understaffed, when our response should be to significantly increase staffing so that Social Security can better respond to the needs of our constituents, we have Elon Musk and his minions at DOGE cutting some 2,500 of Social Security staff. And, incredibly, they are now threatening to cut up to half of Social Security Administration staffing.

And then, on top of all that, you have Mr. Musk claiming that Social Security, which has paid out every benefit owed to every eligible American for over 80 years, claiming that it is a Ponzi scheme. Social Security is not a Ponzi scheme. It has paid out every benefit owed to every eligible American for over 80 years.

And then you have the President of the United States—State of the Union—lying about millions of people: Oh, millions of people, 200 years of age, 300 years of age, imagine that, getting Social Security benefits.

Seniors understand what all of that is about. They know that Musk and Trump want us to lose faith in Social Security and that, over a period of time, they want to give that indispensable program over to Wall Street.

So let us be clear: In America today, 22 percent of Americans living who are 65 years of age are trying to survive on an income of less than \$15,000 a year. Think about that: 22 percent of seniors in America trying to survive on \$15,000 a year or less. Half of seniors are trying to get by on \$30,000 a year or less. Frankly, I don’t know how any senior living on \$15,000, \$20,000 survives. I don’t know. The high cost of prescription drugs, food, housing, keeping warm in the winter, I don’t know how they can do that.

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, we now have the dubious distinction of having one of the highest rates of senior poverty compared to other wealthy nations. In America today, according to the latest OECD estimates, 23 percent of seniors are living in poverty compared to just 4 percent in Norway, 6 percent in France, and 11.5 percent in Canada.

Yes, we have more nuclear weapons than any other country; we have more billionaires than any other country, but we also have one of the highest rates of senior poverty of any country on Earth. We might want to get our priorities right.

Now, while my Republican colleagues would like to make massive cuts to Medicaid in order to provide more tax breaks to billionaires, some of us have a better idea. We think that it makes more sense to substantially improve the lives of our Nation’s seniors by ex-

panding Medicare to cover dental, vision, and hearing benefits.

In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed Medicare, one of the most popular and successful government programs in our Nation’s history, into law. Before the enactment—this is really quite interesting. Before the enactment of Medicare, about half of our seniors were uninsured. Today, everyone in America age 65 or older is guaranteed healthcare benefits through Medicare regardless of their income or medical condition. That is the good news.

The bad news is that, since its inception 60 years ago, Medicare has failed to cover such basic healthcare needs as hearing, dental care, and vision. The result: Millions of senior citizens have teeth that are rotting in their mouths. They are unable to hear what their children say or they are unable to read a newspaper because of failing eyesight.

This is the United States of America. We are the wealthiest country in the history of the world. Senior citizens should not be walking around with no teeth in their mouth. They should not be unable to hear conversations. They should not be unable to afford glasses so that they can read a newspaper.

The need to expand Medicare to cover dental, hearing, and eyeglasses is absolutely critical. Nobody—nobody—denies that oral health, hearing, and vision are essential parts of healthcare. We cannot continue to deny seniors these basic healthcare benefits. We can no longer tolerate the fact that 26 million seniors and people with disabilities in America have no dental insurance and no idea how they will be able to pay for the very expensive dental procedures that they need.

The results have been tragic. Nearly one out of five seniors in America have lost all of their natural teeth. Twenty percent of seniors in America have no natural teeth in their mouths. Disgracefully, 60 percent of our Nation’s seniors have untreated gum disease, which can increase the risk of cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and rheumatoid arthritis.

Further, it is not acceptable that while nearly two-thirds of seniors over the age of 70 experience hearing loss, less than 30 percent of seniors above this age have ever used a hearing aid, primarily because hearing aids are too expensive. In my view, no senior in America should face isolation from their families and friends simply because they cannot afford the extremely high price of a hearing aid.

In addition, we cannot continue to allow seniors with poor vision to go without routine eye exams or properly prescribed glasses. Poor vision can lead to injury, cognitive impairment, and depression.

Adding dental, vision, and hearing benefits to Medicare is not just good public policy; it will not only ease human suffering and improve the health of our Nation’s seniors; it is precisely what the overwhelming majority

of the American people want. Poll after poll tells us exactly that.

According to a poll conducted by Data for Progress last year, it found that 92 percent of the American people support expanding Medicare to provide dental, vision, and hearing benefits, and that is why I have introduced legislation today with Senators WARREN, BOOKER, WELCH, MARKEY, DUCKWORTH, MERKLEY, and BLUMENTHAL to do just that. Congressman LLOYD DOGETT, in the House, has introduced similar legislation, which has more than 110 cosponsors.

Now, I am sure that some of my Republican colleagues may say: Well, you know, it is an interesting idea. It is a good idea, but how are you going to pay for it?

So let me tell you how we are going to pay for it. We are going to pay for it by requiring Medicare to pay no more for prescription drugs than the VA. Right now, we pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, and that means significantly increased expenses for Medicare. By making sure that Medicare pays no more than the VA, which has for years—for decades—negotiated prices with the pharmaceutical industry, we could not only cut the price of prescription drugs for our seniors in half, we will save over \$800 billion over the next decade, which would more—more—than pay for this legislation. Lower the costs of prescription drugs, and get the revenue we need to cover dental, vision, and hearing for seniors.

Now, some of my Republican friends may also argue that this bill is not needed. Some Medicare Advantage plans already offer dental, vision, and hearing benefits, yes, but what my Republican friends may not tell you is, one, seniors still pay thousands of dollars out of pocket because these private Medicare Advantage benefits are totally inadequate. Further, the non-partisan Medicare Payment Advisory Commission has estimated that Medicare Advantage plans overcharge the Federal Government by \$83 billion a year.

In other words, if we are serious about waste, fraud, and abuse—hear a lot about that—we may want to take a look at the massive waste and fraud that is taking place with private Medicare Advantage plans. Those savings would also more than fully pay for this legislation.

Therefore, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 939, which was introduced earlier today, that the bill be considered read three times and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I share my colleague's frustration with the Medicare system that far too often fails our seniors. Medicare's coverage and reim-

bursement paradigms routinely prioritize treating the symptoms instead of the underlying causes of chronic stress and disease. Research shows that patients with diminished vision, hearing, or oral health are more likely to suffer chronic conditions like kidney, Alzheimer's, and heart disease.

We should modernize Medicare to focus on prevention and maintenance interventions. Patients should have access to a full spectrum of specialized providers working together as a team, from nutritionists, to dentists, to psychologists and surgeons. However, we must tackle these reforms without increasing the costs for patients or taxpayers. My colleague's proposal would increase the deficit by tens of billions of dollars and risk spiking seniors' premiums.

After years of record inflation, we cannot rush to enact a policy that has not been carefully considered and appropriately integrated into Medicare. This bill was just introduced today. It hasn't even been looked at by the Finance Committee. No hearing has been held, and no evaluation of how to effectively integrate these types of policies has been made.

I welcome the opportunity to work with my colleague to enact meaningful improvements to Medicare that deliver better outcomes for Americans. However, simply introducing a bill and then moving to have it passed on the floor of the Senate before there has been any consideration is not the way to proceed. We must proceed within the committee and floor process, within the regular order that this Senate requires.

Therefore, for these reasons, Mr. President, I object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask my colleague, my friend, the chairman of the Finance Committee a question. I hear what you are saying. Do I hear you correctly that you are prepared to discuss this legislation in committee?

Mr. CRAPO. I am prepared to discuss the issue. I am not telling you that I will limit the discussion to this piece of legislation. But, yes, we are prepared to discuss significant approaches to how we improve and expand proper healthcare treatment in America.

Mr. SANDERS. Look, I understand that this bill would bring forth serious debate and discussion, but I would appreciate if we could have a starting point. This bill is pretty simple. It says—and I hear you saying that you need—am I hearing you correctly to say that the idea of covering dental, vision, and hearing is something that you entertain, you think is a good idea, or am I not hearing that?

Mr. CRAPO. I do think that idea—that outcome is a good outcome to seek to achieve. I can't say that I want to have your legislation or even my legislation—

Mr. SANDERS. Right. OK. Fair enough. That is fair enough. But what

I would like to do—and I appreciate—you know, I think you and I can agree that we don't use the committee structure here in the Senate as effectively as we might. That is the place to have serious debate and discussion, correct?

Mr. CRAPO. Correct.

Mr. SANDERS. OK. I would hope in one way or another—I would appreciate if we could start off with my bill. You could come in and tell me what you don't like about it, and we can go from there. But this is a crisis situation—I think you and I agree—that too many of our seniors are suffering because of lack of dental, hearing, and vision. I look forward to hearing what you have to say. Let's debate it. But can we get this into the committee and have a serious discussion on it?

Mr. CRAPO. I assume that this bill will be referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. SANDERS. It will.

Mr. CRAPO. If this bill is referred to the Finance Committee, then it, like all other legislation in this area that is referred to the Finance Committee, will be reviewed by us. I can't tell you that it will have a specific hearing. I can't tell you exactly how that will work.

We will look at developing a very significant and I hope broad and successful approach to reducing the cost of our healthcare system and increasing the focus and successes in our healthcare system, and I look forward to working with you on that.

Mr. SANDERS. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON SLATER NOMINATION

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Baldwin	Collins	Fischer
Banks	Coons	Gallego
Barrasso	Cornyn	Graham
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Grassley
Blackburn	Cotton	Hagerty
Booker	Cramer	Hassan
Boozman	Crapo	Hawley
Britt	Cruz	Hickenlooper
Budd	Curtis	Hoeben
Cantwell	Daines	Husted
Capito	Durbin	Hyde-Smith
Cassidy	Ernst	Johnson

Kaine	Moreno	Sheehy
Kelly	Mullin	Smith
Kennedy	Murkowski	Sullivan
Kim	Padilla	Thune
King	Peters	Tillis
Klobuchar	Ricketts	Tuberville
Lankford	Risch	Warner
Lee	Rosen	Warnock
Lummis	Rounds	Warren
Marshall	Schiff	Welch
McConnell	Schmitt	Whitehouse
McCormick	Scott (FL)	Wicker
Moody	Scott (SC)	Wyden
Moran	Shaheen	Young

NAYS—19

Alsobrooks	Markey	Sanders
Blumenthal	Merkley	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Murphy	Schumer
Gillibrand	Murray	Slotkin
Heinrich	Ossoff	Van Hollen
Hirono	Paul	
Luján	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Fetterman	Justice
-----------	-----------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 30.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Pulte, of Florida, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. 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 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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 30, William Pulte, of Florida, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Lindsey Graham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Dan Sullivan, Ashley Moody, Pete Ricketts, Bill Cassidy, Jon Husted, Mike Rounds, James Lankford, Todd Young, Joni

Ernst, John R. Curtis, John Kennedy, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 32.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. 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. 32, Jeffrey Kessler, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, Lindsey Graham, Dan Sullivan, Ashley Moody, Pete Ricketts, Bill Cassidy, Jon Husted, Mike Rounds, James Lankford, Todd Young, Joni Ernst, John R. Curtis, John Kennedy, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Ted Cruz.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. 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.

HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT—Continued

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 331) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for Calendar No. 18, S. 331.

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 Calendar No. 18, S. 331, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Ted Budd, Tom Cotton, Tim Sheehy, Lindsey Graham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Dan Sullivan, Ashley Moody, Pete Ricketts, Bill Cassidy, Jon Husted, Mike Rounds, James Lankford, Todd Young, Joni Ernst, John R. Curtis, John Kennedy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume 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.

DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for the 119th Congress, I ask that the Democratic cochair of the Senate NATO Observer Group be Senator SHAHEEN and, at her recommendation, the following Democratic Senators participate in the group: Senators MERKLEY, COONS, KING, BOOKER, VAN HOLLEN, and ROSEN.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rules of procedure for the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library for the 119th Congress be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

119TH CONGRESS—JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

RULES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING FOR THE 119TH CONGRESS

Rule 1.—Committee Rules

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the Ranking Minority Member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

Rule 2.—Regular Committee Meetings

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the Vice-Chair and Ranking Minority Member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chair, as the Chair may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chair of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the Vice-Chair or the Chair's designee from the members of the Committee who are present, shall preside at the meeting.

Rule 3.—Quorum

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

Rule 4.—Open and Closed Meetings

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session that has been closed to the public.

Rule 5.—Alternating Chair and Vice-Chair by Congresses

(a) The Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses: The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the Chair shall be the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the Chair and Vice-Chair shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the Chair and Vice-Chair represent different parties, the Vice-Chair shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the Ranking Minority Member as prescribed by these rules.

Rule 6.—Parliamentary Questions

(a) Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of Committee shall in the first instance be decided by the Chair; subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

Rule 7.—Hearings: Public Announcements and Witnesses

(a) The Chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chair shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, all witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries. Limited insertions or additional germane material will be received for the record, subject to the approval of the Chair.

Rule 8.—Official Hearing Record

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and actions. Brief supplemental materials when required to clarify the transcript may be inserted in the record subject to the approval of the Chair.

(b) Each member of the Committee shall be provided with a copy of the hearing transcript for the purpose of correcting errors of transcription and grammar, and clarifying questions or remarks. If any other person is authorized by a Committee Member to make their corrections, the staff director shall be so notified.

(c) Members who have received unanimous consent to submit written questions to witnesses shall be allowed two days within which to submit these to the staff director for transmission to the witnesses. The record may be held open for a period not to exceed two weeks awaiting the responses by witnesses.

(d) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of their testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee. Testimony received in closed hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of the Committee.

Rule 9.—Witnesses for Committee Hearings

(a) Selection of witnesses for Committee hearings shall be made by the Committee staff under the direction of the Chair. A list of proposed witnesses shall be submitted to the members of the Committee for review sufficiently in advance of the hearings to permit suggestions by the Committee members to receive appropriate consideration.

(b) The Chair shall provide adequate time for questioning of witnesses by all members, including minority Members and the rule of germaneness shall be enforced in all hearings notified.

(c) Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority on the Committee shall be entitled, upon unanimous request to the Chair before the completion of such hearings, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

Rule 10.—Confidential Information Furnished to the Committee

The information contained in any books, papers or documents furnished to the Committee by any individual, partnership, corporation or other legal entity shall, upon the request of the individual, partnership, corporation or entity furnishing the same, be maintained in strict confidence by the members and staff of the Committee, except that any such information may be released outside of executive session of the Committee if the release thereof is effected in a manner which will not reveal the identity of such individual, partnership, corporation or entity in connection with any pending hearing or as a part of a duly authorized report of the Committee if such release is deemed essential to the performance of the functions of the Committee and is in the public interest.

Rule 11.—Broadcasting of Committee Hearings

The rule for broadcasting of Committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Rule 12.—Committee Reports

(a) No Committee report shall be made public or transmitted to the Congress without the approval of a majority of the Committee except when Congress has adjourned: provided that any member of the Committee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Such supplementary or dissenting reports should be as brief as possible.

(b) Factual reports by the Committee staff may be printed for distribution to Committee members and the public only upon authorization of the Chair either with the approval of a majority of the Committee or with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member.

Rule 13.—Confidentiality of Committee Reports

No summary of a Committee report, prediction of the contents of a report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation shall be made by a member of the Committee or by any staff member of the Committee prior to the issuance of a report of the Committee.

Rule 14.—Committee Staff

(a) The Committee shall have a staff director, selected by the Chair. The staff director shall be an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate.

(b) The Ranking Minority Member may designate an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate as the minority staff director.

(c) The staff director, under the general supervision of the Chair, is authorized to deal directly with agencies of the Government and with non-Government groups and individuals on behalf of the Committee.

(d) The Chair or staff director shall timely notify the Vice-Chair and the Ranking Minority Member or the minority staff director of decisions made on behalf of the Committee.

(e) The Chair is authorized to appoint the Clerk of the Committee (and such deputies or assistants as the Chair in their discretion determines may be necessary) to perform the required and usual duties on behalf of the Committee.

(1) Upon such appointment, the Chair shall inform the Committee.

(2) Further, the Chair is authorized to appoint an acting Clerk of the Committee to perform the required and usual duties of the Clerk of the Committee on behalf of the Committee until a permanent clerk is named.

(f) The Chair is authorized to appoint the Parliamentarian of the Committee (and such deputies or assistants as the Chair in their discretion determines may be necessary) to perform the required and usual duties on behalf of the Committee.

(1) Upon such appointment, the Chair shall inform the Committee.

(2) Further, the Chair is authorized to appoint an acting Parliamentarian of the Committee to perform the required and usual duties of the Parliamentarian of the Committee on behalf of the Committee until a permanent parliamentarian is named.

Rule 15.—Committee Chair

The Chair of the Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Specifically, the Chair is authorized, during the interim periods between meetings of the Committee, to act on all requests submitted by any executive department, independent agency, temporary or permanent commissions and committees of the Federal Government, the Government Publishing Office and any other Federal entity, pursuant to the requirements of applicable Federal law and regulations.

Rule 16.—Other Procedures and Regulations

(a) The Chair may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Committee or to facilitate its effective operation.

(b) The Chair may direct staff of the Committee to make any necessary technical or conforming changes to these Rules without intervening Committee action. In all cases, the Chair shall cause the most current version of the Rules to be available to members of the Committee.

119TH CONGRESS JOINT COMMITTEE OF
CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

RULES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS
ON THE LIBRARY FOR THE 119TH CONGRESS

Rule 1.—Meetings of the Committee

(a) Regular meetings may be called by the Chair, with the concurrence of the Vice Chair, as may be deemed necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

(b) Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedures;

(3) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy of an individual;

(4) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(5) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(i) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(ii) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(6) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulation. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.)

(c) Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all members at least three days in advance. In addition, the committee staff will email or telephone reminders of committee meetings to all members of the committee or to the appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

(d) A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of committee business will normally be sent to all members of the committee by the staff director at least one day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any member of the committee from raising appropriate non-agenda topics.

(e) Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least three business days before the date of their appearance, a written statement of their proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the Chair may direct, unless the Chair waived such a requirement for good cause.

Rule 2.—Quorums

(a) Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, four members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

(b) Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony; provided, however, once a quorum is established, any one member can continue to take such testimony.

(c) Under no circumstance may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

Rule 3.—Voting

(a) Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

(b) If a third of the members present so demand, a recorded vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

(c) The results of roll call votes taken in any meeting upon a measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast in opposition to each measure and amendment by each member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

Rule 4.—Delegation and Authority to the Chair and Vice Chair

(a) The Chair and Vice Chair are authorized to sign all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide on the committee's behalf on all routine business.

RECOGNIZING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, with my colleague Senator CANTWELL, we commemorate the 60th anniversary of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, or PNNL. As one of the Department of Energy's premier national laboratories over the past 60 years, PNNL has tackled some of our Nation's most complex and urgent challenges using its strengths in chemistry, Earth sciences, biology, and data science. As longtime supporters who are well versed in PNNL's valuable contributions to our Nation's scientific discovery, energy, and national security, we are proud to take the opportunity to recognize its 60th anniversary.

In January 1965, the Atomic Energy Commission, the predecessor Agency of the Department of Energy, selected Battelle, a nonprofit research and development organization, to take over the Hanford Laboratories at the Han-

ford Site in southeastern Washington State. Then known as Pacific Northwest Laboratory, the laboratory provided critical support to plutonium production and nuclear waste cleanup at Hanford and over the years evolved into one of DOE's most diverse multidisciplinary laboratories with significant portfolios in science, energy, and national security.

Over the past 60 years, PNNL has leveraged its scientific capabilities to make significant contributions in important areas such as supporting the cleanup of legacy nuclear waste, understanding Earth systems, modernizing the grid, advancing energy storage, enabling energy resilience, supporting nuclear nonproliferation, and protecting against cyberattacks, as well as building and applying artificial intelligence tools to accelerate scientific discovery in key areas related to national security and energy. PNNL has grown from just over 2,200 employees in 1965 to more than 6,400 today. It is the single largest employer in central Washington, with staff at its main campus in Richland, at PNNL-Sequim, DOE's only marine research facility, as well as in satellite offices in Seattle, Portland, Oregon, and College Park, MD.

We also want to highlight PNNL's collaborations with both academia and industry. PNNL has over 200 joint appointments with over 60 academic institutions and is home to seven joint institutes, combining the expertise and capabilities of universities and a national laboratory to accelerate science impact. In Washington, the Washington State University-PNNL Advanced Grid Institute is working to modernize the electric grid and provide secure energy infrastructure for the Nation. The WSU-PNNL Bioproducts Institute explores ways to transform engineered plants and industrial, agricultural, and municipal wastes into valuable materials and chemicals, including sustainable aviation fuel. The University of Washington-PNNL Northwest Institute for Materials Physics, Chemistry, and Technology, also known as NW Impact, focuses on advancements in materials that have the potential to transform multiple fields including energy, telecommunications, medicine, and information technology. Beyond Washington, PNNL has joint institutes with universities in Oregon, Maryland, and Georgia covering biomedical innovation, Earth systems, and cybersecurity and resilient infrastructure.

PNNL also collaborates with businesses large and small throughout the United States. One of the primary missions at PNNL is to move innovations developed at the lab into the marketplace where they can be used to solve national problems, improve lives, and enhance security. Airport security checkpoints use PNNL-developed millimeter wave technology scanning to detect concealed objects and increase security. Technology identifying molecular differences in samples as small as

a single cell and 1,000 times faster than current methods is helping advance medicine and environmental management. And PNNL's superconducting Qubit testbed is contributing to advances in quantum computing, which can help solve problems of energy production and sustainability. PNNL researchers were named on 59 patents granted in fiscal year 2024 and on nearly 1,700 U.S. patents since 1965.

During its long history, PNNL has committed to developing the future workforce in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Last year alone, the lab reached more than 51,000 students and 900 educators and hosted 1,717 students as interns, a 35 percent increase since 2020. In addition, PNNL created a STEM Ambassador Program, training its scientists on how best to communicate and convey the impact and relevance of their work to various audiences. STEM Ambassadors volunteer at outreach events throughout the Richland, Seattle, and Sequim areas using interactive, hands-on displays to spark interest in STEM learning and careers. STEM Ambassadors have been invited to present at DOE's National Science Bowl, a nationwide academic competition. PNNL's STEM Ambassador Program is now a model for similar efforts at other national laboratories.

As longtime champions of PNNL, we know that we are lucky in Washington State to have such a phenomenal resource in our backyard. We want to congratulate all past and present employees of PNNL on an incredible 60 years. Thank you for everything you do for our State, our country, and our entire world. We look forward to many more years of innovation and discovery that will make our world a better, cleaner, and safer place to live.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was absent on Thursday, March 6, 2025, for rollcall vote No. 110. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 18, S. 331, the Halt All Lethal Trafficking (HALT) of Fentanyl Act, rollcall vote No. 110.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:00 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

H.R. 495. An act to require annual reports on counter illicit cross-border tunnel operations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 708. An act to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a working group relating to countering terrorist, cybersecurity, border and port security, and transportation security threats posed to the United States by the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes.

H.R. 862. An act to reduce commuting burdens on Transportation Security Administration employees, and for other purposes.

H.R. 901. An act to require the Under Secretary of the Science and Technology Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security to develop a Department-wide policy and process to safeguard research and development from unauthorized access to or disclosure of sensitive information in research and development acquisitions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 993. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a plan to identify, integrate, and deploy new, innovative, disruptive, or other emerging or advanced technologies to enhance, or address capability gaps in, border security operations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1166. An act to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from procuring certain foreign-made batteries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1374. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make improvements to the Securing the Cities program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

At 6:04 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, 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. 1968. An act making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 495. An act to require annual reports on counter illicit cross-border tunnel operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 708. An act to establish in the Department of Homeland Security a working group relating to countering terrorist, cybersecurity, border and port security, and transportation security threats posed to the United States by the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 862. An act to reduce commuting burdens on Transportation Security Administration employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 901. An act to require the Under Secretary of the Science and Technology Directorate of the Department of Homeland Security to develop a Department-wide policy and process to safeguard research and development from unauthorized access to or disclosure of sensitive information in research and development acquisitions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 993. An act to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a plan to identify, integrate, and deploy new, innovative,

disruptive, or other emerging or advanced technologies to enhance, or address capability gaps in, border security operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1166. An act to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from procuring certain foreign-made batteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1374. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make improvements to the Securing the Cities program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—MARCH 11 (LEGISLATIVE DAY MARCH 10) 2025

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1968. An act making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Stephen Feinberg, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

*John Phelan, of Florida, to be Secretary of the Navy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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 Mr. BENNET):

S. 925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for working family caregivers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. SHEEHY):

S. 926. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a program to furnish to certain veterans items used for the secure storage of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 927. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure accurate payments to pharmacies under Medicaid and to prevent the use of abusive spread pricing practices under Medicaid; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BANKS:

S. 928. A bill to amend the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to prohibit plan investments in foreign adversary and sanctioned entities, require disclosure of existing investments in such entities,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. LEE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 929. A bill to prohibit National Laboratories from admitting certain foreign nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 930. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income capital gains from the sale of certain farmland property which are reinvested in individual retirement plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 931. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide incentives for behavioral health integration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 932. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to molecularly targeted pediatric cancer investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. LUJÁN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 933. A bill to authorize programs for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 2025, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. KIM):

S. 934. A bill to make housing more affordable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 935. A bill to prohibit sales and the issuance of licenses for the export of certain defense articles to the United Arab Emirates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply a 6 percent excise tax on large endowments of certain private colleges and universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 937. A bill to establish that an individual who is convicted of any offense under any Federal or State law related to the individual's conduct at and during the course of a protest that occurs at an institution of higher education shall be ineligible to receive a Federal student loan or for forgiveness, cancellation, waiver, or modification of certain Federal student loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCORMICK (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 938. A bill to establish the Joint Task Force to Counter the Illicit Synthetic Narcotics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 939. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for dental and oral health care, hearing care, and vision care under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 940. A bill to require certain entities to submit to Congress information on the Basel

Committee on Bank Supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 941. A bill to prohibit natural asset companies from entering into any agreement with respect to land in the State of Utah or natural assets on or in land in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 942. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 943. A bill to establish a manufactured housing community improvement grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HAGERTY, and Ms. ALSOBROOKS):

S. 944. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the highway safety improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. 945. A bill to amend the Smith River National Recreation Area Act to include certain additions to the Smith River National Recreation Area, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain wild rivers in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 946. A bill to clarify training requirements for prescribers of controlled substances; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 947. A bill to prohibit importation of commercially produced fresh citrus fruit originating from the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 948. A bill to reauthorize the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 949. A bill to ensure that the National Park Service is fully staffed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. GALLEGGO, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 950. A bill to ensure that the Forest Service is fully staffed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN,

Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 951. A bill to revise sections 552, 1461, and 1462 of title 18, United States Code, and section 305 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1305), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 952. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide a uniform 8-digit subheading number for all whiskies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. GALLEGGO):

S. 953. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Navajo Nation, the Hopi Tribe, and the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. MORENO, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 954. A bill to establish a Strategic Bitcoin Reserve and other programs to ensure the transparent management of Bitcoin holdings of the Federal Government, to offset costs utilizing certain resources of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 955. A bill to establish due process requirements for the investigation of intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 956. A bill to facilitate the entry and processing of merchandise and trade enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 957. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to eliminate consideration of the income of organ recipients in providing reimbursement of expenses to donating individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 958. A bill to support the use of technology in maternal health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ALSOBROOKS (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KIM):

S. 959. A bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to conduct an investigation and submit a report on the impact on businesses in the United States of duties, and the threat of duties, on imports from Mexico and Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. OSSOFF, and Mr. LEE):

S. 960. A bill to ensure that homicides can be prosecuted under Federal law without regard to the time elapsed between the act or omission that caused the death of the victim and the death itself; considered and passed.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 961. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the Armed Forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 962. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to preclude a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service from receiving reimbursement or other compensation for information relating to child exploitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PADILLA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 963. A bill to establish the Space National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 964. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to increase the loan limits and clarify that property improvement loans may be used for construction of accessory dwelling units; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 965. A bill to strengthen the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 966. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to define "State of residence" and "resident", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 967. A bill to provide downpayment assistance to first-generation homebuyers to address multigenerational inequities in access to homeownership and to narrow and ultimately close the racial homeownership gap in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNOCK:

S. 968. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for rent paid on the personal residence of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny interest and depreciation deductions for taxpayers owning 50 or more single family properties; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 970. A bill to establish a pilot program to improve the family self-sufficiency program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 971. A bill to provide for the conservation of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO):

S. 972. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs repays members of the Armed Forces for certain contributions made by such members towards Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAPO, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S.J. Res. 36. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Prohibition on Creditors and Consumer Reporting Agencies Concerning Medical Information (Regulation V)"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COONS):

S.J. Res. 37. A joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared to impose duties on articles imported from Canada; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. Res. 123. A resolution recognizing the contributions of the Charles B. Rangel Graduate Fellowship Program, the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Graduate Fellowship Program, the William D. Clarke, Sr. Diplomatic Security Fellowship, and the Donald M. Payne International Development Graduate Fellowship Program in advancing the national security and the development and diplomacy efforts of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. Con. Res. 10. A concurrent resolution recognizing the essential work of the League of Oregon Cities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 94

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 94, a bill to award 3 Congressional Gold Medals to the members of the 1980 United States Olympic Men's Ice Hockey Team, in recognition of their extraordinary achievement at the XIII Olympic Winter Games where, being comprised of amateur collegiate players, they defeated the dominant Soviet ice hockey team in the historic "Miracle on Ice", revitalizing morale in the United States at the height of the Cold War, inspiring generations, and transforming the sport of ice hockey in the United States.

S. 98

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 98, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish a vetting process for prospective applicants for high-cost universal service program funding.

S. 127

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to establish a whole-home repairs program for eligible homeowners and eligible landlords, and for other purposes.

S. 206

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to suspend normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China and to increase the rates of duty applicable with respect to articles imported from the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

S. 237

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 237, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide public safety officer benefits for exposure-related cancers, and for other purposes.

S. 257

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to improve the resilience of critical supply chains, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 262, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Roderick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to improve the provision of care and services under the Veterans Community Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 297

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 297, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for prostate cancer screenings without the imposition of cost-sharing requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 315

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr.

OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 315, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring access to AM broadcast stations in passenger motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 331

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 331, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 339, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to cap credit card interest rates at 10 percent.

S. 470

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend the CARES Act to remove a requirement on lessors to provide notice to vacate, and for other purposes.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 554

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 554, a bill to enhance bilateral defense cooperation between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 556

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 556, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in logistical transactions and sanctions evasion relating to oil, gas, liquefied natural gas, and related petrochemical products from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to reauthorize the

voluntary public access and habitat incentive program.

S. 752

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 752, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines.

S. 761

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 761, a bill to establish the Truth and Healing Commission on Indian Boarding School Policies in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 802, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to make appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations Act expires before the enactment of a new appropriations Act, and for other purposes.

S. 811

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 811, a bill to express findings relating to the recreational trails program, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 857, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the exclusion for certain conservation subsidies to include subsidies for water conservation or efficiency measures, storm water management measures, and wastewater management measures.

S. 876

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 876, a bill making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown.

S. 890

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to increase the number of landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

S. 894

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 894, 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. 918

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 918, a bill to allow Federal employees who are involuntarily separated from Government service while serving a probationary or trial period to resume that period upon reinstatement, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 8

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 8, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 86

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 86, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) and the harmful conflation of China's "One China Principle" and the United States' "One China Policy".

S. RES. 116

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 116, a resolution celebrating the extraordinary accomplishments and vital role of women business owners in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 1231

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSOFF) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1231 intended to be proposed to S. 331, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1233

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSOFF), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1233 intended to be proposed to S. 331, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1234

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1234 intended to be proposed to S. 331, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1235

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSOFF), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1235 intended to be proposed to S. 331, a bill to

amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1236

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1236 intended to be proposed to S. 331, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED: (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 964. A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act to increase the loan limits and clarify that property improvement loans may be used for construction of accessory dwelling units; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Property Improvement and Manufactured Housing Loan Modernization Act with Senator Lummis. Our bipartisan bill would help more families purchase an affordable home and maintain our housing supply by strengthening the Federal Housing Administration, FHA, Title I Loan Program.

Like its better known title II sister program, FHA Title I expands access to housing and boosts affordability for families by insuring private market loans. However, title I is targeted towards two underserved portions of our housing market—manufactured homes and property improvement.

For decades, title I has enabled families to access stable, affordable housing, while also helping maintain our Nation's housing stock. Indeed, manufactured homes are the largest source of unsubsidized affordable housing in the country, and property improvement loans help prevent more single-family homes and apartments from falling into disrepair and out of our housing supply.

These loans should be an important tool in helping to close our nationwide housing shortage, which the Brookings Institution estimates at nearly 5 million homes. However, outdated loan limits and statutory restrictions have turned title I from an effective program into a missed opportunity.

From the mid-1980s through the early 1990s, lenders offered 15,000 to 25,000 title I manufactured home loans each year. But in 2021, only three loans were issued. Similarly, lenders have gone from making more than 70,000 title I property improvement loans annually in the 1990s to making fewer than 1,000 in 2022. That is a 99-percent drop in loan volume or in other words, as many as 99,000 fewer homes being bought,

preserved, and included in our housing stock each year.

The Property Improvement and Manufactured Housing Loan Modernization Act would refurbish title I and return it to our housing toolbox. It would expand loan limits and terms for all title I loans—making the program fit market demand and needs. Perhaps more importantly, the bill would finally allow FHA to index property improvement loans for inflation and expand the data it uses to set manufactured home loan limits, ensuring title I will remain a crucial tool as home costs rise in future years.

Finally, our legislation makes accessible dwelling units, ADUs, which are small housing units added to a single-family property, eligible for title I financing. This small addition to title I will make the program an even more powerful home-creation program than it was during its prior peak years and will particularly help families who want to provide a safe, comfortable place for aging parents or young adult children to live.

Collectively, these improvements would help more families own a home, remain in homes they have spent decades in, and find an affordable place to live. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and support its passage.

By Mr. REED: (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 965. A bill to strengthen the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator COLLINS and Senators VAN HOLLEN, CORTEZ MASTO, SMITH, and KLOBUCHAR in introducing legislation that would permanently reauthorize the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, the Council or USICH.

The Council was established during the Reagan administration as part of the landmark McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987. Over the last three and a half decades, it has led and coordinated the Federal Government's response to homelessness. In 2009, the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing, HEARTH, Act, which I authored along with Senator COLLINS, expanded the Council's role, allowing it to work with public, nonprofit, and private stakeholders to develop a national strategic plan to end homelessness. Despite its minimal budget and small staff, the Council has helped guide Federal, State, and local stakeholders in deploying their resources in a smart, effective, and coordinated fashion. The results have been evident. In the decade after USICH published its first plan, overall homelessness declined 9 percent. Family and veteran homelessness declined significantly, as well, with the total numbers dropping nearly 30 percent and 50 percent respectively.

In fact, the Council has been able to help 85 communities and 3 States effectively end veteran homelessness.

Despite these successes, homelessness has persisted, and skyrocketing housing prices since 2020 have brought a new surge in homelessness. The Department of Housing and Urban Development's 2024 Annual Homelessness Assessment Report to Congress found that, "[o]n a single night in January 2024, 771,480 people were experiencing homelessness in the United States." This is a record number of Americans experiencing homelessness since the count began. The face of homelessness—which individuals lack a safe, stable home—is also changing. Families with children had the largest increase in homelessness from 2023 to 2024. Indeed, nearly 150,000 children were experiencing homelessness on a single night last year. This staggering increase in homelessness is happening across the country.

USICH helps us meet this challenge by guiding how its 19 Federal member Agencies deploy and leverage their resources with non-Federal partners to help communities effectively address homelessness. We know that smart, coordinated investments in programs that address homelessness and increase affordable housing pay additional dividends. The National Alliance to End Homelessness has found that taxpayers pay an average of \$35,578 per year on each chronically homeless individual, while "based on 22 different studies from across the country, providing permanent supportive housing to chronically homeless people creates net savings of \$4,800 per person per year, through reduced spending on jails, hospitals, shelters, and other emergency services." In short, helping people avoid homelessness not only helps them, it also saves taxpayers money. USICH's coordinating work helps make our investments to address homelessness more informed and more effective.

Indeed, the Council continues to prove that the government can work and save money in the process. I thank HousingWorks RI for its support, and I urge my colleagues to join us in permanently authorizing USICH.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 970. A bill to establish a pilot program to improve the family self-sufficiency program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Helping More Families Save Act with Senator Britt. This bipartisan legislation would help more families in HUD-assisted housing build savings and improve their financial security by creating a pilot program for Family Self-Sufficiency, FSS, universal escrow accounts.

The FSS Program was established under the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 to help low-income families boost savings and improve their professional, educational, and financial

standing. In 2018, I worked with then-Senator Roy Blunt to expand the program to cover more households. Today, millions of public housing residents, Housing Choice Voucher Program participants, and residents of project-based rental assistance, PBRA, housing are eligible for FSS.

FSS provides two key tools for its participants. First, households work with FSS coordinators to develop long-term financial, professional, or educational goals. FSS coordinators also help connect participants with resources, training, and employment opportunities. Second, the program encourages FSS families to save by providing them with an interest-bearing escrow account. Participants who increase their incomes deposit a portion of their additional earnings into their escrow account instead of paying higher rent, as is typically required under federally subsidized housing programs. Upon graduation from the Program, families can use their escrowed savings to pay for job-related expenses, move to private market housing, buy a home, or save for the future.

After more than 30 years, FSS has become a proven financial independence program. For example, in 2022, 34 percent of FSS graduates no longer needed Federal rental assistance within 1 year of leaving FSS, and nearly 10 percent of graduates were ultimately able to purchase their own home. On average, FSS participants with escrow savings graduated from the program with approximately \$10,000 in their accounts. This is no small sum, and it helps HUD-assisted families strengthen their financial stability and move towards greater economic independence.

Despite the program's success and broad eligibility, program participation was effectively capped at about 70,000 enrollees in 2022 simply due to a lack of Federal funding for the required FSS coordinators.

The Helping More Families Save Act would help more Americans access the program by creating a new universal escrow pilot. Under the bill, public housing agencies, PHAs, and PBRA property owners could offer 5,000 additional households escrow accounts identical to those under the current FSS Program without having to wait for an FSS coordinator to be funded by the Federal Government. PHA and PBRA property owners would not be required to offer coordinator services to these new participants, although we expect many will work to offer counseling and support on their own or with outside partners. Moreover, we expect that this pilot will show that those enrolled in the program will be successful and make financially sound decisions.

Our pilot program would help more low-income families improve their financial security, achieve economic independence, and possibly even purchase their own homes, all with minimal cost to the Federal Government.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan proposal that would help more Ameri-

cans pull themselves out of poverty. It is a win for families, the Federal budget, and our economy. I thank Senator Britt for coleading this legislation and Compass Working Capital and LISC for their support. I urge our colleagues to cosponsor the Helping More Families Save Act and support its passage.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 123—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CHARLES B. RANGEL GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, THE THOMAS R. PICKERING FOREIGN AFFAIRS GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, THE WILLIAM D. CLARKE, SR. DIPLOMATIC SECURITY FELLOWSHIP, AND THE DONALD M. PAYNE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM IN ADVANCING THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE DEVELOPMENT AND DIPLOMACY EFFORTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOOKER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 123

Whereas the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and other foreign affairs agencies require a workforce with diverse talents, skills, and experiences to effectively protect United States citizens abroad, expand commercial opportunities for United States businesses, and administer United States foreign policy;

Whereas Congress has required in statute and the Department of State and the USAID have committed to recruit, hire, and retain employees on the basis of merit that reflect the diverse backgrounds of the American people that they represent abroad;

Whereas, in 1990, Congress amended the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a et seq.) to authorize the Secretary of State to make grants to post-secondary educational institutions or students to increase knowledge of and interest in employment with the Foreign Service, with a special focus on minority students, broadening recruitment and retention efforts in order to ensure equal opportunity and draw on the strength of all United States citizens;

Whereas, pursuant to these authorities, the Department of State launched the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship, the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Program, and the William D. Clarke, Sr. Diplomatic Security Fellowship in 1992, 2002, and 2023, respectively;

Whereas these programs increase the inclusion of Pell-eligible and first-generation college graduates in the Foreign Service, with a majority of current fellows having been Pell grant recipients;

Whereas the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Graduate Fellowship Program and the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program—the Department of State's flagship initiatives to recruit top-tier talent—are merit-based, need-based, and highly competitive, with an annual acceptance rate of less than 5 percent;

Whereas all fellows pass the same rigorous selection, hiring, and security clearance

process as all other members of the Foreign Service;

Whereas research shows that developing a workforce representing all of the United States significantly contributes to better national security outcomes by providing a wider range of perspectives, experiences, and cultural understanding, enabling more effective threat identification, innovative solutions, and stronger diplomatic engagement across the globe;

Whereas international affairs fellowships that promote the employment of candidates who belong to historically excluded groups and who have financial needs, including the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Graduate Fellowship Program, the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program, the William D. Clarke, Sr. Diplomatic Security Fellowship, and the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program, represent smart investments vital for building a strong, merit-based, capable, and diverse national security workforce;

Whereas Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has authorized each of these fellowship programs, recognizing the importance of these fellowship programs in expanding merit- and need-based recruitment from a wide geographically and economically diverse talent pool, including from all 50 States and more than 500 institutions of higher education;

Whereas Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, other minority-serving institutions and other institutions of higher education, including community colleges and trade schools, serve populations historically excluded from the Department of State and the USAID and prepare the next generation of international affairs professionals with the core skills necessary to meet the United States global diplomatic and development imperatives; and

Whereas the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development are required by law to consult with Congress before taking steps to modify these programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of efforts to recruit, hire, and retain for United States foreign affairs agencies employees from the broadest talent pool, in order for the United States to be globally competitive and ensure that the diplomatic and development agencies of the United States remain the best in the world;

(2) reaffirms that the Charles B. Rangel Graduate Fellowship Program, the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Graduate Fellowship Program, the William D. Clarke, Sr. Diplomatic Security Fellowship, and the Donald M. Payne International Development Graduate Fellowship Program are statutorily mandated programs enacted into law on a bipartisan basis to address recognized issues that have plagued the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development for decades of exclusion of women, racial and ethnic minority groups, and economically disadvantaged and rural populations;

(3) underscores the importance to United States national security and foreign policy of international affairs fellowships and similar career entry programs; and

(4) recognizes the substantial investment by United States taxpayers in ensuring the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development can recruit top talent from across the country, provide them with critical training, and strengthen the development and diplomatic capabilities of the United States—efforts

that are undermined by attempts to dismantle these programs, wasting taxpayer resources and weakening national security.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10—RECOGNIZING THE ESSENTIAL WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 10

Whereas, in 1925, the League of Oregon Cities was founded by 25 cities in the State of Oregon with the mission of providing support, advocacy, and resources to all incorporated cities in the State;

Whereas, since 1925, the League of Oregon Cities has—

(1) played a pivotal role in advancing municipal governance, promoting best practices, and fostering collaboration among cities, thereby enhancing the quality of life of Oregonians throughout the State of Oregon, from Bandon to Baker City, Medford to Mosier, and Pendleton to Portland;

(2) lobbied tirelessly in advancement of issues that are vital to all cities in the State of Oregon, including sustainable development, infrastructure improvement, public safety, increased community engagement, and the preservation of home rule authority;

(3) empowered local governments to effectively address the ever-evolving needs of their communities through initiatives including legislative advocacy, professional development, and the delivery of essential services and resources; and

(4) worked with its congressional leaders to advance and support Federal policy to match local government priorities;

Whereas 241 cities in the State of Oregon are home to approximately 3,000,000 residents, accounting for 70 percent of the total population of the State;

Whereas the cities in the State of Oregon serve as the economic, cultural, and social hubs of the State, providing essential infrastructure services and opportunities for countless Oregonians;

Whereas continued investment in city infrastructure, including water systems, roads, and housing, is critical to supporting the needs of the State of Oregon, and driving statewide economic growth and contributing to the national economy;

Whereas, in 2022, the League of Oregon Cities supported congressional action to pass Public Law 117-167 (commonly known as the “CHIPS and Science Act of 2022”) (136 Stat. 1366) paving the way for increased investment in the semiconductor industry critical to the economy and educational focus of the State of Oregon;

Whereas, in 2021, the League of Oregon Cities supported congressional action responding to the COVID-19 pandemic with Coronavirus State and local fiscal recovery funds made possible through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-2; 135 Stat. 4);

Whereas, in 2021, the League of Oregon Cities supported congressional action passing the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58; 135 Stat. 429) that provided the State of Oregon with over \$4,500,000,000 in additional infrastructure investment throughout the State;

Whereas, in 2020, the League of Oregon Cities supported congressional action to provide stimulus funds under the CARES Act (Public Law 116-136; 134 Stat. 281) to help communities facing severe challenges from the COVID-19 pandemic;

Whereas, in 2019, the League of Oregon Cities supported congressional action to expand broadband deployment in rural communities through the ReConnect Loan and Grant Program authorized under section 779 of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115-141; 132 Stat. 399); and

Whereas, across a century of steadfast advocacy, the League of Oregon Cities has made incomparable contributions to the resilience and vitality of communities throughout the State of Oregon and improved the lives of all Oregonians: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress recognizes the essential work of the League of Oregon Cities since 1925 and the role the League of Oregon Cities will play in the future in supporting municipalities in the State of Oregon with unparalleled research, technical expertise, and relentless advocacy as a key partner in preserving and strengthening the Federal-local partnership.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1245. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1246. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1247. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1248. Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1249. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1250. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1251. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1252. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1253. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1254. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1255. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1256. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1257. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1258. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1245. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DEPARTMENT OF LABOR GUIDANCE AND REGULATIONS REGARDING OPIOID OVERDOSE REVERSAL MEDICATION AND EMPLOYEE TRAINING.

(a) NON-MANDATORY GUIDANCE FOR EMPLOYERS CONCERNING OPIOID OVERDOSE REVERSAL MEDICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, shall issue nonmandatory guidance to employers on—

(A) acquiring and maintaining opioid overdose reversal medication; and

(B) training employees on an annual basis on the usage of such medication.

(2) EMPLOYER DEFINED.—In this section, the term “employer” has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 652), except that such term does not include the United States Postal Service.

(b) MANDATORY REGULATIONS FOR FEDERAL AGENCIES CONCERNING OPIOID OVERDOSE REVERSAL MEDICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, acting through the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, shall issue regulations to require each Federal agency to—

(A) acquire and maintain opioid overdose reversal medication; and

(B) train employees on an annual basis on the usage of such medication.

(2) FEDERAL AGENCY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Federal agency” means any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government, including the Veterans Health Administration, notwithstanding section 7425(b) of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1246. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SCHOOL ACCESS TO NALOXONE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “School Access to Naloxone Act of 2025”.

(b) GRANTS FOR REDUCING OPIOID OVERDOSE DEATHS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 544(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd-3(c)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting “or administering” after “prescribing”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or on the administration of” after “prescribing of”.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 544(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd-3(g)) is amended by striking “to carry out this section” and inserting “to carry out this section and section 544A”.

(c) GRANTS FOR REDUCING OPIOID OVERDOSE DEATHS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY

SCHOOLS.—Title V of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 544 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 290dd-3) the following:

“SEC. 544A. REDUCING OPIOID OVERDOSE DEATHS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award grants to eligible entities to provide for the administration, at public and private elementary and secondary schools under the jurisdiction of the eligible entity, of drugs or devices approved, cleared, licensed, or authorized by the Food and Drug Administration, for emergency treatment of known or suspected opioid overdose.

“(b) APPLICATIONS.—To seek a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing—

“(1) the information required under section 544(b);

“(2) the certifications specified in subsection (c); and

“(3) such other information as the Secretary shall require.

“(c) CERTIFICATIONS.—The certifications specified in this subsection, with respect to each elementary school and secondary school in the eligible entity’s jurisdiction, are the following:

“(1) The school has in place a program under which the school will permit trained personnel of the school to administer drugs or devices for purposes of providing emergency treatment of known or suspected opioid overdose.

“(2) The school will maintain a supply of such drugs or devices in a location that is easily accessible to trained personnel of the school for the purpose of administering such drugs or devices.

“(3) The school has in place a plan for having on the premises of the school during all operating hours one or more individuals who are such trained personnel.

“(4) The State attorney general of the State in which the school is located certifies that the State—

“(A) has reviewed any applicable civil liability protection law to determine the application of such law with regard to elementary and secondary school trained personnel who may administer drugs or devices for emergency treatment in the case of a known or suspected opioid overdose; and

“(B) has concluded that such law provides adequate civil liability protection applicable to such trained personnel.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘civil liability protection law’ means a State law offering legal protection to individuals who give aid in an emergency to an individual who is ill, in peril, or otherwise incapacitated.

“(2) The term ‘eligible entity’ has the meaning given to such term in section 544.

“(3) The term ‘trained personnel’ means, with respect to an elementary or secondary school, an individual—

“(A) who is a school nurse or other individual designated by the principal or other appropriate administrative staff of the school to administer drugs or devices for emergency treatment in the case of a known or suspected opioid overdose;

“(B) who has received training in the administration of such drugs or devices; and

“(C) whose training in the administration of such drugs or devices meets appropriate medical standards and has been documented by appropriate administrative staff of the school.”.

SA 1247. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—BUST FENTANYL ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLES.

This title may be cited as the “Break Up Suspicious Transactions of Fentanyl Act” or the “BUST FENTANYL Act”.

SEC. 202. INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY REPORT.

Section 489(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291h(a)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “March 1” and inserting “June 1”; and

(2) in paragraph (8)(A)(i), by striking “pseudoephedrine” and all that follows through “chemicals)” and inserting “chemical precursors used in the production of methamphetamine that significantly affected the United States”.

SEC. 203. STUDY AND REPORT ON EFFORTS TO ADDRESS FENTANYL TRAFFICKING FROM THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND OTHER RELEVANT COUNTRIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) DEA.—The term “DEA” means the Drug Enforcement Administration.

(3) PRC.—The term “PRC” means the People’s Republic of China.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT ON ADDRESSING TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL AND OTHER SYNTHETIC OPIOIDS FROM THE PRC AND OTHER RELEVANT COUNTRIES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an unclassified written report, with a classified annex, that includes—

(1) a description of United States Government efforts to gain a commitment from the Government of the PRC to submit unregulated fentanyl precursors, such as 4-AP, to controls;

(2) a plan for future steps the United States Government will take to urge the Government of the PRC to combat the production and trafficking of illicit fentanyl and synthetic opioids from the PRC, including the trafficking of precursor chemicals used to produce illicit narcotics in Mexico and in other countries;

(3) a detailed description of cooperation by the Government of the PRC to address the role of the PRC financial system and PRC money laundering organizations in the trafficking of fentanyl and synthetic opioid precursors;

(4) an assessment of the expected impact that the designation of principal corporate officers of PRC financial institutions for facilitating narcotics-related money laundering would have on PRC money laundering organizations;

(5) an assessment of whether the Trilateral Fentanyl Committee, which was established by the United States, Canada, and Mexico during the January 2023 North American Leaders’ Summit, is improving cooperation

with law enforcement and financial regulators in Canada and Mexico to combat the role of PRC financial institutions and PRC money laundering organizations in narcotics trafficking;

(6) an assessment of the effectiveness of other United States bilateral and multilateral efforts to strengthen international cooperation to address the PRC’s role in the trafficking of fentanyl and synthetic opioid precursors, including through the Global Coalition to Address Synthetic Drug Threats;

(7) an update on the status of commitments made by third countries through the Global Coalition to Address Synthetic Drug Threats to combat the synthetic opioid crisis and progress towards the implementation of such commitments;

(8) a plan for future steps to further strengthen bilateral and multilateral efforts to urge the Government of the PRC to take additional actions to address the PRC’s role in the trafficking of fentanyl and synthetic opioid precursors, particularly in coordination with countries in East Asia and Southeast Asia that have been impacted by such activities;

(9) an assessment of how actions the Government of the PRC has taken since November 15, 2023, has shifted relevant supply chains for fentanyl and synthetic opioid precursors, if at all; and

(10) the items described in paragraphs (1) through (4) pertaining to India, Mexico, and other countries the Secretary of State determines to have a significant role in the production or trafficking of fentanyl and synthetic opioid precursors for purposes of this report.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEA OFFICES IN THE PRC.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall jointly provide to the appropriate committees of Congress a classified briefing on—

(1) outreach and negotiations undertaken by the United States Government with the Government of the PRC that was aimed at securing the approval of the Government of the PRC to establish of United States Drug Enforcement Administration offices in Shanghai and Guangzhou, the PRC; and

(2) additional efforts to establish new partnerships with provincial-level authorities in the PRC to counter the illicit trafficking of fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, and their precursors.

SEC. 204. PRIORITIZATION OF IDENTIFICATION OF PERSONS FROM THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

Section 7211 of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act (21 U.S.C. 2311) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) PRIORITIZATION.—

“(A) DEFINED TERM.—In this paragraph, the term ‘person of the People’s Republic of China’ means—

“(i) an individual who is a citizen or national of the People’s Republic of China; or

“(ii) an entity organized under the laws of the People’s Republic of China or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Government of the People’s Republic of China.

“(B) IN GENERAL.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the President shall prioritize, to the greatest extent practicable, the identification of persons of the People’s Republic of China involved in the shipment of fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, fentanyl precursors, precursors for fentanyl analogues, pre-precursors for fentanyl and fentanyl analogues, and equipment for the manufacturing of fentanyl and fentanyl-laced counterfeit pills to Mexico or any

other country that is involved in the production of fentanyl trafficked into the United States, including—

“(i) any entity involved in the production of pharmaceuticals; and

“(ii) any person that is acting on behalf of any such entity.

“(C) TERMINATION OF PRIORITIZATION.—The President shall continue the prioritization required under subparagraph (B) until the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that the People’s Republic of China is no longer the primary source for the shipment of fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, fentanyl precursors, precursors for fentanyl analogues, pre-precursors for fentanyl and fentanyl analogues, and equipment for the manufacturing of fentanyl and fentanyl-laced counterfeit pills to Mexico or any other country that is involved in the production of fentanyl trafficked into the United States.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “the date that is 5 years after such date of enactment” and inserting “December 31, 2030”.

SEC. 205. EXPANSION OF SANCTIONS UNDER THE FENTANYL SANCTIONS ACT.

Section 7212 of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act (21 U.S.C. 2312) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) the President determines has knowingly engaged in, on or after the date of the enactment of the BUST FENTANYL Act, a significant activity or significant financial transaction that has materially contributed to opioid trafficking; or

“(4) the President determines—

“(A) has received any property or interest in property that the foreign person knows—

“(i) constitutes or is derived from the proceeds of an activity or transaction described in paragraph (3); or

“(ii) was used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate such an activity or transaction;

“(B) has knowingly provided significant financial, material, or technological support for, including through the provision of goods or services in support of—

“(i) any activity or transaction described in paragraph (3); or

“(ii) any foreign person described in paragraph (3); or

“(C) is or has been owned, controlled, or directed by any foreign person described in subparagraph (A) or (B) or in paragraph (3), or has knowingly acted or purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, such a foreign person.”.

SEC. 206. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO AGENCIES OR INSTRUMENTALITIES OF FOREIGN STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “knowingly” and “opioid trafficking” have the meanings given such terms in section 7203 of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act (21 U.S.C. 2302).

(b) IN GENERAL.—The President may—

(1) impose one or more of the sanctions described in section 7213 of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act (21 U.S.C. 2313) with respect to each political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of a foreign government, including any financial institution owned or controlled by a foreign government, that the President determines has knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) engaged in a significant activity or a significant financial transaction that has materially contributed to opioid trafficking; or

(B) provided financial, material, or technological support for (including through the provision of goods or services in support of)

any significant activity or significant financial transaction described in subparagraph (A); and

(2) impose one or more of the sanctions described in section 7213(a)(6) of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act (21 U.S.C. 2313(a)(6)) with respect to each senior official of a political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of a foreign government that the President determines has knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, facilitated a significant activity or a significant financial transaction described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 207. ANNUAL REPORT ON EFFORTS TO PREVENT THE SMUGGLING OF METHAMPHETAMINE INTO THE UNITED STATES FROM MEXICO.

Section 723(c) of the Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 2291 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following “,” which shall—

“(1) identify the significant source countries for methamphetamine that significantly affect the United States, and

“(2) describe the actions by the governments of the countries identified pursuant to paragraph (1) to combat the diversion of relevant precursor chemicals and the production and trafficking of methamphetamine.”.

SA 1248. Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ PEER-TO-PEER MENTAL HEALTH SUPPORT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Peer to Peer Mental Health Support Act”.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use (referred to in this section as the “Assistant Secretary”), in consultation with the Secretary of Education, may, as appropriate and within a relevant existing program, carry out a pilot program and make awards, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to support evidence-based mental health peer support activities for students enrolled in secondary schools (as such term is defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)).

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive an award under this section, an entity shall—

(1) be a State, political subdivision of a State, territory, or Indian Tribe or Tribal organization (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)); and

(2) submit to the Assistant Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Assistant Secretary may require, including a description of how the entity will measure and evaluate progress of the program in improving student mental health outcomes.

(d) USE OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), an eligible entity may use amounts provided under this section to implement or operate evidence-based mental health peer support activities in 1 or more secondary schools (as such term is defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)) within the jurisdiction

of such eligible entity, which may include providing training, as appropriate, to students, adult supervisors, and other appropriate individuals to improve the early identification of, response to, and recovery supports for mental health and substance use challenges, reduce associated risks, and promote resiliency.

(2) PROGRAM OVERSIGHT.—An eligible entity shall ensure that mental health peer support activities under paragraph (1) are overseen by a school-based mental health professional.

(3) FERPA.—Any education records of the student collected or maintained under this section shall have the protections provided in section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

(e) EVALUATION; REPORT.—

(1) EVALUATION.—The Assistant Secretary shall carry out an evaluation to measure the efficacy of the program under this section. The evaluation shall—

(A) measure participation rates in mental health peer support activities, including any associated trends;

(B) describe the specific trainings provided, or other activities carried out under the pilot program;

(C) assess whether such mental health peer support activities impacted mental health outcomes of participating students; and

(D) measure the effectiveness of the pilot program in connecting students to professional mental health services compared to other evidence-based strategies.

(2) REPORT.—The Assistant Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Education and Workforce of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1).

(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Assistant Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, shall provide technical assistance to eligible entities applying for and receiving an award under this section, including the identification and dissemination of best practices for mental health peer support programs for students.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Section 4001 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7101) shall apply to an entity receiving a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section in the same manner as such section applies to an entity receiving funding under title IV of such Act, except that section 4001(a)(2)(B)(i) of such Act shall not apply.

(h) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on September 30, 2029.

SA 1249. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In subsection (e) of schedule I of section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act, as added by section 2 of this Act, add at the end the following:

“(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title or title III, an offense involving the trafficking of a fentanyl-related substance shall not be subject to a quantity-based mandatory minimum penalty.”.

SA 1250. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect

to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF SECTION 230.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 223(h) (47 U.S.C. 223(h)), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The term ‘interactive computer service’ means any information service, system, or access software provider that provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server, including specifically a service or system that provides access to the Internet and such systems operated or services offered by libraries or educational institutions.”; and

(B) in section 231(b)(4) (47 U.S.C. 231(b)(4)), by striking “or section 230”.

(2) TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—Section 45 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes”, approved July 5, 1946 (commonly known as the “Trademark Act of 1946”) (15 U.S.C. 1127), is amended by striking the definition relating to the term “Internet” and inserting the following:

“The term ‘Internet’ means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks.”.

(3) TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1401 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (g).

(4) TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1462, by striking “(as defined in section 230(e)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934)” each place the term appears and inserting “(as defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”;

(B) in section 1465, by striking “(as defined in section 230(e)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934)” and inserting “(as defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”;

(C) in section 2257(h)(2)(B)(v), by striking “, except that deletion of a particular communication or material made by another person in a manner consistent with section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c)) shall not constitute such selection or alteration of the content of the communication”; and

(D) in section 2421A—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as that term is defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”;

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking “(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as that term is defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”.

(5) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—Section 401(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II)) is amended by striking “, except that deletion of a particular communication or material made by another person in a manner consistent with section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not constitute

such selection or alteration of the content of the communication”.

(6) WEBB-KENYON ACT.—Section 3(b)(1) of the Act entitled “An Act divesting intoxicating liquors of their interstate character in certain cases”, approved March 1, 1913 (commonly known as the “Webb-Kenyon Act”) (27 U.S.C. 122b(b)(1)), is amended by striking “(as defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”.

(7) TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 4102 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking “construed to” and all that follows through “affect” and inserting “construed to affect”; and

(ii) by striking “defamation; or” and all that follows and inserting “defamation.”.

(8) DANIEL ANDERL JUDICIAL SECURITY AND PRIVACY ACT OF 2022.—Section 5933(7) of the Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2022 (28 U.S.C. 601 note prec.; Public Law 117-263) is amended by striking “section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230)” and inserting “section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223)”.

(9) TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 5362(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f))” and inserting “section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223)”.

(10) NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATION ACT.—Section 157 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 941) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and

(B) by redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively.

SA 1251. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF SECTION 230.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 223(h) (47 U.S.C. 223(h)), by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) The term ‘interactive computer service’ means any information service, system, or access software provider that provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server, including specifically a service or system that provides access to the Internet and such systems operated or services offered by libraries or educational institutions.”; and

(B) in section 231(b)(4) (47 U.S.C. 231(b)(4)), by striking “or section 230”.

(2) TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—Section 45 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes”, approved July 5,

1946 (commonly known as the “Trademark Act of 1946”) (15 U.S.C. 1127), is amended by striking the definition relating to the term “Internet” and inserting the following:

“The term ‘Internet’ means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks.”.

(3) TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 1401 of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (g).

(4) TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 1462, by striking “(as defined in section 230(e)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934)” each place the term appears and inserting “(as defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”;

(B) in section 1465, by striking “(as defined in section 230(e)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934)” and inserting “(as defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”;

(C) in section 2257(h)(2)(B)(v), by striking “, except that deletion of a particular communication or material made by another person in a manner consistent with section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(c)) shall not constitute such selection or alteration of the content of the communication”; and

(D) in section 2421A—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking “(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as that term is defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”;

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking “(as such term is defined in defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as that term is defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”.

(5) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—Section 401(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(h)(3)(A)(iii)(II)) is amended by striking “, except that deletion of a particular communication or material made by another person in a manner consistent with section 230(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not constitute such selection or alteration of the content of the communication”.

(6) WEBB-KENYON ACT.—Section 3(b)(1) of the Act entitled “An Act divesting intoxicating liquors of their interstate character in certain cases”, approved March 1, 1913 (commonly known as the “Webb-Kenyon Act”) (27 U.S.C. 122b(b)(1)), is amended by striking “(as defined in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)))” and inserting “(as defined in section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223))”.

(7) TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 4102 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking “construed to” and all that follows through “affect” and inserting “construed to affect”; and

(ii) by striking “defamation; or” and all that follows and inserting “defamation.”.

(8) DANIEL ANDERL JUDICIAL SECURITY AND PRIVACY ACT OF 2022.—Section 5933(7) of the Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2022 (28 U.S.C. 601 note prec.; Public Law 117-263) is amended by striking “section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230)” and inserting “section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223)”.

(9) TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 5362(6) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C.

230(f))" and inserting "section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223)".

(10) NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATION ACT.—Section 157 of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act (47 U.S.C. 941) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (e); and
(B) by redesignating subsections (f) through (j) as subsections (e) through (i), respectively.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2027.

SA 1252. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FEDERAL TORT FOR FENTANYL TRAFFICKING VIA SOCIAL MEDIA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED SUBSTANCE.—The term "covered substance" means a substance containing—

(A) fentanyl; or

(B) a fentanyl-related substance, as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802), as amended by section 6(c) of this Act.

(2) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—The term "interactive computer service" has the meaning given the term in section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230).

(b) LIABILITY.—The provider of an interactive computer service shall be liable to any individual who suffers bodily harm attributable to the provider's intentional, knowing, or reckless—

(1) promotion of a covered substance; or

(2) facilitation of the sale of a covered substance.

(c) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—An individual who suffers bodily harm attributable to the intentional, knowing, or reckless promotion, by the provider of an interactive computer service, of a covered substance, or attributable to the intentional, knowing, or reckless facilitation, by the provider of an interactive computer service, of the sale of a covered substance, may bring a civil action against the provider in an appropriate district court of the United States or a State court of competent jurisdiction for—

(1) actual damages;

(2) punitive damages; and

(3) attorney fees and costs.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—This section—

(1) shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) shall not apply to any use of an interactive computer service that took place before the effective date under paragraph (1).

SA 1253. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXCISE TAX ON OPIOID PAIN RELIEVERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF TAX.—Subchapter E of chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after subchapter D the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter E—Opioid Pain Relievers

"Sec. 4191. Opioid pain relievers.

"SEC. 4191. OPIOID PAIN RELIEVERS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed on the manufacturer or producer of any taxable active opioid a tax equal to the amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) AMOUNT DETERMINED.—The amount determined under this subsection with respect to a manufacturer or producer for a calendar year is 1 cent per milligram of taxable active opioid in the production or manufacturing quota determined for such manufacturer or producer for the calendar year under section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 826).

"(c) TAXABLE ACTIVE OPIOID.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term "taxable active opioid" means any controlled substance (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802), as in effect on the date of the enactment of this section) manufactured in the United States which is opium, an opiate, or any derivative thereof.

"(2) EXCLUSIONS.—

"(A) OTHER INGREDIENTS.—In the case of a product that includes a taxable active opioid and another ingredient, subsection (a) shall apply only to the portion of such product that is a taxable active opioid.

"(B) DRUGS USED IN ADDICTION TREATMENT.—The term "taxable active opioid" shall not include any controlled substance (as so defined) which is used exclusively for the treatment of opioid addiction as part of a medication-assisted treatment."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to subchapter D the following new item:

"SUBCHAPTER E—OPIOID PAIN RELIEVERS".

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to calendar years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) FUNDING OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROGRAMS.—From time to time, beginning in the second calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the general fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the total amount of taxes collected under section 4191 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this Act, to the Director of the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration for programs of the Center, including the substance use prevention, treatment, and recovery services block grant program under subpart II of part B of title XIX of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300x–21 et seq.) and the program to address priority substance use disorder prevention needs of regional and national significance under section 516 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb–22).

SA 1254. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—STOP ARMING CARTELS ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Stop Arming Cartels Act of 2025".

SEC. 202. PROHIBITION ON RIFLES CAPABLE OF FIRING .50 CALIBER AMMUNITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 922, by adding at the end the following:

"(aa) RIFLES CAPABLE OF FIRING .50 CALIBER AMMUNITION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall be unlawful for any person to import, sell, manufacture, transfer, or possess, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, a rifle capable of firing .50 caliber ammunition.

"(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(A) GOVERNMENT USE.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the importation for, manufacture for, sale to, transfer to, or possession by the United States, a department or agency of the United States, a State, or a department, agency, or political subdivision of a State, of a rifle capable of firing .50 caliber ammunition.

"(B) GRANDFATHERED RIFLES.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the sale, transfer, or possession of any rifle otherwise lawfully possessed on or before the date of enactment of the Stop Arming Cartels Act of 2025."; and

(2) in section 924(a)(1)(B), by striking "or (q)" and inserting "(q), or (aa)".

(b) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN RIFLES AS FIREARMS UNDER NATIONAL FIREARMS ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5845(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "and (8) a destructive device" and inserting "(8) a destructive device; and (9) a rifle which is capable of firing .50 caliber ammunition and is lawfully possessed on or before the date of enactment of the Stop Arming Cartels Act of 2025".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date which is 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) REGISTRATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or any other provision of law, any person possessing a rifle which is capable of firing .50 caliber ammunition which is not registered to such person in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record shall register each such rifle so possessed with the Secretary in such form and manner as the Secretary may require within the 12-month period immediately following the date of enactment of this Act. No fee or tax shall be imposed with respect to any registration required under this subparagraph.

(ii) INCLUSION IN REGISTRY.—Any registration described in clause (i) shall become a part of the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record. No information or evidence required to be submitted or retained by a natural person to register a firearm under this subparagraph shall be used, directly or indirectly, as evidence against such person in any criminal proceeding with respect to a prior or concurrent violation of law.

(C) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) NATIONAL FIREARMS REGISTRATION AND TRANSFER RECORD.—The term "National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record" means the registry established pursuant to section 5841 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(ii) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" has the same meaning given such term under section 7701(a)(11)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 203. EXCEPTION TO COVERAGE UNDER PROTECTION OF LAWFUL COMMERCE IN ARMS ACT.

Section 4(5)(A) of the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (15 U.S.C. 7903(5)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) an action brought against a manufacturer or seller that knowingly sells or transfers a qualified product, or attempts or conspires to do so, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that the transaction is prohibited under section 805(c) of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1904(c)).”

SEC. 204. FEDERAL FIREARM PROHIBITOR FOR SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS AND CERTAIN OTHER FOREIGN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 922(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (12);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) is—

“(A) a significant foreign narcotics trafficker publicly identified by the President in a report under subsection (b) or (h)(1) of section 804 of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1903); or

“(B) a foreign person designated by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 805(b) of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1904(b)); or”; and

(4) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated, by striking “(10)” and inserting “(11)”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO NICS.—Section 103 of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (34 U.S.C. 40901) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by inserting “or that transfer of a firearm or ammunition to the individual would violate subsection (d)(11) of such section 922” after “section 922 of title 18, United States Code,”;

(2) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “or to whom transfer of a firearm would violate subsection (d)(11) of such section 922,” after “section 922 of title 18, United States Code or State law,”;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or that transfer of a firearm or ammunition to the person would violate subsection (d)(11) of such section 922,” after “section 922 of title 18, United States Code,”;

(C) in subparagraph (F)(iii)(I), by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d)(11), (g), or (n)”; and

(D) in subparagraph (G)(i), by striking “(g) or (n)” and inserting “(d)(11), (g), or (n)”; and

(3) in subsection (g), by inserting “or that transfer of a firearm to a prospective transferee would violate subsection (d)(11) of such section 922,” after “section 922 of title 18, United States Code or State law,”; and

(4) in subsection (i)(2)—

(A) by striking “persons,” and inserting “persons who are”; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, or to whom transfer of a firearm would violate subsection (d)(11) of such section 922”.

SEC. 205. ADDING RIFLES TO MULTIPLE FIREARM SALES REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 923(g)(3)(A) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “pistols, or revolvers, or any combination of pistols and revolvers” and inserting “pistols, revolvers, or rifles, or any combination of pistols, revolvers, and rifles”.

SA 1255. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect

to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 8. REPORT; AUTHORIZATION TO IMPOSE ADDITIONAL DUTIES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report on the amount of fentanyl and fentanyl-related substances that crossed the southern international land border of the United States during the year preceding submission of the report.

(b) AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE ADDITIONAL DUTIES.—If, in any report submitted under subsection (a), the Secretary determines that the amount of fentanyl and fentanyl-related substances that crossed the southern international land border of the United States during the year preceding submission of the report did not decrease relative to the preceding year, the President may impose duties on imports of goods from Mexico that are in addition to the duties on such goods in effect on the date of the report.

SA 1256. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REAUTHORIZATION.

Section 1001(a)(21) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(21)) is amended by striking “2020 through 2024” and inserting “2025 through 2029”.

SA 1257. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “fentanyl-related substance” has the meaning given that term under section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802), as amended by section 6(c) of this Act.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies barriers to fentanyl and fentanyl-related substance abuse education in primary and secondary school; and

(2) describes best practices for fentanyl and fentanyl-related substance abuse education in primary and secondary schools.

SA 1258. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 331, to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike sections 2 through 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. CLASS SCHEDULING OF FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCES.

Section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)) is amended by adding at the end of schedule I the following:

“(e)(1) Unless specifically exempted or unless listed in another schedule, any material, compound, mixture, or preparation which contains any quantity of a fentanyl-related substance, or which contains the salts, isomers, and salts of isomers of a fentanyl-related substance whenever the existence of such salts, isomers, and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation.

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), except as provided in paragraph (3), the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ means any substance that is structurally related to fentanyl by 1 or more of the following modifications:

“(A) By replacement of the phenyl portion of the phenethyl group by any monocycle, whether or not further substituted in or on the monocycle.

“(B) By substitution in or on the phenethyl group with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxy, hydroxyl, halo, haloalkyl, amino, or nitro groups.

“(C) By substitution in or on the piperidine ring with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxy, ester, ether, hydroxyl, halo, haloalkyl, amino, or nitro groups.

“(D) By replacement of the aniline ring with any aromatic monocycle whether or not further substituted in or on the aromatic monocycle.

“(E) By replacement of the N-propionyl group with another acyl group.

“(3) A substance that satisfies the definition of the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ in paragraph (2) shall nonetheless not be treated as a fentanyl-related substance subject to this schedule if the substance—

“(A) is controlled by action of the Attorney General under section 201; or

“(B) is otherwise expressly listed in a schedule other than this schedule.

“(4)(A) The Attorney General may by order publish in the Federal Register a list of substances that satisfy the definition of the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ in paragraph (2).

“(B) The absence of a substance from a list published under subparagraph (A) does not negate the control status of the substance under this schedule if the substance satisfies the definition of the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ in paragraph (2).

“(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title or title III, an offense involving the trafficking of a fentanyl-related substance shall not be subject to a quantity-based mandatory minimum penalty.”

SEC. 3. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO RESEARCH.

(a) ALTERNATIVE REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR SCHEDULE I RESEARCH.—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (1) (relating to required training for prescribers) as subsection (m); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(n) SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS CONDUCTING CERTAIN RESEARCH WITH SCHEDULE I CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (g), a practitioner may conduct research described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with 1 or more schedule I substances in accordance with subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) of this subsection.

“(2) RESEARCH SUBJECT TO EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—Research described in this paragraph is research that—

“(A) is with respect to a drug that is the subject of an investigational use exemption under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)); or

“(B) is—

“(i) conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, or the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

“(ii) funded partly or entirely by a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction from the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(3) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—

“(A) RESEARCHER WITH A CURRENT SCHEDULE I OR II RESEARCH REGISTRATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a practitioner is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I or II, the practitioner may conduct research under this subsection on and after the date that is 30 days after the date on which the practitioner sends a notice to the Attorney General containing the following information, with respect to each substance with which the practitioner will conduct the research:

“(I) The chemical name of the substance.

“(II) The quantity of the substance to be used in the research.

“(III) Demonstration that the research is in the category described in paragraph (2), which demonstration may be satisfied—

“(aa) in the case of a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction, or intramural research project, by identifying the sponsoring agency and supplying the number of the grant, contract, cooperative agreement, other transaction, or project; or

“(bb) in the case of an application under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)), by supplying the application number and the sponsor of record on the application.

“(IV) Demonstration that the researcher is authorized to conduct research with respect to the substance under the laws of the State in which the research will take place.

“(ii) VERIFICATION OF INFORMATION BY HHS OR VA.—Upon request from the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, as appropriate, shall verify information submitted by an applicant under clause (i)(III).

“(B) RESEARCHER WITHOUT A CURRENT SCHEDULE I OR II RESEARCH REGISTRATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If a practitioner is not registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I or II, the practitioner may send a notice to the Attorney General containing the information listed in subparagraph (A)(i), with respect to each substance with which the practitioner will conduct the research.

“(ii) ATTORNEY GENERAL ACTION.—The Attorney General shall—

“(I) treat notice received under clause (i) as a sufficient application for a research registration; and

“(II) not later than 45 days of receiving such a notice that contains all information required under subparagraph (A)(i)—

“(aa) register the applicant; or

“(bb) serve an order to show cause upon the applicant in accordance with section 304(c).

“(4) ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS.—The Attorney General shall provide a means to permit a practitioner to submit a notification under paragraph (3) electronically.

“(5) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS.—A practitioner conducting research with a schedule I substance under this subsection may only possess the amounts of schedule I substance identified in—

“(A) the notification to the Attorney General under paragraph (3); or

“(B) a supplemental notification that the practitioner may send if the practitioner needs additional amounts for the research,

which supplemental notification shall include—

“(i) the name of the practitioner;

“(ii) the additional quantity needed of the substance; and

“(iii) an attestation that the research to be conducted with the substance is consistent with the scope of the research that was the subject of the notification under paragraph (3).

“(6) IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION REQUIREMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection alters the requirements of part A of title III, regarding the importation and exportation of controlled substances.

“(7) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Halt All Lethal Trafficking of Fentanyl Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall complete a study, and submit to Congress a report thereon, about research described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with fentanyl.”.

(b) SEPARATE REGISTRATIONS NOT REQUIRED FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCHER IN SAME INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 302(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) An agent or employee of a research institution that is conducting research with a controlled substance if—

“(A) the agent or employee is acting within the scope of the professional practice of the agent or employee;

“(B) another agent or employee of the institution is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in the same schedule;

“(C) the researcher who is so registered—

“(i) informs the Attorney General of the name, position title, and employing institution of the agent or employee who is not separately registered;

“(ii) authorizes that agent or employee to perform research under the registration of the registered researcher; and

“(iii) affirms that any act taken by that agent or employee involving a controlled substance shall be attributable to the registered researcher, as if the researcher had directly committed the act, for purposes of any proceeding under section 304(a) to suspend or revoke the registration of the registered researcher; and

“(D) the Attorney General does not, within 30 days of receiving the information, authorization, and affirmation described in subparagraph (C), refuse, for a reason listed in section 304(a), to allow the agent or employee to possess the substance without a separate registration.”.

(2) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 302(c)(3) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(c)(3)) is amended by striking “(25)” and inserting “(27)”.

(c) SINGLE REGISTRATION FOR RELATED RESEARCH SITES.—Section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4)(A) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a person registered to conduct research with a controlled substance under section 303(g) may conduct the research under a single registration if—

“(i) the research occurs exclusively on sites all of which are—

“(I) within the same city or county; and

“(II) under the control of the same institution, organization, or agency; and

“(ii) before commencing the research, the researcher notifies the Attorney General of each site where—

“(I) the research will be conducted; or

“(II) the controlled substance will be stored or administered.

“(B) A site described in subparagraph (A) shall be included in a registration described

in that subparagraph only if the researcher has notified the Attorney General of the site—

“(i) in the application for the registration; or

“(ii) before the research is conducted, or before the controlled substance is stored or administered, at the site.

“(C) The Attorney General may, in consultation with the Secretary, issue regulations addressing, with respect to research sites described in subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the manner in which controlled substances may be delivered to the research sites;

“(ii) the storage and security of controlled substances at the research sites;

“(iii) the maintenance of records for the research sites; and

“(iv) any other matters necessary to ensure effective controls against diversion at the research sites.”.

(d) NEW INSPECTION NOT REQUIRED IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.—Section 302(f) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(f) The” and inserting “(f)(1) The”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) If a person is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance and applies for a registration, or for a modification of a registration, to conduct research with a second controlled substance that is in the same schedule as the first controlled substance, or is in a schedule with a higher numerical designation than the schedule of the first controlled substance, a new inspection by the Attorney General of the registered location is not required.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall prohibit the Attorney General from conducting an inspection that the Attorney General determines necessary to ensure that a registrant maintains effective controls against diversion.”.

(e) CONTINUATION OF RESEARCH ON SUBSTANCES NEWLY ADDED TO SCHEDULE I.—Section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) CONTINUATION OF RESEARCH ON SUBSTANCES NEWLY ADDED TO SCHEDULE I.—If a person is conducting research on a substance when the substance is added to schedule I, and the person is already registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I—

“(1) not later than 90 days after the scheduling of the newly scheduled substance, the person shall submit a completed application for registration or modification of existing registration, to conduct research on the substance, in accordance with regulations issued by the Attorney General for purposes of this paragraph;

“(2) the person may, notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), continue to conduct the research on the substance until—

“(A) the person withdraws the application described in paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

“(B) the Attorney General serves on the person an order to show cause proposing the denial of the application under section 304(c);

“(3) if the Attorney General serves an order to show cause as described in paragraph (2)(B) and the person requests a hearing, the hearing shall be held on an expedited basis and not later than 45 days after the request is made, except that the hearing may be held at a later time if so requested by the person; and

“(4) if the person sends a copy of the application described in paragraph (1) to a manufacturer or distributor of the substance, receipt of the copy by the manufacturer or distributor shall constitute sufficient evidence

that the person is authorized to receive the substance.”.

(f) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURING ACTIVITIES AS COINCIDENT TO RESEARCH.**—Section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822), as amended by subsection (e), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURING ACTIVITIES AS COINCIDENT TO RESEARCH.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a person who is registered to perform research on a controlled substance may perform manufacturing activities with small quantities of that substance, including activities described in paragraph (2), without being required to obtain a manufacturing registration, if—

“(A) the activities are performed for the purpose of the research; and

“(B) the activities and the quantities of the substance involved in the activities are stated in—

“(i) a notification submitted to the Attorney General under section 303(n);

“(ii) a research protocol filed with an application for registration approval under section 303(g); or

“(iii) a notification to the Attorney General that includes—

“(i) the name of the registrant; and

“(II) an attestation that the research to be conducted with the small quantities of manufactured substance is consistent with the scope of the research that is the basis for the registration.

“(2) **ACTIVITIES INCLUDED.**—Activities permitted under paragraph (1) include—

“(A) processing the substance to create extracts, tinctures, oils, solutions, derivatives, or other forms of the substance consistent with—

“(i) the information provided as part of a notification submitted to the Attorney General under section 303(n); or

“(ii) a research protocol filed with an application for registration approval under section 303(g); and

“(B) dosage form development studies performed for the purpose of requesting an investigational new drug exemption under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)).

“(3) **EXCEPTION REGARDING MARIHUANA.**—The authority under paragraph (1) to manufacture substances does not include the authority to grow marihuana.”.

(g) **TRANSPARENCY REGARDING SPECIAL PROCEDURES.**—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) **TRANSPARENCY REGARDING SPECIAL PROCEDURES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Attorney General determines, with respect to a controlled substance, that an application by a practitioner to conduct research with the substance should be considered under a process, or subject to criteria, different from the process or criteria applicable to applications to conduct research with other controlled substances in the same schedule, the Attorney General shall make public, including by posting on the website of the Drug Enforcement Administration—

“(A) the identities of all substances for which such determinations have been made;

“(B) the process and criteria that shall be applied to applications to conduct research with those substances; and

“(C) how the process and criteria described in subparagraph (B) differ from the process and criteria applicable to applications to conduct research with other controlled substances in the same schedule.

“(2) **TIMING OF POSTING.**—The Attorney General shall make information described in paragraph (1) public upon making a determination described in that paragraph, regardless of whether a practitioner has submitted such an application at that time.”.

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTION ON CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES DISPENSING.

Effective as if included in the enactment of Public Law 117–328—

(1) section 1252(a) of division FF of Public Law 117–328 (136 Stat. 5681) is amended, in the matter being inserted into section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act, by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

(2) section 1262 of division FF of Public Law 117–328 (136 Stat. 5681) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

(ii) in the matter being stricken by subsection (a)(2), by striking “(g)(1)” and inserting “(h)(1)”; and

(iii) in the matter being inserted by subsection (a)(2), by striking “(g) Practitioners” and inserting “(h) Practitioners”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (1), by striking “303(g)(1)” and inserting “303(h)(1)”; and

(ii) in the matter being inserted by paragraph (1), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

(iii) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (2)(A), by striking “303(g)(2)” and inserting “303(h)(2)”; and

(iv) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (3), by striking “303(g)(2)(B)” and inserting “303(h)(2)(B)”; and

(v) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (5), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”; and

(vi) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (6), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”; and

(3) section 1263(b) of division FF of Public Law 117–328 (136 Stat. 5685) is amended—

(A) by striking “303(g)(2)” and inserting “303(h)(2)”; and

(B) by striking “(21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2))” and inserting “(21 U.S.C. 823(h)(2))”.

SEC. 5. RULEMAKING.

(a) **INTERIM FINAL RULES.**—The Attorney General—

(1) shall, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, issue rules to implement this Act and the amendments made by this Act; and

(2) may issue the rules under paragraph (1) as interim final rules.

(b) **PROCEDURE FOR FINAL RULE.**—

(1) **EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERIM FINAL RULES.**—A rule issued by the Attorney General as an interim final rule under subsection (a) shall become immediately effective as an interim final rule without requiring the Attorney General to demonstrate good cause therefor, notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of the undesignated matter following paragraph (4) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT AND HEARING.**—An interim final rule issued under subsection (a) shall give interested persons the opportunity to comment and to request a hearing.

(3) **FINAL RULE.**—After the conclusion of such proceedings, the Attorney General shall issue a final rule to implement this Act and the amendments made by this Act in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 6. APPLICABILITY; OTHER MATTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Irrespective of the date on which the rules required by section 5 are finalized, the amendments made by this Act apply beginning as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in the amendments made by this Act may be construed as evidence that, in applying sections 401(b)(1) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)) and 1010(b) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)) with respect to conduct occurring before the date of the enactment of this Act, a fentanyl-related substance (as defined by such amendments) is not an analogue of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl] propanamide.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have four requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 11, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 11, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to receive testimony.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 11, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 11, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1968

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1968) making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

JUSTICE FOR MURDER VICTIMS ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 960, introduced earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 960) to ensure that homicides can be prosecuted under Federal law without regard to the time elapsed between the act or omission that caused the death of the victim and the death itself.

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

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

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

The bill (S. 960) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 960

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 "Justice for Murder Victims Act".

SEC. 2. HOMICIDE OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1123. No maximum time period between act or omission and death of victim

"(a) IN GENERAL.—A prosecution may be instituted for any homicide offense under this title without regard to the time that elapsed between—

"(1) the act or omission that caused the death of the victim; and

"(2) the death of the victim.

"(b) RELATION TO STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to supersede the limitations period under section 3282(a), to the extent applicable.

"(c) MAXIMUM TIME PERIOD APPLICABLE IF DEATH PENALTY IMPOSED.—A sentence of death may not be imposed for a homicide offense under this title unless the Government proves beyond a reasonable doubt that not more than 1 year and 1 day elapsed between—

"(1) the act or omission that caused the death of the victim; and

"(2) the death of the victim."

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of sections for chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1123. No maximum time period between act or omission and death of victim."

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Section 1123(a) of title 18, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an act or omission described in that section that occurs after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) MAXIMUM PENALTY FOR FIRST-DEGREE MURDER BASED ON TIME PERIOD BETWEEN ACT OR OMISSION AND DEATH OF VICTIM.—Section 1111(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "imprisonment for life" the following: ", unless the death of the victim occurred more than 1 year and 1 day after the act or omission that caused the death of the victim, in which case the punishment shall be imprisonment for any term of years or for life".

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to adjourn until 6:40 p.m. today.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 11, 2025, at 6:40 p.m.