

Another one:

"How [artificial intelligence] could perpetuate racism, sexism, and other biases in society."

Another:

"Scientists Debunk Lab Accident Theory of Pandemic Emergence."

Here is another one:

"As Trump Pushes Theory of Virus Origins, Some See Parallels In Lead-Up to Iraq War."

Your tax dollars at work.

"As U.S. Confronts Russia, Trump's Admiration Of Putin Is Consistent."

Another headline from NPR:

"The History of Policing And Race In The U.S. Are Deeply Intertwined."

Another:

"After Biden's debate performance, the presidential race is unchanged."

This was the debate performance that President Biden gave after which he got out of the race.

If you believe that headline, you believe in the tooth fairy and the Easter Bunny and that Jimmy Hoffa died of natural causes, but that is what NPR reported with your tax dollars.

Here is more:

"Democracy on Trial, Part One: A Blueprint For the Case Against Trump."

Is that fair and balanced? That is from PBS.

"Racism in the Era of Trump: An Oral History."

Another headline, January 13, 2020.

Another, this one is really special:

"'A Serial Liar': How Sarah Palin Ushered in the 'Post-Truth' Political Era in Which Trump Has Thrived."

Now, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and NPR and PBS have the right, whether I like it or not or whether you like it or not or whether Americans like it or not to publish these articles and to broadcast this news. That is the First Amendment, but they don't have the right to do it with taxpayer money.

At least half of America would look at these headlines and be offended. They would be offended, first, because they would—really for three reasons: No. 1, they disagree with opinion journalism; No. 2, they would disagree with the headline; and, No. 3, they would disagree with the fact that these headlines are not fair. They are not objective. They are obviously slanted to one point of view, and they are using taxpayer money.

If someone introduced a bill tomorrow—I will just pick a publication—to prohibit the New York Times, I would vote against that bill and argue against it. If someone introduced a bill to get rid of FOX News, I would have the same position. If someone introduced a bill to get rid of the Washington Post, that would be my position as well. Whether I agree with those media outlets or not, we have a First Amendment that we cherish, and I am rather fond of the Constitution.

But if somebody introduced a bill to give money to CNN, taxpayer money to CNN or to the New York Times or to FOX News, I would oppose that as well.

This is simply wrong, and we are spending half a billion dollars a year, \$14.5 billion over time, to give to people at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and NPR and PBS to participate in opinion journalism, which they are entitled to do. But they can't do it on the taxpayer dime. They are doing it on the taxpayer dime, but they shouldn't be able to.

I would also point out that the folks at PBS and NPR and PBS are doing pretty well for themselves. NPR just bought a \$201 million office space just up the road from the Capitol—\$200 million. It came from the American taxpayers so they could publish this stuff.

NPR pays its hosts as much as \$532,000 a year, taxpayer money. It pays its chief diversity officer about \$320,000 a year.

And you know what? Despite all this money that the American taxpayers are giving to these left-of-center entities, their viewership has declined because people don't need them anymore. So why are we giving them money?

I have introduced legislation, not to eliminate the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, not to eliminate the Public Broadcasting Service, and not to eliminate the National Public Radio—they can go exist on their own if they want to, but I do want to defund them.

We are running \$36 trillion in debt. This is disgraceful in 2025. It is disgraceful whether it is left-of-center opinion journalism or right-of-center opinion journalism. It is disgraceful to the American people to have to fund this rot. It doesn't mean the rot doesn't have a right to exist, but they don't have a right to taxpayer money.

It is late. So I am not going to go to my second topic.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. Res. 10

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, but no later than Friday, February 28, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 10, and the Senate proceed to its consideration; further, that there be 6 hours for debate only, with the time equally divided between the leaders or their designees on the joint resolution; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the joint resolution be read a third time, and the Senate vote on the joint resolution with no further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF RIVA RIDGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a momentous occasion for the U.S. Army and for the North Country. Today, February 18, 2025, marks the 80th anniversary of the Battle of Riva Ridge during World War II.

During this battle, on the slopes of the northern Apennine Mountains in Italy, the 10th Mountain Division first "Climbed to Glory" and delivered one of the most amazing and decisive victories in U.S. military history.

In the face of grave danger and extreme adversity, the 10th Mountain Division broke through German positions and paved the way for Italy's liberation. Each soldier of the 10th Mountain Division demonstrated extraordinary courage, resilience, and tactical brilliance, forcing the German Army to retreat and providing a major boost to Allied efforts in Europe.

This anniversary comes only days after the 40th anniversary of the reactivation of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum on February 13, 1985.

Since 1943, the 10th Mountain Division has stood as a pillar of strength, resilience, and readiness, answering the call to serve in nearly every major conflict our Nation has faced.

From the battlefields of World War II to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and now in support of Operation Atlantic Resolve and our NATO allies, the soldiers of the 10th Mountain Division have been at the forefront of protecting our national security.

For more than two decades, they have been the most deployed unit in the U.S. Army, demonstrating unparalleled commitment and courage in defending our country and supporting our partners abroad.

But their contributions go beyond their battlefield successes. The 10th Mountain Division is shaping the future of our military—pioneering advancements in mobility, rapid deployment, counter-UAS, and the integration of cross-domain capabilities into training for large-scale combat operations to build the Army of the future and will strengthen our armed forces for years to come. With the activation of elements of the 2nd Multi-Domain Task Force at Fort Drum this summer, the installation's role in our national defense will continue to grow.

Fort Drum is more than a military base; it is a cornerstone of our national security, and I am proud to have fought for the funding and resources necessary to ensure its continued success. As we mark this anniversary, let us reaffirm our commitment to the brave men and women who serve at Fort Drum, ensuring they have the tools, training, and support they need to defend our Nation.

"Climb to Glory!"