

Hoeven	McConnell	Scott (FL)
Husted	McCormick	Scott (SC)
Hyde-Smith	Moody	Sheehy
Johnson	Moran	Sullivan
Justice	Moreno	Thune
Kennedy	Mullin	Tuberville
Lankford	Ricketts	Wicker
Lee	Risch	Young
Lummis	Rounds	
Marshall	Schmitt	

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—5

Blumenthal	Murphy	Tillis
Graham	Paul	

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.

VOTE ON BRIGGS NOMINATION

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 380 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Banks	Daines	McConnell
Barrasso	Ernst	McCormick
Blackburn	Fischer	Moody
Boozman	Grassley	Moran
Britt	Hagerty	Moreno
Budd	Hoeven	Mullin
Capito	Husted	Murkowski
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Collins	Johnson	Ricketts
Cornyn	Justice	Risch
Cotton	Kennedy	Rounds
Cramer	Lankford	Schmitt
Crapo	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lummis	
Curtis	Marshall	

Sheehy	Thune	Wicker
Sullivan	Tuberville	Young

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—6

Blumenthal	Hawley	Scott (SC)
Graham	Murphy	Tillis

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 actions.

The Senator from Alaska.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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.

CIVIC EDUCATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, non-partisan civic education and civic participation are critical for our constitutional and representative form of government.

Increasingly, however, civic knowledge is on the decline.

A recent survey by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce found that 70 percent fail a basic civic literacy test.

Another survey found that nearly 17 percent of Americans could not name any branch of government.

This should be concerning for all of us.

I would like to commend efforts in my home State of Iowa to promote civic education and participation in our colleges and universities. These include Cyclone Civics at Iowa State University, Hawk the Vote at the University of Iowa, and the Center for Civic Education at the University of Northern Iowa.

These programs are crucial in ensuring that the next generation of leaders understands our constitutional system of government and are ready to lead our Republic forward.

GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION FUND

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Environment

and Public Works Committee, I wish to correct the record on one small piece of the big, terrible bill that the Senate barely passed last week and which the President signed into law on July 4. There are many things to say about that legislation, and I will continue to daylight concerning provisions buried in it over the coming weeks.

But today, I want to focus on section 60002 of the so-called "One Big Beautiful Bill Act," which repealed and rescinded all unobligated funds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. There has been some spin put on this section, including in court filings. And so I aim to fix some misconceptions, with the help of the Congressional Budget Office and the relevant Republican House subcommittee chair.

I have spoken a lot about the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund over the past several months, on the floor and in the Judiciary and Environment and Public Works Committees. Most of the time, I have focused on the many red flags raised by outrageous behavior of top DOJ and EPA officials in their attempts to claw back nearly \$20 billion in grant funds that were awarded in April 2024 and fully dispersed into private bank accounts by August. After terrorizing grantees with false allegations of fraud and trying to open bogus criminal cases that went nowhere, EPA froze and then announced the termination of these fully obligated and dispersed grants. The grantees, rightfully, sued EPA for these arbitrary and capricious actions. The dispute is being actively litigated in the D.C. circuit.

The Justice Department continues its mischief. On July 3, 2025, DOJ ran to the court with news of the repeal and rescission of unobligated funds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, claiming that this was Congress rescinding a full \$17 billion, including all of what EPA claimed to terminate on March 11, 2025. That simply is not so. The DOJ reads too much into the repeal of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund language. Two pieces of evidence support my contention here.

First, when this provision came up through the Environment and Public Works Committee, it was "scored" by the Congressional Budget Office. That means the Congressional Budget Office provided an estimate of the funds saved by rescinding unobligated funds. The CBO score for rescinding all unobligated funds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, as provided to us by the majority on June 24, 2025, was \$19 million. That is 19 with an m, not a b. CBO confirmed, further, that the repeal of the program language did not create any additional savings. The repeal and rescission together only saved the \$19 million EPA had remaining to oversee the program. All of the grant funding was out the door, in private bank accounts, and in some cases, tied up in firm legal commitments with third parties. At no point in our discussions with the majority, directly or in our several conversations with the Parliamentarian, was this score disputed.

The majority did express concern about EPA prevailing in litigation and suddenly having nearly \$20 billion back and, for this reason, pushed to repeal the language. But the fact of the matter is, section 60002 only rescinded EPA's administrative dollars and not a cent of the grant funding.

Second, Republicans made clear that rescissions from environmental grant programs only touched funding that had not yet gone out the door. During the markup of the Energy and Commerce Committee title for the House version of this bill, the chair of the Environment Subcommittee Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia made the following statements:

On page 244, lines 5959–64:

I just want to point out that these provisions that we are talking about only apply as far, as this bill is concerned, to the unobligated balances. So if a grant was already given, as far as this bill is concerned, then that would still be going forward.

On page 244, lines 5968–70:

If the grant has already been granted and the money is obligated, then this—then our language does not affect that.

On pages 247–48, lines 6055–57:

... [W]e can't rescind expenditures that have already been obligated.

Neither CBO nor Republican Members understood the repeal and rescission of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to save anything more than

EPA's unspent oversight dollars. Not a cent of the grant funding was touched by section 60002. Wishful thinking on the part of DOJ does not moot the ongoing litigation.

I ask unanimous consent that the June 21, 2025, CBO score for the Environment and Public Works title, including section 2, the repeal and rescission of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, as well as excerpts from the House Energy and Commerce Committee markup transcript be printed in the RECORD.

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

Preliminary Estimated Budgetary Effects of MAZ25453

[Brett Jortland request by email, 6/21/25]

	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2025–2029	2025–2034
Change to Direct Spending												
Sec. 01 Recission of Funding for Clean Heavy-Duty Vehicles												
Budget Authority	–423	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–423	–423
Estimated Outlays	0	–20	–65	–56	–79	–92	–70	0	0	0	–220	–382
Sec. 02 Repeal of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund												
Budget Authority	–19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–19	–19
Estimated Outlays	–3	–3	–3	–3	–3	–3	–1	0	0	0	–15	–19
Sec. 03 Recission of Funding for Diesel Emissions Reductions												
Budget Authority	–60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–60	–60
Estimated Outlays	–13	–16	–12	–12	–3	0	0	0	0	0	–56	–56
Sec. 04 Recission of Funding to Address Air Pollution												
Budget Authority	–70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–70	–70
Estimated Outlays	–5	–20	–10	–5	–10	–10	–10	0	0	0	–50	–70
Sec. 05 Recission of Funding to Address Air Pollution at Schools												
Budget Authority	–14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–14	–14
Estimated Outlays	0	–3	–3	–3	–3	0	0	0	0	0	–12	–12
Sec. 06 Recission of Funding for the Low Emissions Electricity Program												
Budget Authority	–42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–42	–42
Estimated Outlays	–5	–7	–7	–7	–7	–9	0	0	0	0	–33	–42
Sec. 07 Recission of Funding for Section 211(O) of the Clean Air Act												
Budget Authority	–3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–3	–3
Estimated Outlays	0	–1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–1	–1
Sec. 08 Recission of Funding for Funding for Implementation of the American Innovation and Manufacturing Act												
Budget Authority	–3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–3	–3
Estimated Outlays	0	0	0	–3	0	0	0	0	0	0	–3	–3

Subtotal Changes in Direct Spending												
Budget Authority	–6,579	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–6,579	–6,579
Estimated Outlays	–857	–936	–1,237	–887	–570	–360	–112	0	0	0	–4,487	–4,959
Change to Revenue												
Sec. 12 Recission of Funding for Methane Emissions and Waste Reduction Incentive Program for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems	0	0	0	0	0	–375	–300	–275	–275	–275	0	–1,500
Sec. 26 Project Sponsor Opt-in Fees for Environmental Reviews	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total Changes in Revenues	0	0	0	0	0	–375	–300	–275	–275	–275	0	–1,500
Net Effect on the Deficit	–857	–936	–1,237	–887	–570	15	188	275	275	275	–4,487	–3,459

* = between zero and \$500,000. The estimates account for judicial decisions and administrative actions through April 10, 2025.
Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Staff Contacts: Aurora Swanson, Lilia Ledezma, Susan Yeh Beyer, David Hughes, Willow Latham-Proenca, Matthew Pickford, Molly Sherlock.

MARKUP OF BUDGET RECONCILIATION TEXT
(Tuesday, May 13, 2025)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:37 a.m. in Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Brett Guthrie [chair of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Guthrie, Latta, Griffith, Bilirakis, Hudson, Carter of Georgia, Palmer, Dunn, Joyce, Weber, Allen, Balderson, Fulcher, Pfluger, Harshbarger, Miller-Meeke, Cammack, Obernolte, James, Bentz, Houchin, Fry, Lee, Langworthy, Kean, Rulli, Evans, Goldman, Fedorchak, Pallone, DeGette, Schakowsky, Matsui, Castor, Tonko, Clarke, Ruiz, Peters, Dingell, Veasey, Kelly, Barragán, Soto, Schrier, Trahan, Fletcher, Ocasio-Cortez, Auchincloss, Carter of Louisiana, Menendez, Mullin, Landsman, and McClellan.

The Chair. The committee will come to order.

The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there anyone seeking recognition to speak on the amendment?

The gentleman from New Jersey seeks recognition. He is recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman, and I want to thank my colleague Mr. Carter, for

offering this amendment. You know, often when we talk about environmental justice our friends across the aisle roll their eyes. They scoff at the idea of what is environmental injustice. It is not a thing. We don't need to talk about it. So I want to just add a little context to it.

Environmental justice initiatives are lifelines for communities that are at a higher risk of adverse health impacts from exposure to pollution and other environmental challenges. So in my district the Ironbound section of Newark, 25 percent of children living there suffer from asthma. That is three times the state average.

And it isn't just their health that suffers. When we talk about environmental justice, we are talking about children's education. Asthma is the leading cause of absenteeism in school-age children, which is why it is so obscene that today Republicans want to cut funding that would address air pollution at schools. I would just ask the American people, like, what part of addressing air pollution at schools is controversial? I don't think there is anything controversial about.

And this is not just Democratic states or blue states. When we talk about environmental justice, we are talking about mining-related pollution in Appalachia. We are talking about water crises in Alabama and

Michigan. We are talking about over-burdened communities that exist across the country and across party lines.

So speaking about across party lines, another one of our Republican colleagues from Oregon has a district that has been awarded multiple grants at risk from this reconciliation bill that would be saved by my amendment.

You are welcome.

First is the Columbia Gorge Early Learning and Resilience Center, located right outside of Portland in a rural, low-income community of The Dalles, Oregon. This grant-funded project would renovate a 70-year-old school building into a community center that protects public health and provides valuable resources for local residents. That sounds like a home run project to me. The center would provide childcare for up to 200 children, create an on-site learning laboratory, and provide vocational scholarships for students to pursue careers in fields such as engineering or agriculture. That is fantastic.

But the same party that claims to be the party of families wants to shut down a grant that would help some of those families with

child care. The irony is staggering. This is all while also creating a renewable, energy-powered refuge that will protect our most vulnerable residents during extreme weather events like wildfires and winter storms. When the lights go out and the community needs critical heat and services, Republicans turn the other way, even at the risk of their own constituents' lives. Unfortunately, the \$20 million EPA grant to carry out this valuable mission was unjustly and illegally terminated last month.

Similarly, another grant in Oregon, the Chiloquin Community Resilience Hub and Municipal Center, would have remediated a brownfield site into an emergency shelter, municipal space, and community education center. We all sat here weeks ago and touted the brownfields program as a bipartisan program, and yet here we are trying to cut the funding for a brownfield site that would serve as a critical community hub in a Republican district. The center would also provide training and education opportunities for a population that lives in a rural and historically underserved area. The project was awarded a \$16.3 million EPA environmental justice grant—great job getting that for your community—but it was also illegally and arbitrarily canceled last month.

Now Republicans like that congressman from Oregon want to get rid of the program entirely. To me, the conclusion is clear. Republicans are willing to withhold nearly \$40 million from one congressional district alone, from his own constituents, to give tax breaks to those who need them the least.

So in addition to health care, we are not just talking about Democratic environmental priorities. We are talking about cutting funding for programs that will impact districts across the country, and that is why everyone should support this amendment to ensure that you bring those dollars home to your district.

Thank you, and I yield back.

The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back, and I will recognize myself to speak on the amendment, and yield to my good friend from Virginia.

Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to point out that these provisions that we are talking about only apply as far, as this bill is concerned, to the unobligated balances. So if a grant was already given, as far as this bill is concerned, then that would still be going forward.

The Chair. So would you yield back to me? So everyone that was listed, if the grants had been awarded as projects or not—

Mr. Griffith. If the grant has already been granted and the money is obligated, then this—then our language does not affect that.

Mrs. Fletcher. Will the gentleman yield?

The Chair. The—yes, it is my time. Yes, I will yield.

Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair. Yes.

Mrs. Fletcher. I just want to clarify. I understand the statement to be that this particular legislation doesn't deal with the already-obligated funds. But isn't it true that the administration is rescinding the grants and pulling back the money from the projects like my colleague from New Jersey was just explaining?

I know that there have been grants under various programs in my community. One, for example, to help build sidewalks and tree canopy. It is amazing to think about. In my district there is a 17-degree difference in the temperature during the summer between the poorest neighborhoods and the wealthiest. And they have no trees, they have no tree canopy. There is this great program to try to build sidewalks, put in trees, and address some of these challenges that—it gets real hot in Houston, and this is a really impor-

tant program. But I know the funds for that have been revoked.

And so is the statement that this won't do anything to those, but there are still these grants being revoked? Or are we trying to preserve those grants in this legislation and just—the already-obligated funds, are we protecting those in this?

The Chair. Well, this legislation does not take—does not close the grants on any obligated funds, and that—the executive actions—

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield? The Chair. My understanding—and I will yield to my friend from Virginia, if you would like to answer that.

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Griffith. I am happy to say that I don't—The Chair. Louisiana, my friend from Virginia, and then I will yield to you.

Mr. Griffith. I don't know what the administration is doing, per se, to the specific—

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I can help—

Mr. Griffith. —grants that were mentioned, but I would say that this amendment specifically talks about the unobligated amounts, as well, so that whether it be the bill or the amendment, this action that we take does not impact that action that may or may not be going on in the administration.

I know it is confusing for folks back home, as well, to understand that not—the administration does not always tell us everything they are doing because they are doing so many things.

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. Griffith. And while I—

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I will address that.

The Chair. I will yield to you in a second. Let him finish, yes.

Mr. Griffith. I don't have the floor. I have been yielded time, so I have to finish and then I yield back—

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Fair enough, sir.

Mr. Griffith. —to the chair.

And so I can't speak for the administration on this. That is a whole different ball game.

But what we are debating tonight is the bill in front of us. And what we are debating right now is the amendment. Neither the bill in front of us nor the amendment deal with the issues that the gentleman previously raised. And so that is why I ask folks to vote no on the amendment and yes on the bill.

The Chair. Thank you.

The gentleman from Louisiana, I yield to you.

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. And I am happy to have an opportunity to address that, because those comments are not exactly correct.

If the Administrator Zeldin is successful in terminating these critical grant programs in his misguided attempt to gut the agency, these grants will be subject to rescission. It is very clear. So the notion that it has been awarded, it is not going to be impacted, that is a little disingenuous. So I want to clear that up for the record.

I yield.

The Chair. Thank you. I yield, but—to the—back to the gentleman from Virginia.

You want to—okay I will—do you want to speak, the gentleman from Virginia? Go ahead.

Mr. Griffith. And what I would say, Mr. Chairman, is that that may be true for a future rescission, but we can't rescind expenditures that have already been obligated.

Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Oh—

Mr. Griffith. And for purposes of this reconciliation, we can't look at the crystal ball and decide what might happen in the future.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, on July 8, 2025, due to unavoidable travel delays

because of the weather, I missed rollcall vote No. 373. Had I been present, I would have voted no on vote No. 373, cloture on the nomination of Preston Griffith to be Under Secretary of Energy.

On July 8, 2025, due to unavoidable travel delays because of the weather, I missed rollcall vote No. 374. Had I been present, I would have voted no on vote No. 374, cloture on the nomination of Bryan Bedford to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 301, confirmation of Stephen Vaden, of Tennessee, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 375, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 106, Preston Griffith, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy.

Mr. President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 376, motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 81, Scott Kuper, of California, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management for a term of four years.

Mr. President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 377, confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 197, Bryan Bedford, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

TRIBUTE TO MARTHA CRANLEY

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize my friend Martha Cranley, who will retire at the end of the summer after a distinguished career in service to children, families, and communities throughout Wisconsin.

After her family moved north from Oklahoma to set roots in Madison during her childhood, Martha attended St. Norbert College in De Pere. In some ways, this is where she began her career “serving” Wisconsinites: working at a restaurant where players for the Green Bay Packers dined for breakfast during their training camp. Her children still remind her that she failed to obtain a Bart Starr autograph during this time.

Following graduation, Martha returned to Madison, where she worked as a policy aide in both chambers of the Wisconsin State Legislature. While there, she formed many lasting relationships both professional and personal, the most important one being with her husband of more than 35 years Larry Martin.

Martha has spent the more than three decades since her time in State government leading community and