United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2025 *No. 166*

House of Representatives

The House met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FULCHER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 8, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RUSS FULCHER, to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Where, O Lord, do we find insight when all around us, the competing narratives muddle the path toward discernment? Voices cry out for understanding, searching as if for hidden treasure and longing to find the wisdom needed to meet today's challenges.

You alone, O God, give wisdom; from Your mouth only come knowledge and understanding.

Teach us to listen for the Word You speak, that we will learn what is right, just, and fair.

Open our eyes to perceive the path of blamelessness. Remind us that You set before us guardrails to keep us safe if we are honest and to protect us when we are faithful.

Incline our hearts toward discretion. Lead us on straight paths, and guard us against our own willfulness.

In You alone may we seek wisdom. In You only will we find insight.

In Your sovereign name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 13 of rule I, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER 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.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 13 of rule I, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Friday, October 10, 2025.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, October 10, 2025, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC–2124. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Specialty Crops Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wisconsin; Amendments to the Marketing Order [Doc. No.: AMS-SC-22-0052] received October 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC–2125. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing 10 officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2126. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of material violations or suspected material violations of regulations of the Secretary, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3121 note; Public Law 103-202, Sec. 202(d)(1); (107 Stat. 2356); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC–2127. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reliability Standards for Frequency and Voltage Protection Settings and Ride-Through for Inverter-Based Resources [Docket No.: RM25-3-000; Order No.: 909] received September 29, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC–2128. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report to Congress on U.S. Compliance with the Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq Section 4 of the Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 98-119, Sec. 4; (97 Stat. 806); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2129. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2130. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Syria that was declared in Executive Order 13338 of May 11, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2131. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that

was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2132. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2133. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2134. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: RSAT Case 25-11218 pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2135. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Determinations under Section 7012, Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2024; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2136. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-063, pursuant to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2137. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-062, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2138. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-038, pursuant to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2139. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-083, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2140. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-075, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2141. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-073, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2142. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-060, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2143. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-051, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2144. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-047, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2145. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-071, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC–2146. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 26-151 ''Robert F. Kennedy Campus Redevelopment Amendment Act of 2025'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 813); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC–2147. A letter from the Chief Regulatory Officer, Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Facilitating Earlier Filing of Certain Electronically Submitted H-2A Petitions [CIS No.: 2832-25; DHS Docket No.: USCIS-2025-0238] (RIN: 1615-AD04) received October 2, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2148. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates-Visa Services Fee Changes [Public Notice: 12819] (RIN: 1400-AG09) received September 29, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–2149. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Recurring Marine Events; Sector St. Petersburg [Docket Number: USCG–2025-0528] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 29, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–2150. A letter from the Administrative Assistant, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Anchorage Regulations; Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, CA [Docket Number: USCG-2023-0868] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received September 29, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–2151. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rescinding Regulations Regarding Management Systems Pertaining to the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Refuge Roads Program [Docket Number: FHWA-2025-0017] (RIN: 2125-AG23) received September 28, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–2152. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Development, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Restoring Integrity to the Issuance of Non-Domiciled Commercial Drivers Licenses (CDL) [Docket No.: FMCSA-2025-0622] (RIN: 2126-AC98) received October 2, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC–2153. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report ''Exposing Foreign Labor Abuses to Address Unfair Competition for American Workers and Companies'', pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2464; Public Law 93-618, Sec. 504 (as amended by Public Law 106-200, Sec. 412(c)); (114 Stat. 299); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–2154. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material of Chile [CBP Dec. 25-14] (RIN: 1685-AA35) received September 30, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC–2155. A letter from the Senior Regulation Writer, Law and Policy — Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Extension of Expiration Dates for 13 Body System Listings [Docket No.: SSA-2025-0033] (RIN: 0960-AI95) received September 29, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOST: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3123. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to laws relating to the payment of certain benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that are affected by death, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119–339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 5704. A bill to repeal the Smith-Mundt Modernization Act of 2013 and to prohibit domestic propagandization by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AMO (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. WALKINSHAW, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. RIVAS, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. NADLER, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. BROWN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SEWELL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ROSS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. GOODLANDER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CARSON,

Ms. ADAMS, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. BELL):

H.R. 5705. A bill to authorize the reimbursement by the Federal Government of State funds used to maintain participation in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. ANSARI (for herself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 5706. A bill to establish a grant program to assist eligible entities in developing or expanding behavioral health crisis response programs that do not rely primarily on law enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. BROWN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. COHEN, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 5707. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to prohibit a State from removing the name of any registrant from the official list of voters eligible to vote in elections for Federal office in the State unless the State verifies, on the basis of objective and reliable evidence, that the registrant is ineligible to vote in such elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Ms. RANDALL, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Ms. SALINAS):

H.R. 5708. A bill to suspend the enforcement of certain civil liabilities of Federal employees and contractors during a lapse in appropriations, or during a breach of the statutory debt limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Education and Workforce, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CISCOMANI (for himself and Ms. STANSBURY):

H.R. 5709. A bill to amend the United States-Mexico Transboundary Aquifer Assessment Act to reauthorize the United States-Mexico transboundary aquifer assessment program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Ms. LETLOW):

H.R. 5710. A bill to suspend certain payment limitations relating to agricultural risk coverage and price loss coverage for crop year 2025 and to make advance partial payments under such coverages for such crop year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5711. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to improve public understanding of how transportation investments are made by public agencies through establishing greater transparency and accountability processes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 5712. A bill to establish the Commission on American Quantum Information Science Dominance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GILL of Texas (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. HUNT, Mr. FINE, Mr. DAVIDSON, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 5713. A bill to authorize the expedited removal of aliens who are criminal gang members, members of foreign terrorist organizations, or have been convicted of certain specified crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. BACON, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 5714. A bill to direct the Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum to develop a curriculum for the study of modern-day antisemitism surrounding Hamas' October 7, 2023, terrorist attacks against Israel for use in secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. BACON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. STANTON, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 5715. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the American hostages and victims of the October 7th, 2023 attacks, in recognition of their profound suffering and sacrifice; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY (for herself, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. FIGURES, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 5716. A bill to provide for the continuation of agricultural disaster assistance programs in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MCIVER (for herself, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KEAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. POU, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H.R. 5717. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 514 Frelinghuysen Avenue in Newark, New Jersey, as the ''Mildred Joyce Coleman Crump Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5718. A bill to reinstate exemptions to SNAP work-requirements for homeless individuals, veterans, and former foster youth; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5719. A bill to provide for interim appropriations for the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts with respect to any fiscal year for which appropriations are not otherwise provided for the commissions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. RIVAS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 5720. A bill to provide reimbursement to certain Federal employees for childcare expenses during the lapse in appropriations beginning on or about October 1, 2025; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself and Mr. FALLON):

H.R. 5721. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit picketing or parading certain buildings or residences; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY (for himself, Mr. FINE, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. SELF):

H.R. 5722. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit the entry of aliens who adhere to Sharia law and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 5723. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify and report instances of fraud with respect to disability benefit questionnaire forms of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALKINSHAW (for himself, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. STEVENS, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 5724. A bill to amend chapter 77 of title 5, United States Code, to ensure timely rulings by the Merit Systems Protection Board on appeals by Federal employees and applicants for employment; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. ANSARI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas):

H.R. 5725. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant to support communities transitioning to health-centered responses for mental health-related emergencies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAGEMAN:

H.J. Res. 130. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''Buffalo Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ (for herself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CASTRO of

Texas, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CHU, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. RIVAS, Mr. CORREA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. TRAN, and Mr. LANDSMAN):

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution recognizing the significance of equal pay and the disparity in wages paid to Latina women in comparison to White, non-Hispanic men; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. ANSARI (for herself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. TONKO):

H. Res. 792. A resolution declaring a need for increased investments in youth mental health, recognizing May 31, 2026, as ''Youth Mental Health Day'', recognizing September 9, 2026, annually as ''Youth Suicide Prevention Day'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY (for herself, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MANNION, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SIMON, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 793. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 2025 as ''National Learning Disabilities Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H. Res. 794. A resolution recognizing the week of September 30th as ''National Orange Shirt Week'' or ''National Week of Remembrance'', which aims to honor those who were forced to attend Indian boarding schools, and to recognize the experience of Indian boarding school victims and survivors; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER (for himself, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. KIM, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. PETTERSEN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. GILLEN, Mr. LATIMER, Mr. BACON, Ms. LEE of Nevada, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. LIEU, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. BROWN, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. SYKES, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. RYAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. KEAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LALOTA, Mr. YAKYM, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. VINDMAN, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. LAWLER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHRIER, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. CASE, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

H. Res. 795. A resolution condemning the Hamas attacks of October 7, 2023, and calling for Hamas and its leaders to immediately and unconditionally surrender and to release the hostages, including Americans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAWLER (for himself and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H. Res. 796. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 9 through October 16, 2025, as ''National Dyspraxia/Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD) Awareness Week'' and a commitment to raise awareness of dyspraxia/DCD in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DEXTER, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ELFRETH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. FROST, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. LANDSMAN, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. LIEU, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 797. A resolution expressing concern about the growing problem of book banning and the proliferation of threats to freedom of expression in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 798. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of September 15 through September 21, 2025, as ''Rail Safety Week'' in the United States, and supporting the goals and ideals of reducing highway-rail grade crossing-related incidents, fatalities, and injuries; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 5704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. AMO:

H.R. 5705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

By Ms. ANSARI:

H.R. 5706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. CISCOMANI:

H.R. 5709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 5710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 5712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which states the Congress shall have the power ''to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof.''

By Mr. GILL of Texas:

H.R. 5713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 5714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GOTTHEIMER:

H.R. 5715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY:

H.R. 5716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. MCIVER:

H.R. 5717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Postal Clause, Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

Necessary and Proper Clause, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 5718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. OMAR:

H.R. 5720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 5721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII
By Mr. ROY:
H.R. 5722.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. TAKANO:
H.R. 5723.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8
By Mr. WALKINSHAW:
H.R. 5724.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, clause 18
By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:
H.R. 5725.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: [The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Ms. HAGEMAN:
H.J. Res. 130.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 114: Mr. FINE.
H.R. 209: Mr. ONDER.
H.R. 219: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 220: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 247: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 336: Mr. VINDMAN and Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 396: Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 403: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 425: Mr. KEAN and Mr. BAUMGARTNER.
H.R. 433: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 484: Ms. CROCKETT.
H.R. 537: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 539: Mr. ARRINGTON and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 645: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 669: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 740: Mr. SHREVE.
H.R. 842: Mr. MIN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GILL of Texas, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 868: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 880: Mr. WIED.
H.R. 887: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 909: Mr. BABIN and Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 1004: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 1028: Mr. ONDER and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1065: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1106: Mr. WALKINSHAW, Mr. BELL, and Mr. WHITESIDES.
H.R. 1144: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 1171: Mr. MAGAZINER and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 1227: Mr. MCGARVEY.
H.R. 1246: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 1262: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BALINT, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1291: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1319: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1329: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1346: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 1355: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1464: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1492: Mr. MCGUIRE.
H.R. 1505: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1521: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MANN, and Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1542: Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. TRAN, and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 1548: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 1564: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CASAR.
H.R. 1574: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 1581: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1585: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1616: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 1627: Mr. LICCARDO.
H.R. 1631: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1661: Ms. ANSARI and Mr. MIN.
H.R. 1707: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1708: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1845: Mr. HILL of Arkansas and Mr. GILL of Texas.
H.R. 1988: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2162: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 2172: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2253: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2257: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 2303: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2343: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 2348: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 2353: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2357: Ms. PINGREE, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, and Ms. SIMON.
H.R. 2368: Mrs. SYKES.
H.R. 2398: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 2485: Ms. ESCOBAR and Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2489: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 2498: Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 2501: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland and Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 2518: Mr. GRAY.
H.R. 2531: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2533: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 2538: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 2548: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. MFUME.
H.R. 2619: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 2633: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2654: Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 2657: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 2683: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 2717: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 2720: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2757: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 2777: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2788: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 2837: Mrs. TORRES of California.
H.R. 2851: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 2853: Mr. MANNION and Mr. JACK.
H.R. 2896: Mr. GILL of Texas.
H.R. 2906: Mr. LANDSMAN.
H.R. 2909: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 2920: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 2921: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 3004: Mr. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 3036: Mr. MCGARVEY.
H.R. 3051: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3052: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 3054: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3077: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 3132: Mr. MCCORMICK.
H.R. 3139: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3151: Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3160: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 3199: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3267: Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 3277: Mr. BAUMGARTNER and Ms. ELFRETH.
H.R. 3288: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 3307: Mr. NUNN of Iowa, Ms. STEVENS, and Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 3335: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 3366: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 3442: Ms. RIVAS.
H.R. 3475: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 3495: Mr. MCGUIRE and Mr. CRANK.
H.R. 3501: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 3506: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 3514: Mr. TONKO, Mr. WALKINSHAW, and Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 3526: Mr. BEGICH.
H.R. 3527: Ms. TLAIB.
H.R. 3565: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 3569: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3699: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. BEGICH.
H.R. 3743: Ms. RIVAS.
H.R. 3757: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 3812: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3843: Ms. LEE of Florida, Mr. BAUMGARTNER, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. HARRIGAN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. ONDER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. MCGUIRE.
H.R. 3876: Mr. MANNION, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 3884: Mr. LICCARDO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3930: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 3959: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4074: Mr. MAGAZINER and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 4076: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4101: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 4103: Mr. BISHOP, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 4110: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4119: Mr. SHREVE.
H.R. 4157: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4169: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 4186: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 4194: Mr. PALMER and Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 4206: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. HERNÁNDEZ, MR. LICCARDO, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DELUZIO, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4231: Mrs. FISCHBACH and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 4242: Mrs. HINSON and Ms. VAN DUYNE.
H.R. 4253: Mr. LAWLER, Mr. BISHOP, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 4256: Mr. PANETTA and Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 4288: Mr. LICCARDO.
H.R. 4299: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 4317: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 4348: Mr. DELUZIO, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 4407: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 4418: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4444: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H.R. 4445: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4461: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 4509: Mr. SUOZZI and Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4519: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 4582: Mr. COLE and Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 4583: Mr. COLE and Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 4606: Ms. CRAIG and Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 4615: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 4669: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 4723: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 4764: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 4768: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. BARRETT, and Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.
H.R. 4796: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 4807: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 4832: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 4855: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4891: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 4908: Mr. MIN.
H.R. 4921: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 4948: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4954: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 4972: Mr. VINDMAN and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 4977: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4979: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 4980: Mr. MAGAZINER.

H.R. 4987: Mr. TONKO, Mr. RILEY of New York, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 5002: Ms. ANSARI, Mr. LIEU, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
H.R. 5024: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 5064: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 5075: Mr. BARRETT.
H.R. 5106: Ms. PEREZ, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. BAUMGARTNER.
H.R. 5131: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 5142: Mr. MANN and Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5145: Mr. LALOTA and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 5159: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5168: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. Tony GONZALES of Texas.
H.R. 5178: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 5206: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 5221: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 5225: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5267: Mr. SCHMIDT, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 5271: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. MCDONALD RIVET, Mr. LALOTA, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 5298: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 5321: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5325: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 5332: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 5339: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 5356: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 5366: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 5387: Mr. MOYLAN.
H.R. 5390: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5391: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 5398: Mr. SOTO and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5399: Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.R. 5401: Mrs. KIM, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DE LA CRUZ, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. FALLON, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. ONDER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANGWORTHY, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. SOTO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BABIN, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. GRAY, Mr. FIGURES, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 5403: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 5433: Mr. KHANNA and Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 5435: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 5440: Mrs. MCIVER.
H.R. 5448: Mr. DELUZIO and Ms. FRIEDMAN.
H.R. 5451: Mr. CASTEN, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BELL, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. RIVAS, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. SOTO, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. MCGARVEY.
H.R. 5455: Mr. FINE, Mr. ONDER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SHREVE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 5462: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 5463: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.
H.R. 5469: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 5512: Mr. NEHLS and Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 5514: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 5519: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5529: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI and Mr. BACON.
H.R. 5555: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 5556: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 5563: Mr. ESTES.
H.R. 5568: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 5572: Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5599: Ms. RIVAS, Mr. SOTO, Mrs. TRAHAN, and Mr. BELL.
H.R. 5604: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 5614: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 5616: Mr. ROSE, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. MCGUIRE.
H.R. 5626: Mr. BAUMGARTNER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SALINAS, and Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 5628: Ms. RIVAS.
H.R. 5635: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. MCGARVEY, and Ms. DEXTER.
H.R. 5646: Mr. GUEST.
H.R. 5655: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5657: Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 5658: Ms. SALINAS and Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 5663: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 5670: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 5673: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 5674: Mr. BELL, Mr. SWALWELL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SOTO, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 5676: Mr. LIEU, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5687: Mr. LANDSMAN and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 5688: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 5689: Mr. CARSON and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 5690: Mr. BELL.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. EDWARDS.
H.J. Res. 81: Mr. NEHLS and Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.J. Res. 108: Mr. MIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. TRAN, Mrs. MCBATH, and Ms. JACOBS.
H.J. Res. 111: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Ms. ESCOBAR.
H.J. Res. 118: Mr. PALMER.
H.J. Res. 127: Mr. NORMAN.
H.J. Res. 128: Mr. SHREVE.
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. FLOOD.
H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H. Res. 12: Mr. ONDER.
H. Res. 175: Ms. MATSUI and Ms. ROSS.
H. Res. 220: Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 254: Ms. MACE and Mr. FALLON.
H. Res. 332: Mr. VINDMAN.
H. Res. 459: Mr. ELLZEY and Mr. SHREVE.
H. Res. 594: Mr. PALMER.
H. Res. 723: Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY and Mr. BELL.
H. Res. 742: Mrs. KIM.
H. Res. 746: Ms. PINGREE.
H. Res. 767: Mr. HUNT.
H. Res. 770: Mr. MOYLAN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. CROW.
H. Res. 772: Ms. CHU.
H. Res. 774: Ms. CHU and Mr. MULLIN.
H. Res. 777: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 781: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
H. Res. 788: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LAWLER, and Ms. DELBENE.
H. Res. 790: Ms. MACE and Mr. ELLZEY.
H. Res. 791: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *119th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2025 *No. 166*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. 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.

Eternal Father, we rejoice in Your strength. You are our refuge, for Your faithful love endures forever. In spite of this government shutdown, our confidence in Your love sustains us. Be merciful to our Nation and world, for You are our hope.

Lord, provide our lawmakers today with the music of Your wisdom, that they may bring hope out of despair and joy out of sadness. Increase their faith, hope, and love, that they may receive Your promises.

Teach us all to trust in Your prevailing providence, even in life's storms, because You are the God who saves us. Hasten the day when we can say: This is the Lord's doing, and it is wonderful to see.

We pray in Your sovereign 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. MULLIN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO ''MILES CITY FIELD OFFICE RECORD OF DECISION AND APPROVED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT''—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 104, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 104) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''Miles City Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

ARCTIC FROST

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Monday of this week, I invited eight of my colleagues to be briefed on an issue that we just found out about from Deputy Director Dan Bongino. What we learned is very disturbing and outrageous political conduct by the Biden FBI.

As most of you know, this year, Senator JOHNSON and I made records public relating to our investigation of Arctic Frost. Arctic Frost was the FBI investigation that became Jack Smith's elector case against then-citizen Trump. We have shown that partisan FBI agents and the Department of Justice prosecutors created and advanced that matter, and they did so in violation of FBI rules. We have shown that the FBI expanded the investigation to almost 100 Republican groups and individuals, even including Charlie Kirk's Turning Point USA. And we have learned that Arctic Frost included the targeting of at least eight Republican Senators—the same ones that I invited to that briefing.

In 2023, the Biden FBI sought and obtained cell phone tolling data about my colleagues' personal phones. We have been told the date range for that data was January 4 through January 7, 2021. This is obviously an outrage, obviously an unconstitutional breach. Attorney General Bondi and Director Patel need to hold accountable those that are involved in that serious breach and wrongdoing, and I am confident that those two officials will do just that.

Now, based on the evidence to date, Arctic Frost and related weaponization by Federal law enforcement under Biden was arguably worse than the Nixon Watergate scandal.

I have also been informed that Arctic Frost documents, like the one targeting Republicans, have been hidden in prohibited access files.

Now, let me tell you what I think a prohibited access file is. It might be legitimate for national security. It might be legitimate for intellectual property. It may be legitimate for the personal privacy of American citizens. But it should never be used for what it was used for: to hide things from the public that would embarrass bureaucrats and government officials and maybe even political officials.

As I have made public through my oversight, when files are in a prohibited access file, they receive what the FBI calls a false negative search result on their database. So that means that if you ask for emails or some records of the FBI, and they type it in, it doesn't show up, so that it doesn't exist. Clearly, this impedes responses to congressional oversight and court cases. It allows for misconduct.

Because of whistleblowers informing me of this serious problem, the FBI is now reviewing these file types, and only because of that review, the document about targeting eight Republican Senators was located.

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

Lastly, I started the Arctic Frost investigation in July 2022. Now, it has taken years to get records and to advance the investigation. Sometimes my oversight work is done quietly, outside of the public eye, but what the public is now seeing is the importance of congressional oversight and the importance of whistleblowers exposing government misconduct. My whistleblowers deserve great thanks for what they have helped to expose.

We were all shocked and outraged by the unjustified fishing expedition Deputy Director Bongino informed us about. The FBI told us in our briefing that not a single one of my colleagues on the list was under investigation, so the FBI did its dirty digging without legitimate predication.

We expect Patel and Bongino to shut this abuse down and do it immediately, and I want my colleagues and Iowans to know that I won't give up until I have followed all the facts and accountability is delivered for the American people.

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. 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.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it has now been a full week—a whole week—of Donald Trump's government shutdown, and the country is feeling the sting of Republican intransigence. Over 700,000 Federal employees have been furloughed. Services are being disrupted. The Wall Street Journal reported this morning that businesses nationwide with government contracts are in peril.

The Republican-manufactured disaster did not need to happen. The government is shut down for one reason and one reason only: Donald Trump and the Republicans would rather kick 15 million people off health insurance, would rather raise premiums by thousands and thousands of dollars a year on tens of millions of Americans, rather than sit down and work with Democrats on fixing healthcare.

That is the reason. They would rather kick tens of millions off healthcare than sit down with us and work with us in addressing this so important issue—so important to the American people.

Now, Americans are frustrated. The cost of living continues to go up. Donald Trump's tariffs have sent grocery prices spiking. It is even more expensive now to buy a cup of coffee, the first thing many people drink in the morning. They are going to see Trump's tariffs hurting them.

People are worried about paying more on their electricity bill. Forty-one States have seen increased prices. Why? Because in their mania of hating clean energy, they cut out so much of wind and solar, solar being the cheapest form of new energy to go on the grid.

Americans are pessimistic that any of this is going to get any better, and they blame President Trump and the Republicans. A CBS poll from a few days ago found that 75 percent of Americans don't think the administration—the Trump administration—is focusing enough on lowering costs. Fixing healthcare would be at the top of the list for lowering costs for people.

Now, Democrats want to reopen the government right away. We want to have a serious negotiation to fix healthcare so that people can see their costs go down. And we can do both: fix healthcare and reopen the government. This is not an either-or thing, which Republicans are making it, and the American people don't like it.

Democrats have been consistent. Our position remains the same. We have been saying it for months: Republicans are shutting down the government because they refuse to address the crisis in American healthcare.

One sentence sums it all up: Republicans are shutting down the government because they refuse to fix and address the crisis in American healthcare.

Now, our Republican colleagues, being against public sentiment, are flailing. On the one hand, it is starting to sink in for Republicans that their position of not fixing healthcare is untenable in the eyes of the American people.

As President Lincoln said, ''Public sentiment is everything.''

Well, public sentiment is building on fixing healthcare. It is high already. It is getting higher every day, and it is not going to recede. It is getting even stronger.

Republicans refuse to acknowledge that public sentiment is not on the side of Trump and JOHNSON. And JOHNSON has become the No. 1 roadblock to ending a shutdown.

He sent everyone home for 3 weeks now. If you care about fixing the crisis, if you care about reopening the government, how the hell do you keep your House not in session for 3 weeks?

And now their buddy JOHNSON himself is feeling the heat. At first, he and his caucus were telling Republicans in the House: Don't talk about healthcare. They knew the American people were against what they thought. JOHNSON'S leadership team explicitly told Members in a memo not to mention healthcare when talking about the shutdown.

Of course, that didn't work because the public knows, overwhelmingly, that we need lower healthcare premiums and that is what Democrats are fighting for and that is what is preventing the Republicans from coming to the table. They don't want to fix it. That is why they are causing the shutdown.

So feeling the heat, Speaker JOHNSON held a press conference yesterday and said perhaps one of the most ridiculous things I have heard from Republicans in a long time. He said: ''Let me look right under the camera,'' said JOHNSON, ''and [I will] tell you very clearly: Republicans are the ones concerned about healthcare.''

As he did it, he couldn't look right into the camera. Deep in his subconscious, he knew he wasn't telling the truth. What he said was nonsense. He couldn't even look in the camera when he said this because he knows the American people don't buy what he is saying.

Republicans are the ones who cut a trillion dollars from Medicaid, who tried to repeal the ACA. Three times we asked them to vote to sustain it after the new year. Three times they voted it down.

So that is first.

Second, Donald Trump is making all these terrible threats led by the evil Mr. Vought. Trump is saying, he is going to fire people en masse, saying that Federal workers don't even deserve backpay, even though he signed the law guaranteeing backpay in 2019.

Again, they are threatening. They are bludgeoning. They are using the American people, government workers, as pawns. But these kinds of tactics from the administration are backfiring. Americans don't like being used as pawns. Even if they are not one subject to being held hostage, they don't like watching it happen.

The American people know clearly that it is Republicans who are in charge. Republicans have the White House. They control the House and the Senate. So when people are laid off, when people are not paid, when people are not getting backpay, they know it is the Republicans trying to do it, even though they are using it to try and bully us.

It is not Democrats who are threatening to fire people or threatening to withhold backpay. It is the Republican side, Donald Trump, saying all this, and the American people know it and will blame them for these mass firings and chaos.

The data is very clear that trying to use the public as political pawns will backfire for Republicans, and plenty of Republicans in Congress know this. That is why, behind closed doors, some Republicans are praying the administration tones down its threats because these mean-spirited tactics by Russell Vought aren't going to win in the court of public opinion or the hearts and minds of Americans.

Look, Republicans are tripping over themselves because they are divided on the core issue: fixing people's healthcare.

When someone on the hard right—the hard, hard right—MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, openly says Republican leaders are wrong and that we need to fix the premiums, that is how you know how deeply Republicans are split.

Let me read what she said. This is MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, not CHUCK SCHUMER:

I'm going to go against everyone on this issue—

Healthcare that is—

because when tax credits expire this year my own adult children's insurance premiums for 2026 are going to DOUBLE, along with all the wonderful families and hard-working people in my district.

More Republicans should listen to her because on this issue, she is right on the money. Meanwhile, Democrats' position hasn't changed. We urge our Republican colleagues to join us in serious negotiation to reopen the government and extend ACA premiums. It is the right thing to do for the American people, and by doing it, we will be able to quickly reopen the government before any more serious damage is done by the Republicans to our country.

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER LEE MASCOTT

Mr. President, finally, on nominations, today, the Senate will vote to advance the nomination of Jennifer Mascott of Maryland to be a circuit court judge for the Third Circuit. I will oppose Mascott's nomination because she does not seem to have any other qualification for the job other than this: She is a career loyalist and sycophant to Donald Trump.

She has no connections to the Third Circuit. She has never lived in Delaware. She is not even licensed to practice law in Delaware. In fact, her only link to the State is a beachside summer home.

If you look at Mascott's resume, the only time she has ever really practiced law is the 2 years she worked in Trump's Department of Justice. That is it, and you are putting her on the circuit court, one of the most important courts in the country?

Well, the only reason Donald Trump is putting Mascott on the bench is because he thinks she will do whatever he wants from the bench. She will be a total, total Trump sycophant—not look at the law, not look at the facts, just look at Donald Trump and see which way he is nodding and follow it.

This nominee is another troubling example of the ''Trumpification'' of the Federal bench, where loyalists replace jurists and obeisance to Trump matters more than adherence to the law or precedent or even the Constitution.

It is just like what we saw yesterday in the Judiciary Committee.

Pam Bondi exposed herself as woefully unqualified to be Attorney General but a supremely obeisant Trump deputy is what she is instead. She spent her time dodging questions, hurling insults, and, most importantly for Donald Trump, defending the President's interests more than anything else, even if the law or the facts or the truth pointed strongly in the other direction.

This troubling pattern of obeisance above all in our judiciary system is dangerous and troubling. So I will oppose today's nominee and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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 called 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.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are now on day eight of the government shutdown, which is truly unfortunate and unnecessary and totally at the behest of leftwing Democrat special interest groups that have pressured the Democratic leadership into a position that makes absolutely no sense to any thinking person.

I want you to think about where we are. Think about this scenario: You have a bill passed by the House of Representatives, over here in the Senate—24 pages long, clean, short term, nonpartisan, no policy riders, no Republican priorities—a clean resolution to fund the government. And there are 55 Senators—55 out of 100 Senators—who are voting for the clean, short-term funding resolution that would open up the government.

The President of the United States has said that, as soon as it is passed in the Senate, he will sign it into law. So what you have is complete unified support for a short-term funding resolution to keep the government open and make sure that all the government employees who are currently being impacted and their families can get back to work and get paid again.

And so it is always interesting when the Democrat leader comes down here and describes this fantasy world where the bill that they proposed, which would only get 47 votes here in the U.S. Senate—not even 50, not 51, not a majority, and certainly not the 60 that are necessary to pass consequential legislation in the Senate—it wouldn't get a single vote in the House of Representatives.

So they have got a bill, a proposal, that they say keeps the government open, that can't pass the Senate, wouldn't pass the House, and wouldn't be signed into law by the President.

You tell me—you tell me—who is responsible for the government shutdown.

Republicans passed a bill in the House. It is over here in the Senate, 24 pages long, sitting right at the desk. We can pick it up and pass it today and send it to the President, who will sign it into law, and the government opens up again.

Or—or—you can take this proposal the Democrats have, which has $1.5 trillion in new spending, allows for free healthcare coverage for noncitizens, completely obliterates the $50 billion rural hospital fund that we put in place to support rural hospitals in this country that are struggling, and they think that would pass. It doesn't pass here, doesn't pass the House, and wouldn't get signed into law by the President.

So just a logical person, think about this. Think about the juxtaposition of those two positions, and you tell me who is shutting the government down. We have a straightforward, simple proposition: a 24-page funding resolution to keep the government open, with no partisan policy riders, no gimmicks, short term, which funds the government through November 21 to give us an opportunity to do the government funding the way we should do it, through the appropriations process, where we have the committees meeting and Republicans and Democrats contributing, and then bring it to the floor and have an open amendment process here. That is the way the government should normally be funded.

And so what this does is it provides a short-term extension in order for all that to happen. That is all that we are talking about.

They have other issues they want to bring up, which I have said before we are happy to discuss. And, yes, there are some things that I think there is interest on both sides in trying to address when it comes to healthcare in this country. But you can't take the Federal Government hostage and expect to have a reasonable conversation on those issues. The government needs to be funded. Federal employees need to go back to work. Federal Agencies and Departments need to be open and providing the services that the American people expect. It is that simple.

And that is really what this is all about—again, nothing more, nothing less, nothing else. It is whether or not they want to support a 24-page funding resolution that keeps the government open or continue to vote for $1.5 trillion in new spending, free healthcare for noncitizens, and completely wiping out a $50 billion rural hospital fund that is designed to support rural hospitals in this country—something that would get 47 votes here in the Senate and not a majority in the House of Representatives, and wouldn't get a single vote, honestly, among Republicans in the House of Representatives, and would not be signed into law by the President—versus something, again, passed by the House, here at the Senate.

All we need is five more votes. There are a majority of U.S. Senators today who support the short-term funding resolution, 55 out of 100. We need 5 Democrats.

You tell me who shut the government down.

And I think that the public is becoming wise to this debate and this argument and these fallacious arguments that are being made by the Democrats. In fact, there is a new Harvard-Harris poll that came out Monday that found that 70 percent of voters oppose a government shutdown—70 percent.

And of interest to my Democratic colleagues, 65 percent of voters, including 63 percent of Independents, think the Democrats should end the shutdown by accepting a continuing resolution like the clean funding resolution I just described that is in front of us.

So what are my Democrat colleagues doing? Well, after their resounding defeat in the Presidential election last November, you would think they might be paying attention to the strong majority of voters who would like the shutdown to end as well. You would think they might notice that 63 percent of Independents—voters I am sure Democrats would like to capture in the next election—want Democrats to accept a resolution like the clean CR in front of us. But you would be wrong, because Democrats are still deeply in thrall to the far left, and they are taking their marching orders for this shutdown from far-left interest groups. And I mean that literally.

A recent Axios article reported:

Progressive grassroots groups are blasting congressional Democrats on speed dial to ''hold the line'' in any negotiations to reopen the government.

Now, that followed an Axios report that found:

Senator Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER and his staff are closely coordinating their government shutdown strategy with outside liberal groups. . . . Backing down and helping fund the government, like Schumer did in March, is unacceptable, the groups have told his team.

Backing down and helping fund the government, like Schumer did in March, is unacceptable, the groups have told his team.

And so the liberal groups say ''jump,'' and Democrat leaders say, ''How high?''

Forget the robust majority of Independents that want the Democrats to end this shutdown.

You know, back in the day—and by ''back in the day'' I mean as recently as 6 months ago—the Democrat leader was a pretty robust opponent of government shutdowns. Yes, he was an opponent—so much so that even though he didn't like the continuing resolution we passed in the spring, he voted for it anyway because, in his words, ''a government shutdown would be far worse.''

But then progressive groups got big-time mad, and now the Democrat leader is leading the charge to keep the government shut down—indefinitely, apparently—and all those Federal workers and hard-working Americans he was so worried about before seem to have slipped his mind.

In fact, Democrats have barely reacted to the fact that Federal workers are going to start missing pay.

When we realized we were going to need a continuing resolution to allow us more time to complete the fiscal year 2026 appropriations bills, Republicans wanted to do everything we could to ensure that there was no government shutdown, which is why we put forward a clean continuing resolution with no Republican policies or partisan policy riders.

We knew a shutdown would be costly and disruptive for hard-working Americans, and we were determined to ensure the Democrats had no reason—no reason—to oppose our CR. But Democrats weren't deterred by the fact that there was nothing for them to object to in our bill, and they decided to oppose it anyway.

Now, Democrats will get another chance this week to vote to keep the government open. And I hope the Democrat leader and Democrat Senators can summon up some of that concern they used to have about shutdowns and vote to reopen the government.

At the very least, if the Democrat leader is too worried about his polling to vote to reopen himself, he could allow Democrat Senators who do care about the functioning of our government to join Republicans to reopen.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2983

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2983) to reauthorize the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

The majority whip.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO ''MILES CITY FIELD OFFICE RECORD OF DECISION AND APPROVED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT''

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, following up with what the majority leader just said, I have here the Washington Post from this morning, and they have an editorial. And what they have in bold print says:

Democratic leaders play a dangerous game.

That is what the Democrats are doing.

We just heard the majority leader talk about what we are trying to do, what we are facing, how CHUCK SCHUMER is being held hostage by the liberal groups that set up the war room with him. And what we see is a dangerous game being played and threats to the American people.

This goes on to say:

There is a clean funding bill on the table.

This is the Washington Post, this morning.

There is a clean funding bill on the table. Only a handful of Senate Democrats need to vote for it.

The minority leader is leading the Democratic Party into a box canyon. You can't get out, and it is a dangerous game. And it is not just dangerous for them; it is dangerous for the American people. That is where the danger lies.

So I come to the floor because the American people are facing an immediate crisis, and they know why. Anybody watching knows why. It is because Senate Democrats have now voted five times against a clean, bipartisan continuing resolution that would open the government today.

This is day 8 of the Schumer shutdown—day 8. The country is held hostage by the Democrats, and they are playing a dangerous game. This isn't a game, but that is what the Democrats have turned it into.

So the question before us is simple: What have the Democrats accomplished during this dangerous game that they are playing? On October 10, on Friday, in 2 days, Border Patrol agents and other Federal workers will receive only half a paycheck. That is the result of the Democrats' dangerous game. It will be their last paycheck until the Schumer shutdown ends and Democrats vote to reopen the government. They could do it today.

The House of Representatives passed a clean continuing resolution at current funding levels. Democrats voted 13 times under Joe Biden for a continuing resolution to keep the government funded.

A continuing resolution funds our military, pays for law enforcement, continues food assistance for moms and young children, and keeps small business loans flowing.

Thirteen times they voted for this. Now they reject it because they want to please their radical, extreme base—the base that has put up a war room that CHUCK SCHUMER has bowed down to. That is what we just heard from the majority leader—that they are the ones calling the shots—and that is why we find ourselves in this situation.

Democrats are demanding radical, new policies before they allow the government to reopen. I have seen their demand letter—$1.5 trillion in new expenses, as the majority leader just outlined here on the floor. Their ransom note is filled with liberal policies. I look at it—it is stitched together like Frankenstein's monster: $1.5 trillion in reckless new spending; free healthcare for noncitizens; free Medicaid for working-age, able-bodied adults who refuse to work. There are over 5 million of these individuals in the United States, and yet they refuse to work. And the Democrats want them all to get free Medicaid.

Fifty billion dollars the Democrats want to cut from vulnerable rural hospitals, hospitals in rural communities. Do the Democrats not care at all about those communities even though there are rural communities in their States?

They are beholden to the big cities and the mayors, the sanctuary cities that control the Democratic Party.

That is what we are dealing with here. That is why the Washington Post calls what the Democrats are doing—as I pick it up again, Mr. President—''a dangerous game.'' They are holding the American people hostage to extract far-left wing concessions. They are telling our servicemembers their paychecks are negotiable. They are telling small businesses their dreams are collateral damage in a partisan fight. They are telling mothers and young children that WIC benefits are leverage for the far-left demands of healthcare for noncitizens.

Republicans remain committed to ensuring families receive the support they deserve. The Democrats have chosen repeatedly to keep the government closed for political purposes only.

American families are feeling the pain nationwide.

In Georgia, more than 100,000 Federal employees are wondering where they will find the money to pay their bills and buy their groceries.

In Arizona, 344,000 children enrolled in SNAP face uncertainty. The benefits are running out.

Time is of the essence. Shutdown Democrats are telling these families their problems aren't urgent. Well, they are urgent to those families, and the Democrats don't seem to care.

In New York, almost half a million individuals who rely on WIC will lose access at the end of this week. It is already Wednesday. We are talking about pregnant women. We are talking about new mothers. We are talking about young children. They depend on this program.

In Illinois, every week the shutdown continues, it costs the State's economy over $500 million. That is jobs lost, paychecks missed, opportunities evaporated.

In Michigan, small businesses face delays of $92 million in loans because the Small Business Administration is frozen due to the shutdown. These businesses are the backbones of our communities and our economy. They should be able to make payroll, keep their doors open—not as the Democrats continue to play what has been termed ''a dangerous game.''

In Nevada, for each month the shutdown continues, consumer spending from lost wages will fall by over $200 million. It is money that won't flow into local businesses, won't pay rent, won't put food on the table.

In New Jersey, telehealth programs are on hold. I am a doctor. Without these programs, patients could be put at greater risk.

In New Hampshire, workers maintaining our nuclear attack submarines—they face furloughs and unpaid work.

Look, this goes beyond missing a paycheck; this is about national security. The Schumer shutdown—the dangerous game that he is playing—puts America's safety at risk.

At airports nationwide, we are already seeing the direct effects of the shutdown. Flights are being delayed. Security lines are growing longer.

Even the head of the Teamsters union, Sean O'Brien, says that Democrats' political theater is something he can see right through.

He said:

A shutdown will hurt working people. Period. American workers are not bargaining chips.

That is the leader of the Teamsters union, Mr. President.

He goes on to say:

Senators should stop screwing around and pass the House-passed clean, short term funding bill.

That is where we are today. He is right. But regrettably, Senate Democrats are treating the American people as bargaining chips, as hostages, and that is why they sent the list of demands as ransom.

Democrats have now voted five times against opening the government, five times against supporting our military, five times against paying law enforcement officers, five times against food assistance for women and infants and children, five times against the small business loans that help Main Street. Five times, Democrats have looked at the mounting damage of the Schumer shutdown and shrugged their shoulders. That is the situation we have today.

The American people overwhelmingly say Democrats should pass a clean continuing resolution and end the shutdown immediately.

There is a clean, bipartisan resolution before the Senate ready for a vote right now. It reopens the government today. It would protect the paychecks and the programs the American people depend upon. It would end the uncertainty that is gripping millions of American families.

The question is not whether the Democrats can end the shutdown; it is, Will they have the integrity to do it or will they continue to play this dangerous game with our Nation and with our families?

NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, on a separate matter, before Senate Democrats shut down the Federal Government, they shut down the very Senate floor on which I stand, and they did it by freezing the confirmation process.

For months, their blockade created a growing backlog of qualified nominees, so many of whom have come out of committees with bipartisan votes; nominees for positions that, during prior administrations, sailed through the Senate by unanimous consent or by voice vote—but not with this Democrat minority, oh, no.

So in September, Senate Republicans broke the blockade, and now the blockade is being cleared. At the peak of the Democrat obstruction, more than 150 well-qualified nominees, approved by Senate committees, were waiting for a vote on the Senate floor. Yesterday, we confirmed 107 of those nominees, and we did it in a group. This is one of the largest confirmations in the history of the United States. Now there are only 26 nominees on the Executive Calendar.

Our committees are hard at work to approve more nominees, and we are going to confirm them in short order.

As of this morning, President Trump has had 298 nominees confirmed in his second term. By comparison, at this point, Joe Biden had confirmed only 201 at this point in his first and only term. President Trump had confirmed only 183 nominees at the same time in his first term. So the Senate's constitutional duty of advice and consent is now back.

President Trump now has his team confirmed and ready to be sworn in. From Assistant Secretaries, to Ambassadors, to U.S. attorneys, the Federal Government is in a better position today to keep our Nation safe and secure and prosperous.

Senate Republicans are going to continue to work to get America back on track no matter what obstacles the Democrats continue to throw in our path.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I came to the floor a few minutes after Senator THUNE, the Republican leader, spoke, and I missed part of his statement, but I think I heard most of it. I listened carefully to the statement by the Senator from Wyoming.

Let me say at the outset that I consider them both to be friends. We disagree on many things politically, but over the years, I have come to work with both of them and look forward to doing that again someday.

I was disappointed in both of their statements because of what was not said. How can you talk about the government shutdown without ever mentioning healthcare costs to American families? How can you do that? I mean, it is a situation where we understand, I hope, that the Democrats are not in this position for any reason other than to stop the dramatic increase in healthcare premiums that American families will face unless we do something and do it now.

In State after State, the notices are going out that the cost of health insurance for working families in America is going to go up dramatically—in some cases, more than 100 percent. That is going to be hurtful to many. They will have to look for different health insurance plans that they can afford, which means more money out of pocket, or they are going to drop their health insurance coverage altogether.

How can the Republican leader stand before us and even refuse to acknowledge that that is the issue that drives this government shutdown?

The Republicans are insisting on their approach to the budget because they don't want to see American families protected when it comes to these

health insurance increases. And the increases are already being announced. Ten States so far have announced them.

October 27 is the magic date, if you will, for the announcement in my State of Illinois. I know what is going to happen. I am going to hear from hundreds, if not thousands, of families across my State that increasing the cost for families is creating a hardship they never anticipated.

We believe on the Democratic side that this is the time to act, now, to move together to stop these increases from taking place because these increases were part of the big beautiful Republican budget—the Trump budget, voted for by every Republican Senator and no Democratic Senators; the Trump budget, which, of course, he signed into law. That is what is leading to these increases, because the Affordable Care Act insurance plans are no longer going to enjoy a subsidy, a tax credit, to help families pay the premiums, and that is why the cost is going to go up so dramatically.

We can change it. We can do it, but we have to do it quickly. We ought to move on it this week.

I wish the House of Representatives were in session. They haven't shown up for 2 weeks. Speaker JOHNSON happens to believe that being AWOL is the right thing for his Republican Members. I don't think it is the right thing for America.

Democrats and Republicans should be in this Capitol negotiating, sitting at a table together, and the first item on the agenda has to be healthcare costs for American families.

All this talk about a dangerous game and radical-left policies and management—it is not a radical-left idea that a working family ought to have affordable health insurance; it is basic in America.

As flawed as our health system is in this country and as great as it is in many respects, if people cannot afford to have coverage for their family, then hardship follows.

That is the real reason.

They say: Well, what about the cost? Remember, this is an administration that wants to give $20 billion to Argentina. Twenty billion dollars this President is planning to give. I am worried more about 20 million Americans who will lose their health insurance if we don't do something and do it quickly.

The American people get it. This issue has gone from the beltway to the backyards of America. People know that this is coming, and they are worried about it, and they should be. They want us to do something, and they want it done now.

We are making the fight on this continuing resolution because it is timely, and we need bipartisan support to pass it. So let's do something positive in a bipartisan way, and dealing with the cost of health insurance is my approach that I would suggest.

ILLINOIS

Mr. President, let me take this to another issue that is near and dear to my heart, and that is what is happening in my home State of Illinois. We all know the popular quote:

When someone shows you who they are, believe them the first time.

Or, in President Trump's case, if a person shows you who they are a million times over, believe them.

President Trump has shown us his unlawful and inhumane priorities over and over again, city after city. He continues to deploy militarized immigration agents and National Guard troops to more American cities purely for political theater. He wants America to talk about the Texas National Guard in Illinois, not about healthcare costs facing American families.

But it is not going to work.

Unfortunately, the men and women of the Texas National Guard who are in the State of Illinois, as of yesterday, have been sent off on a political assignment, political theater. Instead of working to find a bipartisan way to reopen the government, lower the cost of healthcare, President Trump is focused on scoring points against his perceived enemies.

Just yesterday, 200 or 300 members of the Texas National Guard joined Federal law enforcement officers in Chicago, along with President Trump's loyal FBI Director Kash Patel. The truth is that the arrival of the Texas National Guard and the FBI Director will not make Chicago safer; it will only escalate the unnecessary and dangerous situation this President himself has created.

I still can't get the image out of my mind from 2 weeks ago, when the ICE officials, in full combat gear, carrying long rifles, were marching down Michigan Avenue. It was a hateful effort that was used to provoke people into strong emotional feelings. This administration's unlawful use of military resources to police American cities makes our country less safe, and it is a mistake that will be remembered in the history books.

I pray that the court system will respond accordingly as they did in the case of Oregon and Illinois when the hearing tomorrow is brought before the Federal judge. Deploying the Texas National Guard without the consent of Illinois elected officials is, in my estimation, unnecessary and unlawful.

The Posse Comitatus Act expressly forbids the use of our Nation's military for civilian law enforcement unless expressly authorized by statute or the Constitution.

National Guard personnel do not deserve to be used by the President's political pawns. Let me say and make it clear: As much as I regret the decision by the Texas Governor to send his National Guard troops into Illinois and as much as I want them to leave immediately, I do not make those statements at the expense of the individuals who are in the Guard and volunteered to serve their State and Nation. The same thing is true with the federalized Illinois National Guard. They are doing what they were ordered to do according to the military standards.

But the bottom line is, we all know they are not fighting crime. If the Trump administration truly wants to help Chicago—and I don't believe they do—and Illinois, it won't defy our elected leaders; it will work with us. It will restore millions of dollars the Trump administration suspended in crime prevention and public safety grants. Instead, this administration has chosen to use America's military to create chaos and sow fear in our cities.

We all agree on the importance of reducing crime and making our communities safer. The President claims his aggressive immigration raids and threats to deploy troops are to help get violent criminals off the streets.

I have come to the floor 2 straight days, and this is the third, to condemn what happened last week in the city of Chicago on Tuesday. A South Shore apartment building was raided in the middle of the night. Doors were crashed down, families were roused out of their bedrooms, many of them brought out to the street and questioned as to whether they were in America legally. Some were American citizens. We don't know how many. We certainly don't know if there were any criminals found as a result of that. No report.

But we do know this: What happened on that street on that night was not the way America does business and shouldn't be. It was to terrorize these families, with no warrant for their arrest and no suspicion that they committed crimes, simply because they looked Hispanic and maybe looked like foreigners—I am not sure. This action was taken against them.

These attacks are part of Stephen Miller's personal agenda for mass deportation at any cost. They pulled FBI, DEA, and ATF agents from their assignments, important assignments, to stop narcotics and other things to carry out the President's immigration agenda. They stopped working on fighting crimes like terrorism, gun violence, human trafficking, and drug smuggling to land a helicopter near a building in Chicago and to bring 30 families out into the street in the middle of the night.

I have fought for humane reforms to our immigration system and evidence-based ways to reduce crimes in our cities. If the President is serious about fixing our immigration system or lowering crime in our communities, I will join in on that effort. But sending in militarized Federal immigration agents and National Guard troops to our communities is not the way to do it. These actions have accomplished what I believe is the President's true intention: sowing fear in the hearts of our communities, especially our immigrant communities, and consolidating the President's power in Washington.

The actions taken by this administration undermine the very fabric of America, a nation that was founded on the belief that all people should be free from tyranny. I remember a time when every Member of Congress would have risen in outrage if an administration attempted to use the military unlawfully against cities and communities and States that they represent. Unfortunately, this time has passed. There is nothing but silence from the other side of the aisle. Congressional Republicans are content to stand aside in abject servility to this President as he tramples the Constitution.

But Americans should not stay silent. People across Illinois are peacefully making their voices heard and letting this administration know the attacks on our city will not go unchallenged.

As a Senator from Illinois, I will do everything in my power to hold this administration accountable for their unlawful actions. They may think this is a diversion of attention from the basic issue of controlling healthcare costs and helping working American families afford their health insurance. I think it is much more. It is a threat to our Republic and our Constitution, and I hope that others will join me in condemning this activity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes, Senator HEINRICH be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes, and Senator DAINES be permitted to speak for 5 minutes prior to the scheduled votes.

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given permission to use a prop.

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, it is day 8 of the government shutdown, but it is day 19 of the House being on vacation.

How is it possible that the party in charge of the government is sitting at home while the government is shut down?

Well, let's take a look. This is the House schedule. These yellow blocks are workdays. It is already a pretty nice schedule. Most people, if they are fortunate, get either 7 days or 10 days of vacation. Some people get less; some people get more. But nobody gets this amount of time off. We call that a district work period or a home work period. And that is true, we need to be home to interact with our constituents. But that is what August is for.

Here is what happened. They left early on the 25th, specifically, to avoid a vote on the Epstein files. Then they had this week off, this week off, this week off, this week off, this day off; come back, one, two, three, long weekend; one, two, three, four, long weekend; one, two, three, four, long weekend; another break; another break; another break. And now they are taking another break.

Get back to work.

Get back to work.

We are facing a healthcare crisis, and we didn't pull this out of some Democratic strategist's lab. The Presiding Officer knows this in his home State. Prices are about to spike disproportionately among people who voted for Donald Trump, disproportionately in rural communities, disproportionately among farmers. And they are not going to spike a little. This is not like a normally 4-percent increase is now 7 percent.

For 22 million Americans, the price of healthcare is about to go up 114 percent—114 percent. So you can find some people who are only paying like a 40-percent or 50-percent increase. You still can't afford that. Most people can't afford a 40-percent or 50-percent increase in the cost of almost anything, but healthcare is a big chunk of the cost of living.

So here we are as Democrats saying: Help us help you, Republicans. You created this mess that is causing your signature legislative achievement to be a drag on your electoral chances. And if we were a little bit more cynical, we would just let you stew in it.

But we want those 22 million people to have relief. So we are simply saying, we can open the government tomorrow morning if Donald John Trump realizes he is hurting his own people.

ILLINOIS

Mr. President, I want to follow up on what the Democrat whip was talking about in the city of Chicago in the State of Illinois.

We all swore an oath to the Constitution. I am honestly scared. I used to do this sort of schtick on Twitter. I would say the thing Donald Trump said on Twitter is this, and then I would say he is trying to take your healthcare away. My point was that is a distraction from the main issue, which is that he was going to try to take your healthcare away.

That is not true anymore. He is going through with these authoritarian actions. The last time he posted that one of his political enemies should be jailed, it was James Comey, and then James Comey was indicted. This morning, he pled not guilty. His trial is in January.

So, this morning, Donald John Trump, with the assistance of the Texas Governor, who is endlessly servile to him, is mobilizing, over the objection of the Illinois Governor, 200 or 300 troops to go into Chicago to do nobody knows really what other than to terrorize people.

They are belaying off a helicopter into an apartment building in urban Chicago?

Give me a break.

And lest you think this is theater, this morning, Donald Trump is in one of his moods and he says: Governor Pritzker should go to jail. Are we to assume he is kidding this time? Are you sure he is kidding this time? ''Oh, he is just trolling.'' Last time, 3 weeks ago, he clearly wasn't trolling. The Attorney General went through with what he asked.

So I am asking my Republican colleagues who swore an oath to the Constitution and love this country just like I do to say publicly or privately—I don't care—enough is enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, there is a national monument in New Mexico that is extremely important to me and our community. It is called the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument. It has rocky spires that jut into the sky and preside over bustling communities in southern New Mexico.

It is also home to nearly 250 archaeological sites, including some of the earliest Native American heritage sites in North America, and places like Shelter Cave, Conkling Cavern, and Aden Lava Flow Wilderness.

This January, the Bureau of Land Management issued its most recent monument management plan for Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks. It sets out in this plan how the land will be used over the coming decades, and it came after years—years—of engagement with public land users. From comment periods to public meetings to feedback sessions, input from public land users is the heart of how we administer our public lands across the country. In the end, land use plans like this one take time and are the result of hundreds, even thousands, of people's work—work that deserves respect.

And that is why I am here. Beginning this week, the Senate is voting on three resolutions of disapproval on resource management plans prepared by the Bureau of Land Management.

Now, resource management plans are a pretty simple idea. Every decade or two, public land managers look at a region as a whole and figure out how to balance all the competing different uses of public land across that landscape. They figure out where recreation should be prioritized and where prime game habitats should be protected. They figure out what lands should be available for uses like grazing or oil and gas production. They identify important cultural sites and historic resources that deserve our protection. They also determine which land use requirements can be eased for things like pipelines or transmission lines. They do all of this with the input of local communities, recreation businesses, public land users, Tribal governments, energy developers, and more.

But I am here now because Republicans want to rescind these land use plans through the Congressional Review Act. By doing that, they brush away all of the local voices and community input that went into making these plans.

Imagine telling Tribal communities that their opinion no longer matters on their ancestral lands, telling hunters that their opinion no longer matters on the lands they use to fill their families' freezers, telling hikers that their opinion no longer matters on the routes that they know like the back of their hand, telling local communities that the way their land is used is no longer of importance—telling all of us that our voices do not matter when it comes to the very lands that are our American birthright.

And here is the thing: They are doing it across the board—on every resource management plan since 1996—without even admitting it. So let me walk you through what they are hoping that you won't notice.

First, it is important to understand that resource management plans affect nearly every use on public land, from bird watching to coal mining. These plans get a whole rewrite every few decades, but, in between, smaller amendments are made to address specific places and specific uses that need to be updated. These amendments have been the normal way for new administrations to change plans that they have disagreed with, until today.

Now, instead of using the usual amendment process, which involves all of those same stakeholders, Congress is voting to outright overturn and repeal these plans. Until today, Congress had never ever used a congressional resolution of disapproval to change or overturn a land use plan. That is because no administration has ever considered these land use plans to be ''rules'' under Federal statute. Let me say that again. No administration—none—since the Congressional Review Act was passed in 1996 has ever treated land use plans as rules.

So here is what that means legally: No land use plan has been submitted to Congress, a legal requirement for rules. It has never happened. Because the Congressional Review Act prohibits rules from going into effect until 60 days after they are submitted to Congress—and no administration has ever submitted one—then every land use plan after 1996 never legally went into effect. And if they never went into effect, then all of the leases and permits and rights-of-way that flow from those plans may not be legally valid. That means that every grazing permit, every energy right-of-way, recreation permit, outfitter guide permit, timber sale, and even oil and gas leases issued under a plan finalized after 1996 could be litigated—every single one.

That is bad and not just because it is unprecedented but because the actual impacts on real Americans could be devastating.

For the country, it means potential chaos and uncertainty about what areas are protected on public lands. One of the resolutions under consideration this week is for a land use plan in Alaska. A vote for that resolution would mean that the Ambler industrial corridor will be built. This is a 211-mile, private access road that would destroy some of Alaska's wildest habitat and waterways to produce minerals—all for a foreign company.

As someone from American Hunters and Anglers said, in using slightly more colorful language that I will leave out, this move obliterates ''years of public input from hunters and anglers,'' and uses taxpayer dollars to prop up—I will say it again—a foreign-owned mining company.

The headline describing this road in ''Outdoor Life'' magazine reads:

The Ambler Road Project Would Jeopardize One of the Last Great Wilderness Hunts in America.

Now, I have been fortunate enough to hunt caribou in Alaska, and I have to say I doubt that my grandchildren will ever have that opportunity.

What is even more concerning to me is the impact the Ambler industrial corridor will have on subsistence hunting and fishing. This private industrial mining corridor will carve its way, in addition, through Gates of the Arctic National Park. You heard me right. We are sacrificing one of our most spectacular national parks to enrich a foreign mining company.

I have to think that Teddy Roosevelt is rolling over in his grave.

The damage will be irreparable to the landscape, to our American birthright in these public lands, and to one of the largest caribou herds in Alaska and the communities that depend on that herd.

Imagine sweeping away years and years of input and conversations not just about the public lands on one landscape but about public lands across this country, all because you—what?—found a quicker, easier way, one where you didn't have to listen to anyone? one where some Senators in Washington, DC, get to override and replace the opinions of every single American who contributed to those plans? That is nuts.

Even if you don't care about how land is used by hunters or hikers or Tribes or cattle growers or energy producers—if all you care about is how our lands are used to produce fossil fuels—then look no further than my State. Look at the Bureau of Land Management leases that have been issued in the Permian Basin. Know that, when you vote for these resolutions, when you turn these resource management plans into so-called rules, you call into question those leases—all of them. Know that what you are choosing may be easier, but it is wrong, and it is destabilizing.

I would urge my colleagues to vote no on all of these resolutions of disapproval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, in the final days of President Biden's administration, he quickly and quietly issued a rule that had massive impacts on Montana's economy. This happened after the election. Biden's BLM issued an amendment to the Miles City Resource Management Plan that prohibited all new coal development in Eastern Montana. It shuts it down. This means that the BLM prohibited all new coal leasing in the Powder River Basin. By the way, that is the home of the largest coal reserves in the United States.

They did this despite strong opposition from local counties in Montana and local elected officials—in fact, the entire Montana congressional delegation and the Governor of Montana himself, Greg Gianforte. In fact, Governor Gianforte specifically requested that the BLM Director withdraw that proposed amendment during the BLM's official ''Governor's consistency review,'' and Biden's BLM ignored him. When the Governor submitted an official appeal to Biden's BLM Director, our Governor was rebuffed.

This lack of respect for Montana's local and statewide elected officials cannot be ignored and will not be ignored, and it is going to get changed and reversed today with the passage of this CRA.

Let's be clear as to what this resource management plan amendment is and what we are doing today with this Congressional Review Act.

The RMPA is an attack on Montana jobs. It is an attack on Montana communities. It is an attack on Montana's energy production. It is an attack on Montana's economy. What today's resolution does is it rolls back officially Biden's war on Montana coal, and it does not affect the underlying resource management plan.

What we are doing today is we are disapproving Biden's ill-conceived amendment and nothing else. This CRA does not prohibit the BLM from issuing a new amendment. This CRA simply prohibits a new administration from issuing a substantially similar coal amendment. In this case, that means they can't permanently prohibit any new coal development.

Today, you may hear from the other side of the aisle that the sky is falling. That is absolutely not true. What we are doing today is righting a wrong—something the Biden administration slipped in after the election.

We are grateful that we were paying attention, and we are going to right this wrong—a midnight Biden rule that was issued without the support from the State of Montana. Talk about Federal bureaucratic overreach.

Taking this action this day, today, will lead to more Montana jobs, more Montana energy, and, by the way, more Montana tax revenue to support K-through-12 education and stronger communities in eastern Montana.

I urge my colleagues to, again, like we did last night with the procedural vote, support, with this final vote, Montana jobs, Montana communities, and to vote yes on its passage.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 104

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read

the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. DAINES. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 549 Leg.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 104) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). The Democratic leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS AND OTHER MATTERS ACT, 2026

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2882.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2882.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882, a bill making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Gary C. Peters, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard Blumenthal, Alex Padilla, Tammy Duckworth, Michael F. Bennet, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Mazie K. Hirono, Margaret Wood Hassan.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2882, a bill making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 550 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—52

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, and the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, upon reconsideration, the motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026

Mr. MARSHALL. I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 5371.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote to proceed to H.R. 5371.

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

The motion was agreed to.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371, a bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Bernie Moreno, Marsha Blackburn, Mike Rounds, Eric Schmitt, Tommy Tuberville, Todd Young, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Rick Scott of Florida, Jim Justice, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

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 motion to proceed to H.R. 5371, a bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

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 Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 551 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026—Resumed

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2296) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Wicker/Reed amendment modified No. 3748, in the nature of a substitute.

Wicker (for Ernst) amendment No. 3427 (to amendment No. 3748), to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on casualty assistance and long-term care programs.

Thune amendment No. 3863 (to amendment No. 3427), relating to the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 3864 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 3748), relating to the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 3865 (to amendment No. 3864), relating to the enactment date.

Motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, Thune amendment No. 3866, relating to the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 3867 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 3866), relating to the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 3868 (to amendment No. 3867), relating to the enactment date.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, we know that under Joe Biden and Chris Wray's leadership, the FBI, it turns out, was truly rotten to the core. In many ways, they oversaw the worst political corruption of the justice system in our Nation's history, and now we have proof.

They raided Mar-a-Lago. They indicted President Trump on baseless charges and weaponized America's top law enforcement Agency against conservatives, against parents, and against people of faith.

On Monday, we found out that this abuse of power had reached the Halls of the Congress. Thanks to internal FBI documents provided by Director Patel and Deputy Director Bongino to Chairman GRASSLEY, we now know that the Biden FBI tracked the private communications of eight U.S. Senators, including me.

What we have in common is this: We are all Republicans, we all support President Trump, and we all had questions about the 2020 election.

According to the documents that were given, the FBI tracked who we were calling on our phones, who was calling us, where we were physically located when the calls were made or received, and how long each call lasted. This is an abuse of authority. It is despicable. And we know that their abuses were far greater and more numerous than those abuses toward us.

Earlier this year, Chairman GRASSLEY released whistleblower disclosures showing that the Biden FBI obtained the government-issued cell phones of both President Trump and former Vice President Pence.

Last month, we learned that the Agency launched a political investigation into nearly 100 Republican and conservative groups, including the Republican National Committee, the Republican Attorneys General Association, and Charlie Kirk's Turning Point USA.

We are only learning about this weaponization of government against conservatives because the Trump administration is committed to total transparency for the American people. The work that President Trump, his administration, Attorney General Pam Bondi, Director Patel, and Deputy Director Bongino are doing is so appreciated—not only by us but by the American people.

It is time for the weaponization of government to stop. It is time to make certain that these individuals who did this, who were part of the CR–15 unit that worked with Jack Smith, who were working on Arctic Frost—it is time for them to be fired from their positions. And I appreciate that this work is taking place each and every day.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. President, yesterday, my colleagues and I who are on the Judiciary Committee had the pleasure of hearing from Attorney General Bondi, who has done so much to restore accountability and transparency at the U.S. Department of Justice.

Instead of waging political investigations, the Department, under her leadership, is focused on enforcing the rule of law, and that includes enforcing the rule of law in Memphis, TN.

As we speak, the Justice Department and FBI are among the 13 Federal Agencies that are on the ground working with local and State officials to support the Memphis Police Department and to lock up violent criminals.

In just over a week of operations, President Trump's Memphis Safe Task Force has delivered tremendous results. As of Monday, authorities have made 321 arrests. This includes 82 who were on ICE warrants, 41 on gun charges, 18 for sex offenses, and 1 for homicide. This is on top of the 503 gang members who were arrested by the FBI in their work from July 15 to September 15.

Having the additional Agencies there is support that has truly been needed in Memphis to sustain this work that is rooting out gangs and criminals.

Last year, the city of Memphis saw the highest crime rate in the country. In some parts of the city, shootings, robberies, and murders were a daily occurrence.

Memphians have long demanded action to address the city's crime crisis, but the Memphis Police Department is short 500 officers, with just over 20 people in their current recruitment class. With Federal law enforcement helping to keep the peace, Memphis police are now empowered to track down repeat violent criminals, including gang members who have terrorized city residents for too long.

At the same time as the Memphis operation, the Trump administration has surged Federal resources to other crime-ridden cities to restore law and order. In Portland and Chicago, ICE agents have had to overcome obstruction efforts by Democrat elected officials. They have had to push back on Democrat elected officials to enforce the rule of law and to detain criminal illegal aliens.

To preserve the hard-fought wins of the Memphis Safe Task Force and Federal law enforcement across the country, we need to make certain that these violent criminals are behind bars. Yet, in too many cases, soft-on-crime prosecutors and judges have allowed violent criminals back on the streets without bail to continue their criminal activity.

Last year, in Memphis, an 18-year-old who was released without bond after stealing multiple vehicles went on to murder a man in an attempted robbery. Just days earlier, a man released without bail after being charged with auto theft and unlawful possession of a

weapon killed a Memphis police officer in a shootout.

During a Judiciary Committee hearing that I chaired last week on blue-city chaos and tragedy, State Senator Brent Taylor, who represents parts of Memphis, told me that soft-on-crime prosecutors are the weak link in the work Memphis is trying to do and the work that Memphis law enforcement is trying to do. Their DA is the weak link. After years of senseless violence, we cannot allow the hard work of the Memphis Safe Task Force to go to waste.

To ensure that the rule of law is enforced, I recently introduced the Keep Violent Criminals Off Our Streets Act. This legislation is backed by the White House, and it would ban the award of certain Federal funds to States and localities that limit the use of cash bail.

There must be consequences for these leftist officials who put criminals ahead of law-abiding citizens. There have to be consequences for these prosecutors, these DAs, that continue to practice cashless bail policies. So banning these jurisdictions from having those Federal funds is a way that we can say: Enforce cash bail and get these violent criminals off the streets.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KELLY. 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

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, in just a few weeks, millions of Americans will start the process of picking new health insurance plans, and I believe a number of them are going to see the cost of their health insurance double. This is, unfortunately, not a mistake. It is the price of Washington failing them. And it is not just a number on a bill. It is the first sign for these families that their lives are going to be much harder.

We are now 8 days into a government shutdown, but, make no mistake, this debate isn't about something happening here in this building. It is about the price Americans pay for their healthcare—because if we don't work together to extend the Affordable Care Act's premium tax credits, millions of families will see their health insurance costs skyrocket overnight.

Last year alone, 309,000 Arizonans used these tax credits, saving them an average of more than $400 per month. Many of them would need to pay hundreds of dollars more per month. Some will see their costs more than double.

That is money that a lot of families simply do not have. That means cutting groceries, skipping a car payment, or saying no to the next time that their kid asks to join a school activity, like a Little League team.

For a lot of folks, it will mean losing coverage altogether because they just cannot afford it. So, now, these families are going to be one accident or one illness away from financial ruin.

This uncertainty could also mean that insurers exit the marketplace, leaving people with limited coverage options.

These are not hypotheticals. Over the last week, I have spent time on the phone with Arizonans who have reached out to my office to share what these tax credits mean for them and what also happens when they go away. I want to share a few stories from these folks, who are already bracing for the worst—because if anyone here is still wondering what this debate is about, this is it.

So I talked to a guy named Rusty, from Tucson. He is a cancer survivor. He runs his own small business in Tucson. He also takes care of his mother, who is in memory care. He told me:

> I've been using the Marketplace for years. Last year, I paid $277 a month for my plan. I've now been told my premiums could jump to between $450 and $600 a month.
>
> That will not be sustainable short term or long term.
>
> The premium tax credit has made it affordable for those of us who need health insurance but can't go out to the general market.
>
> I have to have health insurance—

He said—

> but [there's] really no way I can afford what is about to happen.

Rusty is not asking for anything extraordinary. He is asking to keep what is already working for him: the ability to afford care while he works hard and contributes to his community.

Robin, who is 60 years old, lives in Northern Arizona and is trying to save for retirement. She said—and this is a quote from Robin:

> These subsidies have been crucial in making health insurance affordable. I am struggling to pay for my living expenses as is.
>
> My work has not been enough to provide me with a full-time salary, and although I do have some other form of income, it is still not enough for me to live on should my healthcare subsidy disappear.
>
> I feel like many of us, middle class Americans—

This is Robin—

> who are caught up in a trap of helplessness because we do not qualify for other benefits, and yet we do not make enough in order to sustain a healthy quality of life, considering how everything that we need to live on has increased in price.
>
> The expiration of these subsidies could lead to significant increases in healthcare costs and potentially make it difficult to maintain coverage.

Now, Robin doesn't qualify for Medicaid, but she does work hard. She just wants to be able to afford health insurance until she reaches Medicare eligibility. And Robin said she is not looking for a handout; she is looking for a hand up.

Cricket, who is 63, is a realtor from Phoenix. She is self-employed and not yet eligible for Medicare. So for the past 8 years, she has relied on the Affordable Care Act for her health coverage. And if the tax credits go away, her coverage will become unaffordable. She told me—this is a quote from Cricket:

> Without it, I would have faced bankruptcy.
>
> If premiums rise or these subsidies go away, I could lose my home and everything I've worked for.
>
> Health care shouldn't be a privilege, it's a right.

Daylene—this next story should remind all of us of what is at stake in this fight. Daylene, from Casa Grande, was diagnosed with congestive heart failure 20 years ago, when she turned 40. Doctors told her that she might live 1 or 2 years. She said, because of these credits, she has been able to afford her insurance and medication that literally keeps her heart beating. She wrote to us:

> My monthly cardiac drug costs alone would be over $2,000 without my insurance from ACA.

She continued to tell me that these credits gave her more than healthcare. It gave her freedom to leave an abusive marriage because, before that, she relied on her husband to afford her healthcare.

That is what this is about. When people can't afford healthcare, they stay in situations they shouldn't stay in just to keep their coverage: a job they don't want; a city they do not want to live in, maybe farther from family; and, in the worst case, an abusive relationship—because they need affordable coverage.

Survival, dignity, and freedom—that is what we are talking about here when we talk about affordable health insurance and care.

In Arizona, people like Rusty and Cricket and Daylene and Robin, they do not have lobbyists. What they have is faith that when they write their Senator, someone will listen. I am not just listening, I am fighting for them and thousands more across my State who are in the same exact position.

These are hard-working people. They are doing everything right. They are not asking for special treatment. They are small business owners who have to purchase their own plans. They are older Americans who aren't yet eligible for Medicare and folks who live in rural Arizona and don't get healthcare through an employer.

There are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of these people across the country. They are asking for all of us here in this body to work as hard for them as they do for their families. And what makes this so frustrating is how simple the solution is. We can vote today to extend these tax credits and reopen the government. But so far, Donald Trump and my Republican colleagues would rather use people's healthcare as leverage than sit down and work with us to protect it.

Arizonans are counting on us to do what is right, not for political points but for people's lives. That is our job, and I am here ready to work on this with my Democrat and Republican colleagues across the aisle in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives and in the White House. So let's get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

ISLAMIC EXTREMISTS

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about one of the greatest threats facing our country today: Islamic extremism.

You know, 24 years ago, September 11, 2001, nearly 3,000 innocent Americans were murdered in a coordinated terroristic attack carried out by radical Islamic extremists. Those of us who lived through that day remember exactly where we were when those planes hit the buildings. That day changed this country forever.

We were smacked in the face with the reality that there are people who are so hell-bent on destroying America that they will kill themselves just to try to harm us. That is reality. It sends shivers down your spine, but it is true, and it happened.

In the aftermath of 9/11, we created the Department of Homeland Security. Basically, we went to war. We spent the following two decades unsuccessfully attempting to westernize the Middle Eastern countries most responsible for this attack. We strengthened surveillance and gave up personal freedoms in the hope of preventing another large-scale attack.

But 20 years later, we have to ask: Have we made any progress at all in rooting the evil of radical Islam out of this country? Have we done it?

Let's be honest. Radical Islamic terrorism didn't go away after 2001.

In 2009, 13 people were killed in a mass shooting at Fort Hood by an Army psychiatrist who was radicalized by Islamic teachings.

In 2013, three were killed and hundreds injured when two brothers detonated bombs at the finish line of the Boston Marathon. They were inspired by their radical Islamic beliefs.

Then, in 2015, an ISIS-inspired couple killed 14 people and injured 22 at a party in Southern California.

In 2016, Omar Mateen killed 49 people and injured 53 more at a nightclub in Orlando, FL. Mateen pledged allegiance to ISIS during this attack.

It continued in 2019, when a Saudi military trainee opened fire at the Pensacola Naval Air Station, killing three Americans, including one young man from my home State of Alabama.

Earlier this year in Louisiana, a deranged person drove a truck into a crowd on Bourbon Street in New Orleans, killing 14 people. To no one's surprise, he said he was ''inspired'' by the Islamic State.

These attacks, they weren't just against people, they were an all-out assault on Western culture, freedom, and the values that we hold dear to our heart. But it doesn't stop there.

Thanks to Joe Biden, thousands of people on the suspected Terror Watchlist were allowed to enter this country over the past 4 years. Islamic extremism and Sharia Law openly call for the destruction of America and Western culture.

Let's be clear about this: The thousands of terrorists we have allowed to enter our country have brought their anti-American rhetoric and ideology with them. We are seeing this in cities like Minneapolis, Dearborn, Portland, Chicago, and even New York City.

You know, the leading candidate for mayor of New York City is a far-left socialist who sympathizes with extremist groups like Hamas.

But this insanity sadly isn't limited to New York. We have elected Members of Congress who openly support the radical Islamic terrorist organization Hamas.

Just yesterday, we paused to remember the more than 1,200 innocent people, including 40 Americans—40 Americans—who were slaughtered by Hamas terrorists in Israel on October 7, 2023.

Hamas literally means ''Islamic Resistance Movement.'' It has been 2 years, and two U.S. Congresswomen, OMAR and TLAIB, they still refuse to condemn these heinous crimes in Israel. These two Members were elected to represent American citizens, and they are sympathizing with Islamic terrorists instead. It is almost hard to believe, but it is true. And they don't hide it.

You know, we are allowing people with extremist ideologies, people who hate American values, to not only live here but to hold positions of power and influence in our government. It is un-American, and it is an insult to the millions of Americans who have sacrificed their lives for this country and its freedom.

You know, if you think this poisonous ideology won't affect your way of life, just look at Europe. The United Kingdom, once a proud nation that helped save the world from Nazi tyranny, has essentially lost its identity. It is gone.

Mass migration has destroyed their society. There is no freedom of speech; crime is through the roof; and openly Anti-Semitic, pro-Hamas riots have become a regular occurrence. This is in Europe; this is the UK.

The UK Prime Minister, Keir Starmer, recently appointed a person with extreme pro-Palestinian views as Home Secretary. In the UK, the Home Secretary is in charge of protecting national security, ensuring law and order, and overseeing immigration. What a surprise.

So the person who is in charge of immigration and national security is openly a pro-terrorist. If we aren't careful, the United States will look like Europe in 10 years or less. It is coming.

We can't bury our heads in the sand about this any longer. The Quran openly calls for violence against non-Muslims—openly. Radical Islamists take these instructions literally and use them to justify terror.

It is not politically correct to say this, but it is the damn truth, something you won't hear from the deranged leftists who run cover for Islamic extremism is about the inhumane and disgusting ways that they treat women.

In Muslim countries that follow Sharia law, it is considered normal for women to be raped, trafficked, and forced to marry as young as the age of 6. Pedophilia is rampant, and women are lucky if they are allowed to drive.

I am old enough to remember when Democrats championed the #MeToo movement, which was self-described as a ''global, survivor-led movement to end sexual violence.''

But these same Democrats who championed the #MeToo movement have been radio silent when it comes to the way women are regularly treated in countries that practice radical Islam. I have yet to hear my Democrat colleagues who are siding with Hamas talk about the brutal ways Hamas has abused the women they have held hostage since October 7, nor have I heard Democrats who claim to be feminists talk about the fact that some Muslim countries that practice Sharia law require women to be completely covered from head to toe.

These women, they are not allowed to get an education, work a job, or, in some cases, even leave home. They are barred from gyms, parks, and beauty salons. They are forbidden from traveling without a male relative and forced to wear certain covering that covers everything but their eyes.

But meanwhile, the men in these countries are allowed to abuse women, have sex with children, or have multiple wives—no problem. Everyone, but especially feminist groups, should be outraged about this horrible abuse of women, but that doesn't fit the left's narrative. So you won't hear a peep from liberal so-called feminists about the disgusting treatment of women in radical Islamic countries.

You also won't hear from Democrats about how radical Islamic terrorists are currently carrying out a mass genocide of Christians in Nigeria. Think about this, more than 62,000 Christians have been slaughtered since 2000 by radical Islamic terrorists in Nigeria. You heard that right, 62,000.

In just this year alone, more than 7,000 Nigerian Christians have been murdered because of their faith alone.

You can't turn on the TV without hearing about Israel's so-called mass genocide of Palestinians—every day. Yet, when it comes to 62,000 Christians being slaughtered by radical Muslims, it is radio silence. This extreme ideology is straight from the pit of Hell, and it has no place in American society.

We are blessed that freedom of worship is a constitutionally guaranteed right in this country. That is what our forefathers fought for. If you want to come here legally, practice a peaceful version of Islam, and blend into our society life by adopting the treasured values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, you are welcome to do so.

But if you believe that Sharia law supersedes American law, you should be

deported immediately. If we don't take a stand now, our way of life, our Christian values, our freedoms, and our national identity will disappear. There is only room for one law in this country, and that is the Constitution of the United States of America. Sharia law is anti-American and has no place in a free society.

Texas has already taken action to ban Sharia law, and I commend it. Other States should follow. We must protect American values, not apologize for them. I truly believe we are at a crossroads in this country.

For too long, people have tiptoed around this issue, afraid to hurt somebody's feelings or make people uncomfortable. But the time for being politically correct is over. The truth is that radical Islamic extremists want every single freedom-loving American dead—bottom line. They have proven over and over again that they are willing to do whatever it takes to kill just one American citizen, whatever it takes.

It doesn't just happen overseas. It has been allowed to fester and is alive and well in our very own country, just waiting for the right opportunity to attack. It is coming.

Just yesterday, thousands of extremists gathered in New York to champion radical Islam; it is scary. So the question is, Will we continue down this path and end up like Europe or will we honor the sacrifices made by the millions of Americans who have given their lives for our freedoms by standing up against people like the radical Islam?

Now is the time to act because if we don't, we will lose this country as we know it. It will be gone. This isn't about a Republican or Democrat issue; it is an American issue.

I hope my Democrat colleagues will join me in sending a loud, clear message that we will not tolerate Sharia law in this country—not now, not ever.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Alaska.

ALASKA'S RIGHT TO IVORY SALES AND TRADITION ACT

ACCELERATING NETWORKING, CYBERINFRASTRUCTURE, AND HARDWARE FOR OCEANIC RESEARCH ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am down on the Senate floor here to try to pass two really important pieces of legislation for a great part of Alaska, and this is the Alaska Native community in my State. These are incredible, patriotic Americans. By the way, Alaska Natives serve at higher rates in the military than any other ethnic group in the country. They are great Americans. They add so much to our State. They are the first peoples of Alaska, and so in my State, it is almost about 20 percent of the population. So it is a population I care deeply about.

We work closely with them on so many different issues across so many different areas, and so I like to legislate in the areas that matter to them. And we are going to do that. You know, lately—and I am going to try to stay positive here; I have given speeches on the Senate floor about this before—some of my Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle have taken it out on the Alaska Native people in legislation, really kind of bad stuff. I am not going to be negative, but there has been this trend of anti-Alaska Native bias on the other side of the aisle. It has been very disappointing. To be honest, it has been puzzling.

But I am hoping today, these two bills that we are going to move forward that go to the heart of Alaska Native culture in one and Alaska Native patriotism in the other are going to be UC'd. I know my Republican colleagues have already passed on these.

So the first piece of legislation I want to bring up is what we call the Alaska's Right To Ivory Sales and Tradition. The acronym on that is the ARTIST Act.

Now, let me give you a little bit of background on this. For thousands of years Alaska Natives have responsibly harvested whales, walrus, other marine animals from our northern seas. These animals are eaten, shared, honored, and no part of the animal goes to waste.

They still do this tradition in my State. They have the right to do it under law. The bones, the ivory, the baleen, even all of those pieces are used for beautiful art. If you have had a chance to visit my office, you have seen the beautiful art that adorns the walls of my Senate office. Carvings made from whale baleen, walrus tusks, crafted by Alaska Native artists.

This is some of the most beautiful art in America. It is deeply ingrained in Alaska's culture, the ability to make this art. It also provides important economic opportunity for our artists in many of these remote villages, artists who rely on the ability to sell these works to Alaskans and the hundreds of thousands of people who come to my great State to visit who want to take home a piece of Alaska Native heritage. So it is a win-win-win for everybody, but it is an economic driver of a lot of small villages in my State.

And by the way, carving, harvesting walrus ivory is completely legal under Federal law, Federal regulations, Federal law. There is no question about that. However, there has been some, I guess, well-intentioned laws from some States that in an attempt to ban African elephant ivory, which we all want to do that—that is not allowed in America, by the way—States have gone too far and cast this huge net and said you can't buy any ivory products anywhere, including Alaska Native products from Alaska walrus harvesting.

This really has hurt my State. People coming up from States that have banned all ivory say: I can't take that home. I can't buy it. Sorry.

So this is a simple, simple bill. You know, if a visitor wants to come buy some ivory earrings in Alaska by one of our great Alaska Native artists and then bring them home to a State that has a ban on ivory, which is not sensible—again, walrus ivory, not African elephant ivory—we want to be able to say at the Federal level that we should be able to do this.

So that is what my ARTIST Act does. It prohibits States from banning the importation, sale, or possession of Alaskan Native handicrafts made with walrus ivory. Environmental groups support it. By the way, the Biden administration supported this. It is straightforward bipartisan legislation that recently was passed unanimously by the Commerce Committee.

So this is about as bipartisan as it gets. And what I want to do is to cut through the confusion that there now exists with certain States and a lot of tourists in my great State, to affirm the right of the Alaska Native people to continue these centuries-old practices of sustainable, respectful ivory carving, entirely within Federal law, and to be able to make sure that is clarified across the country.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 178, that is S. 254; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, 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. Is there an objection?

Mr. PADILLA. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator modify his request and the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 178, S. 254, and Calendar No. 169, S. 318; that the committee-reported substitute amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; the bills, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I agree to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 254) to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and marine mammal ivory products, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with an amendment to strike all

after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Alaska's Right to Ivory Sales and Tradition Act'' or the ''ARTIST Act''.

SEC. 2. ALASKA NATIVE HANDICRAFTS.

Section 101(b) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act Of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) EXEMPTION FOR ALASKAN NATIVES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) AUTHENTIC ALASKA NATIVE ARTICLE OF HANDICRAFTS AND CLOTHING.—The term 'authentic Alaska Native article of handicrafts and clothing' means an item composed wholly, or in some significant respect, of natural materials and that is produced, decorated, or fashioned in the exercise of traditional Alaska Native handicrafts by an Alaska Native who resides in Alaska and who dwells on the coast of the North Pacific Ocean or the Arctic Ocean without the use of a pantograph, multiple carvers, or any other mass copying device.

''(B) MARINE MAMMAL IVORY.—The term 'marine mammal ivory' includes a tooth or tusk from a walrus (Odobenus rosmarus) or a species of cetacean.

''(C) TRADITIONAL ALASKA NATIVE HANDICRAFTS.—The term 'traditional Alaska Native handicrafts' includes weaving, carving, stitching, sewing, lacing, beading, drawing, and painting.

''(2) EXEMPTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 109, the provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to the taking of any marine mammal by any Alaska Native who resides in Alaska and who dwells on the coast of the North Pacific Ocean or the Arctic Ocean if such taking—

''(i)(I) is for subsistence purposes; or

''(II) is done for purposes of creating and selling authentic Alaska Native articles of handicrafts and clothing; and

''(ii) in each case, is not accomplished in a wasteful manner.

''(B) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(i) INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF ITEMS.—An item presented as an authentic Alaska Native article of handicrafts and clothing may be sold in interstate commerce only if it comports with the definition provided in paragraph (1)(A).

''(ii) EDIBLE PORTION OF MARINE MAMMAL.—Any edible portion of a marine mammal taken for the purpose of creating and selling authentic Alaska Native articles of handicrafts and clothing may be sold for native consumption or in a native village or town in Alaska.

''(3) LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), if, under this Act, the Secretary determines any species or stock of marine mammal subject to taking by Alaska Natives to be depleted, the Secretary may prescribe regulations upon the taking of such marine mammals by any Alaska Native described in this subsection.

''(B) CONTENT OF REGULATIONS.—The regulations described in subparagraph (A) may be established with reference to species or stocks, geographical area, the season for taking, or any other factors related to the reason for establishing such regulations and consistent with the purposes of this Act.

''(C) NOTICE AND HEARING; REMOVAL OF REGULATIONS.—The regulations described in subparagraph (A) shall be prescribed after notice and hearing required by section 103 of this title and shall be removed as soon as the Secretary determines that the need for their imposition has disappeared.

''(D) REGULATIONS TO BE SUPPORTED BY SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.—In promulgating any regulation or making any assessment pursuant to a hearing or proceeding under this subsection or section 117(b)(2), or in making any determination of depletion under this subsection or finding regarding unmitigable adverse impacts under subsection (a)(5) that affects stocks or persons to which this subsection applies, the Secretary shall demonstrate in writing (and make such writing publicly available on the website of the Secretary) that, in consideration of the whole record, including Indigenous knowledge, such regulation, assessment, determination, or finding is supported by substantial evidence.

''(E) APPLICABILITY.—The requirement under subparagraph (D) shall only be applicable in an action brought by one or more Alaska Native organizations representing persons to which this subsection applies.

''(4) PROHIBITIONS.—No State shall prohibit the interstate commerce, importation, sale, offer for sale, transfer, trade, barter, possession, or possession with the intent to sell, transfer, trade, or barter of marine mammal ivory or marine mammal bone or baleen incorporated under this title by an Alaska Native, into an authentic Alaska Native article of handicrafts and clothing.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to—

''(A) impact the rights of any Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)) in effect on the date of enactment of the Alaska's Right to Ivory Sales and Tradition Act; or

''(B) undermine any government-to-government consultation or engagement.''.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 318) to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Accelerating Networking, Cyberinfrastructure, and Hardware for Oceanic Research Act'' or the ''ANCHOR Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(2) OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH VESSEL.—The term ''oceanographic research vessel'' has the meaning given the term in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code.

(3) U.S. ACADEMIC RESEARCH FLEET.—The term ''U.S. Academic Research Fleet'' means the United States flagged vessels that—

(A) have been accepted into, and are active participants administered within, the University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System;

(B) are operated as oceanographic research vessels by research universities and laboratories;

(C) receive funding from the National Science Foundation; and

(D) have achieved designation as a member vessel of the fleet through a standard evaluation process.

SEC. 3. PLAN TO IMPROVE CYBERSECURITY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS OF U.S. ACADEMIC RESEARCH FLEET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall, in consultation with the head of any Federal agency, university, or laboratory that owns or operates a vessel of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the telecommunications and networking needs of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, consistent with the typical scientific missions of the vessels of such fleet;

(2) in consultation with the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, an assessment of cybersecurity needs appropriate for—

(A) the ownership of vessels within the U.S. Academic Research Fleet; and

(B) the scientific missions of such vessels;

(3) an assessment of the costs necessary to meet the needs described in paragraphs (1) and (2), including—

(A) any necessary equipment, such as satellite communications equipment, software, high-performance computing clusters shipboard and shoreside, or enterprise hardware; and

(B) estimated personnel costs in excess of current expenditures, including any necessary training, support, or logistics;

(4) an assessment of the time required to implement any upgrades required to meet the needs described in paragraphs (1) and (2) under varying budgets and funding scenarios;

(5) the adoption of common solutions or consortial licensing agreements, or by centralizing elements of fleet cybersecurity, telecommunications, or data management at a single facility; and

(6) in consultation with any non-Federal owners of a vessel of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, a spending plan for the National Science Foundation, the Office of Naval Research, non-Federal owners of vessels of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, users of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, or any combination thereof, to provide funding to cover the costs described in paragraph (3).

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Director shall, in preparing the plan required by subsection (a), consider—

(1) the network capabilities, including speed and bandwidth targets, necessary to meet the scientific mission needs of each class of vessels of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet for such purposes as—

(A) executing the critical functions and communications of the vessels;

(B) providing network access to conduct medical care via telemedicine or related crisis response care;

(C) as necessary to meet operations, uploading any scientific data to a shoreside server, including the copying of data off ship for disaster recovery or risk mitigation purposes;

(D) as appropriate, conducting real-time streaming to enable shore-based observers to participate in ship-based maintenance or research activities; and

(E) real-time coordinated viewing of—

(i) scientific instrumentation so that it is possible to conduct scientific surveys and seafloor mapping with fully remote subject-matter experts; and

(ii) critical operational technology by manufacturers and vendors so that it is possible to carry out maintenance and repairs to systems with limited expertise on the vessel, with fully remote subject-matter experts advising; and

(2) in consultation with the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the heads of other Federal agencies, as appropriate—

(A) the cybersecurity recommendations in the report of the private scientific advisory group known as JASON entitled ''Cybersecurity at NSF Major Facilities'' (JSR–21–10E) and dated October 2021 as applied to the U.S. Academic Research Fleet;

(B) standards and guidance for information security, including the use of encryption for

sensitive information, the detection and handling of security incidents, and other areas determined relevant by the Director;

(C) facilitating access to cybersecurity personnel and training of research and support personnel; and

(D) the requirements for controlled unclassified or classified information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, the committee-reported substitutes are considered and agreed to, the bills, as amended, are considered read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The committee-reported amendments, in the nature of a substitute, were agreed to en bloc.

The bill (S. 254), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 318), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to let people know back home that means that that bill, the ARTIST bill that we have been trying to get moved for a long time, just passed the U.S. Senate. So I want to thank my colleague from California, my friend from California who has worked with me, by the way, on one of the other bills that just passed. I was a cosponsor with Senator PADILLA on that, so this is good Senate cooperation on these issues.

So that is an important issue for Alaskan Native heritage, culture, artists, and now it has passed the Senate. So, again, I want to thank Senator PADILLA.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 410

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, now I hope we can move to the next bill that, to be honest, should be even easier because the bill I am going to try to pass right now passed the U.S. Senate in December, unanimously. It already passed, so this should be a no-brainer. I hope my Senate colleague from California is on the floor here ready to give this bill his full endorsement and not object to it.

Let me just talk about this bill, briefly. Again, it already passed. It passed the House in July, so if we pass it right now, it is going to go to the President of the United States' desk for a signing. And this is a really big deal for my constituents.

Here is what it is: I talked about what I called the special patriotism of Alaska Natives. They serve at higher rates in the military than any other ethnic group in the country.

They had a situation when so many—and I mean thousands and thousands—of Alaskan Natives were serving in Vietnam. When a whole host of Americans didn't want to serve in Vietnam, Alaska Natives answered the call. So we have tens of thousands of Vietnam vets.

And when they came home, like a lot of Vietnam vets, they were not treated well. That was horrible. Our country should apologize for the horrible treatment our Vietnam vets got. Let's face it, as Alaska Natives, a lot of people still discriminated against Alaska Natives back then. They weren't treated well in that regard either. And, finally, a law had changed when they were overseas.

Alaska Native people used to have a right, starting in 1906, for a Native allotment; that is, 160 acres of land that if they can prove this is where their family raised them and hunted and fished, they could get that allotment—160 acres.

Well, when they were overseas fighting in Vietnam, that law changed. So here they were serving their country—when a lot of American males were avoiding service—and they got home, and they were told: By the way, your allotment that you are supposed to be able to get, that you wanted your whole life, that allotment changed, and you can't do it anymore. Huge injustice.

So during the first Trump administration, I introduced legislation called the Alaska Native Vietnam Veterans Land Allotment Act. And it said: Hey, if you were overseas serving in the military and you came home and the ability to get your allotment extinguished, you shouldn't be penalized for fighting for your country. You get the extended time to get your allotment. So that bill passed.

I was in the Oval Office when President Trump signed it. It was a great day for Alaska Natives, Vietnam veterans, very patriotic. It was a 5-year program. Unfortunately, we had Secretary Haaland implement it. Secretary Haaland did not implement it. Secretary Haaland, when she went through her confirmation hearing, committed to me twice: Senator, I will make this a priority of mine to implement this bill. You know what she did? She didn't do anything.

Shamefully, because radical leftwing environmental groups told her: We don't want anyone else getting land in Alaska, she did 40 allotments out of well over almost 3,000 available. She dragged her feet. She delayed it for 2 years.

So the 5-year program has almost run out of time because Secretary of the Interior Haaland was more interested in appeasing radical leftwing environmental groups than she was getting Alaska Natives their allotment, which is what the law demanded.

So this bill is very simple. Because of that delay, it changes two words in the already passed law. It says ''5 years'' to ''10 years.'' It is just a 5-year extension to a bill that everybody agrees with.

These patriotic Alaska Native Vietnam vets deserve their allotments, and they shouldn't have to suffer because of Secretary Haaland's delay tactics.

So this bill has already passed the House. This bill passed the Senate unanimously in December, and I am really hoping that my Democratic colleagues—respecting the indigenous Native people of my State and their valiant Vietnam service—will join with me in just passing it, like we did in December, and it will go right to the President's desk, and they will have 5 more years to really implement this really important piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 410 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am very glad that we were able to find a bipartisan approach to the Commerce Committee bills that were passed just a few minutes ago, not just because I know it is important to my colleague from Alaska and to his constituents, but so that Native Alaskans know that this side of the aisle also supports them as well.

But as it pertains to these bills, I think we need to find a similar bipartisan approach on the Energy and Natural Resource bills that the Senator from Alaska is suggesting that we approve by unanimous consent. I am more than happy and eager to sit down with my colleague and the chair and ranking member of the committee to put together a larger package of bills to ensure that both Republican and Democratic priorities reach the President's desk and get signed into law.

I think, historically, we have been successful at avoiding a piecemeal approach, instances where only one party's priorities or one Chamber's priorities reach the President's desk and get signed into law.

And so I look forward to continuing to work in that spirit to continue the conversation with my colleague from Alaska to arrive at a balanced, bipartisan package of bills and work together to advance them. Therefore, I must object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from California's cooperation on the first bill, the ARTIST Act.

I am a little disappointed here on this one because, you know, it is a little bit of a delay tactic, but he certainly has my commitment to work with him, if they need to try to pair this. But I will say this: The 5 years of this bill expires at the end of this year, and we cannot—regardless if there is pairing or not pairing—we cannot let this bill expire. These great American

patriots served their country and deserve their allotment that they were unable to get during Vietnam. And then, when we passed the bill, Secretary of Interior Haaland purposefully dragged her feet to make sure that no Alaska Native—or very few—got their allotment. That was a disgrace.

And so, Mr. President, to my colleague from California, you have my commitment to work with you, but we have got to get this done by the end of the year—before the end of the year—and get it on the President's desk. These great patriotic Americans deserve nothing less, and we can't delay much longer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to complete their remarks prior to the scheduled rollcall vote: Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CRAMER, and Senator HOEVEN.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

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

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

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER LEE MASCOTT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, we are going to move to our first vote on Professor Jennifer Mascott's nomination to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. I want to take a few minutes to express my support for her nomination and to urge my colleagues to vote accordingly.

Bipartisanship in this body has become, unfortunately, rare. Our government shut down because of partisan obstruction, and even the few instances of bipartisanship in our committee have been condemned by leftist, dark money groups, such as Demand Justice. The situation is bad for our country and really bad for the American people.

Putting high-quality judicial nominees on the bench to serve the American people should be something that unites this body. In fact, in the Biden administration, that happened. Over 80 percent of the judicial nominees in that administration received bipartisan support on the floor.

By contrast, this Congress, only 20 percent of the Trump nominees have had bipartisan support.

I encourage my colleagues to ignore the pressure from inflammatory progressive groups like Demand Justice and to recognize Professor Mascott's tremendous qualifications.

Professor Mascott is a law professor at Catholic University. She is so beloved by her students. She has had a very distinguished career as a public servant and has impeccable professional qualifications.

Just as an example, as a law student at George Washington University, she earned a recordbreaking 4.22 GPA. Her professors even wrote to the Judiciary Committee prior to her hearing to explain that these professors often thought that her exam answers were better than their own answer keys.

It is no surprise, then, that she went on to clerk for two Supreme Court Justices.

Since her time as a clerk, she has grown into an impressive and nationally influential scholar. Justices of the Supreme Court have cited her scholarship eight times and even mentioned her by name in oral arguments.

She is also well known and well respected by our own Senate Judiciary Committee. The committee has called on Professor Mascott repeatedly to testify about some of the toughest constitutional and statutory questions. She has also filed amicus briefs on behalf of Members of the committee in very important cases. We trusted her judgment then, and we can surely trust that judgment now.

I am confident that Professor Mascott will make an outstanding judge, and I know that she will serve the people of Delaware and the circuit with distinction.

President Trump made an excellent selection in Professor Mascott, and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting to support her nomination so she can serve on the Third Circuit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I just want to supplement the distinguished chairman's remarks with one observation for the benefit of all of my colleagues, and that is that, not long ago, when circuit court nominees were brought forward, they had cleared the Senate blue-slip process because each circuit court seat was associated with a State, except for DC. But, normally, a DC Circuit Court seat was associated with a State, and the Senators from that State had the ability to recommend a nominee to the President.

The Republicans on the Judiciary Committee undid that—what we call the blue-slip rule—for circuit courts. So Senators lost that power.

When we were in the majority, when President Biden was there, there were strident objections when we applied the same standard to circuit court nominees that the Republicans had applied when they broke the blue slip.

With this nomination, we are taking it the next step further. Now, not only are the Senators from the home State not consulted, but in this case, the candidate has almost no relationship with Delaware, the State with which this seat is associated.

She has a summer house there. She has never had a driver's license. She has never had a fishing license. She has never been an income taxpayer. She has never been registered to vote. She has never been a member of the bar. She only recently joined the Third Circuit bar.

She is being airdropped into this seat.

So just be aware that, in the future, when the shoe is on the other foot and people here would like to make sure that their home State is honored and recognized as being the State with which a circuit court seat is associated, that may very well not happen any longer. And we will look back to this minute as the minute that destroyed that tradition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

S.J. RES. 62

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, in a little while, we are going to vote to proceed to S.J. Res. 62, which I introduced with Senator HOEVEN to repeal the Biden administration's Bureau of Land Management resource management plan for North Dakota.

Of course, H.J. Res. 105, which mirrors our bill, introduced by Congresswoman FEDORCHAK, has already passed the House of Representatives, and final passage is scheduled for later this evening.

The Bureau of Land Management—or BLM, as we call it—is the landlord of 745 million acres of land and subsurface deposits nationwide. BLM's management of these public resources is governed by what is known as the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, otherwise known as FLPMA, which requires—I stress ''requires''—the Bureau to develop resource management plans or RMPs to guide management decisions.

And, when created, Congress was clear: These RMPs must abide by the multiple-use mandate.

Now, ''multiple use'' is a term that is thrown around a lot in the public lands discussions. It was championed by President Theodore Roosevelt, who drew from his experience in his two ranches in North Dakota, the Maltese Cross and the Elkhorn Ranch, and throughout the West.

And, by the way, North Dakota is where his Presidential Library is being built, and it will be open next July 4—unpaid announcement.

''Multiple use'' means that land is sustainably used by the State and local population, rather than preserved like a national park or a wildlife refuge. Multiple use lands are used by miners, cattle grazers, oil and gas developers, and recreationalists alike. They are not meant to be locked up.

Multiple use is a mandate, as I said earlier. It is not a suggestion. And that is what brings us here today.

In the final days of the Biden administration, they approved the North Dakota resource management plan, which governs the management of 58,500 surface acres and 4.1 million acres of mineral estate across our State for the next 15 to 20 years.

Despite vocal objections from the State, the people who actually use the

land, the final plan prohibits coal leasing on over 4 million acres by inexcusably prohibiting all future development outside of a 4-mile radius from current development—over 90 percent of North Dakota's affordable, reliable coal, out of touch. It is gone.

It also blocks 213,000 acres, or 44 percent, of federally owned oil and gas acreage from future development. This restriction alone deprives the State—and we are a small State—of $34 million annually and—get this—the State's Common Schools Trust Fund a minimum of $50 million.

And if that wasn't enough, non-Federal minerals are also held hostage to the Federal Government's management plan. As I mentioned earlier, these RMPs govern subsurface acreage. Whether it is coal, oil, or gas, federally owned subsurface minerals are intermingled with State and private mineral owners. In plain speak, the Biden resource management plan is a de facto taking from the State and private mineral owners.

Throughout the rulemaking process, this point was made very clear, but BLM ignored it. And it is unacceptable and needs to be undone. And I will add that it needs to be undone by Congress so it is clear to the bureaucracy that this sort of resource management plan is out of bounds.

By passing this resolution, we reassert congressional intent and remind the bureaucracy: Our boundaries are not optional.

Mr. President, this rule will need to be replaced once we repeal it. Thank goodness Congress had the foresight in the Congressional Review Act to say no replacement rule could be substantially similar to the one it is replacing. But by no means does it preclude the proper replacement of a rule.

I have the utmost confidence in Secretary Burgum and Deputy Secretary MacGregor to get this done right, but this cannot sit on the back burner.

Nearly 6 years ago, during the first Trump administration, I wrote a letter on behalf of a single constituent advocating for this RMP to be updated so he could develop some of his privately held minerals. They started the work, but unfortunately the Biden administration finished the work.

While Congress is acting to repeal their disastrous plan today, the administration must swiftly replace this RMP, ensuring North Dakota gets the best long-term plan possible to responsibly utilize our natural resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution that Senator CRAMER and I introduced to overturn the Bureau of Land Management resource management plan for North Dakota.

This flawed plan, finalized during the closing days of the Biden administration, undermines BLM's multiple-use mandate and restricts access to vast, taxpayer-owned energy reserves in North Dakota. It is yet another example of the Biden administration's overreaching Green New Deal agenda intended to block access to domestic energy production.

North Dakota is an energy powerhouse and the third largest oil-producing State in the Nation. Our energy producers operate under the highest environmental standards in the world.

But the Biden administration's North Dakota resource management plan ignores that record of responsible energy development. Instead, the North Dakota resource management plan seeks to curtail coal, oil, and gas production by locking away taxpayer-owned energy reserves and jeopardizing our Nation's energy security.

Under this plan, nearly 213,000 acres—or 45 percent—of Federal oil and gas acreage is closed off to new leasing. It also closes off access to over 4 million acres—nearly 99 percent—of Federal coal, impacting development at all of North Dakota's major lignite coal mines.

These restrictions will drive up supply costs for baseload coal-fired powerplants—costs that will be ultimately passed on to electric customers across the region. We supply a large region of the Midwest with electric power.

This comes at a time when energy demand is rising. As manufacturing is brought back home and new industries like artificial intelligence and data centers are coming online, our need for affordable, reliable energy is only growing. It makes no sense for the Federal Government to restrict access to the very resources needed to power our economy.

In North Dakota, BLM manages 58,000 acres of surface land and about 4.1 million acres of subsurface minerals. Federal minerals are scattered and often intermingled with State and privately owned minerals due to North Dakota's unique split estate. So when the Federal Government imposes blanket restrictions as included under the Biden-era resource management plan, it blocks development of State and privately owned minerals as well.

The State of North Dakota estimates that this plan would cost $34 million every year in lost revenue from oil and gas alone, including revenue for school trust lands that is meant for North Dakota classrooms.

I am pleased to join Senator CRAMER and Congresswoman JULIE FEDORCHAK in introducing this CRA resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support it and help overturn this overreaching and restrictive plan. By passing this resolution, we can continue working with President Trump and Interior Secretary Burgum to take the handcuffs off and unleash North Dakota's full energy potential.

I yield the floor.

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. 459, Jennifer Lee Mascott, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

John Thune, Jim Justice, Ashley B. Moody, Steve Daines, Thom Tillis, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger Marshall, David McCormick, Tom Cotton, Kevin Cramer, John R. Curtis, Marsha Blackburn, Lindsey Graham, Pete Ricketts, Mike Lee, Ron Johnson, Mike Rounds.

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 Jennifer Lee Mascott, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 552 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Mullin	Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer Lee Mascott, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO ''NORTH DAKOTA FIELD OFFICE RECORD OF DECISION AND APPROVED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN''—Motion to Proceed

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 105.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 105, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''North Dakota Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan''.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

Mr. COTTON. 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 553 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz	Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO ''NORTH DAKOTA FIELD OFFICE RECORD OF DECISION AND APPROVED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 105) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''North Dakota Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here to talk about a bill that is a matter of fundamental fairness to our veterans and most especially to our combat-injured veterans—a group that should evoke the sympathies and support of our Nation as no other.

I am here to talk about the Major Richard Star Act. Many of my colleagues know about it because 76 Members of this body are cosponsors. That is a large number, but so far, it has not been sufficient to gain even a vote. So I am asking today that that support be turned into action.

This bipartisan legislation will correct one of the deepest injustices impacting disabled veterans. It is labeled by stakeholders as the ''wounded veterans tax.''

The wounded veterans tax, as it stands now, causes more than 50,000 combat-injured veterans who were forced to retire to be barred from a full military pension that they earned or were promised. Let me explain. They are getting a dollar-for-dollar reduction of their military retirement pay from their VA disability benefits. The reduction, dollar-for-dollar, in their retirement pay is the result of their receiving those disability benefits for their combat injuries.

They are entitled to each of the separate and distinct and different forms of compensation. They have earned both. They are different, separate, and distinct. But right now, under current law, they are deprived of the full benefits of their pension because they were injured in combat. Just to describe this injustice should make our stomachs turn with outrage.

The Major Richard Star Act is really a commonsense bill. We use that word, ''commonsense,'' all the time in this Chamber, but in this instance, it seems particularly appropriate. It would right this longstanding injustice and finally provide these military retirees their full VA disability and Defense Department retirement benefits.

This cause is not only common sense, it is rightfully bipartisan. It has received overwhelming support—those 76 cosponsors in this body but also 304 cosponsors in the House of Representatives—and it is the collectively top priority of the military and veterans services organization communities of the United States. Yet, year after year, this bill has stalled, and detractors have worked to deny a simple vote.

Now, in public—critics have avoided taking a public position on the bill, and they have given lipservice to veterans and advocates requesting their support. What their real reasons are, I can't say.

But the fact of the matter is that these veterans have been denied this simple justice.

And let me speak to those critics.

We can't balance the Federal budget on the backs of combat-injured retirees. Doing so reneges on our obligation. It is a sacred obligation to take care of veterans after their time in uniform.

The bill doesn't create some great, new, overly generous benefit, but it would be enormously impactful and beneficial for each of those retirees who would be affected. The average is about $1,200 a month—some more, maybe some a little bit less. At $1,200 a month—you can do the math—it is not a fortune, but it would make a difference in the lives of these combat-injured veterans.

It simply ensures that the benefits we have promised and the benefits they have earned are the benefits that are now delivered—it is that simple—not clawed back, as happens now, from the heroes who have sustained those combat-related injuries.

The veterans and heroes involved in these bills are similar to the namesake of the bill, MAJ Richard Star, a decorated war veteran and engineering officer in the Army. He suffered from lung cancer caused by burn pit exposure.

We all know about Iraq and Afghanistan burn pit exposure. We passed the PACT Act to provide care and benefits for victims of those burn pits and exposure to other toxic chemicals.

They led to his retirement and his death in 2021. He was 51 years old. Until

his death, he was a dedicated advocate for his fellow veterans and combat-related disabilities.

His wife Tonya Star walked these halls by his side. She died in 2024. She called my staff days before her passing, in tears because another Congress had ended, in 2024, without a vote on the Richard Star Act. Tonya knew the tremendous difference this legislation would make in the lives of caregivers and widows like her.

It would make a difference also in the lives of veterans like Pat Murray of North Kingstown, RI. Pat is a Marine Corps veteran and a staunch veterans advocate. He recently welcomed a baby boy, and he was forced to move back to Rhode Island to be closer to his family because the injuries he sustained from an IED blast in Iraq made it difficult to care for the newborn.

We need to be very clear. This act won't return his amputated leg. But it can provide him and his family with desperately needed financial certainty, which they deserve, they need, and they were promised.

And it would also help veterans like retired MSgt Gabriel Peterson of Biloxi, MS. He was medically discharged as a result of reactive airway disease. He is on five different drugs. They help with his breathing. It is a struggle for him to live, and this act would ensure that he could provide for his family, even if he is no longer able to be employed.

The stories are powerful, and they are persuasive. They depict the scope and impact of this act, if it were passed, in lifesaving and life-enhancing benefits, and what it will mean to the tens of thousands of veterans across this great Nation.

In fact, these veterans and their families—think of their families—deserve a lot better. They deserve elected officials who will stand up and deliver for them the benefits they were promised and the benefits they earned; and they need them and deserve them today.

I am asking my colleagues to advance this legislation now. The principle of taking care of our veterans has never been Democrat or Republican. The Veterans' Affair Committee is supremely bipartisan. My hope is that tradition will continue, including today.

So let's put politics aside. Let's put partisan differences aside and finally do the right thing and advance this important legislation for our Nation's veterans.

And so notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1032, the Major Richard Star Act; 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Reserving the right to object, let me say that I have deep respect for my colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Connecticut. He is a veteran; I am a veteran. I have no doubt in my mind that Senator BLUMENTHAL has a heart for the veterans and for disabled veterans, and I appreciate that. He is moved with concern for those who have served and who have been injured.

However, my colleague is asking for an entitlement that does amount to a double benefit and that we cannot afford. We are talking about between $9 billion and $10 billion on the Department of Defense authorization act. And we are talking about adding a bill, a piece of legislation, that really belongs in another jurisdiction, as my friend acknowledged.

We cannot possibly add another $10 billion—$9 or $10 billion of entitlement money—to this DOD authorization act and hope to pass it.

And that is the reason that in Democrat majorities and Republican majorities—House Democrat majorities and Senate Democrat majorities—and in Democratic administrations, this legislation has never been accepted—because we simply cannot afford it.

Historically, Congress has provided permanent new benefits only after we have identified an offset, savings of a similar amount. There is no such offset identified in this unanimous consent request.

And when we do not identify offsets, then that $10 billion—almost $10 billion—has to come out of readiness, out of the strength of our military to defend ourselves in the most dangerous time we have had since World War II.

So I have the deepest respect for my friend from Connecticut, and I admire his intentions. But until Congress and until the authors of this proposal identify a way to offset the expense or to make it less expensive, we should not move forward with this legislation.

Therefore, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I want to respond very briefly to my colleague from Mississippi and my friend, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. We have worked together, as he does always, in a bipartisan way on armed services issues. So what I am about to say is not personal to him. In fact, I am willing to bet that it isn't his decision to object here.

But I want to refute two points. No. 1, on double-dipping, let's be clear that these are two separate programs, and the right to payment under each of them is separately deserved. Not everyone who is entitled to retirement pay gets disability benefits. You have to be in that club that nobody wants to join of being combat injured. And it is a separate form of right that in no way involves double-dipping, as we commonly refer to it. The retirement pay is for years of service in the military. VA disability compensation is for the loss of future earnings due to service-connected injuries or illnesses.

And I just want to make clear that this point is really about equity and fairness. Congress eliminated this option for nearly a million veterans who have served 20 years and have a 50-percent VA disability rating or higher. It has already dealt with one segment of this group. This unjust assessment ultimately ought to be eliminated for all the 430,000 veterans who had their military retirement pay clawed back because they are receiving VA disability benefits.

But we are starting here or taking the next step with 50,000 of those 430,000 who, in fairness, should receive both, the retirement pay and disability benefits. And we are doing it because these 50,000 have combat-related injuries.

And as to the total cost—again, not personal to my colleague from Mississippi—but the CBO told us that the Republican-supported tax cuts exploded the deficit by about $3.4 trillion.

Let me repeat that: $3.4 trillion, in large part tax cuts to people who didn't need them.

These veterans need these benefits. This cost is a minuscule fraction of those trillions. This country can afford to do right by these combat-injured veterans. The DOD Office of the Actuary has indicated it could implement the Richard Star Act in an ''actuarially sound manner.''

It is not too costly. It is financially sound. I regret that the Richard Star Act will not be passed today, but I have another measure that I would like to bring to the floor. And it is, with regret, that we are not providing unanimous consent to the bill itself.

And I understand the points made by my colleague, but I would like to present a middle ground. Since we don't have unanimous consent for the Major Richard Star Act today, let's agree to a vote. Let's have a time agreement that would authorize the Senate to take a single up-or-down vote on passage of this bill before the end of the year. This time agreement doesn't guarantee passage. It simply guarantees a vote.

One vote, that is all I am asking. Give us a vote on passage of the Major Richard Star bill, and it would be passage by a 60-vote margin, filibuster proof. If we get 60 votes, the bill passes. If not, it goes down. Let's do it before the end of the year.

I happen to think that we ought to spend whatever time is necessary on this bill. But I understand that leadership is concerned about time. And so my proposal strips away all the time-consuming procedural stuff—I have another word for it—but it allows us to go forward expeditiously. One vote scheduled entirely at Majority Leader THUNE's discretion, before the end of the year—it could start and finish in half an hour or 45 minutes.

Surely, the Republican leadership can spare that short time, scheduled at

their discretion, to give these combat-injured veterans a single vote on this bill before the end of the year.

And so notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader but no later than December 31, 2025, the Committee on Armed Services be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1032; further, that there be up to 2 hours of debate on the bill, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage, all without further intervening action or debate and no amendments or motions in order to the bill prior to the vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). Is there an objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, every time my Democratic friends want to advocate for another expensive program, they mention the tax cuts.

Let me just stray from the issue at hand to say, as I have always said, when Republicans cut taxes on job creators, on small business people, on 95 percent of the people who file a tax return back in 2017, jobs were created. And until the pandemic was visited upon the whole world, jobs were created and revenue rose for the United States of America. I have to say that.

Let me also say this: There have been times, very recently, when the Democratic party controlled the Presidency, the House of Representatives, and the U.S. Senate. And even in those situations—those recent situations—this legislation costing in excess of $9 billion in mandatory spending was not brought forward.

Now, why would our friends across the aisle and the President of the United States, who was a Democrat, not advocate for that and make sure it comes to a vote is that you have got to make choices when it comes to national defense. Where would we take the money, the $9 billion? Are we going to take it out of salary increases for our junior enlisted people, which is in this bill? Are we going to take it out of munitions? Are we going to take it out of modernization of our nuclear strategic system, which is behind and needs it so desperately?

We can't just print up another $9 billion or $10 billion for this purpose, particularly when there is the question that has not been answered about double compensation here.

And so I would just say it is easy to point fingers at this side of the aisle on this occasion and on this unanimous consent request, but there is a reason that there has been a bipartisan reluctance to spend this extra money, which we would love to have if we had it, if we could just wave a magic wand and create the money out of thin air, but we cannot do it.

The responsible thing, regardless of who has been in charge of this Chamber, has been to do the best we can for our veterans with one or the other of these compensation programs. And so for that reason, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I respect the points that are being made by my friend from Mississippi. In fact, we share support for every one of those armed services measures that he had described, whether it is bolstering our nuclear force, providing for more drone protection, increasing well-deserved compensation for our military men and women, and it is the reason why he has led, and I have supported, the current National Defense Authorization Act that, hopefully, will be approved by this body within days.

Where we differ is, I think, that I believe that the $9 billion or $10 billion that would go to ensure fundamental fairness to our military is there or a great nation should ensure it is there when we are talking about the trillions that we will spend on many other things, some of them very worthwhile, but, in my view, none more worthwhile than doing right by these veterans.

It isn't double dipping. It isn't overly generous. It isn't going to break the bank, so to speak. To the Federal Government as a whole, with its trillions of dollars, it is a miniscule fraction; to those veterans, it is not only a matter of quality of life and sometimes survival, it is fundamental fairness.

They were promised. They have earned it. They deserve it. They need it. They ought to have it.

And this measure simply would assure a vote—a vote. We ought to face our responsibilities. Maybe my colleagues, even though 76 of them have cosponsored—that is three quarters of this body—maybe it would still fail for whatever reason. But I would like to take my chances. And I assure my colleague from Mississippi, who I think supports the basic goal from what he has said, that I will continue fighting and working for this measure to pass. I know there is deep and broad support in this body for it, and I look forward to a time when he and I will be on the floor together, both of us, supporting this measure in a vote.

I am not giving up, and I am very hopeful that this cause will continue to be bipartisan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1337

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Extension Act, bipartisan legislation led by my colleagues Senator PETERS and Senator ROUNDS.

For nearly a decade, this law has been one of our most effective tools to protect Americans from cyber attacks. It allows the Department of Homeland Security and its Cyber Infrastructure Security Agency, CISA, to share real-time threat information with the private sector, State and local governments, and critical infrastructure.

When a hospital or water system is hit with ransomware or when a foreign adversary targets one of our Agencies, this law lets CISA warn others before they become the next victims. It is how we connect dots, stop attacks from spreading, and protect Americans in real life.

Just last year, we saw what happens when a single cyber attack can ripple through an entire sector. The ransomware attack on Change Healthcare shut down hospital billing systems across the country, delaying prescriptions and paychecks and patient care for weeks. Imagine if we didn't have the ability to share those threat indicators quickly enough to change that.

But, unfortunately, the law expired on September 30. Right now CISA is operating without its core legal framework for threat sharing, and every day that passes without reauthorization means slower alerts, weaker defenses, and more Americans put in harm's way.

We can't afford for our cyber defenses to be further degraded.

This bill is a simple, bipartisan, 10-year extension of a proven law that protects every American. We should reauthorize it today.

Notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1377 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, the authority already is expired. Every day we delay, our cyber defenders have less information to work with, and Americans are less safe. This isn't a partisan issue. It is about whether the United States can see and stop cyber threats before they are hit.

The experts all agree the program is needed. The only people that benefit from inaction are the hackers who try to exploit our systems.

I urge my colleagues to drop the politics and restore this critical act before any more American businesses or hospitals pay the price for our delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, somewhere off the coast of Venezuela a speed boat

with 11 people on board is blown to smithereens. Vice President Vance announces that ''killing cartel members that poison our fellow citizens is the highest and best use of our military.''

When challenged that killing citizens without due process is a war crime, the Vice President's response was that he ''didn't give a shit.''

Sometimes, in fits of anger, loud voices will say they don't care about the niceties such as due process. They just want to kill bad guys. For a brief moment, all of us share that anger and may even embrace revenge or retribution.

But over 20,000 people are murdered each year in the United States, and somehow we find a way to a dispassionate dispensation of justice that includes legal representation and a trial.

Why? Because sometimes the accused is actually not guilty. Even with the best of care, even with the best of justice, sometimes we find out it is the wrong person.

As passions subside, a civilized people should ask questions. To be clear, the people bombed to smithereens were guilty, right?

If anyone gave a you-know-what about justice, perhaps those in charge of deciding whom to kill might let us know their names, present proof of their guilt, show evidence of their crimes. The administration has maintained that the people that they blew to smithereens were members of a gang, members of Tren de Aragua, and therefore narcoterrorists.

Why? Because we say so.

But certainly, then, if they know that they belong to a particular gang, then someone must surely know their names before they were blown to smithereens. Is it too much to ask to know the names of those we kill before we kill them, to know what evidence exists of their guilt?

At the very least, the government should explain how the gang came to be labeled as ''terrorists.'' How did the people who you say are in a gang, how did they come to be labeled as a ''terrorist''?

U.S. law defines a terrorist as someone who uses premeditated, politically motivated violence against noncombatants.

Show us evidence of that. Show us evidence of their guilt. Show us evidence that they are terrorists, perhaps before we blow people to smithereens.

Since the U.S. policy is now to blow people to smithereens if they are suspected of being in a terrorist gang, then maybe someone should take the time to explain the evidence of their terrorism.

Critics of this whole terrorist-labeling charade, such as Matthew Petti at Reason, explained that, in practice, what we are doing in practice ''means that a 'terrorist' is whoever the executive branch decides to label one.'' You are a terrorist because you are labeled one. You can be killed because you are called a terrorist.

But where in all of this is some sort of evidence that you are guilty of something?

While no law dictates such, once people are labeled as ''terrorists,'' they appear to be no longer eligible for any sort of due process—no, the blow-them-to-smithereens crowd, at this point, will loudly voice their opinion that people in international waters don't deserve due process.

Vice President Vance asserts:

> There are people who are bringing—literal terrorists—who are bringing deadly drugs into our country.

Which, of course, raises the question: Who labeled them as ''terrorists''? And what is the evidence of these specific people who had names before they were blown to smithereens? What is the evidence against them individually? What are their names? What, specifically, shows their membership and guilt? Were they armed at the time they were blown to smithereens?

The blow-them-to-smithereens crowd also conveniently ignores the fact that death is, generally, not the penalty for drug smuggling.

The mindless trolls that occupy much of the internet whine that such questions show weakness or commiseration with drug pushers who are killing our children, a ludicrous assertion to most sentient humans but one I fear that requires a response: International law and norms have always granted due process to individuals on the high seas not actively involved in combat. U.S. maritime law explains in detail the level of force and the escalation of force allowed in the interdiction of drugs. You realize we interdict hundreds of ships off the shore of Miami, off the Pacific coast, and we don't always blow them to smithereens. Why? Because some of them don't actually have drugs on them. Hundreds of ships are stopped daily, yearly. The blow-them-to-smithereens crowd might stop to ponder that a good percentage of these ships that we actually search turn out not to be drug smugglers. Coast Guard statistics show that one in four interdiction finds no drugs.

So far, the administration has admitted to blowing up four boats suspected of drug smuggling. So there is a one-in-four chance, statistically speaking, that one of these boats may not have had any drugs on it. We will never know because they were blown to smithereens. We may never know the names of the people because they were blown to smithereens. We may never know whether they had arms because they were blown to smithereens.

It seems someone should ask, if the U.S. policy is to blow up all suspected ships, should that policy really be extolled as the ''highest and best use of our military?'' What an insult to our military.

Jake Romm puts the dilemma of whom to designate as a terrorist into sharp relief. Jake Romm writes:

> The hollowness and malleability of the term [terrorism] means that it can be applied to groups regardless of their actual conduct and regardless of their actual ideology. It admits only a circular definition . . . that a terrorist is someone who carries out terrorist acts, and a terrorist act is violence carried out by a terrorist. Conversely, if someone is killed, it is because they are a terrorist, because to be a terrorist means to be killable.

It is a circular definition which no one ever bothers to say: Why are they a terrorist? What is their name? What are they guilty of? What have you accused them of?

We say just say: You are a terrorist; therefore, you are killable.

It devolves to madness.

Can you imagine a doctrine in which we just blow up ships off of Miami and say ''whoops'' if they didn't have any drugs on board? Twenty-five percent of the ships that we board currently don't have any drugs on them. It is a mistake. And we allow it because it is a search, and typically it is a voluntary search. But we allow searches. But we don't kill every suspected boat off of Miami suspected of having drugs because 25 percent of them don't have any drugs.

There is a shortage of independent legal scholars who argue that these strikes are legal. Even John Yoo, a former Deputy Assistant Attorney General under George Bush who infamously offered the Bush administration's legal justification for waterboarding, has criticized the administration's justification for the strikes, saying:

> There has to be a line between crime and war. We can't just consider anything that harms the country to be a matter for the military. Because that could potentially include every crime.

John Duffy, a retired Navy captain, eloquently summarizes our current moment:

> A republic that allows its leaders to kill without law, to wage war without strategy, and to deploy troops without limit is a republic in deep peril. Congress will not stop it. The courts will not stop it. That leaves those sworn not to a man, but to the Constitution [to stop this].

Congress must not allow the executive branch to become judge, jury, and executioner.

Often, people will say: What about the Barbary pirates? What about the Barbary pirates? Jefferson went after them; it should be OK.

But Jefferson understood that the Framers' intention was that the President defer offensive war to Congress, to authorization.

So while there was always a justification and still is a justification for violent defensive maneuvers to protect your shipping, there was never an authorization for offensive unless approved.

This is why President Jefferson, when faced with the belligerence of the Barbary pirates in 1801, recognized that he was ''unauthorized by the Constitution'' only with the authorization of Congress ''to go beyond the line of defense.'' Jefferson wanted the authority

to act defensively against the pirates, but he respected the intentional checks placed on the Executive within the Constitution. Only after Congress had passed the Act for the Protection of Commerce and Seamen of the United States Against the Tripolitan Cruisers in February 1802 did he change it from defensive maneuvers to protect the ships to offensive maneuvers.

Our history is prescient. If the Trump administration wants to use military power, they should seek authorization from Congress. There is a difference between war and peace. There is a difference in the rules of engagement. There has to be. Our police don't shoot people on sight. We have a process. Even off of the coast, we have a process.

We have longstanding maritime laws that we obey as well as every other civilized nation in the world obeys. We board ships after announcing who we are and that we are going to board the ship. There is an escalation if there are weapons fired, if there is a reason where the Coast Guard can escalate, but we don't just blow ships to smithereens.

The vote before us today offers every Member of this body an opportunity to reverse the decades-long abdication of this critical responsibility, of leaving this to the executive branch. Our Founding Fathers said Congress shall authorize war. The Executive is not authorized to do this.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution.

TERMINATING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED WITH RESPECT TO ENERGY

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to execute the order of September 17, 2025, with respect to S.J. Res. 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, S.J. Res. 71 is discharged, and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) terminating the national emergency declared with respect to energy.

Under the previous order, the joint resolution was discharged from committee, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be up to 6 hours for debate only, with the time equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to begin a discussion that we will have over the course of the next couple of hours about this Senate joint resolution—a privileged motion pending before the Senate that I filed, together with Senator HEINRICH, to terminate a Presidential declaration of an energy emergency that he issued on his first day in office.

The President took a number of actions on his first day in office, and obviously the one that got the most attention was the fact of his inauguration and the celebrations about that. There were other actions that were taken—the pardon of the January 6 criminal convicts and other pardons of individuals, including one notorious drug trafficker.

But there was also an action that was taken that did not get attention immediately, but I started to pay attention to it a few days after the inauguration. That was President Trump's use of the National Emergencies Act and a related statute known as IEEPA to declare national emergencies in the United States. The IEEPA statute is broadly worded. It allows a President to declare an emergency when there is a significant and unusual challenge to the United States that stems primarily from a source outside the United States' shores.

The President has used the NEA to declare an energy emergency. He has used IEEPA to declare tariffs on virtually every nation in the world.

And he has also used the statute in other ways.

I was puzzled by the President's determination that America, in January of 2025, was in an energy emergency because I went back and checked and found that the United States, at the beginning of the Trump administration, was producing more energy than at any time in the history of the United States. Where is the emergency? We were producing more oil, gas, and coal than at any time in the history of the United States. Where is the emergency?

Even more exciting to me because of its tremendous acceleration, we were producing more alternative energy—low-carbon energy, geothermal, wind, solar—than at any time in the history of the United States.

We have seen this in Virginia. To give you an example, when I came into the Senate, Virginia was deep in the bottom half in this country in solar deployment. Now we are in the top 10. Offshore wind was nowhere in the United States. Now we are nearing completion of an offshore wind farm off the shores of Virginia Beach, VA, and we will be the leaders in the Nation and begin producing components that can help us lead in the world when it comes offshore wind.

So where is the emergency? I look through the President's declaration and can see nothing suggesting that the United States was in an energy emergency. But you declare an emergency for a reason, and the emergency was declared not because there was an emergency but because there was something the President wanted to do. As you read down in the emergency declaration, you found what the President wanted to do was allow a bypass of environmental regulations for energy projects. That is what he wanted to do, and he declared a sham emergency in order to do that.

I found it further interesting as I read—well, what is the definition of energy projects that are getting a bypass around environmental regulations? It was not all energy projects. It was oil and gas and coal but not wind, not solar, not hydropower, not geothermal.

Sometimes, I hear folks say they are for an all-of-the-above energy policy. President Trump is embracing an all-of-the-below energy policy. If it is not a fossil fuel under the Earth, it will not be prioritized by this administration.

That was the President's action on day one. There is an energy emergency, and we need an easy-pass lane for fossil fuel projects, but we are going to make it hard for alternative energy projects.

So I dusted off the statute, IEEPA, and found that a single Senator, even in the minority party, can challenge a Presidential declaration of emergency and be guaranteed a privileged vote on the Senate floor within a set period of time, a prompt vote on a simple majority that cannot be filibustered, and that is what we are doing today.

In fact, you can challenge a Presidential emergency every 6 months. I challenged the President's energy emergency with Senator HEINRICH in March, and it was a partisan vote.

Democrats said: There is no such emergency; it is a sham.

Republicans said: We are sticking with President Trump.

Senator HEINRICH and I issued a warning on the floor in March. We said: You are going to see higher energy costs because of what President Trump is doing, and you are going to see jobs lost because of what President Trump is doing. Energy costs will go up because the cancelation of clean energy projects will constrict the supply of energy at a time when the demand is increasing, and the natural economic reaction when you constrict supply at a time of increasing demand is that people are going to pay more for household energy.

We were not convincing then. Maybe people didn't believe that our prediction would come to pass, but 6 months later, we are renewing the challenge. We are here to say that what we said on the floor last spring has happened, and we are seeing dramatic increases in the price of energy for American consumers and businesses and the slashing of American jobs so that Donald Trump can give an easy pass to the fossil fuel industry.

It took a while for these effects to come to pass, but by the time we got to the debate over the reconciliation bill here in this body in late June and early July, it was pretty clear that the only energy emergency was our President. President Trump is the energy emergency.

We were debating the spending law, the reconciliation bill, and I am just going to go through some of the headlines.

NPR:

Power prices are expected to soar under the new tax cut and spending law.

Why would they soar? Because that tax cut and spending law reduced all

kinds of production and investment tax credits for clean energy projects, making those projects unable to work. Demand is going up. If you constrict supply, prices are going to soar. That was the prediction in July.

Other articles from the same time:

The Trump megabill gives the oil industry everything it wants and ends key support to solar and wind.

Most of the power that has been added to the grid in the United States in the last couple of years has been solar and wind. It is cheap; it is native; it is clean; it is sustainable; it works. It is bringing people's costs down, but Donald Trump's megabill gives the oil industry what it wants by dropping support for solar and wind. That was from CNBC in July.

The story about how this was to benefit Big Oil was revealed earlier in February, shortly after the emergency order went into effect, in The Guardian:

How Trump is targeting wind and solar energy—and delighting big oil.

This was all laid out. There is no emergency other than the President himself. This is nothing but a giveaway to the oil and gas interests.

Shortly after the passage of the reconciliation bill:

EPA plans to end a program that makes solar power available to low-income Americans.

Why don't we punish low-income Americans and make their energy costs go up? Why don't we do that? I mean, it is shameful for that thought to cross your mind, much less for you to do it, but that is what the reconciliation bill and the Trump energy emergency put into motion: punishing low-income Americans by making it more difficult for them to access what is now one of the cheapest forms of energy.

Oh, yes, there was a prediction. We predicted it on the floor in March that electricity prices were going to go up, and then others, when the bill passed, predicted it, but by July 24, it wasn't just a prediction.

Newsweek:

Electricity prices are soaring under Donald Trump.

Inflation is too high because of tariffs and other chaotic economic moves on food, on building supplies, on healthcare, on pharmaceuticals, but the energy inflation is higher now than the general inflation rate because of Donald Trump's policies.

Here is a chart that is one that got some selfish attention from me:

How much Trump's Big Beautiful Bill could raise electricity costs over the next 10 years.

By a State's monthly bills, in Virginia, it is $250 a month. Other States are listed as $480 in Texas and $350 in Iowa. We see the prices already going up. It is happening just as predicted.

In mid-August, The Guardian says:

Trump's tariffs and green energy rollbacks push household electricity bills up by 10 percent.

This is much faster than the core inflation rate, which is going up. So now, energy inflation is outstripping the rest of inflation, and it is particularly hard for low-income households.

Then, finally, just last month, CNN Business:

Trump vowed to halve electricity prices, but they are rising twice as fast as inflation.

Electricity prices—that monthly bill that households pay together with their mortgage or their rent, together with food, together with healthcare—all of these are going up. We have a President who promised, when he ran for office, to deal with the costs of living, the costs to live. What we see is a short attention span focusing on sending troops into American cities and on political prosecutions and on the firing of career prosecutors in Virginia and all kinds of distractions. And the thing he promised the American public he would do—bring down costs—he is not doing.

The only energy emergency in the United States today is Donald Trump, and that is why I am pressing the Senate to vote. Do you want to listen to your constituents? Do you want to decrease energy costs? Do you want to give constituents the ability to have energy that is less costly and that is also cleaner or do you want to just do what Donald Trump says and embrace a sham energy emergency to give an easy pass lane to oil and gas to bypass environmental regulations?

This timing today is bad and good. It is propitious or disastrous. Last night, the administration announced that they were canceling billions and billions of dollars of clean energy projects all over this country in every State—in Virginia, in Missouri—all over the Nation: billions of dollars of projects that hire people, thousands of jobs lost. The projects that are being canceled are going to continue this trend of—at a time of great demand and growth—data centers and all kinds of uses for AI that, through searches, require more energy than what we were doing a couple of years ago.

That demand is growing. In Virginia, we see it all the time, especially with a profusion of data centers. As the demand is growing, if we are cutting off energy projects and constricting supply, we are only going to accelerate the increases.

President Trump has canceled 20 energy projects in Virginia since he became President: an offshore wind staging project in Portsmouth, an offshore wind logistics project in Norfolk, a project dealing with electric vehicles in southwest Virginia, an electric vehicle infrastructure apprenticeship program and workforce training program in Northern Virginia—20 projects.

Here is one in Appalachia, VA: a project that would be implemented by the Virginia Department of Energy, which is part of the Virginia State government. We currently have a Republican Governor. This is an allocation of grant funds to the Youngkin administration's Virginia Department of Energy so they can do carbon capture and storage.

This is a way to take current coal technologies and make them cleaner and more useful—canceled; enhancing energy resilience—canceled; hydrogen deployment—canceled; reducing data center load impacts—canceled; methane reduction—canceled; other projects to do carbon capture and storage—canceled.

The President has canceled 20 projects just in Virginia, totaling $540 million, and costing us thousands of jobs, including jobs in some very important parts of the State that have struggled with unemployment, like Appalachia.

Many of these projects were announced by our Governor. Our Republican Governor announced these projects with pride—economic development and manufacturing in some hard-hit parts of Virginia—because of tax credits that are available to American innovators so that we not only do the right thing by the Virginia economy but lead the world in the development of innovative and clean energy technology. This was canceled by Donald Trump.

So the prediction—and I make predictions that turn out not to be true. I do have to acknowledge that. I have often made predictions that have turned out not to be true. But on the floor of this body 6 months ago, I said, if this energy emergency is not terminated, we will see energy prices spike, and we will see American jobs lost. I get it that sometimes people might not want to vote on a bill based on a prediction. I could be wrong. It is happening, and it is not just happening in Virginia. It is happening in every State in this country, with energy inflation up and jobs being lost.

We can end it here. That is why the privileged motion is available to even a single Senator. The privileged motions—and there are many different kinds of privileged motions. In fact, we will be arguing about another one later tonight dealing with Presidential war powers. All privileged motions kind of fit into the ZIP Code of enabling a Senator to challenge potential overreach by the Executive. They are very much, kind of, in the framework of the checks and balances. Executives have power, but the legislature should have power as well, and the legislature should have the ability to challenge overreach by an Executive.

In this instance, the declaration of an energy emergency, when we are producing more energy than we ever have in our history, as a way to give oil and gas an easy pass lane to avoid environmental regulation is making our environment worse, our costs higher, and our economy weaker.

So, when we finish this debate on the floor tonight, I will ask my colleagues to support the resolution to terminate this fake emergency and restore to American consumers the ability to afford their energy costs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, we are down here telling the Trump administration that their energy emergency, as they call it, is the emergency for our country. Trump, Secretary Chris Wright—this whole administration is using emergency authorities to make up a crisis that is resulting in our electric bills going sky high all across our country, and our clean energy jobs are going up in smoke. This energy emergency is just fossil fuel gaslighting of the American people.

Since Trump took office, electricity prices have gone up more than 10 percent—twice as fast as general inflation, which also remains historically high thanks to the Trump administration running our economy into the ground. Their tariffs and their healthcare policies are leading to higher prices—the price of food, the price of clothing, the price of electricity—because of the Trump policies.

So why is this happening? For starters, Trump and the Republicans are failing Econ 101. On the demand side, Big Tech is demanding big amounts of electricity for its data centers. Data centers are projected to demand up to 130,000 megawatts of electricity load by 2030—as much electricity as is used by more than 100 million American homes. Do you want to hear that again? This is all going to happen in the blink of an eye. They are going to be consuming as much electricity as 100 million homes in our country.

On the supply side, well, Trump is cutting off our cheapest and quickest-to-deploy sources of energy that can meet this demand. Trump's sham energy emergency pushes fossil fuels as the solution, but those fossil fuels are polluting, they are pricey, and they are getting pushed abroad to the highest bidder as exports. These fossil fuel exports actually increase energy costs here for Americans. This is what Senator KAINE has been talking about, trying to raise the profile of these issues.

Last week, the Trump administration announced that they are killing nearly $8 billion in grants for grid development and energy innovation, targeting States that did not vote for Donald Trump in 2024. This week, rumors have been swirling about the impending cancelation of tens of billions of additional energy grant dollars that would be out there trying to create more electricity, more energy here in the United States. These lawless terminations hamstring American competitors, drive up energy costs, and hurt domestic manufacturing.

But this is nothing new for this chaos administration, which has already prevented hundreds of thousands of clean energy megawatts from getting onto the grid. That is more than $42 billion in private sector clean energy projects and 80,000 clean energy jobs already wiped out by Donald Trump in the first 9 months of his administration.

Wright, Vought, Burgum, Trump—it is a fossil fuel cabal. It is not a Cabinet; it is a cartel that is now running the United States of America right out of the Oval Office, killing all of the new energy sources that we need from wind and solar, from batteries, all-electric vehicles—this incredible transformation that was taking place in our country that they are now just trying to completely and totally kill.

Republicans' ''Big Ugly Bill,'' which eliminated programs working to lower household costs and get clean energy built, is expected to cause wholesale electricity prices to rise by 74 percent over the next 10 years—that is just in one bill—while keeping 350,000 megawatts of wind and solar off the grid over the next 10 years.

Just think about that. There are massive amounts of wind and solar all lined up, ready to get on to the wires that go up and down the streets of our country—the grid—and what the Republicans are doing is saying: We are killing it all.

Of course, if you don't have all of that extra electricity and AI consumes all of the remaining electricity, guess who is going to pick up the tab? It is going to be residential homeowners. It is going to be small businesses. They will have to pay much higher rates for the remaining electricity. There will be a bidding war for the remaining electricity in our country. Each individual family cannot compete against these big AI companies. So the ''Big Ugly Bill'' is going to mean a lot of big ugly bills arriving in mailboxes for pretty much every American over the next 10 years for their dramatically skyrocketed electricity.

Their crazed push to produce more fossil fuels, whether by cutting pollution regulation, selling off our public lands, keeping retiring coal plants online, will cost Americans billions more. We will see blackouts and we will see bigger bills because Trump and the Republicans want bigger profits for their fossil fuel buddies—buddies who contributed to Trump's campaign and have gotten paid out big time in return, with more than $4 billion in brandnew handouts from the government this year alone.

Let's call Trump's energy agenda what it really is: oil above all, not all of the above.

Trump's energy agenda is killing American energy, especially the most affordable and the most ready-to-go energy out there because—here are the facts: Last year in the United States, 94 percent of all new electrical generation capacity was wind and solar and batteries. Let me say that again so everyone can hear it. Last year, 94 percent of all new electricity came from wind and solar and batteries.

You wouldn't know that if you listened to the White House. You wouldn't know that if you listened to the Department of Energy or the EPA because they are just lying about it. They are just flat-out lying about the role that wind and solar can play in our system because they are over here just doing the bidding of the natural gas and the coal industry. That is who they are.

They are looking at the future in a rearview mirror while young people are looking to the future. Young people want to have this renewable energy revolution unleashed for their century, for the 21st century.

Solar panels today cost 1 percent of what they cost just 30 years ago—1 percent. That is how much it has dropped. Crazy.

They say it is not working, in the White House. What is happening to them? It is working too well. The oil, gas, and coal industry—they are afraid of the future competition that comes from the technologies of this younger generation in our country. They can smell it coming, that their future is in the rearview mirror. That is what this whole thing is all about.

There is a way of now producing solar energy. Even solar plus storage is cheaper than running any coal-burning plant in the United States of America. But you wouldn't know that from listening to Donald Trump, when he says: I love coal. I love clean coal.

Well, young people love clean solar, clean wind. It is cheaper, and it doesn't lead to asthma, it doesn't lead to lung cancer, and it doesn't lead to genetic damage that can hurt future generations of those families who are nearby those coal-burning plants.

Trump and Republicans have taken aim at renewables because they are just plain scared. Even with all the subsidies that Big Oil and Big Gas get from our government, renewables are winning on the market.

Trump is doing his fossil fuel donors' dirty work and keeping American-made competition off of the grid. These are Trump energy taxes on the American people.

So let's shine a spotlight on this fossil fuel gaslighting. Trump's declaration is the energy emergency. Trump's declaration is the energy emergency. He is stopping the future from arriving. He is stopping this generation from deriving the benefits of a revolution that can be led by the United States and then spread around the world—a solar revolution, a wind revolution, a renewables revolution.

We should be the leaders, so let's end his sham declaration so we can get lower bills, not raise barriers to affordable, American-made, clean energy.

I urge my colleagues to enthusiastically support Senator KAINE and Senator HEINRICH's resolution. This is a critical debate. This goes to, yes, the prices for electricity for all American families, all American small businesses, but it also goes to the future of our planet.

Are we going to reduce the greenhouse gases we are sending up? Are we going to recognize that we have a generational responsibility to be the leader? Because the planet is running a

fever, and there are no emergency rooms for planets. We have to engage in preventive care. That is what the wind and solar and battery storage technologies all represent. They represent that future—a healthier future, a safer future for all generations of all children in all countries of the world. The United States should be the leader and not the lagger.

I thank you, Senator KAINE, and I thank you, Senator HEINRICH, for bringing this resolution onto the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, shortly, the Senate will vote on an important resolution put forward by our colleague and friend Senator KAINE on the topic of U.S. energy production.

As my colleagues know, Senator SCHUMER and I led the development of the clean energy tax credits, which set in motion the possibility of hundreds of billions of dollars of investment in clean energy and, particularly, a policy that would keep prices down and keep good jobs up. It had policies and ideas in it like technological neutrality that created an opportunity for good science to reign and create incentives for development.

Donald Trump came into office huffing and puffing because he didn't like that. He didn't like that kind of energy dominance based on consumer choice and marketplace forces.

He said our economic problems would go away with one thing: ''Drill, baby, drill.'' Here is the reality. Like so much of his agenda, it doesn't add up, and everything he does is rooted in a sweetheart deal for his wealthy contributors.

Back in February, he signed the Executive order declaring an energy emergency. That is the subject of today's floor action. The emergency declaration has nothing to do with energy dominance, but it has everything to do with giveaways for Big Oil. Donald Trump is looking out for the same oil and gas companies that he solicited for big checks for years and years. His offer to them was: Give me your money. Get me elected. I will let your companies run the show.

I will give you this: Donald Trump kept his promise to Big Oil. He has gutted American energy production, ceded ground to China on the clean energy arms race, and rigged the system. There is no technological neutrality, Senator KAINE. It is all about fossil fuels, to the exclusion of everything else.

After declaring this energy emergency, Donald Trump and Republicans took a wrecking ball to American energy production by gutting the tax credits for wind and solar energy in their budget bill. I was struck, as we were making the decisions, when natural gas leaders came and essentially told the Energy Committee, which at one point I chaired: Look, we are for natural gas, but with AI and all the energy needs for growth, we need solar and wind.

These are the gas people. They are not repudiating gas. They said: We need more energy.

My guiding principle has been crafting that legislation—that legislation that took, really, a decade to put together. After cap and trade went down, it was all about the need to create good-paying jobs and secure a clean energy future—and that those two are not mutually exclusive; you can have both. They go hand in hand.

The tax credits helped to kick off a manufacturing boom in America—as I mentioned, hundreds of billions of dollars, not through government but through the private sector—hundreds of thousands of jobs. New factories went up around the country. Battery technology, clean vehicles, energy-efficient products for businesses and homeowners—it was already bringing down energy costs for consumers.

In terms of the global arms race for clean energy jobs and investment, the United States went from the middle of the pack, under our efforts, to the front basically overnight—until, at Trump's direction, Republicans destroyed all of that. All of that progress was destroyed, at the first opportunity, by Donald Trump. Why? To pay for more tax cuts for corporations and his wealthy friends.

When Republicans were gearing up to pass a reconciliation bill, I said this would be a bloodbath for clean energy. Fast-forward 3 months: Manufacturing projects are being canceled, jobs are being lost, and utility bills are going up. Their budget bill was a wrecking ball for clean energy, and those workers are going to lose their jobs as a direct result.

Last week, the administration announced plans to cancel over $7 billion in funding for clean energy. Almost every one of those projects was located, as Senator KAINE and I have talked about, in a blue State. Oregon alone had over $400 million in funding canceled.

Are the Republicans stopping there? No way. They have derailed management of our public lands, and now they want to do it to prop up coal. Oregonians see this for what it is—a gobsmacking attempt to hurt American families just to score points with campaign folks they have been close to.

Now, the United States is barreling toward a self-inflicted energy crisis manufactured entirely by Republicans. Energy demand is skyrocketing. Utility bills are rising. Keeping costs low and meeting demand is going to require an all-of-the-above approach based on technological neutrality. Instead, Republicans are focused on giveaways to billionaires—Americans' bank accounts be damned.

It is as clear as our beautiful Crater Lake at home that all the talk from Trump and Republicans about American energy dominance never was going to be a reality. It was just a hollow campaign slogan. The Republican energy agenda is a level of economic self-sabotage that leaves you slack-jawed: How can you make such an unforced error?

It is going to take a huge toll on the economy. Our people thought they were voting for cheaper groceries, utilities, gas, and good-paying jobs and haven't gotten much of any of that. They didn't vote for an energy crisis that benefits nobody except big oil investors.

So beginning, colleagues, with Senator KAINE's resolution, the Senate now has an opportunity, a chance to go to innovation and modernization and bring an end to Trump's manufactured energy crisis. This is a chance for the Senate to use innovation to fight for lower prices, more jobs, and greater energy security, while Donald Trump stands in contrast trying to undermine all that.

I urge my colleagues, when we vote, to strongly support Senator KAINE's resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to deliver two statements on the two resolutions that are before us. First let me comment upon the proposal S.J. Res. 71, led by my colleagues Senator KAINE and HEINRICH, to overturn President Trump's sham energy emergency.

You would think that, in an energy emergency, the President would be pursuing the all-of-the-above energy policy his administration has touted, but instead he is throwing up roadblocks at more than 90 percent of the power set to come online, as his Energy Secretary has acknowledged. Meanwhile, President Trump has invoked emergency powers to fast-track dirty fossil fuel projects, primarily to reward the Big Oil donors whom he reportedly asked to donate a billion dollars to his campaign.

The fact is, energy prices are a real emergency for the American people, and we need more energy on the grid to keep up with the proliferation of AI and data centers. But the truth also is, President Trump and the harmful actions his administration is taking are actually restricting supply, killing good-paying jobs, and increasing energy prices, which have risen at more than twice the rate of inflation this year under President Trump.

I will highlight two examples of President Trump's reckless actions in my home State of Rhode Island. Right now, the Rhode Island AFL–CIO is leading a critical lawsuit against President Trump's cancelation of the $7 billion Solar for All Program, which was designed to help low- and middle-income families install solar panels on their homes, saving those families about $400 each year on electricity costs.

Rhode Island received nearly $50 million under this program to help thousands of Rhode Island households install and utilize solar energy while supporting hundreds of good-paying jobs in the State.

President Trump claims to support workers, but he is actually killing good jobs that would bring affordable energy online for our constituents. And just weeks after canceling the Solar for All Program, the Trump administration paused work on Revolution Wind, a nearly complete offshore wind project off the coast of Rhode Island. This project is 80 percent constructed, with over $5 billion invested and 45 turbines already installed in the Atlantic Ocean. It supports more than 1,000 local union jobs and is poised to deliver enough low-cost energy to power 350,000 homes in Rhode Island and Connecticut. State officials estimate that losing this project could cost New England ratepayers up to $500 million a year.

I am encouraged that a Federal court in Washington, DC, granted a motion allowing work on Revolution Wind to proceed and that work has restarted, but these cynical moves show that the President doesn't really care about energy prices or supply or jobs; he cares, really, about pleasing his Big Oil donors.

He is also pleasing China, which is becoming the global leader in clean energy technology, building almost three-quarters of the world's solar and wind projects, according to the Global Energy Monitor. And despite President Trump's claims that China is simply exporting these technologies and not utilizing them, the New York Times reported that ''In China, more wind turbines and solar panels were installed last year than in the rest of the world combined.''

At the same time, President Trump is trying to keep the United States hooked on expensive oil and gas and dependent on OPEC and other foreign actors with interests opposed to our own; and while he is doing that, China is launching into a new age of relatively cheap energy that will power their data centers and their infrastructure.

Rhode Islanders deserve infrastructure that creates good jobs; provides affordable, clean power; increases our energy independence; and reduces climate-destroying greenhouse gases in the process. And it is clear Trump's energy emergency is a sham, and I am proud to join my colleagues' efforts to overturn it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, particularly in his remarks on the Executive order that Donald Trump issued on Inauguration Day to declare a nonexistent energy emergency. And I join him in support of S.J. Res. 71 to terminate that Executive order.

Let's be very clear. The only real energy emergency that we have in this country is Donald Trump. Since that day of his inauguration, he has used that Executive order to actually create an emergency. This administration's actions are raising prices, killing jobs, and undermining America's global competitiveness.

Now, we have a lot of evidence—and I will be mentioning some of it—but the most recent is from the International Energy Agency, which has slashed its forecasts for renewable energy capacity growth in the United States this decade, citing the early phaseout of the Federal tax incentives and regulatory shifts under this administration.

Mr. President, I ask that the Wall Street Journal article titled ''IEA Cuts U.S. Renewable Energy Growth Outlook on Trump Policies'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 7, 2025]

IEA CUTS U.S. RENEWABLE ENERGY GROWTH OUTLOOK ON TRUMP POLICIES

(By Giulia Petroni)

The International Energy Agency slashed its forecast for renewable energy capacity growth in the U.S. this decade, citing the early phase-out of federal tax incentives and regulatory shifts under the Trump administration.

The West's energy watchdog now expects the U.S. to add nearly 250 gigawatts of new capacity by 2030—down by almost 50% from last year's projections—as a result of fresh import restrictions, the suspension of new offshore wind leasing and a crackdown on permitting for onshore wind and solar projects on federal land.

President Trump has vowed to boost the oil-and-gas industry, in part by cutting support for renewable-energy and emissions-reduction initiatives. A key factor in the U.S. downgrade was the ''One Big Beautiful Bill Act,'' the IEA said, which has accelerated the phase out of tax credits and imposed new construction-start requirements for wind and solar PV projects.

''With the pushing forward of deadlines, renewable capacity additions are now projected to peak in 2027, then decline in 2028 and remain stable through 2030,'' the agency said. ''After this period, renewable power growth will rely largely on state-driven renewable portfolio or clean energy standards and corporate PPAs [power purchase agreements], rather than federal incentives.''

China's shift from a fixed tariff system to an auction-based model is also impacting project economics and dampening growth expectations. Previously, wind and solar projects benefited from guaranteed long-term revenues tied to fixed tariffs, while now projects are awarded contracts based on competitive bids, with payments tied to market conditions.

Despite these shifts, Beijing continues to dominate the global renewable landscape, accounting for nearly 60% of capacity growth. The country is on track to meet its 2035 solar and wind power targets five years ahead of schedule, the IEA said.

The downgrade is partly offset by more optimistic outlooks for other regions, particularly India and Europe. According to the agency, New Delhi will become the second-largest growth market after China, with capacity set to increase by 2.5 times in five years on higher auction volumes, faster hydropower permitting and a surge in rooftop solar installations.

Globally, the IEA revised its renewable capacity growth forecast down by 5%, but said it still expects capacity to double between now and 2030, increasing by 4,600 gigawatts. That is roughly the equivalent of the combined power generation capacity of China, the European Union and Japan.

Solar power is set to account for nearly 80% of the global increase due to its low costs and faster permitting processes.

''In addition to growth in established markets, solar is set to surge in economies such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and several Southeast Asian countries,'' Executive Director Fatih Birol said. ''As renewables' role in electricity systems rises in many countries, policymakers need to pay close attention to supply chain security and grid integration challenges.''

The report came as clean-energy think tank Ember said renewable energy generated more electricity than coal in the first half of the year for the first time on record.

Offshore wind, however, is a weak spot in the IEA's forecast, with its growth outlook about a quarter lower than last year due to permitting delays, supply chain bottlenecks and rising costs.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, it says:

The West's energy watchdog now expects the [United States] to add nearly 250 gigawatts of new capacity by 2030—down almost 50% from last year's projections—as a result of fresh import restrictions, the suspension of new offshore wind leasing and a crackdown on permitting for onshore wind and solar projects on Federal land.

So let us now turn to one of those onshore—or, in this case, offshore—energy projects: Revolution Wind, just one example of the reckless energy policies that the Trump administration has implemented.

Let's be very clear. When President Trump came into office, America was producing more energy than at any point in our country's history. Last year, the United States added 49 gigawatts of new capacity to the grid, and 95 percent of that new capacity was solar, batteries, nuclear, and wind power.

Yet this administration has launched an all-out assault on these lower cost, less polluting sources of energy.

President Trump promised to lower energy prices for Americans ''in half.'' Now, across the country, electricity prices have jumped more than twice as fast as the overall cost of living. And part of that progress before Inauguration Day for Donald Trump and the emergency energy Executive order was Revolution Wind—now, 80 percent complete.

It is an offshore wind project, off of the coast of both Connecticut and Rhode Island, which is why my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED, mentioned it so prominently in his remarks.

The fact is, Revolution Wind is fully permitted. The project was on track to deliver 704 megawatts of power beginning in 2026—that is next year—powering 350,000 homes, a project well underway before the Trumped-up energy emergency.

Forty-five of the planned 65 wind turbines were already installed when the Trump administration, just months ago in late August, issued a stop work order, grinding this project to nearly a complete halt—men and women on the job in New London, offshore, onshore, stopped from going to work, out of jobs; investors, construction companies, supply chain suppliers, all of them grinding to a nearly complete halt.

The Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection has found that canceling Revolution Wind would cost taxpayers half a billion dollars a year. Let's be clear—half a billion dollars a year to Connecticut and Rhode Island ratepayers every year.

The project has a 20-year contract at 9 cents per kilowatt an hour—less than half of today's regional price. Connecticut families are already facing surging energy costs. Our electricity bills are among the highest in the Nation. Blocking Revolution Wind undermines efforts to make energy more affordable. It undercuts our work to lower prices for consumers, locking in higher bills for decades and impacting, as well, jobs.

Revolution Wind is providing thousands of jobs in Connecticut and Rhode Island. More than a thousand local union workers have already logged more than 2 million hours on the project. The stop work order put hundreds of these workers on the sideline, and I was proud to stand with a number of them at the Connecticut State Pier to support the offshore wind industry.

Let me thank them and thank the unions that were there. The unions were compelling and powerful, and they are representing their workers. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested into that State pier to support the offshore wind industry.

So the Revolution Wind cancellation threatens our economy, jobs, and, most immediately, affordability for everyday Americans, most particularly in Connecticut and Rhode Island.

But it is not just Connecticut that has benefitted from Revolution Wind. The supply chain for this project stretches across the country, in red States and blue States. The construction of the first American-made offshore wind vessel provided hundreds of jobs. Where? In Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi. Steel for the project was sourced in Texas, Alabama, North Carolina, and West Virginia. Offshore wind components were sourced and manufactured in Kansas and South Carolina.

Just as our military construction and manufacturing often is sourced throughout the United States, in this case, all of America is helping to build Revolution Wind.

And what is most galling about the administration's actions on Revolution Wind is they defy logic. Eighty percent complete, all of it permitted, reviewed by the Department of Defense for national security, as well as every other Federal Agency that had anything to do with it, any say at all, approved.

And yet in the eleventh hour, the administration swooped down with a stop work order, citing ''national security concerns.'' And that is it—national security concerns.

Well, that phrase is not a pass for everything the Federal Government wants to do, and so I demanded to know what they were, to be provided with information in a classified briefing, if necessary. I demanded it in a letter. I have yet to receive a satisfactory response. In fact, those concerns collapse under even the slightest scrutiny.

A Department of Defense letter, last year, confirmed, and I quote DOD here, ''construction of the Revolution Wind project . . . would not have adverse impacts to DOD missions.'' No adverse impacts.

So the idea that somehow it might interfere with the movement of submarines from the Groton sub base or maybe testing of submarines by electric boat or some other national security or national defense need, no adverse impact to DOD mission.

So these national security concerns, quite clearly and outrageously, were just a pretext, a flimsy excuse to continue this administration's all-out assault on offshore wind. The President said he doesn't like it. He has got something in for it. There is an animus. Who knows what the reason is.

But, thankfully, there is the law. Yes, a Federal judge saw the administration's stop work order for what it was:

[T]he height of arbitrary and capricious.

Now, Federal judges do not often say that actions by the President of the United States are ''the height of arbitrary and capricious,'' nor do they lightly issue a preliminary injunction against that kind of stop work order, but this judge did. And it was based on the fact and the law, so work was allowed to resume on Revolution Wind.

But let's be very clear, a lot of the harm was done. Work was stopped for almost a month, with workers sidelined and progress halted to the tune of millions and millions of dollars, not the way for the United States to do business, not the way for the United States of America to advance economic growth or provide jobs or, equally important, make energy more affordable.

If this administration can derail a fully approved energy project, whether it is natural gas pipelines or offshore wind farms, why would any developer—why would anyone invest in the United States?

The credibility of the United States as a place to do business craters when projects can be derailed by the personal whim of a President, lawlessly and recklessly, as was done here because this President doesn't like wind power.

On the first day of the government shutdown, the Department of Energy canceled nearly $8 billion in clean energy funding for the whole country. It included $53 million for 12 projects in Connecticut supporting lower energy prices, grid reliability, and American energy independence.

It was done in a way that was as illogical, chaotic, and likely illegal as canceling Revolution Wind was. Again, a self-inflicted wound in every way by this President, and that is why he is the energy emergency. He created it in just months, not even a year. He declared it on his first day in office when there was no energy emergency.

He is denying funding for innovative, promising projects. He is stopping nearly complete offshore wind projects. He is creating chaos. It makes America weaker.

And so I urge my colleagues to vote to end the Trump energy emergency and recommit to finding real solutions to lowering energy costs for consumers and supporting American energy.

And I will just close with, again, referring to the Wall Street Journal's report of today on the International Energy Agency's conclusion about how our capacity for renewable energy will be cut by 50 percent as a result of Trump administration action.

Despite these shifts, Beijing continues to dominate the global renewable landscape, accounting for nearly 60% of capacity growth. The country is on track to meet its 2035 solar and wind power targets five years ahead of schedule.

And we wonder why we are in danger of losing competitive advantage to China, not because we lack the resources or the innovators or the workers. It is a failure of leadership, and it begins in the White House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I have come to the Senate floor today to say what every New Mexican I know can easily tell you: Americans are reeling from an affordability crisis. It doesn't matter if you are talking about the price of groceries or rent or healthcare, everybody is stretched thin.

They need help and they need it now and they need it from Congress and the President. But help is not what the President and his administration are delivering. Instead of working to lower healthcare and energy costs for American families, the President, his administration, and Republicans in Congress are choosing to drive those costs through the roof.

They repeal energy tax credits making it harder and more expensive to build and deliver energy to the grid or even just to put solar panels on your own roof. They made it more expensive to make your home energy efficient. They imposed steep tariffs on steel and aluminum, driving up energy costs, infrastructure costs, and they are blocking energy from coming onto the grid.

Now, if it feels chaotic, it is probably because it is. They are trying to sow chaos. While all of the numbers and

projects and policies float around in the headlines, the real story, the real impact is in your budget. It is in your electric bill.

According to the Energy Information Administration, residential electricity bills have already increased by almost 10 percent since President Trump took office. Household energy costs are expected to increase by another $170 annually by 2035 thanks to tax credit repeals and tariffs.

And when it comes to the impacts on energy supply, it is the same story. As of August, clean power estimated that 25,000 megawatts—that is like 25 gigawatts, it is 25 nuclear powerplants' worth of energy—25,000 megawatts of planned energy generation have been lost to projects being canceled or delayed since the President's election.

That is more than enough power for 8.4 million homes in the United States. And I have bad news: It is about to get a whole lot worse. That is because President Trump is strangling the energy supply we badly need to drive down costs for everyone.

From canceling energy projects to withholding energy permits, to issuing illegal stop work orders on fully permitted generation projects, President Trump is waging a war on affordable, American-made energy. Most recently, that came in the form of canceled energy projects. Last week, the Trump administration unlawfully canceled nearly $8 billion in Federal investments in 223 energy projects across 21 States, including 10 in the State of New Mexico.

In Albuquerque, two projects by the same company were targeted. They have already had to make their first round of layoffs. If these awards are not restored in the next 45 days, they will be forced to lay off 50 percent of their workforce. These are people's lives we are talking about.

And their local partners and collaborators who were anticipating growth opportunities because of the investment are being left in the cold. In Socorro, NM, one technical university lost funding for four projects—$67 million in total. One project alone will impact 36 student researchers, all of whom now have to search for new funding or lose their research roles altogether.

In Fruitland, NM, another canceled project could have unlocked the key to keeping 600 people working. In Taos, NM, more chaos is playing out. Funding for Kit Carson Electric Cooperative's project to provide a battery energy storage system and microgrids to rural communities, canceled.

This project would have directly improved reliability in Picuris Pueblo, the Taos Ski Valley, and El Rito West. Millions of dollars have already been expended, and countless New Mexicans were depending on that project. Now they are all left wondering whether those funds will ever be reimbursed or if New Mexicans will simply be left to pay the price and pick up the pieces.

But it looks like cancellations may just be getting started. This morning there was another article about rumors of even more cancellations coming.

According to reports, this next round of cancellations could involve another 260 awards and $13 billion in revoked funds. Whether that happens or not, I can tell you, without a doubt, that the harm done from the first round will be irreparable.

The cancellations will mean lost jobs for Americans, lost educational opportunities for students. It will mean higher energy bills for households and businesses across this country.

It will make it even harder for folks who are already struggling to make ends meet because of the affordability crisis instigated by this administration's tariffs and economic policies.

It will mean less domestic manufacturing and innovation, all while diminishing America's competitive leadership globally, and it will make it harder for impacted developers and utilities to secure their financing.

That is not just true for the now-canceled projects but also for any future opportunities that depend on the stability of things like government permits and regulatory structure, investments, grants because that is another casualty of this administration's war on American-made affordable energy: the reliability of the permitting process.

In January, on his first day in office, President Trump paused all new leasing and permitting of wind energy projects on public lands.

In February, the Army Corps of Engineers singled out and delayed 168 energy projects on private land.

In March, the Environmental Protection Agency withdrew the permit for Atlantic Shores Offshore Wind.

In April, the Department of the Interior imposed a stop-work order on the Empire Wind 1 project.

In July, the Interior Department released a directive requiring the Secretary's personal review and approval of every wind and solar energy project on public lands—a move that will undoubtedly cause long delays.

In August, the Department of the Interior issued an illegal stop-work order on Revolution Wind's offshore wind project—a project that was already 80 percent done. It was fully permitted, and it was 80 percent complete, and they told people to go home. They said: Your job doesn't matter.

In September, the Trump administration asked a court to cancel the permit on a wind farm off of Ocean City, MD. It is a project that would generate 2.2 gigawatts of energy—enough to power 718,000 homes and, just as importantly, support almost 2,700 jobs every year over the next 7 years.

That is just among the ones that have actually been in the news. I have heard from companies across the Nation about delays and difficulties getting their projects permitted.

So let's be clear. Spending your time canceling ready-to-go energy projects isn't doing anything to address the energy crisis.

Instead of fixing any of this, President Trump's Executive order makes it worse. Here is what his order actually does: hikes energy costs for millions of Americans by doubling down on expensive fossil fuels when it makes no economic sense, sends hundreds of thousands of American jobs overseas as other countries continue to develop their next-generation energy sources, decreases our American-made domestic energy supplies, forces us to be more reliant on foreign energy sources, and erodes our economic competitiveness and energy dominance.

It does not have to be this way. The last time we faced an energy crisis in the United States, it was the 1970s. Energy prices were skyrocketing because of the 1973 oil crisis, when barrels of oil—then, our most in-demand energy source—quadrupled in price. U.S. energy production could not meet domestic demand, and the country saw blackouts and brownouts.

With an energy crisis on its hands, Congress actually acted. In a bipartisan effort, Congress created the Department of Energy. It funded significant research around the country to explore new ways to power things—solar, geothermal, nuclear—including the Energy Research and Development Administration. It worked on advancing transmission systems to create more competitive energy markets, saving money for everyone.

Congress met the moment and defined our energy future for decades to come. As part of that, in 1976, construction began on a 5-megawatt thermal solar test facility at the Energy Research and Development Administration's Sandia Laboratories in Albuquerque, NM. Before it was even complete, the facility became the largest operational solar installation in the world. This solar test facility was just one small example of the huge bipartisan effort to meet that moment.

Today, we are at a similar crossroads. Demand for new technology has once again outpaced available power reserves. Infrastructure is aging. Across the country, utility prices are rising as demand for energy rises too.

Again, Congress can meet this moment. We cannot do that by doubling down on expensive fossil energy or generation sources that take 5, 6, 7, even 10 years to build. If you order a gas turbine today, it would take you 5 to 7 years just to receive it, and its price is going through the roof because of the tariffs that the President has put on things like aluminum and steel. That is not going to solve the rising costs we are dealing with right now.

In contrast, solar, wind, and battery are modular, faster to permit, and easier to construct with fewer supply chain restraints. That is especially true when they are—or were—already permitted, with shovels in the ground, workers ready to build.

Instead of accepting this reality, President Trump and congressional Republicans are flailing, and it is leaving everyday Americans to shoulder the costs.

By eliminating energy sources instead of adding more, this administration is raising your energy prices, raising your electricity bill, not lowering it. The impacts are real, and they are far-reaching.

For many households, the choice to pay hundreds more in energy costs means the choice to not pay for other things—groceries, doctor's bills, school supplies. That is not a choice you should have to make. You shouldn't be a pawn in President Trump's political games.

Senator KAINE and I introduced S.J. Res. 71 to put an end to Trump's war on American-made, affordable energy, to bring down costs for American families, to save jobs that American families rely on, and to call out this administration for its chaos and its incompetence and the fact that it doesn't seem to care about the impacts on everyday Americans.

So I call on all of my colleagues here in the Senate to join us. Vote yes on S.J. Res. 71. Do not make American families pay the price for Trump's war on affordable American energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about President Trump's completely fake energy emergency, which is nothing more than a pretext to move money from the pockets of Americans to his big fossil fuel mega donors.

You may remember that he had a meeting with big fossil fuel donors and asked for a billion dollars in campaign money in return for giving them whatever they want. Well, I don't know that he got a billion, but he got hundreds of millions, and, sure enough, he is giving them everything they want.

But the side effect of the fossil fuel industry having ownership and control over the Trump administration and all of its policies and decisions is that people's electricity rates are going to go up. They are already going up, and they are going to go up more.

This graph shows how voters are feeling about electricity prices, and it says most voters are feeling some pain from electricity prices.

This is already. It is going to get worse. Already, 26 percent of Americans say it has a lot of impact on their lives; 31 percent say a decent amount of impact on their lives; another 30, a little bit. Only 9 percent say: None at all. It is cool. Electric prices are good with me.

So that is a pretty big hit.

Even among Republicans, 25 percent say it hits them a lot, 29 percent say it hits them a decent amount, and 32 percent say it hits them a little bit. Only 11 percent say: None at all. Electric prices are cool.

So electric prices are going up, and they are going up big time, and they are going up for deliberate reasons.

The one deliberate reason has to do with the AI, crypto, tech bros data centers problem.

As you know, the data center crypto people gave a lot of money to Donald Trump. They are big political donors. They are getting pretty much everything they want from this administration. In return, they are making the Trump family hugely rich in crypto billions. But in the meantime, they are driving people's electric prices up.

They are doing so this way. This is an interesting graph. This shows places where electric bills are going down. Blue means the prices are going down. And what is measured here is how far away you are from a data center.

So here is 0 to about 25 miles away from a data center. So if you live between 0 and 25 miles from a data center, if you are in the range of the electric utility that has to serve that data center when it drops in with its huge electric load, with its huge water demand, with all the traffic and pollution and everything else that it means, you see very, very little in the way of cost decreases.

In fact, if you compare it to places that are farther and farther away—this is about 225 miles away from a data center—you can see that the electric prices going down happens much more the farther away you are from a data center.

This shows the opposite. This shows the places where electric prices are soaring—the price increases. And it is the same deal. This is how far away you are from a data center. If you are from 0 to 25 miles away, compare that to this. The comparison between your electricity price increases, if you are near a data center, versus your electricity price decreases, if you are near a data center, couldn't be more clear.

This is me, with a gold marker, marking off the difference. That is not in the original graph, but it focuses your attention on how, when you are near a data center, you are less likely to have low electric prices. You can see how low it is compared to the further away you get.

But if you are near a data center—the nearer you are to a data center, the higher your electric prices go. And if you are really near one, if you are in this block here, within 25 miles, your electric prices are skyrocketing, and that is not a mistake. That is being done on purpose because the Trump administration won't make these big donors who are in crypto world and data center world bring their own clean energy or provide their own clean water, for that matter, to the grid.

So what they do is they arrive, they dump a huge amount of demand into the existing grid, and that means that new and more expensive units have to come online. As those new and more expensive units have to come online, the price goes up and up and up because in almost every grid, it is the most expensive unit running at any minute that sets the price for the entire grid in that minute.

So if you can drive up demand, you drive up these huge, inefficient, polluting, expensive, powerplants and the price goes through the roof. That is precisely why you are seeing this huge increase in costs when you are near a data center, and it is almost impossible to find a decrease in costs if you are near a data center.

So problem 1, energy emergency 1, caused by the Trump administration to pay off its big crypto donors is this: It is the data center bomb falling on regular electric utility ratepayers who suddenly watch their bills skyrocket.

Here is the other bomb. This is the plot in the Trump administration for the sake of their big fossil fuel donors to try to hamper and hinder and injure clean energy. They have the big lie, which is to say clean energy is more expensive; it is clean energy that is driving costs on the grid.

Oh my gosh, expensive clean energy—wrong. That just isn't true. That is a complete fabrication.

This graph shows the Texas grid. This is an illustration of how that plays out. Texas has a unique grid. It is unique to Texas. It doesn't interact with the other grids the way most of the grids do. They have interconnections, and they can interact with each other. Texas is isolated. That is why that big freeze in Texas shut down all the power and caused people to freeze. That took place because that grid was unified, and they couldn't call in power from elsewhere.

This graph does two things. It takes a look at 1 month, August back in 2018, and it looks at what power costs at different levels of demand on the grid. So in 2018, if you had 40 units of gigawatts of demand, then you were paying about 20 cents per megawatt hour. It stayed about the same until demand got bigger. If you get up to 50 megawatts, 60 megawatts, then it starts to spike here, and it hits $75 per megawatt hour once it approaches 70 gigawatts of load.

So what is important here is the comparison. In 2018, these were the prices in August for that increment of load during August. This, the yellow graph, is 2024, 6 years later. What happened to the Texas grid between 2018 and 2024? What happened to the Texas grid between 2018 and 2024 is that huge amounts of clean energy came onto the grid. In fact, last year, 95 percent of the new power coming on the U.S. grid was clean energy. It was solar, it was wind, and it was battery—95 percent.

Between 2018 and 2024, you see this move in the Texas grid. And look at what happens. Pick, let's say, 60 megawatts of load at a given moment in August of 2024. You paid 20 bucks per megawatt hour for the exact same circumstance. Six years earlier, you would have paid 35, maybe 40 bucks—20 bucks, twice as much, basically.

The reason the cost went down from 2018 to 2024 was new, inexpensive, clean energy coming on the grid.

Why is it inexpensive? It is inexpensive because wind is free. It is inexpensive because solar is free. Once you

have built the infrastructure to capture the solar rays, once you have built the infrastructure to capture the wind flowing by, God made those resources free.

For a fossil fuel plant, you still have to build it, but once you have built it, you have to bring in the fossil fuel, pipe in the fossil fuel, burn the fossil fuel. It is expensive. And so almost always, the unit that is setting the price on the grid for electricity is a fossil fuel unit because they are the most expensive ones. So they set the price for the whole grid.

You can see the difference. Let's go to—let's call this 68 megawatts of load, just comparing these two points. Back in 2018, that would have been a $75 per-megawatt-hour cost—75 bucks, and yet here, it is $25. It is a third the cost on the Texas grid because all that clean energy came on. And you have to get way out here before the price spikes when those polluting, expensive, fossil fuel plants have to come on at 80-plus megawatts of load to even begin to match the prices from 6 years earlier.

Clean wind and solar power save consumers money. So when the Trump administration says it is going to inhibit, hinder, injure clean energy development, that is backing this back out of the grid. Now it starts to look more like 2018. If you are buying electricity at this level of grid load, you are paying three times as much—three times as much.

And this is deliberate. You don't think the Trump people don't understand this? They know perfectly well.

And here is the deal. The extra two-thirds of your cost here that comes out of your pocket if you are in Texas is because the clean energy isn't there lowering the cost. That comes out of your pocket.

Where does it go? Where does it go? I will tell you where it goes. It goes to the fossil fuel units that had to get called up to meet that amount of load. The most expensive units on the grid have to be called up to meet that load, and they drive the price up.

If you are a fossil fuel billionaire and you own a bunch of polluting powerplants, sometimes, particularly with clean energy around, they are sitting idle. They are not being called up. They are too expensive to be called up because clean energy is in there beating them. So if you own those plants, you want to go and talk to the Trump administration and say: Hey, knock that clean energy out of the grid. I want my polluting, expensive plant to run again because that is money in my pocket.

And if you are selling that plant to fossil fuel, you go to the Trump administration and you say: Hey, clobber those clean energy guys. I gave you good money. Clobber those clean energy guys and now I get to sell all that fossil fuel to burn to run those expensive plants.

So the people that make a bundle out of knocking down clean energy are the fossil fuel people who cut that deal for hundreds of millions of dollars to Trump's campaign in return for him clobbering their rivals by making it difficult to develop clean energy projects. And what they don't want you to know is that this is on purpose and this is for fossil fuel.

They don't want you to know how this works. They don't want you to know about how the most expensive units get called up as demand grows—that when you take out the clean energy, even more expensive units get called up; that those are the polluting fossil fuel units that tend to set the price.

It is a massive transfer of money from the pockets of ratepayers, whose electric utility rates go up, to the fossil fuel industry in return for all the political money they gave Donald Trump. That is the deal. It is a huge transfer of wealth from ratepayers to big fossil fuel donors.

What they are hoping is that you won't know this. They are hoping you will blame it on the electric utility that sends you the bill. They are hoping that you won't notice that behind that soaring electric utility bill is manipulation of the grid to knock out clean energy, to drive up prices.

And if that is not bad enough, what you then find out is that the climate consequences of all that fossil fuel pollution start coming home to roost, as well.

We did some work on this in the Budget Committee. I will use three quick slides.

These are places where nonrenewal rates for homeowners insurance are increasing. What is the nonrenewal rate, you may ask, for homeowners insurance? That is how often the insurance company says to you, their longtime customers: Hey, thanks for being my longtime customer, but you are fired now. I don't want your property. I can't insure it. There is too much climate risk.

If you looked at where it is really spiking, where did you get? Florida—Florida, because they have huge risks from flooding, sea level rise, hurricanes, and storms. Their whole insurance market is melting down. Where else? Out West, where wildfires are making properties uninsurable.

I tell you what, if you know somebody in Florida, ask them about their home insurance. Just do that for me. If you know somebody who lives in Florida, ask them about their home insurance. You will hear an earful from them.

It is not just getting shot down; it is also that insurance rates are going up. Again, look where—along these coastal areas, along these wildfire-prone areas.

What the Trump administration is doing to reward its big fossil fuel megadonors isn't just to transfer money from your pockets to the big donors through electric utility rates. It is not just to transfer money from your pockets to their big crypto donors by letting them irresponsibly dump their demand on the grid. They are also breaking down the home insurance market so that not only are the insurers saying to people, ''I can't insurance you any longer; your climate risk is too great,'' but they are also saying, ''Wow, if I am going to insure you, we have to really raise our rates.''

These are premium increases—100 percent, 200 percent, 300 percent—that you can find in these areas. In Florida, the average homeowners insurance is $14,000. If you go to Miami-Dade, it is $21,000 for homeowners insurance. If you go to Louisiana here, it is $11,000.

You have got people who try to buy a home in these places. They get the deal together, and they get the mortgage together. They show the Realtor that they can make the nut on the mortgage. Then they try to get insurance to close the deal, and they can't get insurance, and the deal falls apart. There are young families who can't buy homes because of the skyrocketing prices or because the insurers won't insure them because it is too dangerous. And guess what that does. Where does that land? That lands in home values declining.

This is not just me saying this. The chief economist for Freddie Mac—the huge mortgage company—predicts that climate risk makes homeowners insurance unavailable.

When you can't get homeowners insurance, what can you also not get on your property? You can't get a mortgage. If you are a Palm Beach billionaire who is swapping mansions with other billionaires, great, you can pay cash. But for regular families who have bought their homes with a mortgage, when they need to sell them, they need to find somebody who can buy them with a mortgage 9 times out of 10, maybe 99 times out of 100. So when you can't get a mortgage, what happens to that piece of property? When the property is uninsurable and unmortgageable, its value goes down.

That is why the chief economist for Freddie Mac, the mortgage company, predicted the cascade from climate risk to uninsurability, to no mortgages, to what he called a coastal property values crash that could lead to a recession like in 2008.

I remember 2008. It was ugly. I do not want to go there again.

But here you see places in which home values are predicted to change—along the coast here, where there is all the coastal risk; and here, where there is big wildfire risk. And guess what. If you look at the graph, it goes from no change—that is the tan; that is most of it—all the way to—how about that one? You can't read it; so I will tell you what it says: minus 100 percent—a total wipeout of your home's value because it is uninsurable and unmortgageable.

That is the future we are looking at. This is the energy emergency. This is the real energy emergency, and it is an energy emergency that is caused by

fossil fuel pollution. The immediate circumstance also comes through the electric utility bills, as you put less and less clean energy into the grid and make more and more expensive fossil fuels, set the price, and at the same time, you are selling out to the crypto guys. You let them come in and irresponsibly dump their demand on your grid, and supply and demand show that prices spike.

So if you want to know what the real emergency is, the real emergency is that the Trump administration has sold out to the crypto industry; it has sold out to the fossil fuel industry. It denies climate change; it pretends it is a hoax. Literally, the President has said that in, like, words. And that climate change problem is destroying home insurance markets, mortgage markets, and property values. And it has already begun.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The Senator from California.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I rise today to bring before the Senate a resolution concerning one of our most serious constitutional responsibilities: whether the United States should engage in armed conflict against a particular adversary.

The Constitution clearly and intentionally places the power to declare war in the hands of this body, the Congress, not with the President or the executive branch. Our Constitution's Framers, having just endured a war and having paid the toll that war always takes, wanted to ensure that our newly independent Nation would see the representatives of the people make the decision of whether and when to put American lives on the line.

In 1798, James Madison wrote to Thomas Jefferson about the danger of leaving that power in the hands of an executive.

He said:

> The Constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care, vested the question of war in the Legislature.

For the past month, Congress's power to authorize or refuse to authorize the use of power has been usurped by the Executive. This administration has carried out at least four military strikes against vessels that it asserts have ties to drug trafficking organizations. These strikes were not authorized by Congress. Congress has not been shown the evidence of who exactly was on board these ships, whether they were all headed to the United States or some other destination, or whether they posed an imminent danger of attack on the United States. Such strikes are not legal, and they are not made legal or constitutional by the claim—correctly or incorrectly, with or without evidence—that some or all of the occupants of these boats belong to a list of organizations kept secret by the administration.

Being put on a list by the executive branch does not deprive Congress of its vital role in approving the use of force, but such a list kept hidden from the American people, if used as a justification, may drag our Nation into an unintended war.

If it were as simple for a President—any President—to claim that war power for himself by placing an individual or a group of individuals on a list, let alone one held in secret, there would be no limiting principle to the executive's use of force—no limits whatsoever—and that is deeply inconsistent with the intent of our Framers' and the desire of the American people to be kept out of unnecessary military conflicts.

Indeed, the President has confirmed that he does not see a limit. He saw targets at sea, and now he sees potential targets on land.

Now, I know that the word ''unprecedented'' gets used so much these days that perhaps it has lost some of its value, but we need to put in context just how far from normal these strikes are.

For perhaps the first time in our history, a President of the United States ordered the U.S. military to use lethal force against individuals who posed no imminent threat of attack and who could have been stopped thousands of miles from our shore had we interdicted and arrested those on board just as they routinely are by our Coast Guard. Instead, the U.S. military used lethal force on four separate occasions, killing everyone on board.

Despite this breathtaking departure from more than two centuries of law and practice, we still know almost nothing about these strikes, some taking place as far as 2,700 miles away. It may be that there were narcotics traffickers on board some or all of these vessels. It may also be that some of these boats were being used for human trafficking and that the victims of that offense were killed along with the perpetrators, or, if not on one of the first four ships destroyed, then perhaps on the next one.

The lack of detail concerning these strikes is telling. We have learned of these strikes through social media posts from the President, the Secretary of Defense, and from the press. In fact, administration officials have offered differing accounts of where these vessels were heading. Media reports have suggested—without rebuttal from the administration—that the first vessel to be struck had turned around prior to being hit. The Secretary of State originally claimed that one of the boats wasn't even heading to the United States.

Given our Coast Guard presence in the region and with a sizable Navy deployment and expansive intelligence resources, U.S. personnel could have boarded all of these vessels, detained those aboard, seized any drugs or cash, and gathered additional information about ties to drug trafficking organizations, just as they normally do. Secretary of State Rubio even acknowledged publicly that this could have been done but said that the President wanted to send a message by killing all of those on board.

We all agree that the scourge of drugs is real and that scores of Americans die from such poison every year. We are all committed on both sides of the aisle to battling the importation of illegal drugs, even as we work to beat back addiction here at home. But we are also committed to our Constitution, to a system of checks and balances that wisely places the power to make war in our hands, not with an Executive who may grow too fond of using it.

That is why Senator KAINE and I have introduced a resolution to direct the President to stop engaging in armed strikes against these vessels or the country from which they emanate without the explicit authorization of Congress. We are here today to ask our colleagues to join us in this nonpartisan vote, in this affirmation of Congress's authority to declare war or to refuse to declare it; to authorize force or to refuse to authorize it.

We have been precise and deliberate in crafting it. This resolution does not affect the United States' ability to target terrorist groups covered by Congress's existing authorizations to use military force, including al-Qaida, ISIS or its affiliates and offshoots, or to address real threats posed by other groups, like the Houthis. It also in no way limits the United States' ability to defend our own citizens and interests or to come to the collective self-defense of our allies and our partners.

It comes down to this: The President has used our military to strike unknown targets on at least four occasions, and he is promising more. With at least 21 people dead and more killing on the way and with the President telling us that strikes on land-based targets may be next, we ask you to join us in reasserting Congress's vital control over the war power.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to move to the topic before the Senate with respect to the War Powers resolution regarding Caribbean military operations.

I rise to express my deep concern about the Trump administration's ongoing military operations in the Caribbean and to voice my strong support for the War Powers Resolution introduced by Senators SCHIFF, KAINE, WYDEN, and SANDERS.

Over the past month, the United States has carried out four lethal strikes on boats in the Caribbean, reportedly killing 21 individuals. These attacks have been retroactively explained by the President's unilateral declaration that the United States is in ''armed conflict'' with unnamed ''nonstate armed groups'' throughout the Western Hemisphere.

He has deployed thousands of U.S. forces, ships, and aircraft to conduct

these operations—all without congressional authorization and without any credible explanation to the American people.

Let me be clear. The drug cartels that traffic poison across our borders are violent and reprehensible. They have devastated families and communities across our country. We must do everything in our power through law enforcement, intelligence, and international cooperation to bring these organizations down. But that is not what this is all about. These are not police actions or defensive operations; these are targeted, lethal military strikes using weapons designed for warfare, not interdiction or law enforcement.

The administration has offered no positive identification for those killed, nor any information linking the boat crews to cartels. In fact, they have not proven that these vessels were engaged in drug trafficking, nor even that they were destined for the United States.

I would note that even if this evidence had been provided, that would only justify interdiction by law enforcement, not lethal military strikes.

The justification thus far has relied entirely on the President's word, and that is not good enough. Our Constitution does not vest the power to wage war on one man's word. The White House has claimed that these strikes are allowable under the President's article II powers as Commander in Chief, but article II is not a blank check. The Framers of our Constitution deliberately separated the powers of war and peace between the branches.

James Madison warned:

> The executive is the branch most prone to war; therefore the Constitution has, with studied care, vested that power in the legislature.

The War Powers Resolution exists for moments like this. It ensures that before we send American forces into hostilities, the people's representatives have debated and voted on that decision. It ensures accountability. It ensures legitimacy.

If we allow these unauthorized operations to continue unchecked, we will have surrendered Congress's most solemn constitutional duty. We will have set the precedent that the President—any President—may initiate military action at will, without oversight, without transparency, and without the consent of the governed.

We have seen this pattern before. Over the past several years, this administration has repeatedly tested the limits of Executive power—ordering strikes in Iran and Yemen and now the Caribbean, while refusing even a brief consultation with Congress. Each time, the lines blur a little further. Each time, the balance of power tilts a little more toward the Executive.

This body, the U.S. Senate, cannot afford to shrug and move on. The slow erosion of congressional oversight is not an abstract debate about process; it is a real and present threat to our democracy.

The War Powers Resolution before us does not tie the President's hands in responding to genuine threats; it simply requires him to do what every Commander in Chief should: come to Congress, present the facts, and seek authorization from the people's representatives before initiating hostilities. That is not weakness. That is constitutional strength. It is the principle that has guided our Republic for nearly 2½ centuries.

Finally, I will say this: Even setting aside the constitutional questions, this campaign is deeply unwise. The notion that we can bomb our way out of a drug trafficking crisis is not strategy; it is wishful thinking. Using the U.S. military to conduct unchecked strikes in the Caribbean risks destabilizing the region, provoking confrontation with neighboring governments, and drawing our forces into yet another open-ended conflict without a clear mission or exit strategy.

Conflict in the Caribbean or with Venezuela is entirely avoidable, but the risk that we stumble into war because of one man's impulsive decision making has never been higher. Our troops deserve better—much better.

This War Powers Resolution would restore that balance. It reaffirms that the Constitution has always required that decisions of war and peace belong to the legislature, not the Executive.

Mr. President, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to reassert the fundamental role of Congress in matters of war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senators SCHIFF and KAINE's resolution regarding war powers.

This resolution would just say very simply that if the Trump administration wants to be at war against a terrorist organization, they should come to Congress, notify us, and seek our approval.

Currently, the administration is waging a secret war against a secret list of unnamed groups that they will not tell us about. There have been four lethal strikes against boats in the Caribbean. The administration wrote us a letter—wrote this body a letter—about what they were doing in September. They said they considered themselves to be in a ''non-international armed conflict''—that means a war—against a secret list of ''designated terrorist organizations.''

I received a briefing last week on the administration's strikes in the Caribbean. During that briefing, Members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, from both sides of the aisle, asked a Senate-confirmed official whether the Department of Defense could produce a list of the organizations that are now considered terrorists by the United States. They said they could not provide that list.

Now, don't get me wrong. I am a CIA officer. I am a former Pentagon official. I did three tours in Iraq—armed—alongside the military. I participated in the targeting of terrorist groups. I actually have no real problem going against cartels, given what they have done in their inserting drugs in our community and with the death of so many Americans. But as a nation, I think we should have as a basic principle that you can't have a secret list of terrorist organizations that the American public and, certainly, the U.S. Congress don't get to even know the names of.

The problem for me is that this is unprecedented. You know, during the Global War on Terror, which is kind of my era, it was very clear. Terrorist organizations would be notified. If we wanted to declare a new terrorist organization, it would be notified to Congress. Then our intelligence community, the military, and law enforcement would spin up to go after information about that group and prosecute—you know, target against that group. But that is not what is going on today, and we will not understand, apparently, the dozens of terrorist organizations that we have now named until we understand their names.

This is important in the foreign context, right? This is unprecedented in terms of what we have done against foreign adversaries, against foreign terrorist organizations; but what I want to draw people's attention to is the implication for what is happening inside of our own country.

In September—also last month—the Trump administration put out a new Executive order about domestic terrorist organizations. They said that they were going to, again, make secret lists of ''terrorist groups'' inside the United States and send the full force of the U.S. Government against those terrorist organizations. They are not telling anyone the name of these organizations, but they are authorizing law enforcement and the intelligence community to double down and come up with that list.

This is a problem because the Trump administration defined in that document a ''terrorist organization'' or ''domestic terrorism'' incredibly broadly. It suggests that any group that talks about anti-Christian values, views they don't like on migration or race, differing views on the role of the family, religion, or morality could all be grounds for labeling an organization ''domestic terrorists.''

If this administration is not telling us who is on their secret designated terrorist list for groups in the Caribbean, they are definitely not going to tell us who is on their list of domestic terrorist organizations.

We saw, to start us off, the attorney general down in Texas put out publicly that he is now going to launch a campaign against domestic terrorist organizations in his own State. So it has begun.

Meanwhile, we know what is going on in some of our American cities. Trump

said that he would invoke, potentially, the Insurrection Act of 1807. He has made more than 800 of our military generals fly in from across the world and talked about going after the ''enemy from within''—his words—and making American towns and cities their ''training grounds'' for the military.

This is important, and I think every American should understand what it means if the President of the United States follows through with what he said and says—that he is now invoking the Insurrection Act. That means—a certain city—if the violence has gotten to a level of an insurrection, it means that the U.S. military can now be used as law enforcement in our cities. It means the U.S. military can raid; they can arrest; they can detain. You can easily see a world where the President of the United States labels protest groups ''terrorists,'' doesn't tell anyone, and creates an excuse to unilaterally use the military inside our cities, similar to the way he used them in the Caribbean.

Just to be clear, this is straight out of an authoritarian playbook where the President gets to play judge, jury, and executioner. This time, instead of stopping drug traffickers, it will be stopping Americans potentially from exercising their right to freedom of speech.

This is not theoretical, using the U.S. military in our streets. It is not something that the President hasn't already thought about. We know that in the first Trump administration, the President called up his Secretary of Defense and his Chairman of the Joint Chiefs because he was upset about protests that were going on in front of the White House. Mark Esper was the Secretary of Defense. He wrote about this in his book called ''A Sacred Oath,'' and he talked about some of the things President Trump asked him to do.

President Trump wanted him to send in not the National Guard but the 82nd Airborne—an Active-Duty military unit, one of our most elite, a large unit—to quell protests here in Washington, DC. He asked for them to be moved into the city. And when the back-and-forth happened with former Secretary Esper, President Trump asked him point blank: ''Can't you just shoot them in the legs or something?''

I want to just flag for everybody that we are seeing a repeat of that story but in exponentially more gruesome detail play out right now. The President is looking for an excuse to send the U.S. military into our streets, to deploy the U.S. military against his own people, to prompt confrontation, and to hope that confrontation justifies even more military force and military control.

This is a well-worn authoritarian playbook. It is one that quite literally the United States of America was founded on rejecting—the idea that the British soldiers, when they occupied American cities, abused American citizens to the point where Americans turned against them.

I am a former CIA officer, a former Pentagon official. I have worked alongside the military my entire life. I cannot stomach the idea that the American people would fear the uniformed military who have given their lives to protect them for so many years.

But all of us in this Chamber and certainly those of us who have served in the past swore an oath to the Constitution—not to a King, not to a party, not to any one person. Nobody gets to rewrite the Constitution—not a President, not an adviser, no one.

If the President wants to use force abroad or at home, he needs to come to this body and explain it publicly to the American public.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, incredibly, the Democrats are here to condemn President Trump's recent strikes against narcoterrorists operating in their backyard. Maybe they want to distract from the Schumer shutdown by tying the President's hands and siding with narcoterrorists who have the blood of hundreds of thousands of Americans on their hands. Whatever the reason, this would be foolhardy.

If you think I am exaggerating here, let me remind you of the kind of depraved savages we are dealing with. Recall the Tren de Aragua gang member who tried to rape 22-year-old Laken Riley while she was out for a jog on a college campus. After Laken fought back, this savage smashed her head with a rock and strangled her to death.

Also, recall the two Tren de Aragua gang members who, after being released into our country by Joe Biden, raped and murdered 12-year-old Jocelyn Nungaray. These animals threw this innocent little girl's body off a bridge.

Finally, consider the recent arrest of the Tren de Aragua gang leader who kidnapped three women and shot them in the back of the head in an alley in Chicago. Only one survived to call for help.

These are the sorts of horrific acts of violence that narcoterrorists commit against Americans. And, of course, these narcoterrorists—many affiliated with Tren de Aragua—also flood our country with dangerous drugs that have taken the lives of tens of thousands of Americans every year after year after year. They target every State in our Union with their poison.

This is among the many reasons why President Trump was well within his constitutional authority to take action against these narcoterrorists who put American lives at risk. These recent strikes fulfilled President Trump's constitutional duty to protect Americans as their elected Commander in Chief.

This should come as no surprise. President Trump stated very clearly and repeatedly during the campaign that he would attack these cartels if necessary. This is simply him keeping his word to the American people.

Also, the President's strikes were lawfully sound and extremely limited. Because they have been going on for less than 60 days, they don't even fall within the War Powers Resolution threshold.

I would also note that Presidential action like this is hardly unheard of or unique. For context, as of the mid-20th century, scholars identified more than 100 military deployments or actions that lacked express prior congressional authorization.

I could go back to the beginning of the Republic, with the Barbary pirates off the coast of North Africa, but there is another example much closer in time and, for that matter, on the border. That would be President George H. W. Bush's decision to invade and topple the Government of Panama in 1989. Without prior congressional approval, he ordered 12,000 American troops into that country. We toppled Panama's illegitimate regime. We apprehended the country's dictator, and he spent the rest of his life in foreign custody.

Let's compare these two cases. In both cases, you had the leader of a country who is indicted by the U.S. courts for drug trafficking. In both cases, that leader is not recognized by the U.S. Government as the legitimate leader of his country. I would say the comparison ends there because the case is much stronger here than it was in 1989.

Maduro also has I think a $50 million reward on his head from our government. Maduro is associated with a designated foreign terrorist organization. Noriega didn't have a reward. Noriega wasn't associated with a designated foreign terrorist organization. Maduro is in league with China, Russia, Iran, and Cuba. Noriega was not. Yet George Bush invaded Panama and overthrew its government.

I don't hear many Democrats, in retrospect, saying that this was an unwise action or it made our country less safe. And somehow Donald Trump is doing those things merely by striking a few boats of drug traffickers in international waters?

Even if you had misgivings about these strikes, even maybe if you were a Democrat in Congress in 1989—as some of our colleagues were—and you condemned President Bush for taking action to defend our country, I would still point out that the resolution before us is overbroad.

The resolution prevents the President from taking offensive action against any foreign terrorist organization designated on or after February 20 of this year. This includes the Iranian-backed Houthi terrorists in Yemen.

It appears our Democratic friends have forgotten that the Houthis are responsible for at least—at least—150 attacks against the United States and allied naval and commercial ships, which have killed at least 3 people. These terrorists have also targeted our friends in Israel, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates—mostly civilians, for that matter.

So if the Democrats had their way, President Trump would not be able to, for example, strike a secret meeting of senior Houthi leaders; wouldn't be able to strike imminent attacks on our friends in countries like Israel, Saudi Arabia, or United Arab Emirates.

I think we should all agree that we want a President, when terrorists are gathered together for the purpose of planning attacks against American civilians, our troops, or our friends abroad, to have the authority necessary to take action.

The Democrats claim: Oh, there is a carve-out in our resolution. Oh, we have a saving clause. We have a rule of construction that says our troops can defend themselves.

Once again, they are misleading the American people. I invite you to read it closely. They may allow our sailors to defend themselves if these Houthi terrorists shoot a missile or a drone directly at their ship, but it absolutely ties the President's hands if, for instance, we have intelligence about a senior meeting of Houthi terrorist leaders. It absolutely ties the President's hands from protecting our friends in places like Jerusalem and Riyadh and Abu Dhabi. There is no question about that. It is the black letter of the resolution. It only goes for about three lines. I would invite anyone to read it, and you will understand that the Democrats are once again dissembling.

No reasonable person denies the authority of the President to strike a terrorist threat on foreign soil. Yet the Democrats are here tonight questioning the President's authority to do the exact same thing in our own backyard—in international waters, no less; not even foreign territory. This is a dangerous double standard.

Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to vote no on this resolution and to get back to the more pressing business of reopening our government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, let me just take this opportunity to address some of the remarks of my colleague who has, I think, rightly pointed out the horrors of drug trafficking and those that are engaged in that poisonous, deadly trade. I agree with that, and we should do everything we can to fight back against those who are trying to traffic that poison into this country. And I agree with him about the murderous dictator that is Maduro.

But here is the thing. If my colleagues in this Congress want to go to war with Venezuela, if they want to use military force to bring about regime change in Venezuela, or if they want to wage a literal war using the military and armed force to blow up traffickers, then they need to come to Congress and seek an authorization to use military force for that purpose because our Constitution is clear.

There are, essentially, three circumstances in which we can constitutionally use force. One is if Congress declares war. We have not declared war on Venezuela. We have not declared a literal fighting war using military troops either.

Or we authorize the use of military force. We have not done so.

Now, the third circumstance in which a President is authorized to use force is in the event of imminent threat of attack from our adversaries. And that is simply not the circumstance here.

Instead, what the administration seems to be relying on is a claim that it has the power, somehow, to put organizations on a list and go after them wherever they may be, without the approval of Congress. That is what this resolution is about.

Now, my colleague also made an argument about the Houthis. Nothing in this resolution affects the ability to defend ourselves from the Houthis as necessary. The President and the former Presidents who have taken action against the Houthis have not done so on the basis of the Houthis being added to some list. Being added to a list, even the foreign terrorist organization list, empowers an administration to put sanctions on that organization. But being placed on a list by the Executive does not give any greater authority to use armed force against an organization.

The basis in which this President and previous Presidents have used force against the Houthis is the Houthis have attacked us, and if the Houthis attack us again, the President will have the article II power to defend ourselves. And nothing in this resolution touches that in any way, shape, or form.

But let me just underscore the perils of what we are discussing today. Now, this is an article that just came out. I haven't had the chance to vet it: ''Colombia president claims U.S. bombed Colombian boat in strike off Venezuela.''

So I don't know whether we have now struck a Colombian ship or what the circumstances were or who was on board, and that is exactly the problem. That is exactly the problem. Now, maybe this is real and maybe it isn't, but the fact that we don't know, the fact that the Executive asserts the authority to blow up ships without coming to Congress for the authorization of that kind of force could invariably lead to mistakes, could also lead, inadvertently, to war with another country.

This resolution says: If you want to use force against narcoterrorists by blowing up ships, come to Congress for an authorization because at this point you don't have it. If there is an imminent threat of attack, you have all of the authority you need under article II. But if you want to engage in a war with Venezuela or a regime change with Maduro and you want to use military force to do it, you need to come to Congress for an authorization. There being none, these strikes are unconstitutional and unlawful.

I would urge my colleagues to join Senator KAINE and myself in supporting this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, we are here today to talk about a resolution put forth by the Democrats that is very, very not well-taken.

We are all aware in this body that on September 4, President Trump notified Congress of his initial strike against narcoterrorists who were bringing deadly and illegal drugs into this country—the first of four such strikes.

Now, my colleague just referred to the fact that the President can—if there is an imminent attack on our country, that they can strike. This wasn't an imminent attack; this was an actual attack. It was in progress. It was going on. People were attacking our country by bringing in poisonous substances to deposit into our country that would have killed Americans all over America, including your constituents.

Fortunately, most of those drugs are now at the bottom of the ocean. Had that not happened, I guarantee there would have been hundreds—maybe thousands—of people in this country that would have been killed with the tremendous amount of drugs that were being brought in. The facts of that are obviously well-known, well-reported, and if you want to see more, it is certainly available in the Intelligence Committee.

The people carrying those drugs were terrorists, plain and simple. They were trafficking drugs that financed a designated foreign terrorist organization. These strikes were fully compliant and fully justified under the President's article II constitutional authority—and not only authority but duty as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces to defend this country. And he took an oath to do so.

So why are we here today? We are looking at a resolution saying that he can't do this anymore. This is nonsense. It is unreasonable. It is why the American people look at Congress and say: Are you people crazy? You have the President of the United States trying to do something about this terrible scourge that is going on in America, and you in Congress are saying: Don't be doing that anymore unless you come here and ask us for permission to do it.

So these actions are political, pure and simple. These actions here are political. This was a good decision on the part of the President, and the President acted legally. So what are my Democratic friends doing here? They are putting forth this joint resolution No. 83 to stop the President from acting in the way he has just acted to stop these drugs from coming into the country. So let's look at what it says. Let's look at the actual language:

Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against any organization designated on or after February 20, 2025—

His date of inauguration—

as a foreign terrorist organization or specially designated global terrorist, any states in which those entities operate, or any nonstate organization engaged in the promotion, trafficking, and distribution of illegal drugs.

You are telling the President to stop using this against organizations and people who are trafficking drugs for distribution and on the way to the United States.

And it goes on to say that he can't do this unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or a specific authorization for use of military force by this organization.

How long do you think it would take him to get that? Those drugs not only would have been delivered to the United States, they would have not only been distributed in the United States; there would be dead Americans, and we would still be here yapping about it.

So even if this passed—and it is not going to, but if it did pass, he is not going to obey this order. He can't obey this order. He took an oath to defend this country. When he sees an attack like this coming—an attack of drugs or explosives or anything else that is going to kill Americans—he not only has the authority to do something about it; he has the duty to do something about it.

We should have a resolution out here not condemning what he did and telling him ''don't do this anymore''; we should have a resolution out here thanking him for the hundreds—probably thousands—of lives that he saved with these four attacks, including constituents in your districts.

Thank you, Mr. President, for what you did. Thank you. And continue the good work of taking these drugs out of the traffic and putting them on the bottom of the ocean.

My friends, this is Trump derangement syndrome. These people hate President Trump; I get that. But simply because you hate him, you should not wallow in that hate like you have and produce this kind of a product that stops the President from doing what he is supposed to do. This is shameful and it should be defeated and it is going to be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, my colleague from Idaho's emotional speech notwithstanding, this is not about hating a President; it is about loving a Constitution. It is about loving a Constitution.

The resolution that my colleague Senator SCHIFF has filed, which I gladly cosponsored, does not say there cannot be military action against terrorists or cartels or drug traffickers. It just says that the United States should not be at war without a vote of Congress, the United States should not be at war against groups on a secret list prepared by one individual who is unwilling to share it with Congress and with the American public.

My colleague said that we should put a resolution on the floor thanking the President. I have an idea for my Republican colleagues: put a resolution on the floor declaring war against narcotraffickers. Why haven't they done that? That is what the Constitution says they should do. They are so strong in their belief that we should be at war with narcotraffickers, why haven't they put a resolution before this body to say we should be at war with cartels and narcotraffickers?

There are two reasons: They know it would fail, even in a Republican Senate. And second, they are afraid to vote on that resolution because they know their constituents are tired of wars and don't want Congress declaring more wars and treating serious law enforcement problems as challenges for the U.S. military.

I strongly support the resolution my colleague has filed.

When President Trump announced in August that he might undertake this action, Senator SCHIFF and I conferred with other Senators. And when the first strike was taken on the 4th of September, we wrote a letter to the President, as the article I branch charged with the power of declaring war, asking him a basic series of questions: Give us the evidence that these boats were actually carrying narcotics. Give us the legal rationale for striking them without coming to Congress. If you knew where they were enough to strike them, you could have interdicted them. Why did you choose to strike them and not interdict them? We hear that drugs are now at the bottom of the sea.

If you interdict a ship and you seize drugs, you get evidence, you get individuals that you interrogate, and you build cases against the higher-ups in the narcotrafficking ring. When you destroy a boat, you don't get the evidence; you can't build the case.

And we asked: Why not interdict? Why strike rather than interdict? These were questions that Congress has a right to know the answer and the American public has a right to know the answer. And we asked the President: Give us answers to these questions in 7 days—not unreasonable.

We have yet to get answers to these questions. The administration believes it does not have to justify these actions to Congress, it does not have to tell us the evidence about the narcotics content of these boats, it does not have to give us a clear legal rationale, it does not have to explain the decision to strike rather than to interdict.

When you ask the basic questions and you are not given answers, you get suspicious that the answers are not forthcoming because there aren't good answers to the questions that we asked.

We did have a followup hearing, the Armed Services Committee, in the secure facility last week. And I can't really talk about what was said there, but I can sure talk about what wasn't said there. No answer to the question of ''Why not interdict?'' It was asked over and over and over again, and aside from asserting that ''we have the ability to do what we did,'' they could not provide an answer about interdiction.

They could not provide clear evidence that all of those boats actually had narcotics on them, even though they knew we would be asking that question.

And so, to the legal rationale, all they said was ''the President has an article II ability to undertake these actions.'' Saying ''I can do whatever I want under article II'' is not an answer, and that is no legal rationale, but it is essentially what the President is saying: I can put groups on a list—and we understand it is many groups and their affiliates—and not tell Congress and not tell the American public, and I get to make the decision about whether the Nation goes to war.

That is not what our Constitution says.

My colleague Senator SCHIFF is talking about the Constitution, so I won't belabor it. But there are a couple of points that I do want to stress because there is nothing more important in the Constitution than the power to declare war.

The Founders who wrote the Constitution in 1787 debated this topic extensively, and they recognized the reality in the world at the time: Decisions about war were made by the Executive, King, Monarch, Emperor, Czar, Pope. It was made by the Executive.

The Framers of the Constitution in 1787 were dealing with leadership that included the first President of the United States, George Washington, the greatest general that has ever been President of the United States. They revered George Washington.

But when they had to make a decision about who declared war, they said: Even George Washington—even George Washington—is not smart enough to carry that sole decision on his shoulders to make war. So they decided to do something almost completely contrary to the whole flow of human history, and they invested the power to declare war in the legislative branch, in Congress.

And my colleague read Madison's exchange as the principal drafter of the provision with Jefferson, many years later, about why they had done it. They wanted, with studied care, to vest the question of war in the legislative branch.

It is not only in the Constitution, it is in the Constitution for a reason. And here is the reason: A decision about war puts troops in harm's way, puts troops in a position where they may be injured or killed; they may see their best friends injured or killed; they could come home with physical injuries or mental injuries that could affect the remainder of their lives.

The Constitution of the United States, in a somewhat unique way, requires congressional approval for war

so that there is a consensus of the Nation, after a full debate in view of the American public and a vote, that the war is in the national interest.

If a President goes off unilaterally without getting Congress on board, then we are asking people to risk their lives with no national consensus that the mission is worth it. Could there be a grosser example of public immorality than to order troops into harm's way where they could be killed and their lives and their families affected for the rest of their lives without a national consensus that this is a mission worth you risking your life?

That is why that provision is so sacred in the article I branch, and that is why even George Washington was not entrusted by the Framers of the Constitution to make a decision like this on his own.

I will finish where I started. This is not about dissatisfaction with President Trump. I filed similar resolutions, as my colleague from Idaho knows, when President Obama was President. I came into the Senate in 2013 with an absolute obsession because of the military nature of my State, because one of my kids is a marine—with an absolute obsession that the Nation should never go to war—never—without a debate in Congress that the American people can see, can learn from, and a political consensus that the war is worth it.

Yes, there is an exception for defense or imminent attack. That has been understood as part of the Presidential power of Commander in Chief since the very first days of this Republic.

But even in that instance, it was foreseen that Congress would come in and have a debate and agree or not with whether they blessed the mission or not. Letting a single individual take us to war based on a secret list that he won't even reveal to the public and to Congress sets such a dangerous precedent.

And if my colleagues, as they have stated, believe we should be at war in the Caribbean or at war with nations in the Americas or with the narcotraffickers, they have had the ability the entire time to bring a resolution before us and have that debate in front of the American public. I have a feeling that debate would produce some positive votes if it were limited enough, but to allow a President to do it by secret without Congress having the guts to have the debate and vote about whether the war is worthwhile is contrary to everything this country stands for, to the oath we take.

I would urge folks to support my colleague's resolution.

Mr. President, I ask consent that we yield back all remaining time.

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

The clerk will read the joint resolution by title a third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 71

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read a third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. KAINE. 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 Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY).

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 554 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—51

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

NOT VOTING—2

Cruz	Sheehy

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 71) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—Motion to Discharge

Mr. SCHIFF. Pursuant to Section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act, and as provided under the order of October 7, 2025, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 83, to direct the removal of the United States Armed Forces from hostilities that have not been authorized by Congress, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I strongly support this resolution and commend my colleagues from California and Virginia for their leadership. In the space of just 4 weeks, the Department of Defense has destroyed four small boats in the Caribbean Sea, in each instance killing everyone on board. Without producing any evidence, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and President Trump have justified these assassinations of civilians on the grounds that the occupants were ''narco-terrorists'' and ''enemy combatants.''

There is not a single Member of Congress who does not abhor the crime of drug trafficking and the horrific toll that illegal drugs, as well as prescription opioids, are taking in this country. Every State is affected. The insatiable demand for cocaine, fentanyl, and other dangerous drugs has ravaged whole communities and caused the addiction and deaths of millions of Americans. There is no question that we are not doing enough to deal with this problem, either here at home or in the source countries. Yet the President's fiscal year 2026 budget would cut hundreds of millions of dollars for drug treatment programs, despite Americans' unmet demand for treatment, and for grants to support State and local law enforcement. It is a glaring disconnect between rhetoric and action. If Congress approves these cuts, we will be complicit with the White House in making this problem worse.

Rather than increasing resources for treatment, local law enforcement, and drug courts, which have long been proven to be the best antidotes against drug addiction and the violent crime associated with it, this administration has labeled drug traffickers as ''foreign terrorist organizations'' and deployed U.S. warships and other military assets to combat them.

There is no question that drug traffickers, criminal gangs, and other criminal enterprises engage in horrific and violent acts. Murder is murder, whether committed by a human trafficker, a drug trafficker, or a member of al Qaeda. But there are fundamental differences in their motivation, which legally distinguishes a drug trafficker from a terrorist. It is common knowledge that a drug trafficker's purpose is financial enrichment, while the definition of a ''terrorist'' is a person who uses violence or the threat of violence to instill widespread fear to achieve a political or ideological goal.''

Meanwhile, other governments are using the label ''terrorist'' to defame and criminalize social activists, political opponents, and journalists who engage in peaceful dissent. This is common practice in Iran, Russia, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia, where dissidents are imprisoned and even executed for being so-called ''terrorists.''

Neither the White House, nor the Department of Defense, nor the Department of Justice have publicly provided legal justification for these summary executions of alleged drug traffickers in international waters. They have produced no evidence that the unidentified

people in those boats were in fact trafficking drugs and no evidence that they met the definition of ''terrorist.'' Extrajudicial killing is a crime in this country and a violation of international law. Simply calling someone a terrorist does not change that.

Our collective interest is in stopping drug trafficking, drug addiction, and the violence associated with it. But above all, we are a nation of laws, and the administration is flagrantly violating the law in ways that threaten all Americans. If the President can label anyone a terrorist regardless of the well-established legal definition, without saying who they are or producing any evidence, and then conducting a military strike on them, where do we draw the line? Is a drug trafficker in Miami or St. Louis a terrorist? Is a bank robber a terrorist? Are kidnappers terrorists? Is the administration going to start calling Americans who protest the arrests of migrants who are legally in this country terrorists?

When asked for an explanation, administration officials routinely ignore the question, insisting that narco-terrorists are legitimate targets. But that is not what the law says. And as Attorney General Bondi often says, no one is above the law. That includes the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice.

Drug traffickers should be arrested, convicted, and punished. Terrorists should be brought to justice. But no American President, Secretary of Defense, or Attorney General has the legal authority to condone or carry out extrajudicial killings when we are not at war, which only Congress can declare, and the country is not facing an imminent attack.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield the floor.

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

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 555 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—51

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The motion was rejected.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO ''NORTH DAKOTA FIELD OFFICE RECORD OF DECISION AND APPROVED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The majority leader.

SENATOR SUSAN COLLINS' 9,750TH VOTE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, Senator COLLINS will cast her 9,750th consecutive vote—her 9,750th consecutive vote.

Mr. President, 9,750 votes is a substantial milestone all on its own, but 9,750 consecutive votes—that is something else.

What it is, is a tribute to Senator COLLINS' incredible work ethic and her absolute dedication to the people of Maine. Susan shows up for Mainers. She represents them in committee; she represents them on the floor; and she represents them in every single vote—the big votes, the little votes, and the in-between ones. But thanks to SUSAN COLLINS, the people of Maine always have a voice.

Susan, congratulations on yet another incredible milestone.

(Applause.)

Thank you for your service, and thank you for your example.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let's add one more vote to the total.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I yield back all time on H.J. Res. 105.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 105

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. LEE. 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 Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 556 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Gallego	Tillis
Cruz	Hawley	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 105) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, before I pay tribute to Pastor Bjorge, I just want to say thank you to my colleagues who supported that resolution that you just announced that passed. It is very meaningful to North Dakota, and I express my appreciation for the support.

REMEMBERING JAMES RICHARD BJORGE

Mr. President, ''James Richard Bjorge, child of God, went home to be with his Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, on September 29, 2025. He was 94.''

That is the opening paragraph of an obituary for Pastor Bjorge, whose funeral is tomorrow. I will obviously miss it, being here in Washington, but I did want to, first of all, seek unanimous consent to submit his obituary to be printed in the RECORD tonight.

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

JAMES BJORGE

(April 10, 1931–September 29, 2025)

James Richard Bjorge, child of God, went home to be with his LORD and Savior, Jesus Christ, on September 29, 2025. He was 94.

James (Jim) Bjorge was born April 10, 1931 in Windom, Minnesota to Johs and Esther (Johnson) Bjorge, the second of three sons. He was raised in a loving Norwegian (with a touch of Swedish) home. Growing up in Windom was a special time of friendships for Jim. He experienced multi-denominational youth groups, boyish pranks, a respect for others, and most importantly the knowledge of Jesus' love for him.

After graduating from Windom High School, Jim attended St. Olaf College and graduated with honors. He went on to Luther Seminary and received his M.Div. Jim always credited his older brother 'Big John' for encouraging him to attend seminary. Although this was not Jim's original path choice, he received the calling from God and enrolled in seminary. Some years later he attended Westminster Theological Seminary in Escondido, California and earned his Doctor of Ministry degree.

Along with being an excellent scholar, Jim had a love for basketball, tennis, and high jumping. His 6'4" frame broke high jumping records in college and in varsity at seminary.

After seminary graduation in 1957, and before Jim began his first call to Belgrade, Minnesota, he met Frances Erickson, an Augustana graduate. After a few dates the courtship continued with many letters sent during Fran's first year of teaching in California. They were married the next summer. Five children were born to this union.

Jim, with Fran and family, served parishes in Belgrade, Litchfield, and Roseville, Minnesota, Viroqua, Wisconsin, Sioux City, Iowa, and lastly First Lutheran in Fargo, North Dakota. Jim retired from full-time parish ministry after serving 17 years at First Lutheran. He continued to share the Word by accepting an interim position in Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

After Fran's death in 2002, Jim continued with interim preaching at Wahpeton, Fargo, Portland, Grand Forks, Valley City, Horace, and Enderlin, all in North Dakota. In addition to serving his parishes, Jim authored 15 books, which include sermon series, lessons from nature and 2 books on nature.

In 2010 during a short interim at Faith Lutheran in Valley City, Jim met Carol Winter, also widowed, with a heart for music ministry through her singing. The LORD had a plan for Jim and Carol. After a brief courtship, they were married in the Chapel at Mount Carmel Family Bible Camp near Alexandria, Minnesota. Jim had attended Mount Carmel since its beginning in 1938, first as a young boy with his parents, then as a young handsome lifeguard during college summer breaks. He was later a guest preacher for many years at summer adult camp sessions. He continued to speak God's Word with joy until health issues halted him at age 88. The desire to continue sharing the Gospel never left him, even from his bed at Sanford Hospice House.

Jim served on many boards in all of these parish communities. He especially enjoyed being chairman of the Red River Valley Billy Graham Crusade in 1987, and being a member of the Lutheran Health and Banner Health Systems boards from 1990–2005. Being on these boards sparked his love of travel, taking trips to the British Isles, Scandinavia, Europe, the Middle East, and Australia. He led many bus tours throughout the U.S. and tour groups 19 times to Israel, Jordan, and Egypt. Two trips to the Passion Play Performance in Germany were tucked into his travels also.

A noted and gifted motivational speaker, Jim spoke to several varied groups locally and around the country including the Fellowship of Christian Athletes national gathering. As Joe Dill, a former Fargo Forum editor, stated, ''Jim Bjorge is among the best speakers I have heard—stands in front of a group with no cards, and it just rolls out''!

Throughout his life, Jim was a sports enthusiast and a lover of the outdoors and creation. He was an avid hunter of deer and pheasant. Antelope, other game birds, various animal pelts, and fish also adorned his man cave walls. He ruled the remote when his favorite basketball, baseball, and football games were on TV. Another pastime he enjoyed was hobby ranching and always had horses.

Jim is survived by his wife, Carol; children, Barak (Katie), Debbie, Nate (Kate), Tim (Amy), Ben (Renata) Bjorge; Carol's two children, Dawn and Brian Winter; sixteen grandchildren; fifteen great grandchildren; and a number of nieces and nephews. He was preceded in death by his parents, Johs and Esther; brothers, John and Mark; grandson, Willie Bjorge; and his first wife, Fran.

A visitation will be held at 4:00–6:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 9, 2025 in the chapel at First Lutheran Church. A Funeral Service will be held at 10:30 a.m. on Friday, October 10 with a visitation one hour prior, all at First Lutheran Church, Fargo. Lunch will be served in the dining hall following the service. Burial will be at Ellsborough Lutheran Church Cemetery near Lake Wilson, Minnesota.

To send flowers to the family in memory of James Bjorge, please visit our flower store.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, Pastor James Bjorge was—well, he was a pastor. He was a Lutheran pastor, a big Norwegian American from Minnesota. He loved sports, loved the Lord, loved the church, loved his family, loved his community. And he was my pastor. He was a pastor for our family when we attended First Lutheran Church in Fargo, ND.

But Pastor Bjorge was especially gifted. He was also an evangelist. He was, I remember, the chairman of the Red River Valley Billy Graham Crusade in Fargo in 1987. And that is not common for Lutheran pastors. It was more so back then than it is today, to be part of something so evangelical.

But some of Jim's gifts included, of course, being a great orator. Every pastor preaches, but not every pastor preaches well. James Bjorge preached exceptionally well, and I still remember several of his sermons.

One of the gifts that Jim had that I admired so much is he could recite poetry by heart. He had a photographic memory, it seemed to me. He could recite about anything he read, but especially poetry. And I remember some of the poems that he would use as illustrations in his sermons that still stick with me, some of them that were even anonymous in terms of who wrote them.

I remember one where he started out: I had walked life's way with an easy tread, followed to where pleasures and comforts led, when by chance in a quiet place, I met the Master face to face.

He went on to recite this poem perfectly, and I thought: Wow, I would like to be able to do that. I learned one poem—that one.

But I remember him quoting Robert Browning Hamilton when he said:

I walked a mile with Pleasure; She chatted all the way; But left me none the wiser For all she had to say. I walked a mile with Sorrow; And ne'er a word said she; But, oh! The things I learned from her, When Sorrow walked with me.

And I was thinking about that poem and him delivering that poem and me remembering that poem from probably 30 years ago in his sermon because of how profound it was and how profound it is to think about on this sad day.

But while he was all those things—he was a great motivator, great with illustration, great with stories—he was first and foremost a really, really learned teacher of Scripture. He loved the Scriptures. He knew the Scriptures, and he taught the Scriptures with incredible, incredible skill. And he brought the Scriptures to life. He was a profound teacher. He was a solid doctor.

And I remember, of all the many lessons I learned from him—and I am just going to wrap up with this one story. And I remember it so well because I remember reciting it back to him in a letter one time. In one sermon, he said: We should all live with one eye on Heaven.

And there are lots of scriptural references that sort of touch on that, but his point—his point, I believe—was if you live with one eye on Heaven, particularly knowing that you are focused on your eternal destiny, that that would somehow impact how you lived your life on Earth.

And for somebody who taught the Pauline epistle so beautifully, emphasized every single Sunday God's salvation by His grace through faith alone, not by anything we do, it was a good reminder that if you live with one eye on your eternal destiny that you have not earned but rather have been given as a free gift from God, it would affect how you approach your journey here on Earth.

So I think of Pastor Bjorge today. I think of his family, and I wish I could be at the celebration of his life. Tomorrow, no doubt, there will be lots of great stories told and a few tears shed.

But I know this—and in my life, the pastors of my youth, right up to my current pastor, have always left a profound mark on my life, and I know this for sure: While I could never and never have been able to achieve his level of living with one eye on Heaven, because I knew him, I am a better person than I would be if I hadn't known Jim Bjorge.

And when I think about the testimony not only of his words—I mean, he was gifted with words but the fact that he lived with one eye on Heaven gives me great comfort knowing that he is now there—that he is now there—and that his 94 years walking on this Earth, his walk reflected his view of Heaven and the certainty of his destination.

So with that, I just say thank you Pastor Bjorge for making me better.

Thank you for your ministry. Thank you for your testimony and witness. I just wish his family well and just know that I am going to miss him. I am going to miss him but grateful that I knew him.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume morning business.

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

TRIBUTE TO VICE ADMIRAL SARA A. JOYNER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I submit this statement for the RECORD, alongside my colleague Senator ALSOBROOKS, to honor and recognize an extraordinary leader, trailblazer, and native of Maryland VADM Sara A. Joyner, U.S. Navy, on the occasion of her retirement following an exceptional 36-year career in service to our Nation.

Vice Admiral Joyner, known by her call sign ''Clutch,'' hails from Hoopers Island, MD, and is a proud graduate of Cambridge-South Dorchester High School, where she was valedictorian of the class of 1985. She was appointed to the U.S. Naval Academy by President Ronald Reagan and graduated with merit in 1989 with a bachelor of science in oceanography. After completing flight training, she earned her ''wings of gold'' in 1991, becoming a naval aviator and embarking on a career that would break barriers and inspire generations.

Throughout her distinguished career, Vice Admiral Joyner achieved numerous historic milestones. She became the first woman to command a Navy strike fighter squadron, VFA–105, in 2010, and in 2013, she made history again as the first female commander of a carrier airwing. Her operational assignments included deployments aboard the USS *Nimitz*, USS *John C. Stennis*, and USS *Harry S. Truman* in support of Operations Southern Watch, Enduring Freedom, and Iraqi Freedom. She accumulated over 3,700 flight hours and 750 arrested landings in naval aircraft, including the F/A–18 Hornet, Super Hornet, and Growler.

Vice Admiral Joyner's leadership extended beyond the cockpit. She served in numerous key positions ashore, including as an adversary pilot, a Joint Strike Fighter requirements officer, and as director of the Navy Senate Liaison Division in the Office of Legislative Affairs. Her flag assignments included leading the Physiological Episode Action Team (PEAT), serving as director for Manpower and Personnel (J1) on the Joint Staff, and commanding Carrier Strike Group 2. Most recently, she served as the Director for Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment (J8) on the Joint Staff, where she played a pivotal role in shaping the Department of Defense's strategic direction and resource allocation.

As Director of J8, Vice Admiral Joyner oversaw the formulation of three Department of Defense budgets and her leadership in global force management ensured the readiness and responsiveness of the Joint Force. Her efforts have left an indelible mark on the Department of Defense and the security of our Nation.

Vice Admiral Joyner's career is a testament to her resilience and determination. She entered naval aviation at a time when women were prohibited from flying in combat, yet she persevered, earning the respect of her peers and breaking barriers for future generations. She has often spoken about the importance of grit and passion, values instilled in her during her upbringing on Maryland's Eastern Shore. Her words of encouragement to the next generation, including as a commencement speaker at her alma mater Cambridge-South Dorchester High School, continue to inspire.

Vice Admiral Joyner's service has been recognized with numerous awards, including the Navy Distinguished Service Medal, Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, and Air Medal, among others. At the time of her retirement, she is the highest ranking female flag officer in the U.S. Navy—a remarkable achievement that reflects her dedication, leadership, and trailblazing spirit.

As Vice Admiral Joyner retires, she leaves behind a legacy of service, leadership, and inspiration. Her contributions to our Nation's security and to the lives of those she served alongside will not be forgotten. On behalf of a grateful Nation, we extend our deepest thanks to VADM Sara Joyner, her husband of 32 years, Jim Joyner; their children ENS Sara Beth Joyner and Mark Joyner; and her family for their sacrifices and support throughout her career.

May her retirement be filled with the same sense of purpose and fulfillment that defined her remarkable career. Maryland is proud to call her one of our own, and her legacy will continue to inspire generations to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING VOLVO CARS

• Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Volvo Cars on 70 years in the United States and the 10th anniversary of its plant in South Carolina. For decades, Volvo has been a strong partner in advancing America's automotive progress with innovations such as the three-point safety belt, now standard in every vehicle.

With more than $1.3 billion invested in U.S. manufacturing, the Volvo Car Charleston Plant stands as a powerful example of how global partnerships have bolstered South Carolina's economy. Today, the plant produces their flagship EX90 SUV for markets around the world, helping to strengthen exports and create good-paying jobs at home. Volvo Cars also recently announced it will add the XC60 mid-size SUV to the South Carolina production line. Volvo Cars has 283 retailers in 48 States, employing more than 11,500 people.

Again, congratulations to Volvo and its employees for 10 years of manufacturing in South Carolina.•

TRIBUTE TO JOE CASTIGLIONE

• Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the retirement announcement of Joe Castiglione or ''Joe C'' as Sooner fans like to call him. Under his watch, Oklahoma has won 26 national championships and 117 conference championships in a span of 27 years. Roughly 58 percent of OU's national championships were won under his impeccable leadership.

Originally a native of Fort Lauderdale, FL, Joe attended college at the University of Maryland, graduating in 1979. After serving in previous roles at Rice, Georgetown, and the University of Missouri, in July 1998, he was hired as director of the OU Athletics Department. In the 27 years that followed, he went on to completely transform the athletics program.

From Joe's strategic coaching hires like Bob Stoops, K.J. Kindler, and Lon Kruger, to unprecedented fundraising and facilities construction, Joe created and sustained a culture of excellence at OU Athletics. The athletic department raised $109 million in the 2021–2022 year, $79 million in 2022–2023, and $110 million in 2023–2024. The Gaylord Family-Oklahoma Memorial Stadium underwent a $160 million renovation prior to the 2016 season, and new facilities like the Griffin Family Performance Center and Love's Field, the new softball stadium, have been built.

Joe's calm and steady response to the Covid–19 pandemic is emblematic of his vision for the athletics department. During the fear and uncertainty of the pandemic, Joe was intent that OU Athletics would overcome and persevere through the difficulty. More recently, Joe has helped navigate the changing landscape of college athletics, which include the transfer portal and name, image, and likeness, NIL.

In 2024, Joe oversaw the Sooners' move from the Big 12 to the Southeastern Conference, SEC. Additionally, in the 2024–25 academic year alone, the women's gymnastics team shared the SEC regular season title and won its seventh national title; softball captured the regular season SEC title; men's gymnastics won the Pacific Sports Federation Championship; and men's and women's track were in the top 15 of the NCAA Outdoor Championships.

With immense success on the field, it would have been easy to push academics to the side, but Joe has always

maintained that the student-athletes come first. He helped ensure that student-athletes maintained a strong academic focus. The student-athlete GPA for the last 27 consecutive semesters has remained a 3.0 and above.

In 2018, Joe was named Co-National Athletic Director of the Year. A 2017 Sports Illustrated survey named him the best athletics director in the country. He has also been the recipient of the LEAD1 Association Pearl Award of Excellence, the John L. Toner Award from the National Football Foundation, and has been inducted into the Oklahoma Sports Hall of Fame. He is also the only person in history to have served on the College Football Playoff Committee and the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball and Baseball Committees.

His wife Kristen has supported his endeavors for 30 years. Retirement will give both of them the chance to spend a bit more time together in the years ahead. They have two sons Joseph Jr. and Jonathan.

In his nearly three decades at OU, Joe C's vision for Sooner magic created the gold standard of athletics at OU today. Since Joe will not be officially retiring until 2028, this is not the final goodbye, but an opportunity to thank Joe for his decades of service and dedication to a program that owes him so much. Joe, thank you for your leadership.●

TRIBUTE TO ADAM CHENAULT

● Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Deputy Adam Chenault of the Cooper County Sheriff's Office for his extraordinary bravery, composure, and willingness to put his life on the line for others.

In the middle of February, Deputy Chenault responded to an urgent call along the frigid Missouri River. A woman in distress was perched above a 70-foot drop amidst icy and snowy conditions. After Deputy Chenault arrived on the scene, he quickly exited his patrol vehicle and approached the cliff's edge, placing himself at great personal risk. He kept responding units back while he calmly spoke with the distressed woman, eventually talking her off the ledge to safety.

Deputy Chenault remained by her side until medical personnel arrived, and he ensured her safe transportation to a nearby hospital. His decisive action, disregard for personal safety, and calming words saved a life.

Deputy Adam Chenault is truly a Champion of Missouri. Chenault was presented with the Life Saving Award by the Cooper County Sheriff's Office. His unwavering commitment to protecting those in danger exemplifies the best of Missouri law enforcement. I commend Deputy Chenault for his lifesaving service.●

TRIBUTE TO CLARA HILL

● Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Clara Hill of Missouri Middle School for her election as president of Missouri Middle School FBLA.

Future Business Leaders of America, FBLA, is a nationally recognized organization dedicated to preparing the next generation of students for careers in business, leadership, and service. By earning the trust and support of her peers in this competitive election, Clara Hill has demonstrated maturity and a strong commitment to excellence well beyond her years. Her achievement reflects not only her personal dedication and leadership ability, but also a bright future for the next generation of Missouri youth.

As a newly elected leader in the Missouri Middle School's FBLA chapter, Clara Hill will play a vital role in empowering her fellow classmates to grow as leaders and citizens. Her accomplishment serves as a powerful example of how determination, character, and vision can inspire others to succeed.

Clara Hill is truly a Champion of Missouri. Her ability to lead and strong determination were critical in winning her school's FBLA election. I commend Clara Hill for her service to Missouri and wish her all the best in her future endeavors with the Future Business Leaders of America.●

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL PAUL NICHOLS

● Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Corporal Paul Nichols of Hartsburg, MO, and to thank him for his years of service to our State and great Nation. Over his time in the U.S. Army during the closing months of World War II through his discharge just prior to the Korean war, Corporal Nichols, then serving with the 48th Field Artillery Battalion, demonstrated excellence in his work as an electrical lineman and inspector for communication lines across Korea. Through both his time in our Republic's armed forces and his time at home, he more than demonstrated his capability.

Corporal Paul Nichols is truly a member of the greatest generation and is an outstanding example of a Heartland Hero. I am truly grateful for his commitment to protecting our fellow Americans, am honored by his devotion, and know that my colleagues will join me in wishing him the best.●

REMEMBERING ADRIENNE L. OTTAVIANI

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of Adrienne L. Ottaviani, who passed away on September 23, 2025, at the age of 78. Adrienne was a devoted wife, mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother, and a leader whose kindness and dedication enriched western Maryland for more than four decades.

Born in Denbo, PA, and raised in Baltimore, Adrienne married her husband Philip in 1968. Together, they shared 57 years of marriage and built a loving family. In 1980, the Ottavianis moved to Cumberland, MD, where Adrienne quickly became a pillar of the community. She was first active in the PTA and served on the Allegany County Board of Education. In 1990, she was elected to the Allegany County Board of Commissioners, becoming one of only four women ever to hold that office. Adrienne demonstrated leadership, dedication, and a deep commitment to public service throughout her tenure.

Adrienne's greatest legacy, however, may be the warmth and fellowship she shared through Ristorante Ottaviani, which she and her husband opened in downtown Cumberland in 2005. Known affectionately as ''Mama O,'' she welcomed every guest like family, serving food, friendship, and her signature hugs. The restaurant became a cherished community gathering place, reflecting her love of people and her belief that everyone deserved to feel special.

Adrienne Ottaviani was a trailblazer, a friend, and a source of light to all who knew her. She will be remembered for her service, her compassion, and her extraordinary generosity of spirit. She leaves behind her husband, three children, nine grandchildren, and three great-grandchildren, who will carry forward her legacy of love and community. Her memory will remain a blessing to her family, her community, and to the State of Maryland.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting a nomination and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2983. A bill to reauthorize the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–1975. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule

entitled ''Preparer Tax Identification Number (PTIN) User Fee Update'' (RIN1545–BR55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1976. A communication from the Associate Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval of American Society of Mechanical Engineers Unconditioned Code Cases'' (RIN3150–AL20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1977. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Definitions and Common Reference Tables'' (FRL No. 12821–02–R7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1978. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; California; San Joaquin Valley 1-Hour Ozone Area; Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request'' (FRL No. 12521–02–R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1979. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Washington; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan for the Second Implementation Period'' (FRL No. 12449–02–R10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1980. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; West Virginia; 2024 Amendments to West Virginia's Ambient Air Quality Standards'' (FRL No. 12329–02–R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1981. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; New York; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference'' (FRL No. 12028–01–R2) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1982. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Delaware; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program Certification'' (FRL No. 11841–02–R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1983. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Water Quality Standards to Protect Acquatic Life in the Delaware River'' ((RIN2040–AG30) (FRL No. 10760–02–OW)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1984. A communication from the Associate Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.101 Revision 7, 'Emergency Response Planning and Preparedness for Nuclear Power Reactors' '' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1985. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Oversight and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers Eligibility for Legacy Participants and Legacy Applicants'' (RIN2900–AR28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1986. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Oversight and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation'' (RIN2900–AS11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1987. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Oversight and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance and Veterans' Group Life Insurance-Accelerated Benefit Option Regulation Update'' (RIN2900–AR67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–1988. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''OCC Withdraws Principles for Climate-Related Financial Risk Management for Large Financial Institutions'' (News Release 2025–27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1989. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 14257 with respect to regulating imports with a reciprocal tariff to rectify trade practices that contribute to large and persistent annual United States goods trade deficits; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1990. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amicarbazone; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 12992–01–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1991. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Update to Section 355 PLR Procedures'' (Rev. Proc. 2025–30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1992. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interest Capitalization Requirements for Improvements that constitute Designated Property'' (RIN1545–BN93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1993. A communication from the Chairwoman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–123; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1994. A communication from the Chief Regulatory Officer, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Facilitating Earlier Filing of Certain Electronically Submitted H–2A Petitions'' (RIN1615–AD04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1995. A communication from the Director of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material of Chile'' (RIN1685–AA35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1996. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category-Initial Notification Date Extension'' ((RIN2040–AG48) (FRL No. 8794.3–02–OW)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1997. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Revisions to Regulation for Control of Ozone Season Nitrogen Oxide Emissions'' (FRL No. 12075–02–R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1998. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Revisions to Regulations for Sulfur Dioxide Emissions from Combustion Sources'' (FRL No. 12823–02–R4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1999. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Updates to the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule'' (FRL No . 12862–02–R4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2000. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Standards for Granting Permits and Major New Source Review Permit Rules'' (FRL No. 12923–02–R4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–2001. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Removal of Emissions Statements Requirement and Updates to Permit by Rule'' (FRL No. 12937–02–R4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 7, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Finance.

*Derek Theurer, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

*Jonathan Greenstein, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

*Donald Korb, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury.

By Ms. ERNST for the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

William Kirk, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Small Business Administration.

By Mr. MORAN for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

*Jeremiah Workman, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

*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.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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 Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 2984. A bill to reform the labor laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2985. A bill to secure the dignity and safety of incarcerated women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2986. A bill to establish certain conditions on employment and other work arrangements at the Food and Drug Administration to ensure the safety and security of drugs and devices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2987. A bill to establish a program of workforce development as an alternative to college for all, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 2988. A bill to bolster upgrades and infastructure for lasting development at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2989. A bill to prohibit certain sales or leases of real property for a health care entity if the terms of such a sale or lease would lead to long-term weakened financial status of the health care entity or place the public health at risk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2990. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2991. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to the requirement to test drivers of commercial motor vehicles for English proficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BANKS:

S. 2992. A bill to repeal the Portable Fuel Container Safety Act of 2020 and the Children's Gasoline Burn Prevention Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''Buffalo Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment''; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 442. A resolution condemning Russian incursions into NATO territory and reaffirming Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 443. A resolution expressing concern about the growing problem of book banning, and the proliferation of threats to freedom of expression in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 332

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to require a study on Holocaust education efforts of States, local educational agencies, and public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor 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 New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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. 494

At the request of Mr. SCHMITT, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 494, a bill to establish a national plan to coordinate research on epilepsy, and for other purposes.

S. 558

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 558, a bill to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes.

S. 609

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 609, a bill to improve mental health services of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 761

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) 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. 970

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 970, a bill to establish a pilot program to improve the family self-sufficiency program, and for other purposes.

S. 1454

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1454, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes.

S. 1756

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1756, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination against

health care entities that do not participate in abortion, and to strengthen implementation and enforcement of Federal conscience laws.

S. 1757

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for more efficient hearings on nuclear facility construction applications, and for other purposes.

S. 1792

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1792, a bill to prohibit employment discrimination against whistleblowers reporting AI security vulnerabilities or AI violations, and for other purposes.

S. 1838

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1838, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a program of research, training, and investigation related to Down syndrome, and for other purposes.

S. 1854

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1854, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to political and economic elites in Haiti, and for other purposes.

S. 1884

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1884, a bill to clarify the Holocaust Expropriated Art Recovery Act of 2016, to appropriately limit the application of defenses based on the passage of time and other non-merits defenses to claims under that Act.

S. 1932

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1932, a bill to amend the National Housing Act and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 to include information regarding VA home loans in the Informed Consumer Choice Disclosure required to be provided to prospective FHA borrowers and to require a military service question on the Uniform Residential Loan Application, and for other purposes.

S. 2042

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2042, a bill to provide lasting protection for inventoried roadless areas within the National Forest System.

S. 2191

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2191, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent bulk sales of ammunition, promote recordkeeping and reporting about ammunition, end ammunition straw purchasing, and require a background check before the transfer of ammunition by certain Federal firearms licensees to non-licensees.

S. 2309

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2309, a bill to direct a physician or nurse practitioner employed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certify the death of a veteran not later than 48 hours after such physician or nurse practitioner learns of such death, and for other purposes.

S. 2346

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2346, a bill to require the Election Assistance Commission to develop voluntary guidelines for the administration of elections that address the use and risks of artificial intelligence technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 2386

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2386, a bill to limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and for other purposes.

S. 2426

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2426, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide pharmacy payment of certain services.

S. 2451

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2451, a bill to ensure that paraprofessionals and education support staff are paid a living wage.

S. 2738

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2738, a bill to establish eligibility requirements for covered educational employees under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, and for other purposes.

S. 2936

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2936, a bill to designate Antifa as a domestic terrorist organization, to counter domestic terrorism and organized political violence, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 83

At the request of Mr. SCHIFF, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 83, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 409

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 409, a resolution recognizing the 74th anniversary of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Philippines and the strong bilateral security alliance between our two nations in the wake of escalating aggression and political lawfare by the People's Republic of China in the South China Sea.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 442—CONDEMNING RUSSIAN INCURSIONS INTO NATO TERRITORY AND REAFFIRMING ARTICLE 5 OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. THUNE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. REED, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 442

Whereas, in February 2014, Russia launched an unprovoked military assault on Ukraine, seizing Crimea and considerable territory in the eastern part of the country;

Whereas, on February 24, 2022, Russia launched a full-scale military invasion of Ukraine designed to topple its democratically elected government and install a puppet regime, an assault that was repelled but which continues unabated today;

Whereas Russia has undertaken a sustained campaign of sabotage, arson, intimidation, and assassination across member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Europe;

Whereas, on September 9, 2025, at least 19 Russian drones entered Polish airspace, some reaching more than 100 miles into Polish territory;

Whereas, on September 14, 2025, at least one Russian drone entered Romanian airspace;

Whereas, on September 19, three Russian MIG–31 fighter jets crossed into Estonian airspace, marking the fourth such Russian incursion in 2025;

Whereas, on September 22, 2025, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Mike Waltz said at a meeting of the Security Council, ''As we said nine days ago, the United States stands by our NATO allies in the face of these airspace violations. I want to take this first opportunity to repeat and to emphasize: The United States and our allies will defend every inch of NATO territory.''; and

Whereas, among nine such encounters this year, on September 24, 2025, United States

military aircraft intercepted two Russian Tu–95 long-range strategic bombers and two Su–35 fighter jets flying in the Alaskan Air Defense Identification Zone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns Russian incursions into the territory and airspace of NATO member countries;

(2) condemns Russia's continued assault on Ukraine, kidnapping of Ukrainian children, and refusal to negotiate an end to the war it started; and

(3) reaffirms NATO's Article 5 commitment to collective self-defense.

SENATE RESOLUTION 443—EXPRESSING CONCERN ABOUT THE GROWING PROBLEM OF BOOK BANNING, AND THE PROLIFERATION OF THREATS TO FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 443

Whereas the overwhelming majority of voters in the United States oppose book bans;

Whereas an overwhelming majority of voters in the United States support educators teaching about the civil rights movement, the history and experiences of Native Americans, enslaved Africans, immigrants facing discrimination, and the ongoing effects of racism;

Whereas an overwhelming majority of Americans are confident that the public schools of their communities select appropriate books for students to read;

Whereas, in 1969, the Supreme Court of the United States held in Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District, 393 U.S. 503 (1969), that students do not ''shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate'';

Whereas, in 1982, a plurality of the Supreme Court of the United States wrote in Board of Education, Island Trees Union Free School District No. 26 v. Pico, 457 U.S. 853 (1982), that schools may not remove library books based on ''narrowly partisan or political grounds'', as this kind of censorship will result in ''official suppression of ideas'';

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protects freedom of speech and the freedom to read and write;

Whereas Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that ''everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers'';

Whereas PEN America has identified 6,870 instances of individual books banned between July 2024 and June 2025;

Whereas books banned between July 2024 and June 2025 include 3,751 unique titles, censoring the works of 2,589 authors, illustrators, and translators;

Whereas the majority of book bans were enacted without following the best practice guidelines for book challenges outlined by the American Library Association, the National Coalition Against Censorship, and the National Council of Teachers of English;

Whereas the unimpeded exchange of ideas and the freedom to read are essential to a strong democracy;

Whereas books do not require readers to agree with topics, themes, or viewpoints, but instead allow readers to explore and engage with differing perspectives to form and inform their own views;

Whereas suppressing the freedom to read and denying access to literature, history, and knowledge are repressive and anti-democratic tactics used by authoritarian regimes against their people;

Whereas book bans violate the rights of students, families, residents, and citizens based on the political, ideological, and cultural preferences of the specific individuals or groups imposing the bans;

Whereas book bans have multifaceted, harmful consequences on—

(1) students, who have a right to access a diverse range of stories and perspectives, especially students from historically marginalized backgrounds whose communities are often targeted by thought control measures;

(2) educators and librarians, who are operating in some States in an increasingly punitive and surveillance-oriented environment and experience a chilling effect in their work;

(3) authors whose works are targeted and suppressed;

(4) parents who want their children to attend public schools that remain open to curiosity, discovery, and the freedom to read; and

(5) community members who want free access to a range of uncensored information and knowledge from their public libraries;

Whereas classic and award-winning literature and books that have been part of school curricula for decades have been challenged, removed from libraries pending review, or outright banned from schools, including—

(1) ''Brave New World'' by Aldous Huxley;

(2) ''The Handmaid's Tale'' by Margaret Atwood;

(3) ''Anne Frank's Diary: The Graphic Adaptation'' adapted by Ari Folman;

(4) ''Their Eyes Were Watching God'' by Zora Neal Hurston; and

(5) ''To Kill a Mockingbird'' by Harper Lee;

Whereas books, particularly those written by and about outsiders, newcomers, and individuals from marginalized backgrounds, are facing a heightened risk of being banned;

Whereas, according to PEN America, a disproportionate number of books banned or otherwise restricted in the United States have LGBTQ+ characters or themes that recognize the equal humanity and dignity of all individuals despite differences, including—

(1) ''And Tango Makes Three'' by Justin Richardson and Peter Parnell; and

(2) ''This Book Is Gay'' by Juno Dawson;

Whereas many books, both fiction and nonfiction, that have been targeted for bans or restrictions in the United States are books about race or racism, or that feature characters of color, including—

(1) ''The Story of Ruby Bridges'' by Robert Coles and illustrated by George Ford;

(2) ''Letter from Birmingham Jail'' by Martin Luther King Jr.;

(3) ''Thank You, Jackie Robinson'' by Barbara Cohen;

(4) ''Malala: A Hero For All'' by Shana Corey;

(5) ''Fry Bread: A Native American Family Story'' by Kevin Noble Maillard;

(6) ''Hair Love'' by Matthew A. Cherry;

(7) ''Good Trouble: Lessons From the Civil Rights Playbook'' by Christopher Noxon; and

(8) ''We Are All Born Free: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights in Pictures'' by Amnesty International;

Whereas the Comic Book Legal Defense Fund has reported a dramatic surge in challenges at libraries and schools to the inclusion of graphic novels that depict the diversity of civic life in the United States and the painful and complex history of racism, homophobia, Anti-Asian bias, and antisemitism embedded in the human experience, including—

(1) ''New Kid'' by Jerry Craft;

(2) ''Maus'' by Art Spiegelman;

(3) ''American Born Chinese'' by Gene Luen Yang; and

(4) ''Drama'' by Raina Telgemeier;

Whereas books addressing death, grief, mental illness, and suicide are targeted alongside nonfiction books that discuss feelings and emotions written for teenage and young adult audiences that frequently confront these topics;

Whereas, during congressional hearings on April 7, 2022, May 19, 2022, and September 12, 2023, students, parents, teachers, librarians, and school administrators testified to the chilling and fear-spreading effects that book bans have on education and the school environment;

Whereas, since 2021, State legislation censoring certain content within schools and libraries has been enacted across the country, resulting in nearly 23,000 book bans;

Whereas an increasing amount of book censorship goes unreported and may be higher than is currently reported due to mass removals implementing vaguely-written State legislation and a lack of transparency about district-based removals;

Whereas, according to PEN America, from July 2024 to June 2025, 23 States across the country limited access to certain books for limited or indefinite periods of time, including—

(1) Florida, where at least 2,304 books have been banned or restricted in 33 school districts;

(2) Texas, where at least 1,781 books have been banned or restricted in 7 school districts;

(3) Tennessee, where at least 1,622 books have been banned or restricted in 8 school districts;

(4) Idaho, where at least 150 books have been banned or restricted in 1 school district; and

(5) Iowa, where at least 113 books have been banned or restricted in 4 school districts;

Whereas the President of the United States has repeatedly expressed support for the censorship of certain subjects such as gender, sexuality, and race through public statements and executive orders;

Whereas, following executive orders, Department of Defense Education Activity (referred to in this preamble as ''DoDEA'') schools removed books related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, ''gender ideology'', and anything that would suggest ''that America's founding documents are racist or sexist'', resulting in the censorship of classroom instruction and student activities, as well as the removal of at least 596 books in DoDEA schools;

Whereas, following the same executive orders, the Department of Defense directed all military academies to identify and remove books from their libraries that include themes related to race, ''gender ideology'', and other ''divisive concepts'' that the Administration considers ''incompatible with the department's core mission'', which led to the temporary removal of nearly 400 books

from the Nimitz Library of the United States Naval Academy, including ''I Know Why The Caged Bird Sings'' by Maya Angelou;

Whereas at least 20 books remain suspended from the shelves of the United States Naval Academy;

Whereas grants administered by the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and other Federal agencies have been terminated or revoked for using language related to race, gender, and LGBTQ+ identity or addressing social inequality; and

Whereas the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education has claimed book bans are a ''hoax,'' ended investigations of alleged discrimination related to book banning, and fired the staff person in charge of addressing the book banning crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses concern about the spreading problem of book banning and the proliferating threats to freedom of expression in the United States;

(2) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to supporting the freedom of expression of writers that is protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution and the freedom of all individuals in the United States to read books without government censorship;

(3) calls on local governments and school districts to follow best practice guidelines when addressing challenges to books;

(4) calls on local governments and school districts to protect the rights of students to learn and the ability of educators and librarians to teach, including by providing students with the opportunity to read a wide array of books reflecting the full breadth and diversity of viewpoints and perspectives;

(5) calls for the return of all books removed from Department of Defense schools and libraries under executive orders since January 2025; and

(6) calls for the repeal of executive orders and rescission of directives that have enacted content-based and viewpoint-based restrictions on the freedom to read and learn in United States public schools and libraries.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3927. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3928. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3927. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1067. IDENTIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ENGAGED IN CROWD CONTROL.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Federal law enforcement officer'' means—

(A) an employee or officer in a position in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Federal Government who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise a law enforcement function; or

(B) an employee or officer of a contractor or subcontractor (at any tier) of an agency in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Federal Government who is authorized by law or under the contract with the agency to engage in or supervise a law enforcement function;

(2) the term ''law enforcement function'' means the prevention, detection, or investigation of, or the prosecution or incarceration of any person for, any violation of law; and

(3) the term ''member of an armed force'' means a member of any of the armed forces, as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, or a member of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(3) of title 32, United States Code.

(b) REQUIRED IDENTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each Federal law enforcement officer or member of an armed force who is engaged in any form of crowd control, riot control, or arrest or detainment of individuals engaged in an act of civil disobedience, demonstration, protest, other activity protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or riot in the United States shall at all times display identifying information in a clearly visible fashion, which shall include—

(A) for a Federal law enforcement officer, the Federal agency and the last name or unique identifier of the officer; and

(B) for a member of an armed force, the service branch and the last name or unique identifier of the member.

(2) PROHIBITION ON COVERING OF IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.—A Federal law enforcement officer or member of an armed force may not tape over or otherwise obscure or conceal the identifying information required under paragraph (1) while the officer or member is engaged in any form of law enforcement activity described in paragraph (1).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) provide any new authority or expand existing authority for members of an armed force to engage in law enforcement activity; or

(2) affect existing law regarding the deployment of members of an armed force for law enforcement activity.

SA 3928. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 922, add the following:

(h) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program for deploying microreactors at United States military installations to strengthen energy resilience and reduce reliance on vulnerable civilian grids.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I have nine 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 COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 3:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 8, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an open hearing on nominations.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Shane Reader,

who is a legislative fellow in my office, to be granted floor privileges for the duration of his fellowship.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Matthew Sheffield, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

HONORING CHARLES RILEY AND TRIBUTE TO BRETT STASSI

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, on Monday evening, a tragedy occurred at the courthouse building in Plaquemine, LA. Captain Brett Stassi, Jr., of the Iberville Parish Sheriff's Office, the son of the Parish Sheriff, Sheriff Stassi, and Deputy Charles Riley were shot by a suspect they were booking in connection with a sexual assault case.

Here, you see their pictures.

The two officers were taken to the hospital. Deputy Riley, a 6-year veteran of the Iberville Sheriff's Office, husband and father, died.

Captain Stassi, I am told, has undergone several surgeries and is in critical but stable condition.

A tragedy like this reminds us that law enforcement officers put their lives on the line for us every single day. We can never take that for granted.

Deputy Riley gave his life protecting our community booking somebody for sexual assault, a horrific crime—booking him, and he himself was killed, an even more horrific crime.

We pray for the close friends of both, the loved ones of both, those who grieve the loss of someone they looked up to and will deeply miss.

Our hearts are with the fellow deputies who are hurting and the whole Plaquemine and Iberville Parish community. We pray and hope for Captain Stassi's strength and full recovery and, of course, for his wife and family.

The support we get from law enforcement, their willingness to put themselves in harm's way, can never be repaid. We take it for granted until it no longer can be done so.

We support law enforcement. We support those suffering in the wake of this tragedy.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO MARY HAJEK NUGENT

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am about to list several things which are all kind of unique. A 102-year-old woman—kind of unique—who is a naval veteran, a female naval veteran, who is now 102 and she is a Louisianan and she exemplifies the best of our State: hard work, service, and faith.

She turned—Mary Hajek Nugent—turned 102 years young this month. Born on a farm near Libuse, LA, Mary has always been a hard worker. She grew up tending vegetable gardens, a fruit orchard, and farm animals before enlisting in the U.S. Navy, building planes at a bomber plant, and serving as a parachute rigger.

For some reason, if I were a guy using a parachute, I would rather have a woman rigging it for me rather than some guy. I don't know why. But I think she would have been more attuned to the detail of making sure that when that ripcord was pulled, the guy using it landed slowly and softly and not (motioning).

After World War II, she returned to central Louisiana and devoted her time and talents to the tuberculosis unit at Pineville Veterans Hospital. She later worked at the downtown Alexandria Veterans Affairs office, where she met her husband Robert Nugent.

I am told Mrs. Nugent still greets people with a warm smile and has a deep appreciation for nature. Perhaps her habit of looking for the good in everything and in everyone is the secret to a long life, something we in Washington should adopt.

As a longtime member of Calvary Baptist Church, Mary's faith is strong, and she still wakes up every day with a smile and words of thanksgiving.

Mary, thank you for your service to our country and State. You have made Louisiana and our country a better place for 102 years. You inspire; you bless; you make Louisiana proud. Happy birthday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on Executive Calendar No. 459 be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the Mascott nomination at a time to be determined between the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, no earlier than Thursday, October 9.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2025

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 115, S. 2296; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, cloture motions filed during Tuesday's session of the Senate ripen at 11:30 a.m.; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday's session of the Senate, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. CRAMER. For the information of my colleagues, there will be three rollcall votes at 11:30 a.m. and further votes expected throughout the day.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:02 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 9, 2025, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LEE LIPTON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on October 8, 2025 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

KAREN BRAZELL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR BENEFITS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE JOSHUA DAVID JACOBS, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JUNE 16, 2025.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING LEIGH-ALLYN BAKER AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Leigh-Allyn Baker as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

Leigh-Allyn Baker is a beloved actress, producer, and voice-over artist, best known as ''Amy Duncan'' on Disney Channel's hit series, Good Luck Charlie. While her career spans film, television, and voice work, Leigh-Allyn is most passionate about using her platform to encourage and inspire others through her faith.

In recent years, she has become widely recognized not only for her artistry, but also for her courage to stand boldly for biblical values in today's culture. She openly shares her trust in God and her commitment to freedom and truth, addressing students on college campuses, speaking at Turning Point USA events, and encouraging her millions of followers online. With a special love for the generation that grew up watching Good Luck Charlie, she now calls Gen Z to live with conviction, resilience, and hope.

Her debut children's book, One Small Little Voice, and her new kids' series, Adventures with Iggy and Mr. Kirk, reflect her heart to inspire young people. She also stars in A Week Away: The Series on Angel Studios.

In recognition of her influence and Christ-centered leadership, Leigh-Allyn is being honored and named a Christian Woman of Distinction by She Leads America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

HONORING THE OUTSTANDING SERVICE OF THE BROWNSVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary courage and service of the Brownsville Fire Department's Water Rescue Operations Team, whose selfless actions in the aftermath of devastating storms in Harlingen exemplified the highest standards of public service.

In March 2025, the Rio Grande Valley experienced severe storms that unleashed over 20 inches of rain in just 48 hours. The storms caused widespread flooding and damage, forcing families from their homes and leaving communities in urgent need of help. The city of Harlingen and the surrounding areas suffered some of the worst damages, with Valley International Airport inundated and closed from March 27 to March 29.

Without hesitation, the Brownsville Fire Department's Water Rescue Operations Team responded to over 70 emergency calls across Cameron County. Through swift and calculated action, these first responders carried out water rescues that saved lives and brought relief to families stranded by floodwater. The Brownsville team's bravery was a critical component in the broader network of mutual aid and collaboration among first responders across the Valley, who together demonstrated the very best of Texas solidarity in the face of disaster.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of South Texas, I wish to express our profound gratitude to the Brownsville Fire Department Water Rescue Operations Team.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LIEUTENANT JOHN MARINO

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to recognize the extraordinary life of Hollywood, Florida Police Lieutenant John Marino.

Lieutenant John Marino dedicated his life to the City of Hollywood and the Hollywood Police Department, serving more than two decades with honor, courage, and a deep commitment to both his fellow officers and the community he loved. He was not only a trusted leader within the department but also a devoted husband to his college sweetheart, Tara, for 29 years, and a proud father of three sons. Throughout their upbringing, he coached youth football across Hollywood, Plantation, Pembroke Pines, Davie, and Cooper City, shaping the lives of countless young athletes and mentoring them as if they were his own.

Beyond his police service, Lieutenant Marino also served as a liaison at Memorial Healthcare System, running the detail that protected and safeguarded doctors, nurses, and caregivers—ensuring that those who heal others could do so in safety. He gave selflessly of his time, his heart, and his strength, whether to his family, his neighbors, or his brothers and sisters in blue.

At the young age of 53, only 14 months shy of 30 yrs of service, Lieutenant Marino was taken far too soon by a sudden heart attack, leaving behind a void that can never be filled. Yet his legacy endures—as a protector, a coach, a mentor, a husband, a father, and a dear friend.

We will forever remember his devotion to service, his love for family, and his unwavering commitment to giving back to others. I am grateful to Lieutenant Marino and his family for the sacrifices they have made to serve and protect our community. May his memory be for a blessing.

HONORING SYDNEY SATCHELL AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sydney Satchell as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

Sydney Satchell is a trailblazer whose life and career are marked by faith, perseverance, and purpose. A proud Howard University alumni, and former Division I Lacrosse player, Sydney's journey through sport and service has been extraordinary. Just months after graduation, she faced the unimaginable when a car accident claimed her lower leg. Through resilience and determination, she went on to become a Paralympic Gold Medalist in 2025 in women's sitting volleyball and was named Best Female Libero at the 2023 ParaVolley Pan American Zonal Championships.

Her achievements have been recognized nationally. Sydney was honored as a 2023 Howard x Jordan Legacy 23 Honoree, received the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference Distinguished Alumni Award in 2025, and was inducted into the Ethel Walker School Athletics Hall of Fame in 2025. In tribute to her legacy, Howard University established the Sydney Satchell Award for Perseverance, celebrating her courage and impact.

In March 2024, Sydney was ordained as a Minister, using her voice to push back darkness and bring encouragement to professionals, athletes, campuses, and organizations across the Nation. Her philanthropic work reflects her servant heart, supporting education, health, and Gospel-centered missions. Today, as a She Leads America Christian Woman of Distinction, Sydney inspires others to walk boldly in their God-given purpose with hope and strength.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

HONORING DARRIN KELLY'S WORK AND CONTRIBUTIONS FOR WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

HON. CHRISTOPHER R. DELUZIO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. DELUZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Darrin Kelly for his seven years of service as President of the Allegheny-Fayette Central Labor Council.

Darrin is stepping down in January after leading the labor movement in Western Pennsylvania. He leaves behind a legacy as a fighter, an organizer, a coalition builder, a strategist, and a fiery champion for the dignity of hardworking people and the sanctity of the union way of life.

Darrin is tough as nails. He knows when it's time to build bridges and he knows when it's time to stand your ground and fight.

Darrin Kelly embodies so much of what Western Pennsylvania is all about: hard work, the sacred labor movement, and service to country.

While his time leading the Labor Council may be ending, I know he'll never let up for a second fighting hard for workers and this great country of ours.

I congratulate Darrin for all he has done for the labor movement in Western Pennsylvania and across America. Fair winds and following seas, Shipmate.

HONORING AZENETH CORRALES, KARLA RIVERA, AND MADELYNN GONZALEZ FOR THEIR ARTISTIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to speak on the achievements of three outstanding student artists from the Rio Grande Valley: Azeneth Corrales of Harlingen High School; Karla Rivera, a Harlingen High School South graduate now attending the University of Texas at Austin; and Madelynn Gonzalez, a St. Joseph's Academy graduate currently at Texas State University.

All three students were awarded RGV Palm Award in recognition of their artistic excellence and dedication. On September 15th, these three talented young women performed at the Noche de Gala, at the 2025 Visioning Summit: Mission Possible hosted by the National Hispanic Foundation for the Arts. The Noche de Gala is a closing celebration of the 2025 Visioning Summit and a true celebration of Latino contributions to culture and the arts.

Achievements like theirs provide a valuable opportunity to recognize talents present in the Rio Grande Valley. I am delighted to represent such creative and intelligent students who make our community proud as they excel with their artistic pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a proud community, I wish to honor Azeneth Corrales, Karla Rivera, and Madelynn Gonzalez for their dedication and achievements.

HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF BRUCE HARTMANN

HON. TIM BURCHETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my friend Bruce Hartmann in celebration of his amazing career. Bruce is a Knoxville native who served in multiple management roles at the Knoxville News Sentinel for twenty-six years, before serving as Senior Vice President and Chief Community Relations Officer at the University of Tennessee Medical Center.

Bruce's career began in Baltimore at The Baltimore Sun, followed by stints in Massachusetts at The Lowell Sun and in New Hampshire at The Nashua Telegraph. Finally settling down in Knoxville, he began work at E.W. Scripps Company, becoming the youngest President and Publisher of the Company at 36 years old. He oversaw the construction of the new Knoxville News Sentinel headquarters in 2001 and has been an integral part of the success of the News Sentinel.

Most recently, Bruce has served the Knoxville community at the University of Tennessee Medical Center. He has helped the hospital secure more than 60 million dollars in grants for the advancement of patient care. He also helped establish the Fentress County Emergency Department and was a true pioneer of rural healthcare in East Tennessee.

Perhaps more importantly, Bruce has a wonderful wife, Tami, and together they have raised an amazing family. Tami and Bruce have been married for 44 years with three children and eight grandchildren. I am thankful for Bruce, his commitment to East Tennessee, and his advocacy for the University of Tennessee. We wish him all the best in retirement.

HONORING BRANDI SWINDELL AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brandi Swindell as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

Brandi Swindell is an internationally recognized speaker, human rights advocate, and the Founder and CEO of Stanton Healthcare International and the Stanton Public Policy Center. For nearly 30 years, she has been a bold voice—empowering women, standing with the marginalized, and protecting human rights in the womb.

Stanton Healthcare operates accredited women's health care clinics across the United States and internationally, providing exceptional pro-life medical care, resources, and hope to women facing unexpected pregnancies. The Stanton Public Policy Center, based on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C., is a women's advocacy and educational organization addressing issues of human rights and justice that inspire and equip women nationally and globally.

Brandi's public policy work includes testifying before Congress on women's pro-life health care, receiving a White House invitation to discuss the role of life-affirming clinics, and advancing legislation to protect women and the unborn.

Her unwavering faith in Jesus Christ is the foundation of her life and leadership. It shapes her vision, sustains her courage, and directs her pursuit of justice for the most vulnerable. In recognition of her leadership and devotion, she is being honored as a 2025 She Leads America Christian Woman of Distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

HONORING PETTY OFFICER FIRST CLASS DONALD RHODES

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Petty Officer First Class Donald Rhodes, a proud native of Jackson, Mississippi, for his outstanding service aboard the USS *Delbert D. Black*, a United States Navy warship stationed in Mayport, Florida.

A 2014 graduate of Raymond High School, Petty Officer Rhodes enlisted in the Navy ten years ago with a vision to save his country and broaden his horizons. Today, as a Culinary Specialist, he is entrusted with ensuring the health and readiness of his shipmates—a role that underscores the critical importance of every sailor aboard a modern warship.

He has often spoken of the values that have guided him in uniform: the importance of speaking up, seeking help when necessary, and consistently showing up with commitment and integrity. His leadership has extended beyond the deck of his ship, as he returned to Jackson to serve as a recruiter, opening doors of opportunity for the next generation of sailors.

Serving aboard a guided-missile destroyer equipped with advanced weaponry—including Tomahawk missiles, torpedoes, guns, and a Phalanx close-in weapons system—Petty Officer Rhodes plays a vital role in maintaining our Navy's readiness and ensuring our nation's security.

Mr. Speaker, Petty Officer Rhodes stands as a testament to the strength, resilience, and determination of Mississippians who choose the path of service. His story not only honors his family and community, but also inspires young people across our state and nation to pursue excellence, service and leadership.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Petty Officer First Class Donald Rhodes for his dedication and sacrifice. His service reflects the very best of Mississippi and the very best of America.

REPORT (H. REPT. 119–299) TO ACCOMPANY H. RES. 722

HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee report (H. Rept. 119–299) to accompany House Resolution 722 should have included in its waivers of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 5371 a disclosure of the following violations:

Section 303 of the Congressional Budget, which prohibits consideration of legislation providing new budget authority, a change in revenues, or a change in the public debt limit, for

a fiscal year until the budget resolution for that year has been agreed to.

HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST UNITED CHURCH OF BROWNSVILLE

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and honor that I rise today to recognize the 175th anniversary of the First United Church of Brownsville, a cornerstone of faith, fellowship, and service in the Rio Grande Valley. For nearly two centuries, this congregation has stood as a beacon of spiritual strength and community engagement, guiding generations of Brownsville.

Founded in 1850 by the Reverend Nehemiah Cravens, who traveled from Alabama on horseback, the First Methodist Church began its mission of service to the people of Brownsville, Texas. Over the decades, the church has grown and adapted, relocating several times before establishing its current home on Boca Chica Boulevard in 1974. Through every chapter of its history, the church has remained committed to serving God and neighbor.

Among its many contributions, the church founded the Good Neighbor Settlement House in the early 1950s, a ministry that provides meals, shelter, and care to the homeless and migrant populations of Brownsville. This enduring service reflects the congregation's deep commitment to compassion toward the community.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful South Texas, I congratulate the First United Methodist Church of Brownsville on its 175th anniversary. I commend the church's clergy and all members past and present for their enduring devotion to faith and community. May their light continue to shine brightly for generations to come.

HONORING ALEXA PENAVEGA AS A SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Alexa PenaVega as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

Alexa PenaVega is an actress, author, and producer whose career began at just four years old. Known for her breakout role in the Spy Kids franchise and dozens of film and television projects since, Alexa has grown up in the entertainment industry. Over the years, her journey as a wife, mother, and follower of Jesus has reshaped not only how she lives her personal life but also how she approaches her professional calling.

As Alexa's faith deepened, a noticeable shift took place in the types of projects she chose to pursue. Together with her husband, Carlos, she founded Good For You Entertainment, a production company committed to creating high-quality content with the Kingdom at its core.

In recognition of her faith-driven leadership and positive influence, Alexa is being honored as a She Leads America Christian Woman of Distinction. This distinction reflects her dedication to living out her calling with integrity, courage, and Kingdom purpose.

For Alexa, faith is not separate from her art—it is the lens through which she views every decision. She believes storytelling has the power to inspire change, build community, and point people toward His light in a world often overwhelmed by darkness. Her work today is an extension of her walk with God.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

CONGRATULATING GERALDINE ''BUBBY'' LITVIN SHAFFER ON HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. MORGAN McGARVEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday October 8, 2025

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary life and centennial milestone of Geraldine ''Bubby'' Litvin Shaffer, who celebrates her 100th birthday on October 28, 2025.

Born in 1925, Geraldine has lived a life centered on faith, service, and love for her family. Together with her beloved husband, Louis Shlomo Leib Litvin, she raised five children, and today, she is the proud grandmother to over 100 grandchildren and great-grandchildren, including Jewish leaders in America, Cyprus, and Israel.

Geraldine's devotion to her family is equaled only by her commitment to her community. In Boston, she distinguished herself as both an entrepreneur and education activist. While running a shoe store, she also headed the board of a Jewish school, working tirelessly for its success. In recent years, she has made her home in Kentucky, where she became a matriarch for her entire community. Known for her kindness and generosity, she volunteers her time and reaches out to all with warmth and care. She is a dedicated student of the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, and is a devout Jew and incredibly proud American.

Mr. Speaker, Geraldine ''Bubby'' Litvin Shaffer's century of life stands as a remarkable testament to her resilience, faith, and love for others. I ask my esteemed colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to please join me in celebrating her 100th birthday and wishing her continued joy surrounded by family and community.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR INTERIM APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS WITH RESPECT TO ANY FISCAL YEAR FOR WHICH APPROPRIATIONS ARE NOT OTHERWISE PROVIDED FOR THE COMMISSIONS

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce a bill that would exempt from federal government shutdowns the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and the Commission of Fine Arts (CFA). This bill is modeled on a provision I have gotten enacted each year since the 2013 federal government shutdown to exempt the District of Columbia government from federal government shutdowns.

NCPC and CFA are both closed during the current federal government shutdown. Although NCPC and CFA are both federal agencies, they have a significant role in local D.C. land-use decisions. This bill would allow these agencies to reopen during the current shutdown and to exempt them from future shutdowns to prevent interruptions in local D.C. land-use decisions during federal government shutdowns. I have separately introduced bills to remove the authority NCPC and CFA have over local D.C. land-use decisions. Until Congress passes those bills, the agencies should be exempt from federal government shutdowns.

Under federal law, NCPC has approval authority for the development of D.C.-owned buildings located in the ''central area,'' including the location, height, bulk, number of stories and size of such buildings. D.C. is required to consult with NCPC on the development of D.C.-owned buildings outside the central area, but NCPC has only advisory authority in those areas. The central area is defined by the concurrent action of NCPC and the D.C. Council and currently consists of the Downtown and Shaw Urban Renewal Areas.

Under presidential executive orders (EOs) and federal law, CFA has review authority for D.C.-owned parks and buildings, as well as for certain private land in D.C. Under EOs, CFA has review authority for the design of D.C.-owned parks and buildings. Under the Shipstead-Luce Act, CFA has review authority for the design of private buildings in D.C. ''adjacent to public buildings and grounds of major importance,'' such as Rock Creek Park and the Potomac riverfront. Under the Old Georgetown Act, CFA has review authority for the design of private buildings in the part of Georgetown referred to as ''Old Georgetown'' in the act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

HONORING DR. CORINTHIA RIDGLEY BOONE AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Corinthia Ridgley Boone as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

Dr. Corinthia Ridgley Boone is an author, bridge builder of unity, and an ambassador of prayer and reconciliation, both in the United States and internationally. She earned her Ph.D. in Philosophy and Counseling from Union University and devoted 25 years of service to the Prince George's County School System as a teacher, principal, and instructional specialist.

In 1987, Dr. Boone founded Together in Ministry International to foster international and interracial relationships among pastors and churches in the capital region. Building on that vision, she established the International Christian Host Coalition in 1996 to coordinate churches, ministries, and organizations in reconciliation efforts, evangelistic outreach, and compassionate service.

Since 1985, she has faithfully chaired the Capital City National Day of Prayer, uniting believers across denominational and cultural lines. Her leadership was recognized in 1988 when she was honored in Who's Who in Women's Ministry, and in 2025 is being honored as a She Leads America Christian Woman of Distinction.

Dr. Boone has served tirelessly on numerous national and regional boards. She has spoken widely across the U.S. and abroad, emphasizing unity, prayer, racial reconciliation, and generational bridges. She continues to serve as God's ambassador of prayer and reconciliation in this generation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF COLONEL TRENTON N. TWEDT

HON. ZACHARY NUNN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Colonel Trenton N. Twedt of the Iowa National Guard, whose nearly four decades of distinguished service in uniform exemplifies unwavering commitment to our state and our country.

Colonel Twedt began his military career in 1986, enlisting in the United States Air Force as an avionics specialist. From those early days working on aircraft systems to later roles in command, he carried a steadfast dedication to mission and to the Airmen and women with whom he served.

After earning his degree from the University of Iowa, Colonel Twedt received his commission in 1999. This marked the beginning of a new chapter in a remarkable career that advanced from the enlisted ranks to the highest levels of leadership within the Iowa Air National Guard.

His service carried him to many parts of the world, including Iraq, Afghanistan, Qatar, and Germany. Yet through all his overseas assignments, his heart remained in Iowa, where he guided and mentored Guardsmen to ensure they were trained, supported, and prepared to serve. His mentorship, including to myself as a Squadron Commander, where he imbued his leadership traits upon the next generation of Air Force officers as our Group Commander, reflects his enduring commitment to building leaders of character and service.

Over the years, Colonel Twedt has been a steady hand in moments of challenge, a trusted advisor to his peers, and a mentor to the next generation of Air Force leaders. His leadership has been recognized with the Legion of Merit and many other commendations. However, his most enduring legacy will be found in the lives he has influenced, the careers he has shaped, and the high standard of integrity he has upheld throughout his service.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Trenton N. Twedt has lived a life of service that exemplifies the very best of the Iowa Air National Guard and the United States Air Force. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our gratitude for his dedication to duty, his leadership through decades of change, and his contributions to our state and our Nation.

HONORING SIDEWINDER OF TEXAS FOR 41 YEARS OF MUSIC AND SERVICE

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to congratulate and recognize Sidewinder of Texas, a legendary band from Los Fresnos, for bringing joy and pride to South Texas for over four decades. Their music embodies the Valley's resilience, creativity, and pride, reminding us that ''time flies when you're having fun.''

Since its founding in 1984, Sidewinder of Texas has been a defining part of the Rio Grande Valley's music scene, blending their signature ''Texas Style Rock and Roll'' with deep community roots. Formed by David Valdez, Paul Pederson, Rey Ybarra, and Raul Garcia, they quickly earned recognition across the state and beyond with hits like Cruisin' on the Levee, Ready to Rock, Can't Take my Dreams, and My Country. Their music has reached audiences on radio, at the South by Southwest Music Festival, and through countless live performances.

Beyond their musical achievements, Sidewinder of Texas has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to the community. They have donated their time and talent to many charitable causes, including Toys for Tots, the Muscular Dystrophy Telethon, the Make-A-Wish Foundation, and the Wounded Warrior Project. Their generosity and service reflect the spirit of unity and compassion that defines the people of Los Fresnos and the Rio Grande Valley.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of South Texas, I join the City of Los Fresnos in honoring Sidewinder of Texas for their outstanding contributions to music, their dedication to service, and their commitment to representing our community with heart and pride.

CELEBRATING THE TOWN OF DAVIE, FLORIDA

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize the Town of Davie, Florida's Centennial Celebration: 100 Years of Trailblazing.

A century ago, visionaries and pioneers laid the foundation of Davie with hopes, dreams, and a commitment to building a better future. And that vision has certainly come to life. Over the years, the people of Davie faced challenges, embraced change, and celebrated countless achievements. It is truly a town known for its spirit, resilience, and diversity.

The Town of Davie is home to nearly 107,000 residents who live across a lush 35 square miles within central Broward. The Town's rural atmosphere, western-themed district, and sprawling educational complex foster an environment that separates Davie from all other municipalities in Broward County. Green open spaces, numerous parks, over 165 miles of trail system, and the opportunity to live an equestrian lifestyle are amenities you won't find in today's growing South Florida.

The Town of Davie is also the nexus of higher education in South Florida where several nationally known colleges, technical institutes, and universities make up the South Florida Educational Center. And Davie's business climate ranges from entrepreneurial small businesses to the headquarters of Fortune 500 firms.

And the Town of Davie holds a special place in my heart. It's where my husband Steve and I bought our first home as we began our life together.

This 100th anniversary is a time to honor the past and the efforts of those who came before us, as well as celebrate the achievements of today and the next 100 years.

Congratulations to Mayor Judy Paul and the Town Council for working tirelessly to ensure Davie remains a warm, close-knit community with a hometown ambiance for all who live, work, and visit.

RECOGNIZING JENNIFER SEVILLA KORN FOR HER PUBLIC SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jennifer Sevilla Korn for her public service and leadership.

A native of East Los Angeles and a proud Marine Corps spouse, Jennifer is a national conservative leader, policy expert, and political strategist whose faith has guided her throughout a distinguished 20-year career in public service. She helped elect and advise two U.S.

Presidents and two U.S. Attorneys General while leading national grassroots and communications efforts that achieved historic gains among minority, veteran, and faith voters.

Appointed by President Trump as Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of the newly created White House Faith Office, Jennifer works to protect religious freedom, ensuring Americans of all faiths have a voice in their government. She advises the President on matters of faith at home and abroad. Previously, she co-founded the National Faith Advisory Board, the largest faith coalition in the United States, representing leaders from every state, denomination, and ethnic background.

Her earlier career includes serving as Deputy Political Director at the Republican National Committee, Director of Hispanic and Women's Affairs in the George W. Bush White House, and Senior Advisor to two U.S. Attorneys General at the Department of Justice. As a She Leads America honoree, Jennifer believes leadership is a calling to serve others with both truth and compassion, empowering individuals, strengthening families, and preserving freedom for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman for her public service and leadership.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALMA FAMILY SERVICES IN BOYLE HEIGHTS

HON. JIMMY GOMEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. GOMEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the 50th Anniversary of Alma Family Services located in the Boyle Heights community of East Los Angeles.

Since 1975, Alma Family Services has been a steadfast advocate for families and individuals with special needs. Founded by parents in East Los Angeles with the mission of providing multilingual and culturally competent services to their communities, Alma Family Services has become a trusted service provider with 18 locations across Los Angeles County. Every year, the organization serves over 15,000 individuals with mental health services, substance abuse support, youth development, and many more resources.

Over the last 50 years, Alma Family Services has expanded their services to provide multigenerational support for our neighbors of all ages. Through an extensive network of connections spanning across various levels of government, businesses, and fellow organizations, Alma Family Services strives to address the unique needs of seniors, parents, and students across LA County. The impact of their efforts can be felt in every corner of California's 34th Congressional District, where our neighborhoods are revitalized and uplifted through the organization's crucial resources.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Alma Family Services on their 50th Anniversary.

HONORING DR. RALPH H. SEXTON, JR.

HON. CHUCK EDWARDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is an extraordinary privilege for me today as we gather to honor a remarkable servant of God, Dr. Ralph H. Sexton, Jr., a beloved pastor, evangelist, and community leader from Asheville, North Carolina, on this momentous occasion to celebrate his fiftieth year in ministry.

Fifty years. That's half a century of preaching the Word, shepherding souls, comforting the brokenhearted, celebrating life's joys, and standing firm in times of trial. From his very first sermon preached to his most recent prayer whispered, Dr. Sexton has lived out the calling described in 1 Peter 5:2, ''Be shepherds of God's flock that is under your care, watching over them . . . not because you must, but because you are willing, as God wants you to be.'' And that is exactly what he has done—not out of duty, but out of love: love for God, love for the Gospel, and love for His people.

Dr. Sexton was born on January 17, 1947, to Ralph H. Sexton. Sr., and Jacqueline Sexton, and was educated in the public schools of Asheville, North Carolina. He graduated from Lee Edwards High School in 1965 and continued his education at Trevecca College in Nashville, Tennessee, the University of North Carolina at Asheville, and the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. He later received a Doctor of Divinity from Bethany Theological Seminary in Dothan, Alabama, and has been awarded multiple honorary degrees in recognition of his lifelong devotion to faith and service.

Ordained in 1975, he began his service at Trinity Baptist Church in Asheville, North Carolina, where he has faithfully ministered for nearly five decades. Let us commend him for mentoring his grandson, Winston Parish, who is destined to continue the legacy at Trinity. In 1980, he entered the field of full-time evangelism, leading crusades, revivals, and seminars across the United States and in nations including Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Honduras, Haiti, Germany, and the Bahamas.

Through the years, Dr. Sexton has done more than deliver sermons; he has built bridges between generations and nations. He baptized new believers, married couples, mourned with families, and stood as a steadfast presence in our community and around the world. He's taught us that faith is not just preached on Sundays—it is lived out every day, in every act of kindness, every word of encouragement, every prayer whispered on someone else's behalf.

Through that example, Dr. Sexton has strengthened my personal faith in God and motivated me to be a more effective and obedient public servant. We could fill libraries with the stories of lives touched by his ministry—the young person who found direction, the struggling soul who found hope, the family that found faith again. And yet, Dr. Sexton would be the first to remind us that all glory belongs to God. That humility, that unwavering focus on Christ rather than self, is part of what has made his ministry so powerful.

A devoted friend of Israel, Dr. Sexton has traveled to the Holy Land more than fifty times, has twice been honored as a guest of the Israeli government, and was invited to observe the Middle East Peace Talks in Washington, D.C. He received the prestigious ''Tree of Life'' Award and served on the Committee to Relocate the U.S. Embassy to Jerusalem.

His service to the community extends far beyond the pulpit. In 1994, the City of Asheville honored him with ''Ralph Sexton Day'' for his disaster relief efforts. He is a recipient of the Order of the Long Leaf Pine, the highest honor a citizen of North Carolina can receive, and was named an Honorary Attorney General of the State. He has been an active member of the Asheville Kiwanis Club, a life member of the Downtown Optimist Club, and a certified special deputy with the Buncombe County Sheriff's Department for more than 30 years, where he now serves as Chaplain. He also organized the ''Family Values March'' in Asheville, which drew more than 20,000 participants.

Dr. Sexton's devotion to family and faith has been the foundation of his life. He shared over 50 years of marriage with his late wife, Muzette, and together they raised three children, were blessed with many grandchildren, and had great-grandchildren.

Today, let's thank Dr. Sexton for his sacrifices, his patience, his wisdom, and his unwavering belief in God's promises. Let's thank him for every late-night hospital visit, even' wedding and funeral, every Bible study and mission trip. And we thank him for showing us, by example. what a life wholly devoted to God looks like.

May the Lord bless him abundantly in this next chapter of his journey, and may he hear those words we all long to hear one day: ''Well done, good and faithful servant.''

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO THE CITY OF BROWNSVILLE'S ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FOR THEIR SERVICE TO OUR COMMUNITY

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Brownsville's Engineering and Public Works Department for their exemplary service following the severe storms that struck Cameron County and devastated neighborhoods in Harlingen and surrounding areas last spring.

In March of this year, our region received more than 20 inches of heavy rainfall, which caused widespread flooding, damaged infrastructure, and left countless families in need of urgent support.

During this crisis, the Brownsville Engineering and Public Works Department deployed staff, equipment, and expertise to assist flood-impacted communities. Their crews worked tirelessly, operating pumps, heavy machinery, and other resources to help remove water from our streets and restore accessibility for residents. Their work provided not only critical relief, but also a sense of hope to our neighbors in Harlingen.

This effort was not theirs alone. The Brownsville Police Department served more than 600 hot meals to affected families at

Laureles County Park. Meanwhile the Brownsville Fire Department stood alongside residents to safeguard their health and safety. Together, these coordinated actions reflect the best of who we are in South Texas—neighbors helping neighbors, united through compassion and service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of South Texas, I wish to extend my deepest gratitude to the Brownsville Engineering and Public Works Department, along with all the city staff who answered the call to serve. Their dedication and solidarity in times of hardship embody the very spirit of community that makes the Rio Grande Valley strong.

HONORING TERRI ''WINDTALKER'' CLAH AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Terri ''WindTalker'' Clah as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award.

Terri ''WindTalker'' Clah of the Diné (People of the Land) Nation and Ute Mountain Ute Tribe was raised in the Four Corners region on her ancestral lands, immersed in the beauty, resilience, and painful history of her people. Listening to the elders' stories from a young age—some filled with hope, others scarred by struggle—shaped her deep understanding of cultural identity, spiritual strength, and the need for healing across generations.

Leadership is woven into Terri's heritage. Her great-uncle, Deshna Clah, served as the second Chairman of the Diné Nation, while her uncle, Peter McDonald, was both a President of the Diné Nation and is one of the last living U.S. Marine Code Talkers. Inspired by her mother, Bessie Clah, who modeled a life of service, Terri embraced her own path of advocacy and reconciliation.

At age 26, she encountered Jesus Christ, whose message of love and restoration affirmed her Native identity and calling to bridge cultures. Through her Moccasins Across America Prayer Walk—from California to Washington, DC, May through October 2025—Terri has ignited a national movement for prayer, justice, and healing. Today, as a She Leads America Christian Woman of Distinction, she continues to inspire others to walk in faith and carry the love of God to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

HONORING MAJOR GENERAL LAURA M. CLELLAN

HON. JASON CROW

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. CROW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize a truly remarkable leader and dedicated public servant, Major General Laura M. Clellan, on the occasion of her retirement as The Adjutant General of Colorado. For over three decades, Major General Clellan has served our Nation and the State of Colorado with unwavering commitment, integrity, and distinction.

Major General Clellan's exceptional career began in 1989 when she was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant through the Army ROTC program. Her journey has been one of exemplary leadership and selfless service, marked by numerous key assignments and deployments that have taken her across the globe in defense of our freedoms. She has answered the call of duty in Afghanistan, Hungary, Panama, Saudi Arabia, and Honduras, leading our troops with courage and compassion.

Her command of the 193rd Military Police Battalion during Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan stands as a testament to her leadership under the most demanding of circumstances. She has consistently demonstrated a profound dedication to the well-being and readiness of our Soldiers and Airmen.

In her most recent role as the 44th Adjutant General of Colorado, Major General Clellan made history as the first woman to hold the position. She has been a transformative leader for the Colorado National Guard. Assuming command in 2020, she expertly guided the organization through a period of unprecedented challenges, including the state's response to the COVID–19 pandemic, devastating wildfires, and floods. Her steady hand ensured the safety and security of our communities while fostering a climate of excellence and inclusivity. As Executive Director of the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs, her strategic vision enhanced not only the readiness of our forces but also the support for our state's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, Major General Clellan's career is a shining example of a life dedicated to service. Her leadership has left an indelible mark on the Colorado National Guard and our Nation. On behalf of a grateful state and Nation, I extend my deepest gratitude to Major General Laura M. Clellan for her more than 35 years of distinguished service.

RECOGNIZING THE COMMISSION OF USS PIERRE (LCS 38)

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the officers and crew of the USS *Pierre* (LCS 38) as they prepare for the commissioning of their ship, the 19th and final Independence-variant Littoral Combat Ship of the United States Navy.

The USS *Pierre* is the second Navy vessel to bear the name of South Dakota's capital city. Littoral combat ships are fast, agile, and mission-focused, built to counter 21st-century coastal threats while ensuring security and supporting joint operations across the globe. The men and women who serve aboard the USS *Pierre* will carry forward this mission with dedication and distinction.

For the people of South Dakota, it is a great honor to see the name of our capital city once again sail under the flag of the United States Navy. This ship and her crew will continue a proud legacy of service that began with the first USS *Pierre* during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the officers and crew of the newly commissioned USS *Pierre* (LCS 38). We honor their commitment and thank them for their service.

RECOGNIZING FRANK ESTEN COOK III AND HIS SERVICE TO HIS COUNTRY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Frank Esten Cook III and his service to his country. Frank was born in Washington, D.C. on March 25, 1963, and passed away in Richmond, Kentucky on September 13, 2025. He was an avid outdoorsman, boater, and hunter.

Frank was a U.S. Army veteran and served his country as a commissioned officer. His first love, however, was serving as a non-commissioned officer as a Blackhawk helicopter Crew Chief with the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (SOAR).

In 1994, Frank was awarded Night Stalker Soldier of the Year for Outstanding Individual Contribution to Army Special Operation Aviation. This award was sponsored by Robertson Research Group, Inc.

Frank was tough in every sense of the word, but he also cared deeply for his friends, family, and country. He would give you the shirt off his back, if you really needed it. He taught his family the value of being tough and rolling with what life gives you. He was fond of the saying ''rub some dirt on it, you'll be fine'', which carries weight with everyone who knew him.

Frank took immense pride in being a Night Stalker. These men and women are some of the best rotary wing aviator crews in the world. Frank's attention to detail, his skills, and his tenacity drove him to join this elite regiment.

Frank was very proud of both of his sons, Frank E. Cook IV (Frankie) of Jersey City, NJ and Anthony Guidi of Aloha. OR. As Frankie says, ''My dad wouldn't want anyone to cry over him.'' So today Mr. Speaker, we won't cry over him but rather honor this man as a veteran, a father, a brother, a son, and an American.

HONORING CECE HEIL AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize CeCe Heil as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

CeCe Heil is Senior Counsel and International Legal Director at the American Center for Law and Justice, specializing in public policy and global legal matters, including the

United Nations. She heads a team of lawyers handling cases in defense of life, defense of Christians, protection of U.S. national security interests, defense of Israel, and confronting Islamic extremism. She was the lead attorney responsible for the release of Pastor Brunson from Turkey and Pastor Nerren from India.

Heil is a recognized leader in advancing pro-family, pro-life, and pro-free enterprise policies, including being a former candidate for U.S. Congress. Her service and expertise as a constitutional law scholar earned her the support of Sarah Palin, who named her one of a handful of "Mama Grizzlies." In recognition of her leadership and faith, she is being honored as a 2025 She Leads America Christian Woman of Distinction.

Guided by her deep faith in Jesus Christ, Heil views her legal work as more than a profession—it is a calling. Prayer and biblical values shape her decisions and sustain her courage to stand for truth and justice on behalf of the vulnerable.

Heil has practiced law for 33 years and is licensed in California, Tennessee, Virginia, and Missouri, as well as being licensed to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

HONORING THE OUTSTANDING SERVICE OF THE BROWNSVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the outstanding service of the Brownsville Police Department during the historic flooding that struck South Texas earlier this year.

In just two days, our community in South Texas was hit with nearly a year's worth of rainfall. The city of Harlingen was hit especially hard, receiving over twenty inches of rain, which left vehicles stranded, streets flooded, and many residents without power or access to food.

In response to this natural disaster, the Brownsville Police Department answered the call for help. Partnering with The Salvation Army, they served over 600 hot meals to families in need. Their swift action and compassion provided critical relief to families struggling in the aftermath of the storm. Mr. Speaker, this cross-city partnership is a powerful reminder of our region's resilience and commitment to service. When disaster struck, the Brownsville Police Department stepped up when our community needed them the most, exemplifying the highest standards of service and solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful South Texas, I am proud to honor the brave men and women of the Brownsville Police Department for their exemplary heroism during a devastating flood.

RECOGNIZING EMERGENCY NURSES WEEK

HON. JENNIFER A. KIGGANS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a Member of Congress, but as a geriatric nurse practitioner and an advocate for our nurses across the Nation, to recognize the unyielding composure of our emergency nurses during Emergency Nurses Week.

In the United States, it is federal law that an emergency room never closes and that every person who comes to an ER receives care. Day or night, emergency nurses answer the call of duty—providing quality care to patients in critical condition while operating in demanding, high-stakes environments where every second counts. Emergency nurses work around the clock, caring for patients of all ages and across every specialty—from cardiology and oncology to pediatrics and geriatrics.

Emergency nurses are heroes, often the first point of contact for patients within the ER, and they provide comfort and attentive care during an uncertain or stressful time for patients and their families. Their critical thinking skills and their compassion for their patients make their role essential for preserving our Nation's healthcare system.

It is important that we give our emergency nurses the praise and attention they deserve during Emergency Nurses Week to show our appreciation for the dedication they have to our Nation's health and for the millions of lives they touch on a daily basis. We're forever grateful for their sacrifice.

CONGRATULATING DR. STEVEN ASHBY ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Dr. Steven Ashby on his retirement as Director of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in Richland, Washington.

Since 2015, Dr. Ashby's leadership at PNNL has driven scientific excellence and innovation, advancing the lab as a world leader in science, national security, and energy research and development.

Dr. Ashby believes our biggest challenges cannot be solved alone, and his tenure reflected that belief. Having spent over a decade working to expand the lab's reach with new partnerships and opportunities, he transformed PNNL from a research lab to a world-class institution held in the highest regards throughout the scientific community.

I also commemorate Dr. Ashby for his work on modernizing PNNL and equipping the lab for the future. Under his leadership, the campus became a hub for new and emerging technologies, including the Energy Sciences Center and the Grid Storage Launchpad, that will contribute to research and innovation for decades to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Ashby for his willingness to work with myself and members of the Washington Congressional Delegation. We built a strong relationship over the years and worked diligently to ensure PNNL had the resources needed to not only be successful but excel in their mission.

I wish Dr. Ashby the very best in his retirement and thank him for his years of service.

HONORING BROOKE L. ROLLINS AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Brooke L. Rollins as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

Brooke L. Rollins is the 33rd U.S. Secretary of Agriculture and only the second woman in history to serve in this role. A native of Glen Rose, Texas, she brings decades of leadership in law, policy, and public service. Most recently, she was the Founder, President, and CEO of the America First Policy Institute (AFPI). During President Trump's first administration, Rollins served as Director of the Domestic Policy Council, Assistant to the President for Strategic Initiatives, and Director of the Office of American Innovation—roles in which she helped develop and lead transformational domestic policy initiatives with lasting national impact.

Her career began in Texas, where after graduating with honors from Texas A&M University and becoming the school's first female student body president, she earned her Juris Doctor from the University of Texas School of Law. She went on to serve as Governor Rick Perry's policy director and later as CEO of the Texas Public Policy Foundation, transforming it into a nationally recognized think tank.

Guided by her deep Christian faith, Rollins views her work in public policy as a calling to serve people, strengthen families, and uphold biblical values. She is being honored as a 2025 She Leads America Christian Woman of Distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DAVID SCHAECTER

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a heavy heart that I rise to recognize the extraordinary life of David Schaecter. President of the Holocaust Survivors Foundation USA, who passed away on September 4, 2025, at the age of 96.

David was born in a small town in Slovakia in 1929. At age 11, after witnessing the murder of his father, he and his family were rounded up by the Nazis and sent to the Auschwitz death camp. He survived the hell of Auschwitz, and even a transfer to Buchenwald. But the entire rest of his family; his

mother, father, sisters, brother, aunts, uncles and cousins were all brutally killed in the Holocaust—105 family members in total. After the war, as a lone survivor, David fled to Prague and eventually came to America in 1950. He learned English in only nine weeks and graduated from UCLA with a degree in industrial engineering.

David was a shining spiritual light even though he experienced such horror and despair. He spent his life sharing his story with others with the hope that it would end the scourges of antisemitism, hate, and violence. He became a national spokesperson on behalf of survivors, visited schools in 18 states to educate our young people, and remained active and engaged until very recently, having testified before the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging on the subject Never Again: Addressing the Rise of Antisemitism and Supporting Older Americans.

At home, David co-founded the Holocaust Memorial in Miami Beach that has served as a cornerstone for Holocaust education for South Floridians and visitors from around the world. This lion in our midst was a relentless and powerful advocate for the Holocaust survivor community and a true Zionist, a supporter of the state of Israel as the rightful homeland of the Jewish people. He was an icon who used his experiences to teach us all about the perils of antisemitism, so the words ''Never Again'' have meaning.

His work on behalf of survivors was inspiring, and I was proud to call him my friend. My heart is with David's wife Sydney, his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. May his memory be for a blessing.

HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DIOCESE OF BROWNSVILLE

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 60th anniversary of the Diocese of Brownsville, a community of faith that has for decades served as a spiritual home and source of strength for the people of the Rio Grande Valley.

Since its founding in 1965, the Diocese of Brownsville has grown into one of the most vibrant Catholic dioceses in the nation. Through its parishes, schools, and ministries, the Diocese has nurtured the faith of its members and provided essential services to countless families across South Texas.

The Diocese has long been a committed voice for justice and compassion in our region. Its leaders and parishioners have worked tirelessly to support immigrant communities, provide disaster relief, and advocate for the dignity of all people. This commitment reflects not only the teachings of faith, but also the values of service and solidarity that define the Rio Grande Valley

As the Diocese marks its 60th anniversary, it does so with a proud legacy of compassion, inclusivity, and unwavering dedication to the people of South Texas. Its clergy, religious, and lay leaders have carried forward a mission rooted in faith and community, inspiring generations to service others and live lives of devotion.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful South Texas, I congratulate the Diocese of Brownsville and all those who have contributed to its mission over the past six decades. May the Diocese continue to serve, inspire, and strengthen our communities for many years to come.

HONORING KAYLEIGH BUSH AS A 2025 SHE LEADS AMERICA YOUNG CHRISTIAN WOMAN OF DISTINCTION

HON. LISA C. McCLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 8, 2025

Mrs. McCLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kayleigh Bush as a 2025 She Leads America Young Christian Woman of Distinction award recipient.

In 2025, Kayleigh Bush competed and won the Miss America preliminary title of Miss North Florida. Just four weeks after being crowned, she faced a decision that tested her faith, her courage, and her convictions. Pageant directors presented a newly revised contract that redefined what it means to be female. Choosing truth over a title, Kayleigh courageously declined to sign.

Following the Matthew 18 model, she privately pleaded with the organization's leaders, urging them to return to truth and biological reality. Her appeal was met with indifference, but Kayleigh remained steadfast, accepting the loss of her title rather than compromising her faith.

Kayleigh represents a modern-day Esther: one who is willing to speak when the culture demands silence. Her story reminds us that courage is contagious, truth is not negotiable, and that no earthly crown compares to the one given by Christ.

Her boldness has been recognized nationally. In 2025, She Leads America is honoring Kayleigh with a Young Christian Woman of Distinction award, celebrating her as a rising leader who demonstrates unwavering faith, integrity, and moral clarity. This recognition places her among a network of accomplished Christian women leaders who are shaping culture with courage and conviction.

Today, we honor Kayleigh Bush—not just as the Canceled Crown, but as a living testimony of 1 Timothy 4:12: ''Let no one look down on you because of your youth, but be an example for the believers in speech, in conduct, in love, in faith, and in purity.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this outstanding woman of distinction. This outstanding woman of distinction.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 9, 2025 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 22

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. 2960, to develop economic tools to deter aggression by the People's Republic of China against Taiwan, S. 2130, to make improvements to the AUKUS partnership, S. 2424, to require a report of, and a strategy to combat, arms sales of the Government of the People's Republic of China, S. 1744, to amend the Arms Export Control Act to include Taiwan among the list of recipient countries with respect to which shorter certification and reporting periods apply and to expedite licensing for allies transferring military equipment to Taiwan, S. 2626, to strengthen the leadership role of the United States at the Inter-American Development Bank, S. 2146, to require the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to advocate for increased transparency with respect to exchange rate policies of the People's Republic of China, S. 2950, to require the Secretary of State and relevant executive branch agencies to address international scam compounds defrauding people in the United States, to hold significant transnational criminal organizations accountable, S. 2550, to provide for international cooperation to secure critical mineral supply chains, S. 1854, to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to political and economic elites in Haiti, S. 2657, to impose sanctions relating to the support of the People's Republic of China for the invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation, S. 2018, to modify certain limitations and exclusions regarding defense articles and requirements regarding security assistance and sales with respect to the Republic of Cyprus, S. 799, to establish and implement a multi-year Legal Gold and Mining Partnership Strategy to reduce the negative environmental and social impacts of illicit gold mining in the Western Hemisphere, S. 2684, to support countries in Latin America and the Caribbean that maintain official diplomatic relations with Taiwan, to counter efforts by the People's Republic of China to coerce or pressure governments into breaking such ties, to deepen coordination with Taiwan on diplomatic, development, and economic engagement in the Western Hemisphere, S. 2224, to amend the Taiwan Allies International Protection and Enhancement Initiative (TAIPEI) Act of 2019 to provide that the United States, in its role as a member of any

international organizations, should oppose any attempts by the People's Republic of China to resolve Taiwan's status by distorting the decisions, language, policies, or procedures of any such organization, S. 2918, to amend the Rebuilding Economic Prosperity and Opportunity for Ukrainians Act to improve the implementation of the seizure of Russian sovereign assets for the benefit of Ukraine, S. 1000, to establish an Ambassador-at-Large for Arctic Affairs, and S. Res. 409, recognizing the 74th anniversary of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Philippines and the strong bilateral security alliance between our two nations in the wake of escalating aggression and political lawfare by the People's Republic of China in the South China Sea.

S–116

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6995–S7040

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2984–2992, S.J. Res. 89, and S. Res. 442–443. **Page S7036**

Measures Passed:

Miles City Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment: By 52 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 549), Senate passed H.J. Res. 104, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''Miles City Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment''. **Pages S6995–98, S6998–S7003**

ARTIST Act: Senate passed S. 254, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and marine mammal ivory products, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S7007–09**

ANCHOR Act: Senate passed S. 318, to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S7007–09**

North Dakota Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan: By 50 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 556), Senate passed H.J. Res. 105, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''North Dakota Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan''. **Pages S7012–16, S7031**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 553), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. **Page S7012**

Measures Failed:

Energy National Emergency: By 47 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 554), Senate failed to pass S.J. Res. 71, terminating the national emergency declared with respect to energy, after the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources was discharged of consideration, and as provided under the order of October 7, 2025. **Pages S7016–30**

Measures Considered:

Continuing Appropriations and Extensions and Other Matters Act: By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 550), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate upon reconsideration rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2882, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026. **Page S7003**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on October 6, 2025. **Page S7003**

Senate agreed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on October 6, 2025. **Page S7003**

Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act: By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 551), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate upon reconsideration rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 5371, making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026. **Pages S7003–04**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on October 6, 2025. **Page S7003**

Senate agreed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on October 6, 2025. **Page S7003**

National Defense Authorization Act—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of S. 2296, to

authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, taking action on the following amendments and motion proposed thereto: **Pages S7004–07, S7009–11**

Pending:

Wicker/Reed Amendment Modified No. 3748, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7004**

Wicker (for Ernst) Amendment No. 3427 (to Amendment No. 3748), to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on casualty assistance and long-term care programs. **Page S7004**

Thune Amendment No. 3863 (to Amendment No. 3427), relating to the enactment date. **Page S7004**

Thune Amendment No. 3864 (to the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 3748), relating to the enactment date. **Page S7004**

Thune Amendment No. 3865 (to Amendment No. 3864), relating to the enactment date. **Page S7004**

Motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, Thune Amendment No. 3866, relating to the enactment date. **Page S7004**

Thune Amendment No. 3867 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 3866), relating to the enactment date. **Page S7004**

Thune Amendment No. 3868 (to Amendment No. 3867), relating to the enactment date. **Page S7004**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, October 9, 2025; and that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during the session of the Senate of Tuesday, October 7, 2025, ripen at 11:30 a.m., on Thursday, October 9, 2025. **Page S7040**

Hostilities Not Authorized by Congress: By 48 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 555), Senate did not agree to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 83, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities that have not been authorized by Congress, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Sec 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Control Export Act, and as provided under the order of October 7, 2025. **Pages S7030–31**

Mascott Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Jennifer Lee Mascott, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit. **Pages S7011–12**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 50 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 552), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S7011**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that all post-cloture time on the nomination be considered expired, and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at a time to be determined between the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, no earlier than Thursday, October 9, 2025. **Page S7011**

Nomination Received: Senate received the following nomination:

Lee Lipton, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines. **Page S7040**

Nomination Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nomination:

Karen Brazell, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Benefits of the Department of Veterans Affairs, which was sent to the Senate on June 16, 2025 **Page S7040**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S7034**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7034–36**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S7036**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7036–37**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7037–39**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7033–34**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S7039**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7039**

Privileges of the Floor: **Pages S7039–40**

Record Votes: Eight record votes were taken today. (Total—556) **Pages S7003–04, S7011–12, S7030–31**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:02 p.m., until 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, October 9, 2025. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7040.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BIG TECH AND SILENCING AMERICANS

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Big Tech and silencing Americans, after receiving testimony from Eugene Volokh, Hoover Institution, Stanford, California; Sean Davis, The Federalist, and Gene Kimmelman, Yale University Tobin Economic

Policy Center, both of Washington, D.C.; and Alex Berenson, Garrison, New York.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Ho Nieh, of Alabama, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, who was introduced by Senator Britt, and Douglas Troutman, of Maryland, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Jonathan Greenstein, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, Donald Korb, of Ohio, to be Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service and an Assistant General Counsel, and Derek Theurer, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary, all of the Department of the Treasury.

LABOR LAW REFORM

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine labor law reform part 1, focusing on diagnosing the issues and exploring current proposals, after receiving testimony from Sean M. O'Brien, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Rachel U. Greszler, The Heritage Foundation, and Jennifer Ann Abruzzo, Communications Workers of America, all of Washington, D.C.; Marvin E. Kaplan, Jackson Lewis P.C., New York, New York; and Steve Cochran, Volkswagen, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

PATENT ELIGIBILITY RESTORATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Intellectual Property concluded a hearing to examine the Patent Eligibility Restoration Act, focusing on restoring clarity, certainty, and predictability to the United States patent system, after receiving testimony from Mark A. Cohen, Asia Society of Northern California, Alexandria, Virginia; Andrei Iancu, Sullivan and Cromwell LLP, Los Angeles, California; David J. Kappos, Cravath, Swaine, and Moore LLP, New York, New York; Mike Lemon, National Retail Federation, and Sue Peschin, Alliance for Aging Research, both of Washington, D.C.; Richard L. Blaylock, Pillsbury, Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP, San Diego, California; Steven P. Caltrider, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, Massachusetts; and Corey Salsberg, Novartis, East Hanover, New Jersey.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of William Kirk, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Small Business Administration.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Jeremiah Workman, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

NOMINATIONS

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Joshua Simmons, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Peter Metzger, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

CLOSING HEALTH LOOPHOLES

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine closing loopholes that kill American patients, after receiving testimony from Anthony Sardella, API Innovation Center, Chesterfield, Missouri; Tony Paquin, iRemedy Healthcare Companies, Inc., Stuart, Florida; and Andrew Rechenberg, Coalition for a Prosperous America, and Marta E. Wosinska, The Brookings Institution Center on Health Policy, both of Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R. 5704–5725; and 9 resolutions, H.J. Res. 130; H. Con. Res. 56; and H. Res. 792–798 were introduced. **Pages H4526–28**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4529–30**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 3123, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to laws relating to the payment of certain benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that are affected by

death, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–339). Page H4526

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fulcher to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H4525

Quorum Calls—Votes: There were no Yea and Nay votes, and there were no Recorded votes. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 3 p.m. and adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2025

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of General Kenneth S. Wilsbach, USAF, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Chief of Staff of the Air Force, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider the nominations of Crystal Carey, of New Jersey, to be General Counsel, and James Murphy, of Maryland, to be a Member, both of the National Labor Relations Board, and Rosario Palmieri, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary, and Anthony D'Esposito, of New York, to be Inspector General, both of the Department of Labor, 9:50 a.m., SD–430.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine AI's potential to support patients, workers, children, and families, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Rebecca L. Taibleson, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, David A. Bragdon and Lindsey Ann Freeman, both to be a United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina, Robert P. Chamberlin and James D. Maxwell II, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Mississippi, Matthew E. Orso and Susan Courtwright Rodriguez, both to be a United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, Sara Bailey, of Texas, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy, Braden Boucek, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Tennessee for the term of four years, Dominick Gerace II, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio for the term of four years, Jerome Francis Gorgon, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan for the term of four years, James Kruger, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Mississippi for the term of four years, Scott Leary, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Mississippi for the term of four years, Bryan Stirling, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years, Thomas Wheeler II, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years, Thomas Albus, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of four years, and Adam Mildred, of Indiana, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Indiana for the term of four years, 10:15 a.m., SH–216.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

10 a.m., Thursday, October 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of S. 2296, National Defense Authorization Act.

At 11:30 a.m., Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 2882, Continuing Appropriations and Extensions and Other Matters Act. Following disposition of S. 2882, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 5371, Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act. Following disposition of H.R. 5371, Senate will vote on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.J. Res. 106, Central Yukon Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan.

Senators should expect additional votes on passage of H.J. Res. 106, and on confirmation of the nomination of Jennifer Lee Mascott, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, during Thursday's session of the Senate.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

12:30 p.m., Friday, October 10

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 12:30 p.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.