



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 29, 2025

No. 130

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.

O mighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage, empower our Senators to have clean hands and pure hearts worthy of a nation that depends on You. Today, may they experience Your perfect peace, which the world cannot give or take away. Keep them humble and eager to accept Your forgiveness and renewing grace. Lord, infuse them with such a spirit of civility that they will be peacemakers who are called Your children. Create in them pure hearts that they may understand Your will and follow where You lead. And, Lord, show compassion upon those who are shackled by violence, hunger, and grief. We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MOODY). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Earl Matthews, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NEW YORK CITY SHOOTINGS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, before I begin with my remarks, I would like to say my condolences and prayers are with the families of the New York police officers involved in last night's tragic shooting.

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA HOSPITALS AND CLINICS

Madam President, I want to tell my colleagues how a 1-year-old baby has made history. The University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics is home to some of the world's best doctors, nurses, researchers, and many other topnotch healthcare professionals.

So what happens now, it is the home to the Guinness World Record for delivering the most premature baby. So on July 5, 2024, the University of Iowa's Stead Family Children's neonatology team delivered Nash Keen, whose parents live in Ankeny, IA.

Nash was born 133 days premature, or at about 21 weeks. He beat the impossible odds. Today, he is a happy and healthy 1-year-old with loving parents Randall and Mollie.

While their journey over the past year has been difficult, thanks to the University of Iowa and its world-class medical team, Nash is with us today.

The university is home to the highest survival rate for extremely premature infants in the United States. Now, it happens that babies born before 28 weeks of pregnancy are considered extremely preterm. When a baby is born

extremely preterm, their organs can't fully develop. The baby is at a high risk for serious, long-term health issues.

For newborns admitted to the University of Iowa Stead Family Children's Hospital neonatal intensive care unit at 22 weeks, these babies have a survival rate of 62 percent. This is more than double the national average. At 25 weeks, the university's survival rate for preterm babies is 91 percent.

These survival rates are a medical miracle that we don't see anywhere else in our great country. When Nash arrived at 21 weeks, his chances of survival were technically nonexistent because no baby had ever been born so early and survived.

The University of Iowa Hospital has achieved this medical advancement because of its neonatology team providing some of the most advanced care for extremely premature and high-risk infants anywhere in the world.

This care includes hemodynamics that has led to an incredible patient outcome. The University of Iowa has trained two physicians in its hemodynamics fellowship program. This is the first of its kind in the United States.

The care that extremely preterm babies receive moments after birth has been very vital to their survival and long-term health.

So we should all congratulate the University of Iowa on its hard work and dedication to caring for extremely premature and high-risk infants. Your work shows that life is precious.

And a happy birthday to 1-year-old Nash.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4785

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The majority leader is recognized.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. THUNE, Madam President, the last few years have been some of the most challenging in recent memory for America's farmers and ranchers. Agriculture is already a challenging way of life, but in the past few years, it has been made more difficult by higher input costs, higher interest rates, disease, and natural disasters; and it has left more than a few producers wondering about the future of their operations.

Earlier this year, I promised that farmers and ranchers would be a priority for the new Republican majority. Thanks to Senator BOOZMAN's leadership and the work of the Agriculture Committee, we have addressed some of the farmers' and ranchers' challenges head-on in the One Big Beautiful Bill—and not just with short-term patches to get through the season. We made lasting reforms to help get American agriculture firing on all cylinders again.

Madam President, that starts with the farm safety net. The One Big Beautiful Bill reauthorizes commodity programs through 2031 and raises reference prices for every covered commodity. In recent years, reference prices haven't even covered increases in input costs. But thanks to this bill, commodity program reference prices will more closely reflect the actual market conditions that farmers are dealing with.

We also included a voluntary base acre update for these programs—the first in a number of years—making 30 million acres available so these programs are based on current planted acres. That is just on commodity programs.

The One Big Beautiful Bill also bolsters crop insurance, the cornerstone of the farm safety net. And it includes my bill to extend crop insurance support for beginning farmers from their first 5 years of operation to their first 10 years.

We also addressed the needs of livestock producers. We improved the Livestock Indemnity Program, covering 100 percent of losses for animals lost to predation and 75 percent for those lost due to weather or disease, plus a supplemental payment for loss of unborn livestock, all of which will provide peace of mind for ranchers and other livestock producers when losses strike.

We also reduced the number of weeks of drought necessary to trigger payments from the Livestock Forage Disaster Program. Now those payments can begin after 4 consecutive weeks of drought, and they continue if the drought persists into a second month.

Our bill makes critical investments in disease prevention and preparedness efforts, an issue that has been national news as things like the bird flu, the New World screwworm, and African swine fever have threatened livestock.

There is a lot more in our bill to support agriculture and promote a strong and secure food supply for our country.

The One Big Beautiful Bill bolsters the Dairy Margin Coverage program for our dairy farmers. It improves support for honeybee producers when they suffer losses; invests in conservation programs that support wildlife habitats, like those that support South Dakota's wild bird population. And it supports research and agriculture research institutions and promotes trade opportunities for agriculture commodities.

This bill enables farmers and ranchers to make critical investments in the future of their operations. Agriculture producers will benefit from the individual and small business tax relief in this bill.

Our bill makes permanent the lower tax rates from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, increases the standard deduction and the child tax credit, and adds a bonus deduction for seniors, which means lower tax bills permanently.

Many farmers and ranchers will be able to claim the 199A small business deduction, which frees up more cash for them to invest in their operations. Plus, full expensing—now a permanent feature of the Tax Code—will allow them to deduct the full cost of new equipment the year they start using it. That is good news, whether you need a new tractor or combine or working to build a farm of the future with precision technology.

Madam President, farming and ranching is more than just a job; it is a way of life. And most farmers and ranchers I know dream about the next generation keeping that way of life going. Thanks to the One Big Beautiful Bill, more farmers and ranchers are going to be able to stay in the family. Our bill raises the death tax threshold, which protects a lot more farmers and ranchers from this flawed tax. It means farmers and ranchers won't have to worry about the death tax eating up what they spent a lifetime building. It means they won't have to spend time and money on complicated estate planning to ensure their operation stays intact after they die. And it means their kids won't have to sell all or part of their family farm just to settle a tax bill.

Madam President, agriculture is a tough way of life. It is filled with uncertainty and risk. But we depend on the men and women who work hard every day to produce the food, fuel, and fiber for America and for the world, and we owe them support through the challenges that come with this work. I am proud that the One Big Beautiful Bill delivers for them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Mr. BARRASSO, Madam President, Republicans came to the Senate with a clear mandate. That was 7 months ago. Our job as a majority was to get America back on track. We made that commitment, and we are following through on it. We are keeping that commitment. America is stronger; America is safer; and America is more prosperous than it was 7 months ago. Not since Ronald Reagan reversed the failures of Jimmy Carter have we seen such a dramatic turnaround.

Earlier this month, Republicans passed our comprehensive legislative agenda. President Trump calls it the One Big Beautiful Bill. It is now the law of the land. It delivers to the voters of this country what the voters sent Republicans here to do.

First, Republicans stopped a \$4 trillion tax increase—the largest tax increase in American history. Every single Democrat in this Chamber voted to raise taxes by \$4 trillion. Had Democrats succeeded, working families would have paid over \$1,700 more in taxes just next year. Small businesses would have seen their taxes go up quite a bit. The families of farmers and ranchers would have paid a much higher death tax. On all of these things, Republicans stopped the Democrats. Instead, we delivered a working-class tax cut. We cut taxes on tips, taxes on Social Security, taxes on overtime. No taxes on tips puts about \$1,300 back into the pockets of waiters, barbers, and bartenders. No taxes on overtime puts about \$1,400 more back into the pockets of nurses, firefighters, and police officers. No taxes on Social Security puts more money into the pockets of seniors through a larger deduction.

Thanks to Senator KATIE BRITT of Alabama, Republicans modernized tax credits for childcare. It was the first update in 25 years. This helps make daycare more affordable for hard-working moms and dads. Moreover, Republicans expanded child tax credits. Parents receive \$2,200 each year for each child. Well, that helps pay for rent, food, and school supplies.

Thanks to Senator TED CRUZ of Texas, Republicans created a \$1,000 savings account for every newborn American citizen. Now an American child born today could have tens of thousands of dollars waiting for them when they turn 18. This could be a downpayment on the American dream. If you wish to go to college, to own a home, or to start a business, all of these things are now much more realistic.

AMERICAN ENERGY

Madam President, now let's talk about American energy.

America's future depends on abundant energy resources. We know what happened under Joe Biden: Energy prices rose 31 percent in just 4 years. Today, thanks to Republican leadership, America is producing energy much more again and prospering again.

We are producing energy onshore, offshore, and in Alaska. My home State of Wyoming is America's energy breadbasket. We are drilling; we are mining; we are powering data centers and factories.

More production at home lowers prices, it creates more jobs for energy workers, and it restores America's energy dominance.

Moreover, Republicans are strengthening Medicaid with reasonable work requirements. Currently, 4.8 million able-bodied adults who will not work still receive Medicaid benefits. Our law changes that. If you can work, you should work. That is fair to everyone else. It strengthens our safety net for those who truly need it.

Democrats are fearmongering about Medicaid. I am a doctor. Let me set the record straight. Under our law, single mothers keep their coverage. Children keep their coverage. Disabled Americans keep their coverage.

On national security, Republicans are reversing 4 years of weakness and woke distractions. We are restoring America's peace through strength. Our new law includes \$150 billion to rebuild our military. Our military will once again be lethal, ready, and respected.

Of course, national security starts with border security, and that is why Republicans secured the border. President Trump ended Joe Biden's disastrous open border policy. Under Joe Biden, 10 million illegal immigrants flooded across our border. Ten thousand illegal crossings every day was the standard for the Democrats and the Biden administration with their open border policy. Illegal border crossings are at a record low.

We ended the Biden policy of catch-and-release. In the last 2 months, the number of illegal immigrants who were released into this country is zero—zero. That is right. Think about what that means. I mean, think about what it means for our communities, for families. Zero releases means zero communities overwhelmed by an influx of illegal immigrants, zero schools overcrowded, zero hospitals overrun, zero new cases like Laken Riley's and Rachel Morin's. Our new law provides \$46.5 billion to finish the wall at our southern border. It also invests significantly in Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Additionally, Republicans cut billions in wasteful Washington spending around the world. Under Joe Biden, Democrats planned to spend taxpayer dollars on—listen to this—\$500,000 on electric buses in Africa, \$880,000 on social media mentorship in Europe, and \$6 million for net zero cities in Mexico. The list goes on.

Republicans passed a rescissions bill that saved taxpayers \$9 billion.

Here is the bottom line: These are commonsense reforms. At one time, they were bipartisan. In 1986, 30 Senate Democrats voted for President Reagan's tax cuts. One of the 30 was then-Senator Joe Biden. Today, every Demo-

crat in Congress voted to raise taxes on working Americans. Every Democrat voted for open borders and to give free healthcare to illegal immigrants.

The Democratic Party today is the party of high taxes, high prices, and open borders. Democrats are more than just liberal; they are radical, they are extreme, they are dangerous, they are scary, and they are terribly out of touch.

A Wall Street Journal poll this week-end found Democrats' favorability at a 35-year low. The American people see what we see and what I have just talked about in terms of what the Democrats are trying to do to this country and continue to push.

On critical issues like the economy, inflation, immigration, and national security, Americans trust Republicans more, and they are right to do so because Republicans are lowering costs, we are securing our borders, we are rebuilding our military, we are getting America back on track, and we are just getting started. The American comeback is real. The Republican majority is delivering, and America's best days are still ahead.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NEW YORK CITY SHOOTING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I come to the floor this morning not as Democratic leader, not even as the senior Senator from New York, but simply as a New Yorker, as a kid from Brooklyn, as someone who has walked that stretch of Park Avenue a thousand times.

Yesterday, my city—the greatest city on Earth—was shattered when a gunman took the lives of four innocent New Yorkers in cold blood just four blocks from my office in Midtown Manhattan. I actually worked in the building where the shooting took place for one summer as a summer associate at a law firm.

One of the victims, Officer Islam, was a husband and a father of two, with a third baby on the way. He was the best of who we are—a proud Bangladeshi American, a proud cop from the 47th Precinct, and a proud New Yorker. He died doing what NYPD officers do every day—running toward danger, protecting others, putting his own life on the line. That is what he did, and he paid—he paid the ultimate price.

When an NYPD officer is killed doing his duty, it is not just a tragedy; it is a rupture in the soul of our city, our beloved city, and it requires that we mourn and honor all those we lost.

I have lived in New York my whole life. I know this city, I know the people, and I know how we carry pain like this, how it lingers—I still remember the officers who had been shot in the line of duty months, even years and decades ago—because that is what happens when innocent lives are taken in the heart of your home.

This happened just four blocks from my office, in broad daylight, in one of

the busiest, safest, most iconic parts of Manhattan, right across from where New Yorkers pour in and out of work, pick up lunch or stop to say a prayer at St. Bart's or St. Pat's or Central Synagogue or at the Muslim Community Network mosque, all of which are in Midtown Manhattan, very close to the location where the shooting occurred.

We also grieve for another victim—Wesley LePatner, killed in the building. She was a brilliant executive from Blackstone, a beloved wife and mother of two.

We know there are two other victims as well whose names have not yet been made public, and we mourn them as well.

When something like this happens, every single New Yorker feels it. It is felt in every precinct, every kitchen table, and it is etched in the hearts of the families left behind, who will always have a hole in their hearts for the rest of their lives.

I want those families—especially Officer Islam's wife and kids and the families of Wesley LePatner from Blackstone and the other victims not yet named due to family notifications—to know this: You are not alone. All of New York grieves with you. We ache for you.

We will always remember the sacrifice Officer Islam—a husband, a son, and a father—made for all of us.

To the other victims—people just trying to make a living, do their jobs—our hearts are broken, and we, too, grieve with your families.

The city will carry their memories forward. We will continue to pray for those still recovering and in critical condition.

I want to thank the first responders who ran toward the gunfire—all the cops, EMTs, and firefighters that got there fast and prevented even more bloodshed. They are heroes, every one of them. That is New York—courage under fire, grace in the face of horror. It is who we are.

As we mourn this awful day in New York, we must remember that we cannot keep meeting these moments with thoughts and prayers alone. We owe these families more than silence; we owe them action. For now, we mourn, but we mourn as New Yorkers—together. We will carry on, yes. That is who we are. But we will never, never be the same.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. President, on costs, chaos, and corruption, nearly 8 months into Donald Trump's second term, the American people feel deep buyer's remorse. As you have seen so many times, Donald Trump's big promises turned out to be just duds, turned out to be more lies. He seems to lie every day. He doesn't even care. He doesn't even shrug his shoulders. He doesn't show a bit of remorse on his face as he spews out lie after lie after lie.

Today, only 37 percent of people approve of the job Donald Trump is doing, according to Gallup. Only 37 percent of Americans believe the country

is headed in the right direction, according to a recent YouGov poll. And an overwhelming number of Americans, including Independents and conservatives, despise Donald Trump's "Big Ugly Betrayal."

These are not the signs of a golden age; this is Trump malaise, created by three things: higher costs, endless chaos, and rampant corruption.

Let's talk about costs—the No. 1 thing on Americans' minds.

Donald Trump's tariffs have been a national sales tax on the American people. Yale Budget Lab estimated this week that the totality of Donald Trump's tariffs will cost \$2,400 this year—\$2,400. That is a lot of money.

The cost of healthcare is going to skyrocket. Thanks to the "Big Ugly Bill," as many as 15 million Americans are going to lose their coverage. Even if you don't lose your coverage outright, you are still in great, great danger of paying far more out-of-pocket, hundreds of dollars more—sometimes even thousands—for healthcare insurance. That is because Republicans failed to extend the ACA's premium tax credits, which expire at the end of the year.

Twenty-four million Americans will soon get a letter in the mail telling them that their premiums are going to go up in 2026. This letter ain't coming 2 years from now, as they tried—the Republicans—to kick the can down the road and hide this from people; it is coming right now, folks. You are going to get those letters, those increases, in the mail. Remember, it is because of Donald Trump and the Republican Senators' lack of courage to stand up for you as they bow down to millionaires.

If Republicans don't work with Democrats to restore these tax credits, premiums are going to go up by 75 percent, and 5 million Americans will lose their coverage altogether.

Let me say that again. If Republicans don't work with Democrats to restore these tax credits, premiums are set to go up by 75 percent, and 5 million Americans will lose coverage altogether. That is precisely what Donald Trump did to help the billionaire class and the corporate special interests—hurting, and hurting grievously, American families, so many of them.

(Mr. SHEEHY assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, on chaos—now, as costs go up for the American people, so does the chaos. It is unending. It is exhausting. It is dangerous.

Donald Trump's trade war: total chaos. One minute he says yes to tariffs, the next he says no, and after that, he changes his mind again. And the American people are going to pay a lot more because of these tariffs.

What about DOGE? Again, unmitigated chaos and a failure at achieving any real efficiency. DOGE has fired, rehired, and fired again everyone from VA workers to medical researchers to USAID workers to even nuclear safety personnel. Incredible.

The Social Security Administration is being hollowed out in realtime. They

don't like Social Security, these right-wing DOGE people—it is a government program—even though it is the most successful government program we have ever had.

So they are afraid to just shoot it through the heart. So instead, they strangle it: fewer people answering the phones, fewer people solving the problems when you can't get your check, putting barriers in the way of people applying. They have sent 7,000 staffers packing. Wait times on the phones have gone way up. Online services have gone dark. Millions of seniors who depend on Social Security have been left anxious and betrayed and in the dark.

You can be sure when that chaos occurs, they will somehow figure out a way to blame someone else. But they are to blame. They did it.

Finally, as this all happens, as Americans pay out of pocket, as chaos keeps Americans distracted day after day after day, what is happening here in Washington with all this cost increase happening, with all this chaos? In addition, unfortunately, it is unprecedented corruption. Never in our lifetimes have we seen a President use the levers of power so transparently to personally enrich himself and his inner circle.

That never happened in America. Presidents, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, conservatives, liberals—they respected the fact that being in high office was a guardianship, not to grab and reach and make money and enrich themselves. But that is what Trump is doing regularly.

In the past few months, Donald Trump accepted a luxury plane from Qatar to use as Air Force One. And we have no clue—no clue—as to how many hundreds of millions or more in taxpayer dollars will be spent in renovations. You have to renovate it because there could be listening devices in even the little nails and screws in those planes. So you have to almost take it apart and put it back together so Donald Trump can have his plane.

The way the deal works, after he leaves office, it goes to his Presidential library. Can you imagine a gift like that to a sitting President from a country we have to deal with, in Qatar, where we have had good and bad relations all the time?

That is not all. He turned the south lawn of the White House into a Tesla dealership when he was friendly with Musk. His family is getting rich off crypto schemes, selling access to the White House for profit—personal profit.

Truly, the Trump administration is rampant self-dealing at an unprecedented scale, and that turns the stomachs of Americans who believe we are better than that. And there are many millions of us who believe that we are better than what Donald Trump is doing.

And then, we have Jeffrey Epstein. The more time passes, the less we all know about the truth behind Trump's relationship with the late billionaire

predator. Donald Trump promised he would release the Epstein files. While he was on the campaign trail, he made that promise. He has yet to do it. Speaker JOHNSON quite literally preferred to shut Congress down and send everyone home on an "Epstein recess" rather than risking a vote on the Epstein files to take place.

Americans are right to be angry over the lack of transparency. But this isn't just about getting the truth; this is also every bit about our national security. Whatever may be in the Epstein files is clearly troubling enough that Donald Trump doesn't want to touch this issue with a 10-foot pole. So it is natural to ask: What happens if America's adversaries use cyber attacks or other means to access investigative material into Jeffrey Epstein that are embarrassing—or worse—for the President and/or the people around him? What happens if Epstein materials end up in the hands of the Chinese Government or Russia or North Korea?

Unless the Epstein files are released and made fully transparent to the public, could our adversaries use that information to blackmail someone like the President or other senior leaders in government? What kind of risk could that pose to our national security?

So, today, I am calling on the FBI to immediately conduct a counterintelligence threat assessment to ensure we understand the risk posed if a foreign adversary were to gain access to anything connected to the Epstein files. Specifically, I am calling on the FBI to do three things: First, we must determine if foreign intelligence agencies could gain access to the information the President does not want to release in the Epstein files through methods that include cyber intrusion; second, the FBI must identify any vulnerabilities that could be exploited by foreign intelligence agencies with access to nonpublic information in the Epstein files, including being able to gain leverage over Donald Trump, his family, or other senior government officials; and, third, I am calling on the FBI to publicly show their developing mitigation strategies to counter these threats and safeguard our national security.

The idea of foreign adversaries hacking into Agency files to collect information that could be leveraged against our government is not at all a remote possibility. Just last Thursday, it was reported that DHS and HHS were among several government Agencies hacked as a part of a breach to Microsoft's SharePoint service. This hack, Microsoft confirmed, was carried out by Chinese actors.

Hacks like this could very well be an attempt to exploit Federal systems to get access to Epstein files and potentially use it to influence those named in the files.

Whatever is in the Epstein files is concerning enough that Donald Trump is running scared. If that is, in fact, the case, our adversaries could certainly be

interested in trying to use this information to hurt America and Americans. We must ensure that that can never happen, and the FBI must immediately conduct a risk assessment so we are not caught flatfooted if our adversaries have already seen these files.

National security, Mr. President, is not and should never be a partisan issue. We need to do everything we can to make sure we are protecting the United States and American families every single day. This report is imperative to do just that.

And there is one more thing Donald Trump could do to quell people's anger, confusion, frustration, and fears over the national security ramifications: Stop running away from this issue; tell the truth; and if there is clearly no national security risk, release the Epstein files, President Trump.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

NOMINATION OF EMIL J. BOVE III

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, soon, the Senate will vote on President Trump's nomination of Emile Bove to a New Jersey seat on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

The swirl of information concerning the Department of Justice this year is almost impossible to follow. And as ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee, we try to follow closely not only the nominees for judicial positions and positions of leadership at the Department of Justice but also those issues that are relevant to our jurisdiction.

Surprisingly, a case that has been around for years, the Jeffrey Epstein case, has captured the attention not only of Washington but of many people in this country. I have never seen anything like it. The House of Representatives went into a rollcall vote that lasted for 8 hours. Eight hours the rollcall was open. I am sure it set a new record. What hung them up so dramatically? The Jeffrey Epstein case and whether the files would be released.

As a result of that, the Speaker of the House decided that he would give a special recess to the House of Representatives and basically tell them: Leave Washington. We are not going to vote on the Epstein question.

What is it in these files that is so frightening to the President, the White House, the Department of Justice, and the Republican leadership in Congress? The American people have had their doubts for a long time that we knew all that we needed to know about this case, but now they have been confirmed by the actions of the Speaker of the House and the President of the United States.

I would just say flatout for the record: I know of no information that implicates the President in wrongdoing with Jeffrey Epstein, period. But I do believe, as many Republicans believe, the best thing to do for all of us is to disclose to the American people the truth of the situation. What actually

happened with Mr. Epstein? Did he commit suicide? There are questions that are still unanswered.

And then, last week, something happened that was completely unheard of: One of the leaders in the Department of Justice asked for a private, personal meeting with a woman who was convicted for her activity with Jeffrey Epstein. Her name is Ghislaine Maxwell, and she is serving a 20-year term in prison, in Federal prison, for her wrongdoing. She was involved in the trafficking of children and young women for Mr. Epstein and his friends, and she lied about it. According to the prosecution, brazen lies. The penalty she faced: 20 years in prison. That is a hefty penalty. It indicates some serious wrongdoing.

The Trump administration sent a higher official to meet with her privately in the prison and to ask her questions. We don't know the nature of those inquiries, but it is certainly unusual for someone serving a 20-year sentence to have that kind of a visitor. We don't know what was said, but we should.

I joined with Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, in sending a letter to the Department of Justice. We want a copy of the transcript of that conversation between the Department of Justice officials and Ms. Maxwell, who is serving these 20 years in prison. We want to know what was said. I think we have a right to.

If there is some aspect of it that relates to redacting or, perhaps, relates to national security, I will be sensitive to that, as I am sure everyone would want me to be. But if it is a question of what kind of strategy was behind meeting with this woman—Jeffrey Epstein's girlfriend at one time—now serving a 20-year prison sentence, I think the American people have a right to know.

And, secondly, let me make it clear: For her wrongdoing, she is being penalized dramatically—and should be. Any notion that she is going to receive a pardon from Donald Trump, which seems to be a rather common thing in his administration, is totally unacceptable—totally. She was branded as a brazen liar when she was sentenced. Now that she has a chance to reduce the sentence or eliminate it by making statements, her credibility is zero. Any notion of a pardon or any notion of clemency by this President is totally inappropriate.

Let's go back to the nomination of Emil Bove to a New Jersey seat on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. An unusual thing occurred with this. He came and answered questions, as he should, for the White House as well as for the Judiciary Committee and then appeared before us under oath and answered questions.

But what was unusual about this situation is that the many questions he tried to answer, he didn't get close to coming to the truth. So egregious were his statements that individuals who

worked with him were willing to risk their career in public service to come forward as whistleblowers to members of the committee in Congress to tell them that Mr. Bove had misrepresented the facts before us.

They risked their public careers to come and tell us this information, and as a result of it, some of them are going to have to leave the Department of Justice. But it seems that when given a test of values and ethics, time and again, Mr. Bove fails, and those around him step forward and risk their own careers to tell the truth.

So we said, as Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee, to the chairman: We believe these whistleblowers are credible. They are telling us things about Mr. Bove that contradict his testimony before the committee, and we believe that they should be heard. They are willing to come before the committee and take an oath to tell the truth and run the risk of retribution or penalty if they are found to have misled the committee in misrepresenting the facts.

You can't ask for more than that; someone willing to risk their job to tell the truth and then to appear before our committee under oath and testify as to what happened. I think that is credible, and I don't think it is avoidable.

We are talking about Bove being appointed to a Federal circuit bench that is a lifetime appointment. This is a critical decision, and we need to have the facts before the American people.

So what was the response of the Republicans on the committee, the chairman? They turned us down. They don't want to hear any whistleblowers. They don't want to hear people who are willing to stand before us under oath and tell us what actually happened with Mr. Bove and his misrepresentations to the committee.

As members of the conservative legal establishment have noted, Mr. Bove's nomination represents an alarming departure for the type of nominees we considered under the first Trump administration.

Like other individuals President Trump has installed at the highest positions of our government during his second term, Mr. Bove's primary qualification appears to be his blind loyalty to this President.

As Acting Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Bove personally ordered the terminations of dozens of career Federal prosecutors who worked to put violent January 6 offenders behind bars.

Remember what happened January 6? Vice President Pence was sitting in the President's chair. They were counting the ballots for the electoral college to determine who won the Presidential election, and we had to stop. Capitol Police came in, took the Vice President off the podium, and then notified us that there was a demonstration taking place in the Capitol Building that was dangerous.

I remember the first thing they said to us: Stay in your seats. This is going to be a safe room. You can stay here.

Ten minutes later, the same policeman came up and said: We were wrong. It isn't safe. Leave as quickly as possible.

We filed out that exit door, all the Members of the Senate. The Vice President was gone.

These demonstrators swarmed through the Capitol, attacked the Capitol Police, who were there trying to defend the building and the people in it, causing 140 of them to be injured and 5 of them lost their lives as a result of this.

Then they went on and started doing the job of ransacking this Chamber and the offices of the Senators in this building. They did great damage to this building—millions of dollars—and even worse, in my estimation, they desecrated what I consider to be a cathedral to democracy, the U.S. Capitol Building.

Many of them, of course, when they were aping for the cameras, were creating videotape evidence that was used against them. The Department of Justice went into an investigation of these demonstrators who had ransacked the Capitol and threatened the lives of people who were here.

As a result of it, more than 1,500 were prosecuted for that wrongdoing. It took a long period of time and a lot of investigation. U.S. attorneys were asked all over the United States to participate in this.

What happened? The 1,500—many of them ended up with criminal sentences, some very serious sentences, and some were incarcerated. Then came Donald Trump, and he gave a full, unconditional pardon to the January 6 rioters who came into this building—full and unconditional.

Then, to make it even worse, his new administration and the Department of Justice came in and said: If you were an assistant U.S. attorney following orders to prosecute these individuals and these rioters, you can be fired for doing that. We want you to disclose whether you participated in the investigation and prosecution of these individuals.

Who was behind all this? Well, quite a few members of the Trump administration. But as Acting Deputy Attorney General, Emil Bove, the man who is seeking this judgeship, personally ordered the termination of dozens of career Federal prosecutors who worked to put violent January 6 offenders behind bars.

Mr. Bove even made the outrageous claim that the prosecutions of January 6 rioters were “a grave national injustice that has been perpetrated upon the American people.”

Imagine that. He doubled down on this sentiment during his confirmation process and further insulted the law enforcement officers who kept us safe and risked their lives from these rioters.

In response to a question before our committee, Mr. Bove wrote that the “heavy-handed tactics” by January 6

prosecutors were “equally unacceptable” as rioters’ attacks on the police.

Think about that for a moment. He is saying the assistant U.S. attorneys—the prosecutors—who went after the individuals who stormed through the Capitol were just as bad as the rioters themselves.

I pointed this out to my Republican colleagues; that a man seeking a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench believes that those who prosecute cop-beaters are as bad as the cop-beaters themselves.

Expecting my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to react as I have this morning, what did I get? Crickets. Silence. No response.

He said the prosecutors were as bad as the rioters themselves.

Mr. Bove has been up to far more as a senior Justice Department official than just excusing the conduct of January 6 offenders. He personally led the administration’s attempt to strike a corrupt bargain with New York City Mayor Eric Adams by offering to drop his pending prosecution in exchange for Mayor Adams’ cooperation on President Trump’s immigration policies.

Get that straight—investigations of corruption on the mayor of New York City, the response from the Trump administration, from Mr. Emil Bove, was: We will cut a deal with you. We won’t prosecute you if you promise to play ball with us when it comes to mass deportations.

In response to Mr. Bove’s alleged quid pro quo, several Federal prosecutors in the Southern District of New York, including the U.S. attorney herself—a staunch conservative who clerked for Justice Scalia and was appointed to the position by President Trump—made it clear that they would not participate in Emil Bove’s deal with the mayor of New York.

Mr. Bove’s disdain for the rule of law has been a theme throughout his entire career. As a Federal prosecutor in the Southern District of New York, he once admitted that prosecutors he supervised told the defense team a “flat lie” regarding their disclosure obligations—a flatout lie.

Given that background, it appears Mr. Bove’s time in the Trump administration has been true to form.

Last month, Erez Reuveni, a career DOJ attorney who defended the first Trump administration’s administrative policies in court, filed a whistleblower complaint with my office. According to Mr. Reuveni, Mr. Bove told other Department attorneys they might need to say “f you” to Federal courts that issue orders which the Trump administration disagreed with.

Remarkably, when he was under oath before the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Bove would not deny that he delivered such a message. He merely said he did not recall whether he had used the explicit language.

So I asked Mr. Reuveni, the whistleblower, to substantiate his claims, and he did. Mr. Reuveni provided text mes-

sages, emails, and a trove of other documents corroborating his claim that Mr. Bove had both suggested the possibility of violating court orders and had spearheaded efforts to mislead judges.

Mr. Reuveni is willing to testify under oath about what I have just said.

I asked the Judiciary Committee, in a formal letter, to take his testimony, but apparently my Republican colleagues have no interest in learning the truth about Mr. Bove.

Mr. Reuveni is apparently not alone. According to public reporting, another whistleblower filed a complaint with the Justice Department’s inspector general that further backs up these allegations.

My office is working to obtain a copy of that complaint filed with the inspector general. The contents of that complaint are one of many unanswered questions regarding Bove’s conduct.

It appears my Republican colleagues fear the answers. That is the only reason I can see for their insistence on forcing this nomination through at breakneck speed before all the facts are public.

In addition to the outstanding inspector general complaint, we have absolutely no idea how involved Mr. Bove has been in the Trump administration’s Jeffrey Epstein coverup.

As I noted previously, it was very convenient for Senate Republicans that Attorney General Bondi did not announce her plan to keep the Epstein files hidden until shortly after Mr. Bove’s obligation to answer questions before the committee.

Interesting timing.

Mr. Bove has served at the most senior levels of the Justice Department in these early months of the administration. It is highly unlikely that he does not have knowledge of the Epstein coverup.

So my colleagues and I sent him followup questions to assess his involvement. No surprise, refused to answer.

Some conservative voices have been willing to speak truth to power regarding Mr. Bove’s nomination. The editorial board of the Wall Street Journal, a known liberal newspaper, pointed out that Mr. Bove’s record “creates an impression of . . . a lawyer comfortabl[y] pursuing policy outcomes by pushing legal boundaries.”

Conservative legal commentator Ed Whelan wrote that he has “serious doubts that Bove has the character and integrity to be worthy of confirmation as a federal judge.”

You don’t have to take it from them or me. President Trump, himself, has made the claim that Mr. Bove was selected for his position not because of his legal accomplishments or his dedication to a conservative method of constitutional interpretation. As the President put it, Mr. Bove will “do anything . . . that is necessary to, MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN.”

I strongly urge my colleagues to consider the implications of giving this man, Emil Bove, a lifetime seat on the

Federal bench. Join me in opposing his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the 11:30 vote.

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

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM KIMMITT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the motion to invoke cloture of Mr. William Kimmitt, who is nominated to serve as the Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

In this role, Mr. Kimmitt would lead the Department of Commerce's International Trade Administration. This Agency promotes U.S. exports, attracts foreign investment, and counters unfair trade.

Mr. Kimmitt is well-qualified to lead the International Trade Administration. In addition to his private sector experience, Mr. Kimmitt served at the Office of the United States Trade Representative during President Trump's first term.

As a counselor to the U.S. Trade Representative, he advised on important trade policy and legal matters, including the United States-Mexico-Canada agreement.

At his nomination hearing, Mr. Kimmitt said he understands "how trade policy affects real workers, real businesses and the long-term competitiveness of the United States."

He pledged to bring this perspective "to every aspect of his job," and I am confident that he will do so.

I thank Mr. Kimmitt for his commitment and for his responsiveness throughout the nomination process. I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me today in voting to advance Mr. Kimmitt's nomination.

I yield the floor.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the Kimmitt and Monarez nominations.

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

VOTE ON MATTHEWS NOMINATION

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

Mr. ROUNDS. 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 Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 441 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

Cassidy Cruz Justice

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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 assistant bill 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. 94, William Kimmitt, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

John Thune, David McCormick, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Eric Schmitt, Roger Marshall, Ron Johnson, Kevin Cramer, Jim Banks, Dan Sullivan, Pete Ricketts, Rick Scott of Florida, Ted Budd, Jim Justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of William Kimmitt, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 442 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

Cassidy Justice

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, and the nays are 47. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William Kimmitt, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

RECESS

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

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON KIMMITT NOMINATION

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

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 443 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Blackburn	Grassley	Mullin
Boozman	Hagerty	Murkowski
Britt	Hawley	Paul
Budd	Hoeven	Ricketts
Capito	Husted	Risch
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sheehy
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Cruz	Marshall	Thune
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	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	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Galleo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Justice	Tillis
---------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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. 274, Susan Monarez, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (New Position)

John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John R. Curtis, Pete Ricketts, Tim Sheehy, Roger Marshall, Jim Justice, Cynthia M. Lummis, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Steve Daines, David McCormick, Bernie Moreno.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Susan Monarez, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (New Position), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 444 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Graham	Mullin
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Risch
Budd	Husted	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Curtis	McCormick	Wicker
Daines	Moody	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	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	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Galleo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—

Justice

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). On this vote, the yeas are 52, and the nays are 47. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Susan Monarez, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (New Position)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise today seeking unanimous consent to pass a package of bipartisan bills that will support current and former law enforcement officers who have sacrificed so much—sometimes everything—to protect our families.

Yesterday morning, three people died in a shooting in my home State in Reno, NV, and just hours later, four people died, including a law enforcement officer, in a shooting in New York City.

The only reason more people didn't die is because law enforcement responded quickly. Law enforcement officers run toward danger for the rest of us. These are the people we are supporting with the package of bills today.

This package includes three pieces of legislation that I am proud to cosponsor and one I introduced myself.

I am a cosponsor of S. 419, the Reauthorizing Support and Treatment of Officers in Crisis Act of 2025 introduced by Senator HAWLEY. This bipartisan bill would help fund family support, suicide prevention, and other mental health services to law enforcement officers.

I am also a cosponsor of S. 1316, the Strong Communities Act of 2025, introduced by Senator PETERS. This is bipartisan legislation that would make law enforcement recruits eligible for funding to make their education and training programs more affordable in return for their commitment to service to our communities.

And, finally, I am cosponsoring S. 539, the bipartisan PROTECT Our Children Reauthorization Act of 2025, introduced by Senator CORNYN. This bill authorizes funding for the Department of Justice to assist Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in investigating and prosecuting child exploitation.

These bills, along with four others, including my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR—these bills honor our law enforcement officers and have support from both Republicans and Democrats.

The legislation I want to focus on today is S. 911, the bipartisan Chief Herbert D. Proffitt Act of 2025, which I was proud to introduce with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL.

The men and women who serve as law enforcement officers risk their lives every day to keep our community safe. Whether they are actively serving or have retired in good standing, we owe them a debt of gratitude. That is why the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program exists.

It provides death and education benefits to the surviving family members of fallen law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other first responders.

It also provides disability benefits to officers who have suffered irreparable injuries in the line of duty. It is a critical program that supports the families of those who sacrificed everything to protect our communities.

Unfortunately, the existing PSOB Program does not cover the rare instance in which a retired law enforcement officer dies as a result of their service.

In 2012, Chief Herbert D. Proffitt, a retired law enforcement officer in Kentucky, was going about his day. When he went outside his house to check his

mail, he was tragically shot and killed by a man he had arrested a decade earlier.

Even though his murder was a direct retaliation for his service in uniform, Chief Proffitt's family was denied the benefits they deserved simply because he had already retired. To me, that is unacceptable, and I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree.

That is why Senator MCCONNELL and I worked together to write the Chief Herbert D. Proffitt Act to ensure that families of retired law enforcement officers who were killed as a result of their service are not denied benefits, so no more families have to go through what Chief Proffitt's family has gone through. This is just commonsense, bipartisan legislation that passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee—unanimously.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and the rest of the bipartisan bills in this package to protect the men and women who protect us every day, and their families.

I would like at this time to provide an opportunity for my colleague from Iowa—to yield some time to him, the Judiciary chairman, right now, to provide some remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Nevada for coming to the floor to push for passage of these bipartisan bills that she has mentioned.

I also see that Senator KLOBUCHAR is on the floor to seek like legislation that she has worked on in a bipartisan way to protect law enforcement and first responders, and I would also support her efforts.

Law enforcement across the country put their lives on the line every day. We see examples of the dangers they face on the news and in our communities on a daily basis.

This month, Immigration and Customs Enforcement reported an 830-percent increase in assaults on their officers and agents during the course of their enforcement duties. Agents and officers had rocks and other projectiles thrown at them, causing injury to person and property. These agents and officers have been doxed and had their home addresses, family members' names, and other personal information posted on social media for anyone to see, which has resulted in an increased number of threats and intimidation to these law enforcement personnel and their families.

We had the opportunity to hear firsthand from three Federal law enforcement officers during a Judiciary Committee hearing on cartels last month about the ongoing risk and dangers to law enforcement.

We had Special Agent in Charge Matthew Allen of the Los Angeles field office of the Drug Enforcement Administration testify that his agents are oftentimes surveilled by cartel members and other bad actors. He further testi-

fied that he has lost several friends and fellow law enforcement officers as a result of their law enforcement duties.

Just recently, we learned that an off-duty Customs and Border Protection officer was shot in the face in New York City during an attempted robbery by a previously deported illegal alien. Thankfully, the officer is expected to survive.

According to the Fraternal Order of Police, as of June 30 of this year, 166 officers were shot in the line of duty, and 21 of them lost their lives. While these numbers are lower than from previous years, the shooting this weekend is yet another example of the threats and dangers our men and women in blue face every day, both on and off duty.

Earlier this year, Senator DURBIN, who is also on the floor with us—he is the ranking member of the committee I chair—he and I led a resolution honoring 234 officers who made the ultimate sacrifice and are being recognized as line-of-duty deaths. It passed with over 80 cosponsors.

We worked together across the aisle to report these bills that are being discussed here on the floor of the Senate. Those bills were voted out of committee in what we honor as Police Week in the United States. The seven bills are part of the largest Police Week package in over 15 years. The package of seven bills passed the committee with bipartisan support and also by unanimous vote. They provide a good example of the extensive problems facing our law enforcement community. For example, one bill deals with recruitment and retention issues to ensure our law enforcement is well staffed. Other bills deal with protecting law enforcement from the dangers of fentanyl and providing law enforcement with the equipment they need to serve our communities.

Lastly, the bills provide protection to the families of first responders and provide the much needed resources for the mental health of law enforcement.

Mr. President, I would yield back to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Iowa and the Judiciary Committee and all of the good work he has done on these important pieces of legislation, as they really work towards ensuring that all of our communities across the country stay safe and that we are supporting our law enforcement.

So as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 77, S. 180; Calendar No. 79, S. 419; Calendar No. 80, S. 539; Calendar No. 81, S. 911; Calendar No. 82, S. 1316; Calendar No. 83, S. 1563; Calendar No. 84, S. 1595; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 1563 be agreed to and the committee-reported amendment to S. 1316 be agreed to; that the committee-reported sub-

stitute amendment to S. 539 be withdrawn and the Cornyn substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; finally, that the bills, as amended, if 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. Is there an objection?

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I am reserving the right to object.

I want to begin by acknowledging the tragic loss of New York City Police Officer Didarul Islam last night, just about 50 miles from where I live. He made the ultimate sacrifice, bravely placing himself in harm's way to protect strangers, people he didn't know, because that is what American police officers do. This selfless commitment is a daily reminder. It is a reminder of the reality for police officers in America who risk their lives to safeguard communities. My deepest condolences go out to his family and his young children during this time of unimaginable grief.

I rise today to propose an amendment to the bills before us, one that guarantees every officer in every State like Officer Islam has the full support they deserve in their service to our communities from this body.

Sadly, this is not what the Justice Department is doing. Rather than supporting law enforcement agencies and officers equally across the Nation, they are weaponizing public safety grants to punish State and local jurisdictions that resist the Trump policy agenda, including my home State of New Jersey.

The Department of Justice is right now withholding funds from law enforcement agencies across the country—including New Jersey—that we have passed through this body in a bipartisan way unless they enforce the administration's unjust immigration agenda and comply with the President's unjust and unlawful Executive orders and memoranda. It is disgraceful, it is unfair, it is unjust, and it is dangerously reckless towards the officers whose well-being they are jeopardizing—officers like the ones I know personally who serve and protect New Jersey.

Come on now. Federal funds should not be used for partisan political games. They shouldn't be weaponized to benefit this State that supported the President and not this State that didn't support the President. This is the shift towards authoritarianism. It is undermining the separation of powers we have here in America.

This body has duly-approved grants. It is our job. It is spelled out in the Constitution that each of us has sworn an oath to protect. And this President is upending that process, violating the

will of this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, in pursuit of his petty political agenda. And who is getting hurt? Well, in this case, New Jersey police officers are being hurt; New York police officers are getting hurt. In the wake of a murder of a police officer in New York yesterday, this is outrageous.

Public safety grants like these that I am a cosponsor of are not meant to reward law enforcement in favored jurisdictions or States while punishing others. It shouldn't matter whether a person puts on his uniform in Texas or New Jersey. Does it matter that Officer Islam, who was killed last night in New York City—does it matter that he is a New York cop and not a North Dakota cop? Sadly, it appears that Donald Trump thinks so.

For us as a body, to move forward right now is being complicit in what Donald Trump is doing. I say no. I say we stand. I say we fight. I say that we reject this and, in a bipartisan way, that we demand an end to this kind of constitutionally unjust carving up of the resources we approve.

Think about this: In April, Donald Trump's administration cut nearly 400 public safety grants administered by its Office of Justice Programs without any notice or explanation. Think about that for a second. Programs that I supported, programs that I cosponsored, programs that protect police officers and communities, he canceled without a justification.

I have written letters to the Justice Department. They have not given a justification. I have asked in open hearings: Why did you cut this funding for approved grants to States like New Jersey? No justification. I sent a letter to the DOJ signed by 30 of my colleagues demanding information about what happened and that they reinstate all grants that had been rescinded, and no action and no response. Yet, today, we want to move forward with needed grant programs to protect police officers, but that money won't go to New York; that money won't go to New Jersey. You have got to be kidding me.

When will we stand and fight this President?

This offers little consolation. Today, nobody is speaking to the organizations in New Jersey, to the police officers in New Jersey that partner with law enforcement but now lack the resources to endure a burdensome appeal or to operate without critical grants or funding now for months.

When are we going to stand up as a body and defend our work, defend our jurisdiction, defend this coequal branch of government?

I ask my colleagues to pass these bills with my amendment to provide resources to law enforcement agencies with this important provision that safeguards these grants from politicization and ensures that all law enforcement agencies have a fair chance to secure these important grants.

Our officers have the hardest job in America. Every day, they put their lives on the line. Why would we do something today that is playing into the President's politics and is going to hurt the officers in States like mine?

I believe in these bills. I am a cosponsor on some. That is why I am standing here to fight to ensure police departments in New Jersey aren't excluded from accessing these vital funds. Our officers have just as much of a right as officers in other States. So do officers in California, in New York, in Illinois, in Washington, and in other States that have been the target of this Department of Justice.

I am an American. I pledge allegiance to that flag—liberty and justice for all. Pass my amendment and make sure that all officers in America who put their lives on the line have access to these grants.

I ask consent that the bill be modified, that my amendments to S. 180, S. 419, S. 539, S. 1316, and S. 1563, which are at the desk, also be agreed to, and the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc so that all police officers in America get the intended resources that the Judiciary Committee passed unanimously for American police.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Reserving the right to object, I agree. Withholding funding for law enforcement anywhere in the country—across the country—is just not acceptable and it should not be done and it should not be based on party affiliation, playing favoritism—I absolutely agree.

But I also agree, two wrongs don't make a right. And where we are today, these bills passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee weeks ago, and my colleague from New Jersey, I have respect for him. He is on the committee. He voted to pass these bills. He had an opportunity at that time to present this amendment. This is the first time we are ever hearing about it.

We have been trying to pass this package of bills that passed out of committee unanimously in the last 8 weeks. And now that we came to the floor to try to push and get this done, we are hearing for the first time about this amendment.

Let me just say, this amendment really is not even applicable to the Proffitt bill that is part of this. It has nothing to do with grant funding. This bill has everything to do with trying to make sure that grant funding goes to all the States. I am not here to talk about grant funding. There is no funding associated with it, yet he wants to put it on my piece of legislation.

This is why it is ridiculous. This is an attempt to kill all of these bills. I don't know why. I don't know why, because at the end of the day, all of these bills are about bipartisan support.

If my colleague absolutely has concerns about getting funding to his law

enforcement, I would be willing to work with him. I would be willing to work—and I know my colleagues would try to figure out how we ensure that this administration doesn't play favorites and fight for that funding and holding them accountable to get that funding to all of our law enforcement communities across this country.

I agree; President Trump's impoundment of funding is a serious concern. But tacking on poison pill language to these bills won't guarantee that any additional funding makes it to New Jersey, Nevada, or any other State. Instead, what it will do, it will keep critical bills from passing in the first place. Let me just say that again. These are critical bills.

One bill, the Protecting First Responders for Secondary Exposure Act, requires purchasing devices that prevent secondary exposure to fentanyl and other lethal substances. Reauthorizing Support and Treatment for Officers in Crisis Act 2025 provides family support and mental health services to law enforcement personnel. PROTECT Our Children Reauthorization 2025 assists Federal, State, and local law enforcement Agencies in investigating and prosecuting child exploitation.

And we are sitting here today saying: That is not going to pass—even though it came out of committee unanimously; even though there was a time to address the concerns that my colleague has. And now he wants to kill all of these bills, some of them that his amendments are not even applicable to.

You have to question what is going on here. Is this the right venue to fight for what he is seeking?

I absolutely respect him and understand his concern and would be willing to fight with him to get that funding—essential funding—to his State that this administration has, apparently, blocked. But this is not the way to go about it, to kill all of these bills with this poison pill amendment. For that reason, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object, I am confused by my colleague because she knows I don't object to her two bills. She is going to be offering her two bills in a second. I don't know what the confusion is there.

I object to the bills that are putting resources out that States from California to New York are not eligible for because of the actions of this President.

The second thing my colleague confuses me is saying I had my chance. Actually, I didn't. The regularly scheduled Judiciary Committee hearing wrapped up, and then a hastily one was put back together. I had no notice of that, no ability to plan for it, and had a conflict.

This, to me, is the problem with Democrats in America right now, is we are willing to be complicit to Donald

Trump; to let this pass through when we have all the leverage right now there is to say that if you are as passionate about police as we are, then pass bills out of this body that will help the police officers in Washington, that will help the police officers in Illinois, that will help the police officers in New Jersey, that will help the police officers in Newark.

Don't be complicit to the President of the United States who, we both know, doesn't understand that language: "Oh please, oh please, don't hurt blue States."

We are standing at a moment where our President is eviscerating the Constitution of the United States of America, and we are willing to go along with that today.

No, no. Not on my watch. I stand against this. It is a violation of our Constitution for the President of the United States to ignore the will of Congress and decide which States are eligible to grants and which are not.

Well, we know something in New York and New Jersey. I was a Newark elected official when 9/11 happened. I saw my first responders charging into those buildings. I know what police officers do every day.

My amendment was just called a poison pill. That is ridiculous. My amendment just says police officers in New Jersey are just as important as the police officers in North or South Dakota. It says the police officers in New York are just as important as the police officers in Texas. It says the police officers in California are just as important as the police officers in Alabama.

Why would we go along with a President who is violating our Constitution time and time again? When in the history of this body—Democrats and Republicans used to stand up for their turf. These could easily pass. Put a simple amendment that says: You know what? You can play games however you want, President Trump, but when it comes to resources for police officers, no games.

Today, I stand and fight for the Constitution. I stand and fight against this President. And, heck, yeah, I am going to stand and fight for the police officers from the great State of New Jersey. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Nevada for her work in trying to bring these bills to a vote on the floor. I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I want to thank Senator DURBIN, who is here, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee; someone who has, by the way, been a leading voice on immigration for years in this Chamber.

One of the things I don't understand here is that we have committees for a reason, and we have hearings for a reason. You can't do one thing on Police Week and not show up and not object

and let these bills go through and then say another thing a few weeks later in a big speech on the floor. I like to show up at the markups, and I like to make my case.

And I will note that Senator BOOKER objected to my police reauthorization bill, the COPS funding—the Clinton COPS funding, long before Donald Trump came into office. So this is not just about this. This is a long dispute over this type of funding, funding that I think is really important right now.

Our country's law enforcement professionals do some of the hardest and most important work out there. Every day across America, we ask them to put everything on the line to keep us safe. We ask them to run towards danger and to guide others to safety. And every day across America, they put on their uniforms, their bulletproof vests, their badges, and they get to work. We need to have their backs, and that is what this package of bills does—by the way, a bill supported out of the committee from some of the most liberal Senators and some of the most conservative Senators in this body. We came together. There were bills we would have liked to include that we did not.

If the objection is based on some of this horse show that is going on out of the White House, I agree with that piece of Senator BOOKER's points. I have been equally vociferous taking on this administration. But all of these bills came out of the committee unanimously, and I think they deserve that support on the floor.

These bills help fund grants for mental health services for law enforcement. By the way, if this issue—which I agree with Senator BOOKER on about all these States should be treated the same—well, then, I suppose then he will be voting against all of this funding for New Jersey unless this is changed. So we should be watching for that for every single vote, instead of just these bills. These bills that are in front of us were supported unanimously out of committee—grants that help law enforcement combat child sexual exploitation; grants that help address recruitment and retention crisis that is plaguing local law enforcement; Senator CORTEZ MASTO's bill, as she explained, to help support families of fallen law enforcement officers who were targeted and attacked because of their service as law enforcement.

My bill, which has now been objected to—so I am not going to mention it separately or ask for it to be called up separately. My bill, the Retired Law Enforcement Officers Continuing Service Act, done with Senator GRASSLEY, would make sure that law enforcement agencies can continue to utilize the skills that talented law enforcement retirees have built up over their career of public service. There are many retired law enforcement officers who want an active retirement and are eager and ready to serve their community.

This might sound like small ball, but when we are looking how we are going to build up these police agencies when we don't have enough police, when they are out there at these scenes getting shot at, we have to be creative in terms of the ideas.

I believe strongly, we are going to see another President in the future. We are going to see, out of these next elections, a check on some of this. But for now, I want to get these programs started.

This bill would allow law enforcement agencies across the country to keep using their expertise to review video footage to solve carjacking cases or help cyber and financial crime investigations. This bill will also help train the next generation of law enforcement officers. These and the other police bills passed during Police Week while those police officers are sitting there in the hearing room when no one objected, they are bipartisan, common-sense legislation. They passed the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

And I can't help it if someone couldn't change their schedule to be there. I think that these hearings should mean something and that people should be saying the same thing they say in Police Week when those people are sitting out there in their uniforms who have lost loved ones. As they say on this Senate floor, if we expect law enforcement to respond to some of the most difficult crises at a moment's notice, it is on us to set them up for success.

I was there at the National Mall where it rained the entire night, and not a family wasn't there when they thought it was going to be a nicer day. And that was this year on the National Mall to honor those fallen heroes, the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Candlelight Vigil. Every single officer whose name was read that night was a beloved family member and a friend to so many, including three from my State.

There was Officer Jamal Mitchell who was shot and killed in the line of duty just last June; and Officers Paul Elmstrand and Matthew Ruge who, along with Firefighter Paramedic Adam Finseth were killed responding to a domestic violence call in Burnsville, MN. They were called to duty. They answered the call. They actually got seven kids out of this house and saved their lives. One was gunned down. A paramedic came in to try to save him, and he was gunned down. I will never forget hearing from Adam Medlicott, who was there with the three fallen first responders when they answered the call.

He said of his fallen comrades:

We were there for seven children. Nothing could be more honorable.

He is absolutely right. You can't teach that kind of heroism. Our brave law enforcement professionals deserve to know that the resources they rely on will be there when they need them.

I hope we can work some of this out. I completely agree with Senator BOOKER about what this administration is doing, but you can't just pick out a few bills that came out of committee and say, "I am going to stop those," and then allow for other bills that fund other parts of your budget in your State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I was just called out by name, and I want to respond.

This is what frustrates me. I have passed numerous pieces of legislation for our police officers. I partnered with CHUCK GRASSLEY—the incredible Senator from Iowa—on a bill very similar to the one I support about police officers who fall in the line of duty. In this case, it was COVID. Police officers who got COVID and died had difficulty proving it was a line-of-duty death. We passed that legislation to make sure those families got the benefits.

I have worked in bipartisan ways and within my own party to make sure we get resources to our police officers. I don't need lectures about the urgency of this. One of my childhood best friends—a police officer in a small town in New Jersey—after a hard day's work, before he even went home to see his family, died by suicide. I don't need somebody implying in any way that this is not vital to me and my State that we have resources for our police officers. That is why I support this package. That is why I am a cosponsor of some of the bills in this package.

But what I am tired of is when the President of the United States of America violates the constitution and trashes our norms and traditions. And what does the Democratic Party do—comply? allow him? beg for scraps? No. I demand justice. Somebody is implying that this, to me, is not about resources for my State. I will fight for Jersey every day, every night and when it comes to the police officers of my State as to anybody who implies that something is going on other than my allegiance and fealty to the safety, strength, and protection of my police officers because they protect me and everybody in this body.

This is a call, folks. The Democratic Party needs a wake-up call. I see law firms bending a knee to this President, not caring about the larger principles—those free speech rights that you can take on any client. Why are you bending the knee?

I see universities that should be bastions of free speech bending at the knee to this President. I see businesses taking late-night talk show hosts off the air because they dare to insult a President. I see people who want mergers suddenly think they have to pay tribute to this President.

And what are the very people here who are elected to defend the Constitution of the United States saying? Oh, well. Today, let's look the other way and pass some resources that won't go

to Connecticut; that won't go to Illinois; that won't go to New York but that will go to the States he likes. That is complicity with an authoritarian leader who is trashing our Constitution.

It is time for Democrats to have a backbone. It is time for us to fight. It is time for us to draw lines. And when it comes to the safety of my State being denied these grants, that is why I am standing here. Don't question my integrity. Don't question my motives. I am standing for Jersey; I am standing for my police officers; I am standing for the Constitution; and I am standing for what is right.

Dear God, if you want to come at me that way, you are going to have to take it up with me because there is too much on the line in America with people's due process rights and free speech rights and as secret police are running around this country picking people up off the streets who have a legal right to be here. There is too much going on in this country.

When are we going to stand together for the principles that I just heard that were agreed with? When are we going to stand together? If we don't stand as Democrats, we deserve to lose, but if we stand united, if we stand strong, if we stand with other people, if we tell America, with a chorus of conviction, that what this President is doing is wrong—if we stand up and speak that way—dear God, we will win like all of those people who are our ancestors who joined hands together and said: We shall overcome.

No, not on my watch. I am protecting Jersey today. I am protecting our Constitution today. I am standing today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, let me try to refocus this on the bills that are before us today.

I am not sure if the answer here is to stop bipartisan legislation that gives tools to law enforcement across the community to keep our communities safe—that stopping those is the answer moving forward here. I don't know of anyone across this community who has a concern when they make that 9-1-1 call who doesn't want law enforcement to respond. I don't care whether you are a Republican, a Democrat. I don't care if you are nonpartisan. I don't care where you live. You want law enforcement to respond if there is something happening in your community.

That is what these bills are focused on, is how do we ensure that our law enforcement has the tools that it needs to ensure that it can keep our communities safe. That is all it is, and there are several of them, bipartisan, and they passed in a unanimous way for that very reason—to keep our communities safe.

Now, we can talk about the funding for those in appropriations. That is a separate subject, and I am willing to work with my colleague and fight the administration from stopping that

funding, but if we don't pass these pieces of legislation, we are not even giving the tools to law enforcement to keep our communities safe. That is what this is about, and that is why there was unanimous consent for it.

I do want to also thank one other person I didn't get a chance to, who is Senator DURBIN. He has worked tirelessly on the Judiciary Committee on these pieces of legislation, has worked with law enforcement, has worked with all of us in the understanding that it is about safe communities at the end of the day and about ensuring we keep and give law enforcement the tools it needs to keep our communities safe.

I also appreciate my colleague who is willing to work with me on two pieces of the bills that are before us, albeit we worked this out just before we walked on the floor today, but I appreciate his willingness to allow me to really kind of pull out two pieces of legislation and talk to him about it and then his willingness—what I am hearing—to support it.

CHIEF HERBERT D. PROFFITT ACT
OF 2025

IMPROVING POLICE CRITICAL AID
FOR RESPONDING TO EMER-
GENCIES ACT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 81, S. 911, and Calendar No. 84, S. 1595.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to proceeding to the measures en bloc?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. So, Mr. President, this casts a shadow over everything that was just said because I support these bills. Why do I support these bills? Because the officers of the State of New Jersey are going to benefit from them because Donald Trump hasn't targeted these and cut these, and these are things that are going to help all officers. That is what this body should do—not pick and choose one State over another, not pit one State against another, not pit so-called blue States over so-called red States. It is the United States of America.

God bless my colleague for bringing these bills forward. They should have been passed a long time ago. I support them fully because they will apply to every officer in the United States of America. That is the way this body should work, and I have no objection whatsoever.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time and passed en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. BOOKER. I would just like the clerk to read the titles of the two bills.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 911) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include certain retired law enforcement officers in the public safety officers' death benefits program.

A bill (S. 1595) to establish standards for trauma kits purchased using funds provided under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 911) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 911

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chief Herbert D. Proffitt Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN RETIRED PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS IN THE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' DEATH BENEFITS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1201 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(p) PERSONAL INJURY TO RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'retired law enforcement officer' means an individual who separated from service in good standing as a law enforcement officer in an official capacity at a public agency with or without compensation.

"(2) ELIGIBILITY.—A retired law enforcement officer shall be eligible for a benefit under this part if the officer died or became permanently and totally disabled as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury resulting from a targeted attack because of the retired law enforcement officer's service as a law enforcement officer."

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply to any matter—

(i) pending before the Bureau of Justice Assistance or otherwise on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) filed (consistent with pre-existing effective dates) or accruing after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any action taken against a retired law enforcement officer described in section 1201(p) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (as added by this Act) on or after January 1, 2012.

The bill (S. 1595) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1595

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving Police Critical Aid for Responding to Emer-

gencies Act" or the "Improving Police CARE Act".

SEC. 2. TRAUMA KIT STANDARDS.

Section 521 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10202) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) TRAUMA KITS.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'trauma kit' means a first aid response kit, which includes a bleeding control kit that can be used for controlling a life-threatening hemorrhage.

"(2) REQUIREMENT FOR TRAUMA KITS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a grantee may only purchase a trauma kit using funds made available under this part if the trauma kit meets the performance standards established by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance under paragraph (3)(A).

"(B) AUTHORITY TO SEPARATELY ACQUIRE.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall prohibit a grantee from separately acquiring the components of a trauma kit and assembling complete trauma kits that meet the performance standards.

"(3) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND OPTIONAL AGENCY BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, in consultation with organizations representing trauma surgeons, emergency medical response professionals, emergency physicians, other medical professionals, relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor or representative organizations, and law enforcement trade associations, shall—

"(A) develop and publish performance standards for trauma kits that are eligible for purchase using funds made available under this part that, at a minimum, require the components described in paragraph (4) to be included in a trauma kit; and

"(B) develop and publish optional best practices for law enforcement agencies regarding—

"(i) training law enforcement officers in the use of trauma kits;

"(ii) the deployment and maintenance of trauma kits in law enforcement vehicles; and

"(iii) the deployment, location, and maintenance of trauma kits in law enforcement agency or other government facilities.

"(4) COMPONENTS.—The components of a trauma kit described in this paragraph are—

"(A) a tourniquet recommended by the Committee on Tactical Combat Casualty Care;

"(B) a bleeding control bandage;

"(C) a pair of nonlatex protective gloves and a pen-type marker;

"(D) a pair of blunt-ended scissors;

"(E) instructional documents developed—

"(i) under the 'Stop the Bleed' national awareness campaign of the Department of Homeland Security, or any successor thereto;

"(ii) by the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma;

"(iii) by the American Red Cross; or

"(iv) by any partner of the Department of Defense;

"(F) a bag or other container adequately designed to hold the contents of the kit; and

"(G) any additional trauma kit supplies that—

"(i) are approved by a State, local, or Tribal law enforcement agency or first responders;

"(ii) can adequately treat a traumatic injury; and

"(iii) can be stored in a readily available kit."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

REQUIRING THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION TO EXTEND THE TIME PERIOD DURING WHICH LICENSEES ARE REQUIRED TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HYDROPOWER PROJECTS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, hydropower produces affordable, reliable, and clean baseload power in Montana and across the United States. For years, I have worked with my colleagues to grow our hydropower portfolio in creating new jobs, lowering prices, and strengthening our grid.

I want to thank Senator FETTERMAN for joining me as my colead to push this bill across the finish line.

Our bipartisan bill, S. 1020, simply allows the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to extend licenses for the construction of new hydropower projects that have been affected by supply chain shortages back to 2020.

This bill passed the Senate last year by unanimous consent, and we can do that again here today. There are a number of projects whose licenses will expire if we don't pass my bill—projects in Montana, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Oregon, and Alaska—pumped storage projects that will help balance the grid and small projects that will also power rural communities. It is bipartisan and non-controversial. It is one that we must pass today. The good news is, we do not have objections so it is going to pass today.

With that, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 1020 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1020) to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to extend the time period during which licensees are required to commence construction of certain hydropower projects.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1020) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1020

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HYDROPOWER PROJECTS.

(a) DEFINITION OF COVERED PROJECT.—In this section, the term “covered project” means a hydropower project with respect to which the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issued a license before March 13, 2020.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806), on the request of a licensee of a covered project, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may, after reasonable notice and for good cause shown, extend in accordance with subsection (c) the period during which the licensee is required to commence construction of the covered project for not more than an additional 6 years beyond the 8 years authorized by that section.

(c) PERIOD OF EXTENSION.—An extension of time to commence construction of a covered project under subsection (b) shall—

(1) consist of not more than 3 consecutive 2-year periods;

(2) begin on the date on which the final extension of the period for commencement of construction granted to the licensee under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) expires; and

(3) end on the date that is not more than 6 years after the latest date to which the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is authorized to extend the period for commencement of construction under that section.

(d) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If the time period required under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) to commence construction of a covered project expires after December 31, 2023, and before the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may reinstate the license for the applicable project effective as of the date of expiration of the license; and

(2) the extension authorized under subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of that expiration.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF EMIL J. BOVE III

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon the Senate will proceed to a final vote on the nomination of Emil Bove; that is to be judge on the Third Circuit.

As I said in my statement in the Judiciary Committee multiple times, I support the nomination of Mr. Bove. He has a strong legal background and has served his country honorably.

I believe he will be diligent, capable, and a fair jurist. My Republican colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee agree, and that is why he was reported out of committee with every Republican supporting his nomination.

It is no surprise to anyone who follows this nomination that I have serious concerns with how my Democratic colleagues have conducted themselves.

The vicious rhetoric, unfair accusations, and abuse directed at Mr. Bove by some on this committee have crossed the line.

I wish I could say that this posture has been limited to just this nomination, but unfortunately it appears to be a pattern. Since the very beginning of this Congress, Democrats have engaged

in obstruction campaigns for nearly every one of President Trump's nominees.

Their playbook has included maximum procedural obstruction, unfair media attacks, repeated attempts to allege misconduct, and demands for delayed consideration, records, and investigations. This Congress alone, Democrats have sent at least 26 letters to 17 agencies or parties demanding records, delays, or investigations into President Trump's nominees, just in the Judiciary Committee. Like clockwork, just before a hearing or a vote, we get another breathless accusation that one of President Trump's nominees needs to be—you guessed it—investigated. I am afraid that what we have seen recently on the Bove nomination has been more of the same.

My Democratic colleagues have tried to weaponize my respect for whistleblowers and the whole whistleblowing process against me and, in turn, against Mr. Bove. Now I am here to set the record straight.

I take whistleblower complaints very seriously. During both Republican and Democratic administrations, I have spent over four decades defending patriotic whistleblowers. My conduct in defending whistleblowers and running bipartisan investigations stands in stark contrast to the conduct of my Democratic colleagues.

During the first Trump administration, I defended the Ukraine whistleblower's use of the whistleblower process even despite serious concerns about the substance of his complaint. When I was last chairman, I interviewed Donald Trump, Jr., and other Republicans as part of my bipartisan investigation into the alleged Russian collusion, and that was conducted through the Senate Judiciary Committee.

But when it came to the Biden family and the Biden administration, despite serious allegations and overwhelming evidence of misconduct, Democrats made no effort to investigate or conduct similar interviews like I did during a Republican administration. In fact, they worked hard to thwart any attempt at oversight. Now, these weren't fringe claims; they involved potential crimes squarely within the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction.

The Trump administration has said that Mr. Reuveni isn't a whistleblower. Now, I publicly disagreed with the position of the Trump administration. Now, that happens to be the opposite posture that my Democratic colleagues took with the IRS whistleblowers who blew the whistle on the Biden administration. My Democratic colleagues tried to destroy those whistleblowers and use the press to falsely claim that they were not, in fact, whistleblowers.

No one can say that I don't take whistleblower complaints seriously or that I don't investigate allegations in good faith. I have always said my door is open to whistleblowers, and my efforts regarding the Bove nomination show that this is true.

Mr. Reuveni made allegations against Mr. Bove—can you believe this?—just the morning before the nomination hearing. The allegations broke in a New York Times story, and the paper, as you would expect, gleefully ran the unvetted accusations without so much as giving the Justice Department or even the nominee the opportunity to respond.

At our Bove hearing in the Judiciary Committee, the Deputy Attorney General flatly denied the allegations in public statements, and the nominee denied them under oath both in the hearing and in response to written questions from members of the Judiciary Committee.

Then my Democratic colleagues received yet additional records from the whistleblower on July 1 and July 7 but hid them from Republicans. I didn't receive these accusations and records until July 10. Now—can you believe it?—that is the very same day that Mr. Bove's nomination was scheduled for its first markup.

The coordinated media strategy—let me repeat that. That is so important—how the media works in line with what the Democrats want to accomplish on this nomination. The coordinated media strategy involved a New York Times exclusive about the files and a Democratic press release containing a misleading summary of the documents. Why? All designed to smear Mr. Bove. This timeline raises serious concerns, and it is legitimate to raise them as a major problem.

If my Democratic colleagues wanted to investigate allegations, they should have come to this Senator, and we could have vetted the allegations in good faith together. They didn't want this; they wanted to run a one-sided media campaign.

Regardless, I still did my job and investigated. My staff reviewed the disclosure document by document and analyzed the facts. The result: Almost none of the material referenced Mr. Bove at all. More concerning, the Democrats' summary grossly mischaracterized the documents that it purported to summarize. In short, the documents didn't say what the Democrats say the documents said.

My staff also interviewed multiple people who were present for the March 14 meeting described in the whistleblower disclosure. Four separate people other than Mr. Bove who were present at the meeting told us the following: First, there was never any directive to ignore a court order, and secondly, each of them left the meeting with the understanding that the Justice Department would aggressively litigate but would follow court orders.

My staff then spoke to numerous other individuals, including many current and former Justice Department employees who wanted to share information about the Bove nomination. All told, my staff interviewed or spoke with more than a dozen individuals who came forward to discuss the Bove nomination.

With respect to the initial whistleblower allegations, even if you accept most of the claims as true, there is still no scandal. Government lawyers aggressively litigating and interpreting court orders isn't misconduct; that is common sense. That is not misconduct because that is what lawyers always do.

Concerningly, the minority repeatedly recast discussion of litigation strategy as wrongdoing, even discussions that reflected the government's official litigation positions, some positions which prevailed on appeal.

Now, pay attention to what—the whistleblower alleged misconduct, but 10 days after the key event he describes, he signed a brief stating, without qualification, that “the government has complied with the Court's orders in this case.” Now, this is the very same person that you have been reading about in the media that said that Bove was telling everybody not to follow court orders. Ten days after the key event he described, that person said this:

The government has complied with the Court's orders in this case.

If he believed the Department defied court orders, why sign a brief as an officer of the court saying that it had complied?

During the hearing, Mr. Bove firmly denied the allegations. He testified under oath:

I did not advise any Justice Department attorney to violate court orders.

Recent public reporting backs his account. Months before the whistleblower came forward, his former supervisor wrote in a letter to Mr. Bove:

[A]dvised our team that we must avoid a court order halting an upcoming operation to implement the Act at all costs.

This statement confirms Mr. Bove advised his team to avoid triggering a court order, not defy a court order, and that is consistent with Bove's testimony before the committee.

Now, everything I gave you up to now was the initial allegation, but now, on the very eve of Mr. Bove's final vote here in the U.S. Senate, the Democrats and their media allies have launched yet another salvo against Mr. Bove. On Friday—in other words, 3 days ago, maybe 4 days ago; you count it—we learned from social media that two other whistleblowers allegedly have derogatory information about Mr. Bove. One whistleblower said that they have filed a complaint with the inspector general. My staff requested the complaint and to speak with the whistleblower. Their requests were denied.

Another group, a group called Justice Connection, publicly alleged that a whistleblower has evidence that Bove wasn't truthful in his hearings and that “the whistleblower has tried to share [this] info[rmation] with Republican Senators for weeks and they [haven't responded].”

To the extent that anyone is suggesting that this Senator GRASSLEY

hasn't been willing to receive and consider relative evidence, everybody that knows me would know that is just plain false.

I am the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and I represent Republicans on this committee. Regarding this whistleblower, my office was not proactively approached.

Indeed, since we saw these news reports on Friday, my staff proactively and repeatedly reached out to whistleblower lawyers asking to see the evidence that they apparently had already shared with multiple Democrats and also with the media.

My staff assured them that we would review the evidence in good faith. But now, here, all weekend—I want to repeat, all weekend—my staff was stonewalled and given the runaround. Any assertion that I or my staff was uninterested in the evidence is entirely false.

It wasn't until Monday morning—so you got Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday morning—that my staff received any information. Even then, it was bits and pieces of information created by lawyers, not original information.

My staff tried over and over to get all the information, only to be rejected. My staff was not shown the underlying transcript of the meeting until this morning. They were shown what was represented to be verbatim transcript of a meeting, but we still didn't have access to the underlying source.

So what did I do? I followed my usual process. I asked Mr. Bove to respond to the allegations that his testimony was inconsistent with the evidence that we saw for the first time Monday.

And he sent me a letter doing just that. I plan to make that letter public.

I have also asked permission to make this transcript public as well, but I don't know whether the lawyer will give me that permission.

In his letter, Mr. Bove flatly denies the allegations that he misled the committee. He explained that he testified truthfully in response to “compound yes or no questions that sought to attribute words to me that I did not use during the February 14, 2025, video meeting.”

He also responds to the attacks on his character and rejects the allegations against him.

Viewed in light of the transcript, Bove's responses to compound hostile questions about specific words used in a meeting that happened months before his hearing do not, to me, indicate deliberately false and misleading testimony.

And, more importantly, the substance of the meeting itself does not reflect misconduct. It reflected a sympathetic tone during a turbulent time and appropriately characterizes the role of a Justice Department attorney.

In the meeting, Mr. Bove specifically acknowledged that being a Justice Department attorney means “following orders from the President or [from] the

Attorney General, unless we view them as unlawful or unethical.”

He apologized to the attorneys present for tension and told them:

I don't want to put pressure on you.

I am also curious at my Democrat colleagues' newfound interest in candor to the committee. During the Biden administration, Kristen Clarke unequivocally perjured herself before the Judiciary Committee in response to written questions.

When the information came to light after her confirmation, Democrats do what Democrats do: They closed ranks and refused to join Republicans in their call to hold her accountable.

Democrats likewise expressed no interest in evaluating the misleading and inconsistent testimony from numerous other Biden appointees.

When this committee considered the nomination of Justice Kavanaugh—now on the Supreme Court—I criticized the tactics that Democrats employed, and I said this:

The Ranking Member sat on these allegations for nearly seven weeks, only to reveal them at the eleventh hour when it appeared that Judge Kavanaugh was headed toward nomination.

Now getting back to the Bove nomination, with respect to it, as with other nominees this Congress, Democrats appeared to have dusted off the playbook that they devised against Justice Kavanaugh.

They hid allegedly relevant information until a politically opportune time and then used it as an ambush to hurt the nominee. As I said about the Democrats' conduct during director—FBI Director Patel's nomination:

This is becoming a pattern, and I will not facilitate a campaign to undermine the results of the election by delaying consideration of nominees.

If anyone, including my colleagues, has information regarding a nominee—any nominee—that they believe is relevant to their fitness for office, I expect them to share it with me in a timely and candid manner so that the allegations can be fairly vetted, as opposed to what I have just told you: that we got most of this information from the Democrats that the whistleblowers were—the Democrats were peddling the whistleblowers' accusations the morning before the hearing, the morning before we were considering the nomination.

Everybody should know that my door is always open to whistleblowers. And while I may not always agree with someone else's conclusions, I will always fairly consider any information brought to my office.

My message to the three whistleblowers in this case is this: Just because I may disagree with the conclusions in a whistleblower disclosure, it doesn't mean that I don't support whistleblowers' rights to come forward. Whether I agree or disagree with whistleblowers, I will defend whistleblowers' rights.

Reasonable minds can differ, and when I direct my staff to allocate resources away from other ongoing whistleblower projects to handle situations like Bove, their efforts ought to be respected and given good faith treatment.

But contrary to what happened, this eleventh-hour media smear by my colleagues based on information that was hidden from the committee, these are all unacceptable, and I won't stand for it as a delay or obstruction tactic. This tactic didn't work against Justice Kavanaugh, and it won't work against Mr. Bove.

Mr. President, I look forward to supporting Mr. Bove and urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wanted to make a very brief response about whistleblowers. Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa is recognized for his working with whistleblowers in a constructive way throughout his Senate career. I don't question that.

In this particular case, Mr. Bove is seeking an appellate court position, which came before the committee, and we were contacted by a whistleblower who worked with him at the Department of Justice.

This man has now been disclosed and identified. He wanted to give us information which he said contradicted the testimony of Mr. Bove before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He was willing to appear before the Judiciary Committee, chaired by Senator GRASSLEY, under oath and tell us his side of the story.

I don't think you could ask for much more in someone who could subject themselves to possible perjury charges by misleading the committee and do so under oath. I think he was a credible person. I am sorry the Republicans on the committee rejected his offer. It would have brought more truth to light.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, recently, there was flooding in Texas. The tragedy there is unspeakable—135 lives claimed. And you can't listen to the story of the young campers being swept away literally by the flood waters without getting emotional—26 feet of water rising in just 45 minutes.

And so, for many Americans, that is hard to imagine—but for not as many as you might expect.

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, nearly every parish and county in the United States has experienced flooding in the last few decades—not every State, every parish and county.

No place in our country is untouched by flooding. For example, not in New York City. This is New York City—New York City, as we used to say down

South. It saw its second wettest hour in history this month as rain caused what the New York Post headline described as “terrifying, freak flash flooding.”

Not New Mexico, on the bottom of this. New Mexico, what you think of as being in the desert, saw deadly flooding this month despite its dry climate. We in Louisiana, as well as anybody, know that there is a tragedy which can result not just with the flooding but can result after the flooding, a tragedy which people cannot afford to live in their homes no matter what they do to prevent future flooding because of unaffordable flood insurance rates.

I am all about preventing the first tragedy. How do we stop the initial episode of flooding?

I have supported the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities, or BRIC, grants, and the administration has assured me that they are going to release those funds.

I also want to prevent the second tragedy of people losing the place where they have lived, perhaps for decades—no matter what they do to prevent their homes from flooding again—not because it is destroyed, but because they cannot afford flood insurance at a reasonable rate on a property that once flooded but now the risk has been mitigated.

That is why I continue to work toward a solution on the National Flood Insurance Program: Make flood insurance affordable again.

Until the program is affordable for a homeowner, accountable to the taxpayer, and sustainable for future generations, Americans will, unfortunately, be forced to drop the program because they can't afford the premiums.

Now FEMA aid may be available to help people repair homes after a federally declared disaster, but it often covers just a fraction of the cost. And, by the way, because of FEMA's risk rating 2.0, people whose homes have never flooded or people who have taken measures so their home will not flood again are, nonetheless, forced to pay outrageous premiums.

You might think: How can a working American be expected to afford flood insurance when the price spikes so much? Or maybe you think: Well, it is expensive, but some can still afford the program.

Well, we have another problem threatening the flood insurance program: It expires September 30.

If we do nothing, every American enrolled in the National Flood Insurance Program, which is millions of Americans, will be without protection by the time the next flood season starts. National emergencies won't stop, the destruction will not end, the threat of flooding will not vanish, but the safety net to rebuild a life—that will go away.

Now I am working on a long-term National Flood Insurance Program reauthorization and reform bill to stabilize the program, protecting tax-

payers and protecting communities. When all Americans are affected, a Federal response is necessary, and I want to work with President Trump and my colleagues to make flood insurance affordable again.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HURRICANE KATRINA

Mr. President, I want to mark the upcoming anniversary of one of the worst disasters my State and our country have ever faced: Hurricane Katrina.

Twenty years ago this August, Louisiana and much of the gulf coast region suffered a devastating blow that required such a response. It is a heart-breaking anniversary. Hurricane Katrina killed hundreds of Americans, separated families, and destroyed belongings we thought would be cherished forever.

The devastation was felt in every community. You may have had your home destroyed in New Orleans East, but if you lived in Shreveport or in Bossier City or in Monroe, our fellow Louisianians came there to live in the Hirsch Coliseum, the Bossier City Civic Center, to stay there, sleeping on a mat in a communal setting, walking over here to take a shower or over there to go to the bathroom, because their homes had been destroyed.

In Baton Rouge, I led a group of volunteers to convert an abandoned K-Mart into an emergency surge facility for the overflow from the regular hospital. You know, because of that, looking around at the failure of government at every level, I thought, my gosh, maybe I should run for office. And I have been working to prevent another disaster on this scale ever since.

Since then, Louisiana and our Nation have invested \$15 billion in the levee system, and these have helped prevent flooding.

There is a levee system in what we call the Bayou Region. The Bayou Region touches the Gulf of Mexico. The flood mitigation structures we built have been said to have prevented 10,000 homes from being flooded during Hurricane Ida. We know that building resiliency works.

In the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, I worked to get millions in coastal resiliency grants and millions more in flood mitigation assistance grants for my State but for other States similarly affected.

One example, by the way, if you fly into New Orleans and you drive towards Baton Rouge, around a city called LaPlace, there is a huge flood control structure, and you can see how the swamp has been separated and that they are building the mound of dirt in between. That is what the money is going for, to prevent these communities from being flooded again.

If you go to Lake Pontchartrain, there is money to restore what is called the batture. The batture is the area between the levee and the water level. We have invested money as a Federal Government and as a State government to rebuild that batture, and in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, more money was applied.

You knew it worked because one of our storms—I happened to be out there looking, and there was a wave that crashed off Lake Pontchartrain. It hit the batture, it began to crest, and it fell. As it fell, it almost hit to the top of the levee, and a few drops went over. That batture being built out kept the wave from cresting right next to the levee and that water going over and flooding everybody on the other side.

Building resiliency works. It works for the Federal taxpayer, it works for the Louisiana taxpayer, and it works for the families whose lives are secure.

Improving highway evacuation routes, hardening the electrical grid, and investing in flood mitigation are all things I worked for in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. The reason I did it is that we can't prevent another hurricane, but we can prevent the bad things that happen afterwards.

As the 20th anniversary approaches, we are reminded of those losses but also the gallantry, the true gallantry of the American people, because in the worst times, we come together. We are seeing the same reaction following the terrible flooding in Texas.

In the weeks following Katrina, people from all over the world and all over the country stepped up with disaster relief. Now we see that in Texas. I am told that Florida, Kansas, Pennsylvania, California, Nebraska, Illinois, Michigan, New Hampshire, Ohio—I could list the States, all sent National Guard. I am sorry, that was in Louisiana.

But, similarly, people from different States all went to Texas to help—Indiana, Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, Missouri, and it continues. When tragedy hits, Americans respond.

We may not be able to take away the pain of loss—I wish we could—but Congress can help ease the financial burden of recovery, and an essential way to do that is by making flood insurance affordable.

TRIBUTE TO TY BOFFERDING

Mr. President, I rise to honor an exceptional member of my team, HELP Committee senior adviser and communications director Ty Bofferding. Next month, Ty will be leaving my office after 9 years of service to Louisiana and the Nation. He is starting a new chapter in his life as he and his wife Kenna move to my home city of Baton Rouge.

Ty joined my office as a press intern in 2016 when he was a junior in college. He was talented, creating and seizing every opportunity—all before, I think, he could legally drink alcohol. But by the time he graduated from college, he was a deputy press secretary.

One story. During the Graham-Cassidy effort to replace ObamaCare, my previous communications director had just left, and Ty took over as temporary communications director. I don't think he was 21. And speak about a baptism by fire, because nobody in the Republican conference was ready

for this. So whenever anybody got a call, whether in the majority leader's office or in the conference itself or anything, they would say "Call the Cassidy office," and there was Ty fielding all the calls. We did not pass our legislation, but we got further than anyone expected because of the efforts of Ty and of others.

At 23, Ty became the youngest Senate communications director of all time, a testament to his work ethic and his ability to think strategically. He is a model for all these young people who are starting in our offices who want to advance. They can look and see how Ty became the communications director at 23 and take that as an example.

He has been a trusted adviser, a steady voice, a constant source of clarity in challenging moments, and a crucial part of my efforts to strengthen Louisiana's energy sector, reform America's healthcare system to make it more affordable, bring historic infrastructure investments to Louisiana, and improve mental health resources for all Americans.

Particularly, Ty was very helpful in getting President Trump's nominees, including two Cabinet Secretaries, through the Senate confirmation process.

Now, perhaps his greatest accomplishment is meeting his wife Kenna. Kenna is a Baton Rouge native, and they met at Washington Mardi Gras. And while I didn't introduce them, I am more than happy to claim credit for putting them together.

Kenna, it is your influence that brings him back to Louisiana. Thank you very much.

This is bittersweet, but as I say about those who eventually depart from my office, my loss is someone else's incredible gain. I am proud that he will continue to serve Louisiana both as a professional and a productive member of the community. And while Ty will no longer be in my office, I will always consider him part of Team Cassidy.

It has been a privilege watching Ty's personal and professional growth. He will be missed not only by my office but by the entire Capitol Hill community. I appreciate his service to Louisiana and, most of all, his friendship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

GAZA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, the Israeli-inflicted starvation of Palestinians in Gaza must end. It must end.

I have come to the floor time and again to urge the Senate to take action, to demand a cease-fire, to stop the bombing, to demand a surge of humanitarian aid in Gaza, and to bring home the hostages.

Two months ago, I spoke about a young girl who starved to death in Gaza—Jinan Iskafi, seen here—who died in the arms of her father. All those speeches have been to no avail.

Tragically, Jinan—and by the way, that name means "paradise," the hope of that family for what they hoped would be a future for this beautiful, young girl—died of starvation, government-inflicted starvation, in Gaza.

Tragically, many more young children have followed. Jinan's death and the deaths of so many—tens of thousands of innocent people—in Gaza will become part of our history because the U.S.A. shares responsibility for this catastrophe, and we and future generations of Americans will have to live with that forever.

The children who survive this war will be remembered as victims of a unique class of warfare. This is a man-made famine caused by weapons provided by the United States—and paid for, by the way, by U.S. taxpayers.

The starvation we are seeing today is not the unforeseen or unintended consequence of war. Let me be direct. The starvation we are witnessing today is the result of a military policy to concentrate the Palestinian population into an ever-smaller slice of land.

The starvation we are witnessing today is an advanced and accelerating stage of the Netanyahu government's military strategy, devised and executed immediately following the terrible attacks by Hamas on October 7, and that was to force the Palestinians out of northern Gaza and to induce them to leave the territory forever.

Compelled by hunger and thirst, the people, the Palestinians in Gaza, are being forced to make their way to a handful of sites that our closest allies have uniformly condemned as the drip feeding of aid. This so-called humanitarian pause is a mirage. It is false. It is a trickle of aid to the mere 12 percent of Gaza that is not a military zone that is being razed and flattened as we speak—razed and flattened as we speak—razed to ensure that it cannot be returned to.

From the earliest days after October 7, we witnessed this plan that can only be seen for what it is—a systematic and wanton destruction of homes, of mosques, of hospitals, and of schools. That is what is happening.

With bombs provided by American taxpayers, the Netanyahu government has unleashed the most deadly and destructive aerial bombardment campaign since Vietnam. More than 200,000 buildings were destroyed. Thousands of children were killed and injured, thousands of amputees, and it goes on and on.

In the last 3 months, that campaign has continued. Thousands more homes have been flattened by controlled demolitions—self-conscious application of military explosives to destroy a home or a school. Thousands more have been demolished by bulldozers before the very eyes of people whose homes they are seeing totally flattened.

It is too late for the 60,000 people that have been killed in Gaza, but it is not too late for the Senate to act. We are

at an absolutely catastrophic inflection point, and I believe that the U.S. Senate has an obligation, as our country does, under international humanitarian law to act.

We can act and help to save thousands of Palestinians who as I speak are starving to death—as I speak, are starving to death.

Two months ago, I led a resolution. It was sponsored by 46 Democrats. It had a simple demand: Our country must work to end the siege on food aid. It was blocked.

You know, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I am sure every bit as much as I am, are horrified at the suffering in Gaza.

But it is not enough for us to be horrified. We have to act. We all condemn Hamas. We all want the release of the remaining hostages. But we have to ask ourselves the question: Is it at all justifiable that there is a policy that has to be recognized that starvation is being used as a tool of warfare?

I reject the legitimacy of that act. It is a war crime. It is a war crime to starve a population to get what you want from your enemy. As righteous as your defense against an enemy may be, it is illegal to starve children to obtain a battlefield advantage. Yet the Netanyahu government has actually said it is doing that.

In my view, Mr. President, it is long, long past the time to say: Enough, enough, no. The United States will not stand by while hunger is used as a weapon. We don't do that, and we cannot separate the current starvation in Gaza from the Netanyahu government's strategy of forcibly displacing Palestinians from their land.

A short-term surge of aid to keep Palestinians alive is not what we need. We need full, uninhibited, generous, accessible aid, medical and food. But that is not the Netanyahu government policy.

And we can sometimes act as though we are not an agent here or we don't quite see or we want to give them the benefit of the doubt because Israel has been our ally. But take the words—can we be numb to the words of the Netanyahu government officials? The Prime Minister himself said “I don't care about targets” and ordered military officials to “destroy [the] homes, bomb [everything in Gaza].”

He said that.

Finance Minister Smotrich said Gaza will be totally destroyed. Civilians will be sent to the south to a so-called humanitarian zone. And from there, they will start to leave in great numbers to third countries.

He said that, a high official in the Israeli Government.

Heritage Minister Eliyahu said last week—last week—that the Israeli Government was rushing toward Gaza being wiped out.

There is no mystery here. These are the statements of high government officials.

Defense Minister Katz said:

Gaza residents, this is a final warning . . . you will pay the full price . . . return the hostages and remove Hamas, and other options will [be] open [to] you, including leaving for other places in the world for those who want to.

The Palestinians who live in Gaza, hard as it may be for us to appreciate it, that is what they call home and they want to stay there.

Mr. President, the tragedy and suffering in Gaza today demands our full attention and our full engagement because this is a war that we are contributing to sustain. I am here today to debate Gaza's famine conditions because the United States has been paying for weapons that Israel is using to flatten Gaza but not to feed Palestinians in Gaza. It was American taxpayers who paid for the bombs and bulldozers that are continuing to flatten homes to ensure they are never returned to and that are creating the misery that all of us are shocked to see today.

America, first under President Biden and now under President Trump, provides cover for extremists in the Netanyahu government to continue these actions. America's closest allies have called for an end to the war and cut off the shipment of weapons that send a green light to the extremist government of Binyamin Netanyahu.

And yet just 2 weeks ago, President Trump notified the Senate that he intends to ship another half billion dollars' worth of 2,000-pound bombs and 1,000-pound bombs to Israel. While President Trump speaks of trimming budgets and spending more money here at home, he is shipping billions of dollars of bombs and shells and bullets that are being used not just to starve the Palestinian people but to flatten their homes and drive them off of their land.

Mr. President, I oppose this. I believe the American people have had enough. The American people are demanding leadership and clarity from us—from the White House—that can put an end to this terrible bloodshed and put an end to the misery of generations of Palestinians in Gaza. And the American people are demanding leadership from us today to help secure a real justice and peace for the people of the Middle East.

Mr. President, whatever differences we may have, none of us can—none of us should; none of us can—condone the excruciating starvation and misery that can be abated immediately with the full access to the food and medicine that the people of Gaza need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

NOMINATION OF SAMUEL BROWN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today I want to speak on the nomination that we are considering now. That nomina-

tion is of retired Army CPT Sam Brown to be the Department of Veterans Affairs Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs.

The Under Secretary of Memorial Affairs is responsible for making certain the National Cemetery Administration honors the memory of our Nation's veterans by caring for their final resting places and providing services to their surviving loved ones.

More than 4 million Americans are laid to rest in NCA's 156 national cemeteries. Kansas, my home State, is home to three of those NCA cemeteries where more than 62,000 Kansas veterans and their family members are now buried. We must have an Under Secretary who treats this position with the utmost respect and understands the importance in honoring and remembering those who pay an ultimate sacrifice.

We also need confirmed permanent leadership at the VA filling roles that are critical to serving veterans and their families.

Today, we are voting on a leadership role that has a no-fail mission to make certain veterans' families have a dignified place to grieve and to remember their loved ones.

Our nominee is a West Point graduate, combat veteran, a husband and father of three. CPT Sam Brown understands sacrifices made every day by men and women of the U.S. military and their families as well, and he is well-equipped to undertake this significant responsibility. In his testimony before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Captain Brown shared how he suffered painful burns in the line of duty in Afghanistan. His testimony included how he heard his gunner, who ultimately saved his life. That gunner shouted: Sir, I've got you, in the midst of the flames. That is the same message of hope that I know Captain Brown will take with him to the National Cemetery Administration. That is the same attitude of service that I expect he will instill in an entire NCA workforce as they fulfill our solemn obligation to the families of our Nation's veterans.

I am grateful to Captain Brown for his service to our country, for his sacrifice, and now for his willingness to continue serving his country in this new capacity. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting his confirmation today.

I thank my colleagues for listening.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

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

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

VOTE ON MONAREZ NOMINATION

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

Mr. TUBERVILLE. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted "yea."

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 445 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Blackburn	Grassley	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	Sheehy
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	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	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Hagerty	Sullivan
---------	----------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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 assistant bill 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. 85, Samuel Brown, of Nevada, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs.

John Thune, Dan Sullivan, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Todd Young, Cynthia M. Lummis, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, Bernie Moreno, John R. Curtis, Ted Budd, Mike Crapo, Katie Boyd Britt, Jim Banks, Markwayne Mullin, Jon Husted, Steve Daines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory

quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Samuel Brown, of Nevada, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 446 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—2

Hagerty	Tuberville
---------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel Brown, of Nevada, to be Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Memorial Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last year, this body unanimously passed 41 bills from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Now, 16 of those bills, for one reason or another, didn't end up getting signed into law last

year. Some of those bills perhaps were casualties of the legislative calendar but for one reason or another didn't make it through but remained undisputed and remained noncontroversial. They have been reintroduced by Republican and Democratic Senators and are cleared on the Republican side of the aisle.

It is important to note here that these noncontroversial, bipartisan bills all remain completely unchanged. Not a single letter, not a single period, comma, or exclamation mark has been altered on them. They remain utterly noncontroversial—not a whiff of partisan dispute between them.

In the past, these bills were, in many circumstances, packaged together. It has been something of a custom in the Senate to package together groups of bills. Lands bills in some cases were paired together as part of much larger bills.

In some instances, parts of some of those bills were themselves controversial—larger bills, bills that were sometimes written in secret and not available to individual Members to review prior to the time that they were prodded for a unanimous consent request on the floor.

So today, I am going to make an entirely reasonable offer to move four bills off of the floor from among that group that passed last year by unanimous consent in the Senate. They are unchanged, they are still noncontroversial, and they carry no substantive policy objections, no objections to the merits of the bill and what they do. They are bills that are locally supported, bills that have been thoroughly vetted by the committee of jurisdiction and that are ready to move today.

In short, they are bills that are ready to move in the same type of open, Member-driven process that the Senate was built for and that the Senate, quite frankly, prides itself in fostering and encouraging rather than being held hostage for a larger backroom deal negotiated in secret.

The first is a bill from Senator BARRASSO that would provide common-sense flexibility for ranchers during natural disasters to help ensure range-land health on Federal lands.

The second is a bill that I have introduced called the Utah Wildfire Research Institute Act, which would add Utah as a fourth location for the Southwest Ecological Research Institutes, which would be housed, for the Utah portion of it, at Utah State University. This institute would foster collaboration to promote healthy forests, wildfire prevention, and resilient water supplies. Utah is well positioned and ready to work with the other institutes, including the New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute, to protect the unique landscapes and communities across the Western United States.

The third bill is one from Senator CORTEZ MASTO, the Sloan Canyon Conservation and Lateral Pipeline Act.

This bill would make certain boundary changes and would authorize a right-of-way for the Horizon Lateral water pipeline in Nevada—something important to Nevadans as a desert State like mine. Water for Nevadans is very important.

The fourth bill is one from Senator PADILLA which would adjust the boundary of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Now, again, just to reiterate, all four of these bills have certain things in common. They do different things. They operate in different parts of the country. They have different sponsors from different political parties. But they all have a few features in common: They all passed by unanimous consent in this body just a few months ago. Not a single Republican, not a single Democrat objected to any of them. They remain entirely unchanged and entirely noncontroversial.

If there is any outstanding policy issue, I would love to be made aware of it and would love to address it, but as of this moment, I am not aware of one—not on the House side and not even on the Senate side.

So to that end, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: S. 211, Resiliency For Ranching and Natural Conservation Health Act from Senator BARRASSO; S. 457, Utah Wild-fire Research Institute Act of 2025 from myself and Senator CURTIS; S. 1142, Golden Gate National Recreation Area from Senator PADILLA; S. 392, Sloan Canyon Conservation and Lateral Pipeline Act from Senator CORTEZ MASTO; further, that the bills be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I appreciate the Senator from Utah being here tonight to offer this package, but I believe there needs to be a more bipartisan and thoughtful way to consider how we protect the future of our public lands.

For example, the legislation that the senior Senator from Utah wants to pass tonight does not include my Wild Olympics bill. Now, this is a bill that will help preserve the wild and scenic rivers of the Olympic Peninsula. That has very strong support from Democrats and Republicans in my State. There is a strong nonpartisan coalition of support for this bill from Tribes, hunters, fishermen, conservationists, and even loggers. That is because my bill supports the peninsula economy and ensures continued access to our world-class outdoor recreation on the Olympic Peninsula, and it preserves

critical habitat for salmon and water resources for our very rural communities.

Moreover, this bill has passed the House several times now with bipartisan support. In fact, I have been working on this for over a decade to build support and consensus around this bill. It is carefully drafted, it is a thoughtful piece of legislation, and the grassroots support for this bill has only grown over the years. That is exactly the kind of bill which should be included in a bipartisan public lands package.

I would invite the senior Senator from Utah to visit the land this bill covers, to help protect our Olympic National Forest.

I think you would find out why I am here tonight objecting to this because it doesn't include it.

I want the Senator from Utah to know that my door is always open. I hope that in the future, we can work together in drafting a public lands bill that does include legislation like my Wild Olympics bill, and I know I am not alone. Many of our colleagues have worked on important legislation for their respective States.

So for now, I object, but I do so with my hand outstretched, ready to work with the Senator together on a public lands package that is comprehensive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the characteristically thoughtful and thorough remarks by my friend and colleague the distinguished Senator from Washington. I do want to be clear about a couple of things.

No. 1, this has been the product of a lot of effort on our part, good-faith efforts that we have made to work with Ranking Member HEINRICH and Members of both political parties to move these bills to the floor to get them passed over many months.

Now, again, I want to reiterate that if there are substantive policy concerns with any of the bills in this package, understanding that these are only four bills—those four bills don't comment on—they neither preclude nor prejudice in any way, shape, or form our ability to pass other bills.

Anytime you are choosing a finite group of legislative proposals to be considered for adoption by unanimous consent or through any other expedited process, you are necessarily excluding others that are not on that list. And so it becomes incumbent upon those involved in the effort to decide which ones belong.

Let's talk a little bit about how we go about that, how we went about that here with these bills. These are four of the bills that, again, passed the Senate unanimously just a few months ago that remain unchanged in this conference; that didn't draw a single "no" vote, a single objection from any Republican or from any Democrat. In that respect, they all have things in

common, even though they operate in different States, have different sponsors from different political parties and do different things.

The bill of which my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, refers does quite opposite of those things. I am sure she put an enormous amount of effort into it. I am sure it is important to her. And I am sure it has been carefully drafted because my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, is thorough.

But there are some things that bill doesn't have in common with these. In fact, harkening back to childhood, there is a song called "One of These Things Is Not Like the Other." If you were trying to include that bill in a list of these bills, that would be the clear standout. Why? No. 1, it hasn't passed the Senate; No. 2, it was considered in the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and it resulted in strict party line votes—Democrats vs. Republicans, Shirts vs. Skins. There was not a single vote overlapping between the two parties.

That doesn't mean it is not a good bill. It doesn't mean it is not important to her or the people in the State of Washington. But it does mean it lacks the core characteristics held in common by each and every one of the bills I just offered by unanimous consent.

If that is going to be the standard, that anytime there is any package of bills—a package consists of two paired sets, a Republican and Democratic legislation brought forward together; in this case, bills that drew not a single "no" vote, not a single objection from Members of either party and remained unchanged since that last happened. If anytime we try to offer those bills, it is appropriate to object in the absence of any substantive on-the-merits objection or concern with the legislation, it is going to be very difficult for us to get this done.

Now, none of this means we couldn't find a way to pair that with something that would make sense, coupled with any changes that Members of both parties might insist on in order to make them comfortable with moving it forward. But it does mean that it would be incongruous, illogical, counterproductive, and destructive to the effort to pair that bill with this bill.

That is a wilderness bill. By definition, by its very nature, it designates large tracts of wilderness and large scenic rivers. It is not something inherently repugnant to either party, but it ended up drawing objections and "no" votes from literally every Republican on the committee. That suggests to me that before it is ready to be included in a unanimous consent request, it might need some additional work.

I am confident we can get it there. Most types of legislation can get to the point where objections can be addressed through some combination of

modifications to the legislation itself and the legislation that it might be paired with in order to help offset those objections.

But, nonetheless, I will keep working to pass bipartisan bills that have unanimous support. I hope and expect and respectfully request that my colleagues across the aisle would take into account these dissimilarities. If they want to add others that meet similar characteristics, let's have that conversation. If they want to get to the point where we can pass Senator MURRAY's bill, I am sure there is a way that could be considered and we could possibly get there.

But we can't assume that you can pair something that is that dissimilar; that is, by its very nature and according to the legislative record, it is the very definition of partisan and not the kind of thing that one can expect. We would be crazy to assume that something that resulted in a party line committee vote last year would suddenly get to the floor and not draw a single Republican objection.

I would also hope that next time, when we add pairings to the floor—Democrat and Republican bills—I would love to see those hotlined on the other side of the aisle in the same format of which they were hotlined on our side. My understanding is they were not; and they should be. There should be an apples-to-apples comparison. If they are given the opportunity, I can't imagine that many, if any, of my Democratic colleagues would object to any of these bills in isolation. If they wouldn't object to them in isolation based on their substantive policy merits and if they were given that in a hotline request, I think this would have turned out differently.

I do think it is important we should pass bills expeditiously and in the light of day. These bills have gone through public examination in the light of day, and they have been found not wanting for bipartisanship. They have been found richly blessed with bipartisanship through a proven, undisputed track record.

So, look, I think it is a big mistake to hold noncontroversial bills put forward by Senators in good faith—to hold those hostage in order to perpetuate a broken and sometimes corrupting process from a bygone era, one in which bills were prevented from passing, not because they were controversial but because they were popular and being used as bait in order to bring about the passage of other bills that were controversial. That makes no sense.

What makes the Senate work best are those moments when we can identify things as to which we do not disagree. This, Mr. President, is one of those things. This, Mr. President, is where we can do better; and do better we must.

I am not going away. I will be back. I will be back soon—hopefully, successful next time—and we will do what we

have to do in order to move the legislative process.

I humbly implore my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Let's not take these moments where we do agree for granted. Let's not assume that just because anytime—by definition, anytime you come up with a list of four bills offered at once, that necessarily excludes the thousands of others that may be submitted during the course of any particular Congress in that legislative Chamber.

You can't get everything all at once. Why not take the things that we know can pass and have passed in the past? Let's get that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NOMINATION OF EMIL J. BOVE III

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is probably too late to do anything about the upcoming vote. I know a little bit about how this place works, and at this point, the proverbial die is likely cast.

But what we are about to do is so wrong, so unusual, that even if these remarks will have no effect whatsoever, I feel obliged to come to the floor.

We are about to vote into high judicial office an individual who managed to engage in three separate significant episodes of prosecutorial misconduct in 6 months. That is undoubtedly a Department of Justice world record.

These were not minor episodes of prosecutorial misconduct. These were not a file missing from a Brady disclosure. These were not an inopportune word dropped in an oral argument. This was planned, deliberate, serious prosecutorial misconduct.

I will briefly describe the three episodes. The first had to do with the political desire to freeze funds that Congress had already appropriated and obligated and that even had been disbursed out to a bank as the fiscal agent for the appropriated program. But because it involved clean energy, the Trump administration wanted to claw that money back.

The time for Presidential veto had long, long, long gone. There was no Federal hold on the money. It was in a private bank. So, really, that cow had left the barn. But they were so insistent because they hate clean energy so much, they had to get this money back. The White House was demanding it, presumably.

So here is the plan that they cooked up. Emil Bove and the acting U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, they would create a fake criminal investigation. And on the basis of that fake criminal investigation, they would go to a judge and try to get an order to freeze the funds that they were so irritated about. Remember what I just said: a fake criminal investigation. It is kind of prosecutor 101 that you don't pursue fake criminal investigations. There is prosecutor language for how you go about starting a criminal investigation. You have to have something called predication,

some reason to believe that there is a crime.

But they needed a criminal investigation in order to find a way to seize the money, so they started a fake one—or at least they tried to. How did that work out? Not that well, actually, because the Chief of the Criminal Division, a career, experienced attorney said: Boss, there is no crime here. We can't do a criminal investigation if there is no evidence whatsoever of any crime.

For her pains, she was driven out of the office, forced to resign. So then they shopped it around the office: Is there anybody else willing to sign this plead in; any career attorney in the very big U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia? None. No one would sign it because it was a fake criminal investigation.

So the U.S. attorney went in on his own—that almost never happens—to try to get the order from the fake criminal investigation. And the magistrate shot him down, said: No, no chance. And that almost never happens, because U.S. attorneys don't go into court unprepared and they want to enjoy the credibility of the local bench.

So they go through all sorts of hoops, every conceivable effort to make sure that a request for a judicial order or warrant is well-supported. Not this time. It was too important. The fake criminal investigation is completely outside of what is appropriate for a prosecutor's responsibilities.

It gets—actually, if you can believe it—worse because they had a client in this, the rather corrupt individual who now runs the Environmental Protection Agency. And they let their client run all around in the media, on the news, publicly disparaging the recipients of those funds, which included groups as ominous and dangerous as Habitat for Humanity. But to whip up an atmosphere of criminality, accusations were made about crimes—false accusations were made about crimes.

Well, it is also prosecutor 101 that you don't disparage the subject of your investigation or the subject of your prosecution. Prosecutors have all the tools in the world to make cases, to take away people's property, to take away people's liberty. Where there is a death penalty, you can take away people's lives. You play within bounds. You let your pleadings do the talking. You don't go out on talk shows and talk about the supposed subjects of a criminal investigation—even a real one—in disparaging terms. You just don't do it. It is beneath most prosecutors. Not these characters.

That was episode 1.

Episode 2 was to stop an ongoing criminal case involving an elected official so that they could dangle that case over the head of the elected official as part of a deal to get that elected official to follow administration policy on immigration enforcement. You don't do that. Again, if you are not a prosecutor, it might not seem like this is

obvious, but it is obvious. It is prosecutor 101. If you have the case, you make it. If you don't, you don't. A criminal case against an elected official is not an opportunity for "let's make a deal." That is way out of bounds, but that is what they did.

A judge ended up shooting it down and saying: Look, if you are going to dismiss this thing temporarily so you can hang this thing over this guy's head, no. You have to dismiss it with prejudice—done, over, finished.

But it took a judge to step in to break that scheme of prosecutorial misconduct.

Episode 3, Trump is trying to illegally deport lots of people. He is trying to do it in the dead of night. He is trying to do it around American constitutional due process, and somebody has gone to a judge to say: Whoa. This isn't right.

So lawyers have gotten involved, and now lawyers are in court, where you are supposed to tell the truth. The lawyers for the Department of Justice—in court, supposed to tell the truth—were being lied to by Trump administration officials, denied information they needed for court by Trump administration officials.

The crowning—the crowning—blow being told by this Trump administration official—the one whom we are about to put on the bench—is that they should be ready to tell courts "f you" if they try to interfere with illegal deportations—and it wasn't just an "f" in the transcript.

These are three separate, significant episodes of prosecutorial misconduct in just 6 months. Nothing like this has ever been seen at the Department of Justice. And it is so well corroborated, it is so well documented, there is no denying it. There is no question of, is this real or not?

In the first case, that criminal chief who got run out wrote it down. She sent a letter laying out everything that had happened. She was a live witness to that episode whom the Judiciary Committee could have called to hear from to help get to the bottom of this.

If there was any doubt on the question of the false allegations of fraud and crime, the Department of Justice's own lawyers, in a later civil proceeding, conceded to the court: Yep, we are not alleging fraud here. There is nothing we are saying here about any actual fraud. Never mind all those allegations of criminality that have been made on behalf of the government by the client in this case.

So that episode was very, very well corroborated.

In the next episode, the one involving the elected mayor, you had a similar letter from the acting U.S. attorney, who resigned rather than go along with this corrupt bargain; you had Trump's own border czar, who went on television to confirm that this was, in fact, an agreement, that they had, in fact, done "let's make a deal" with an elect-

ed official over a pending criminal case. Your own client at that point is confirming it on live TV. A whistleblower came forward, so you had a whistleblower as well. You had triple-decker confirmation of that second episode of prosecutorial misconduct.

As to the deportations and telling prosecutors to get ready to tell courts "f you," there were multiple whistleblowers and lots of corroboration from actual emails and texts at the time. You had prosecutors texting each other about that "f you" comment. If it had not occurred, those text exchanges would have made no sense. The first response would have been: What are you talking about? But, instead, everybody knew what was being said in the text chain because they had been in the room, they had heard him say it, and now two whistleblowers have come forward on that.

So you have multiple whistleblowers, lots of written evidence from career prosecutors, and statements by Trump officials corroborating these schemes. And what have we got? Monkey see no evil. Monkey hear no evil. Shove this guy onto the court because Trump wants it. Oh, did I mention he was Trump's criminal lawyer in the cases in which Trump was convicted of crimes?

The hearing was a shocking disgrace. I guess it turns out that nowadays, in order to get through a judicial confirmation hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee, all you need to do is to remember to say "I don't recall," "That would not be appropriate for me to answer," or "That information isn't public." You learn three answers, and you get through the hearing because the majority will never force the witness to answer an actual question.

It actually gets a little bit worse with respect to the deportation matter because there was another line of corroboration that could have been developed to prove this character's involvement in this scheme to fool the judge and ultimately to simply refuse to obey a court order. That was that, after all this nonsense went down in front of the judge—judges aren't stupid; he knew he was being had—he found probable cause of contempt of court, opening the prospect of a hearing, with evidence, into contempt of court, where witnesses would have testified, where the full email and text chains would have come into the record, where there would have been an indisputable judicial record of what took place.

Well, what became of that? It got stopped by two Trump appointees who stopped the contempt proceedings through a device called an administrative stay over the dissent and objection of the third judge, the one who was not a Trump appointee. So two Trump appointees stop a hearing into contempt of court by the Trump DOJ.

An administrative stay is supposed to last hours or days. Not too long ago, Justice Barrett chided the circuit

court of appeals for an administrative stay that had lasted 2 weeks. This administrative stay that stopped the development of the evidence of this individual's misconduct has been in place for 3 months without explanation, but it was just enough time for the Trump operatives in the DOJ to shove this individual through the confirmation process, where real questions and real answers never appeared, while the place that would have gotten this with cross-examination, under oath, with consequences of perjury, was stalled by two other Trump judges. This smells like a play, like a maneuver, and we are going to continue to look into it.

I will say to my colleagues: This is not going to go away. It took me 6 years to ultimately prove that the FBI had been instructed in the Kavanaugh supplemental background investigation to do only what the White House told them, no more; that they had no rules, no practical guidelines—only what the White House Counsel told them. And what the White House Counsel told them is, you may not seek or find corroborating evidence.

Then, of course, all of our colleagues on the Republican side stood up and said: Oh, look, there is no corroborating evidence.

They didn't bother to share that it had been the White House's instruction to the FBI to avoid any corroborating evidence.

It took us 6 years to dig that out. So I can be persistent, and I will tell you, this is an episode that requires persistence.

First of all, there is a bar complaint against this guy for his misconduct that the New York bar referred to the Office of Professional Responsibility at the Department of Justice. Well, as soon as we confirm him, he is out of the Department of Justice, and the OPR has no jurisdiction any longer. So I see no reason not to go back to that bar complaint and get somebody to take a look into this since a MAGA OPR is not about to look into a MAGA Department of Justice employee.

Second, there is contempt here. At some point, that administrative stay is going to be lifted, and then there will be testimony. Then there will be evidence. Then people will be subjected to cross-examination. Then the truth will come out, and I strongly suspect it is going to be highly, highly embarrassing.

Perhaps to prevent that, the Department of Justice just filed a new complaint against the judge who will hold that contempt hearing. Presumably, their argument is going to be, ah, we have now filed a complaint against that judge; therefore, he is conflicted out, and that hearing can't go forward.

This is the Department of Justice—the MAGA Department of Justice filing a complaint, perhaps even in bad faith, against a U.S. district judge to try to conflict him out from a hearing that would show contempt of court by that very Department of Justice. What a tangled web we weave.

Last, there are going to be questions asked about those two Trump judges and why the administrative stay and why for 3 months and why the amazing coincidence that those 3 months of administrative stay was the period that it took to pick up this character, shove him through the nominations process, shove him through the Republican-controlled Judiciary Committee, and stuff him onto the bench without that hearing taking place. That is too much coincidence for this lawyer.

So this is not over. I strongly suspect that my colleagues will come to regret and lament their vote for this character. Bad nature is hard to make disappear.

I will end where I began the first time I came to the floor to discuss the nomination of Emil Bove to the Third Circuit, and that is the story about the snake by the side of a path, injured and broken, who was picked up by the lady who was walking along and taken to her home, where the snake was fed and cared for until he healed. Then she took him back to where she had found him, back to his home. She set him down beside the path, and he bit her.

As she was dying from the snake's venom, she said to the snake: Why did you bite me—the one who picked you up, the one who cared for you, the one who fed you, the one who brought you back here to your home area?

The snake said: You knew when you picked me up that I was a snake. This is my nature.

This man's nature will out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). The Senator from Utah.

VOTE ON BROWN NOMINATION

Mr. CURTIS. I know of no further debate on the Brown nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brown nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 447 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Banks	Capito	Cramer
Barrasso	Cassidy	Crapo
Blackburn	Collins	Cruz
Boozman	Cornyn	Curtis
Britt	Cortez Masto	Daines
Budd	Cotton	Ernst

Fischer	Lummis
Graham	Marshall
Grassley	McConnell
Hawley	McCormick
Hoeben	Moody
Husted	Moran
Hyde-Smith	Moreno
Johnson	Mullin
Justice	Murkowski
Kennedy	Paul
Lankford	Ricketts
Lee	Risch

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—2

Coons Hagerty

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask that the Senate execute the order of July 23 with respect to the Bove nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Emil J. Bove III, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

VOTE ON BOVE NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 448 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Cassidy	Daines
Barrasso	Cornyn	Ernst
Blackburn	Cotton	Fischer
Boozman	Cramer	Graham
Britt	Crapo	Grassley
Budd	Cruz	Hawley
Capito	Curtis	Hoeben

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Hagerty

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I want to be very clear about what Senate Republicans are doing.

Tonight, Senate Republicans vote to put Emil Bove—a January 6 sympathizer—on one of the highest courts in the country. They reward a man—credibly accused of wanting to lie to judges—with a black robe and a gavel of his own. And they are confirming him for one reason only: Mr. Bove is loyal to Donald Trump. Therefore, Donald Trump wants him on the bench. The calculus is as simple as that—as simple as that.

It is unfathomable that, just over 4 years after the insurrection at the Capitol—when rioters smashed windows, ransacked offices, and desecrated this Chamber—Senate Republicans are willingly putting someone on the bench who shielded these rioters from facing justice, who said their prosecution was a grave national injustice.

To my colleagues who were here on January 6 and who are now putting him on the bench, shame on you. To confirm Mr. Bove is a sacrilegious act against our democracy, a deep violation against the spirit of our oaths of office.

But this is not just about January 6. Mr. Bove has been accused by multiple whistleblowers of telling DOJ lawyers to intentionally mislead judges about the administration's policy. Mr. Bove denied these claims, but we have text messages, emails, and other documents saying otherwise. Recently, another whistleblower has come forward, sharing evidence with Senators, suggesting Mr. Bove misled the Judiciary Committee during his sworn testimony.

Since it seems very likely Mr. Bove lied to Senators, he never should become a Federal judge, but Republicans

are rushing Mr. Bove through tonight, hoping the American people aren't paying attention. That includes the Judiciary chairman, someone who prides himself on standing up for whistleblowers but who rushed the process through in committee without fully vetting this nominee and without getting to the bottom of the facts underpinning these grave accusations.

Honestly, how have Republicans allowed the bar to fall so low—so dismally low—that they would confirm someone accused of lying to judges to the bench without turning over every stone and examining every lead before making this decision?

How have our Republican colleagues forgotten the horrors of January 6 so soon that they would let Mr. Bove—one of the great defenders of the insurrectionists—sail through this Chamber?

This is a dark, dark day, a dark vote, and a dangerous nominee Republicans are confirming.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I want to thank Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, for his words.

This is a really tough moment for me, not just because this is in New Jersey. This is someone who has had something I have never seen before—hundreds of judges, hundreds of Federal prosecutors and Federal public defenders from both parties come forward, saying that Emil Bove should not be on the Third Circuit as a judge for a lifetime position; not only that, but that his temperament of using vulgarities to show, it is claimed, that folks should disobey—that the Trump administration should disobey—court orders disqualifies him from being on the bench. That is one thing that bothered me.

The other thing is the fact that he has had some of the worst ethics violations of any judge I have seen come before the Judiciary Committee in holding back exculpatory evidence when he was a prosecutor. He was called by former prosecutors and former defense attorneys the drunk driving version of a prosecutor—reckless and dangerous.

Then, finally, what was the ultimate frustration was we saw a whistleblower come forward who had impinged his testimony with receipts, but there were other whistleblowers trying to come forward who were afraid for themselves because of this climate in which people who stand up and speak the truth are often targeted and attacked. Contrary to what my colleague was saying on the floor, their lawyers were trying to get somebody in the Republican Party just to listen to the evidence, and no one wanted to even listen.

This is a sad day for our democracy. This is a sad day for the judiciary and a sad day for the U.S. Senate, whose constitutional obligation is to advise and consent, to look at all of the evidence, especially when you have whis-

tleblowers standing up with courage and wanting to speak the truth—not even to listen to it. We saw those tactics in the Judiciary Committee: not wanting to have debate, not wanting to have a discussion, rushing this nominee through as quickly as possible to this floor for a vote before any more evidence could come out before another 200, 300, 400 judges or prosecutors could come out with damning indictments of this man's qualifications.

This is a very unfortunate day for the U.S. Senate, a very unfortunate day for the State of New Jersey, and a very unfortunate day for the Third Circuit. I am expressing my deepest disappointment in this body in its abdication of its responsibilities.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 271.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Cheryl Mason, of North Carolina, to be Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 271, Cheryl Mason, of North Carolina, to be Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs.

John Thune, Tommy Tuberville, Bernie Moreno, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, John R. Curtis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Mike Rounds, Katie Boyd Britt, Roger Marshall, Pete Ricketts, John Boozman, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Rick Scott of Florida, Eric Schmitt, Lindsey Graham.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 254.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrea Lucas, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2030 (Reappointment).

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 254, Andrea Lucas, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2030. (Reappointment)

John Thune, Tommy Tuberville, Bernie Moreno, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, John R. Curtis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Mike Rounds, Katie Boyd Britt, Roger Marshall, Pete Ricketts, John Boozman, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Rick Scott of Florida, Eric Schmitt, Lindsey Graham.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 59.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Casey Mulligan, of Illinois, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 59, Casey Mulligan, of Illinois, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John R. Curtis, Rick Scott of Florida, Bernie Moreno, Pete Ricketts, Eric Schmitt, Jon Husted, Roger Marshall, Jim Justice, Tommy Tuberville, Bill Hagerty, Joni Ernst, James E. Risch, Marsha Blackburn, Tim Sheehy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 118.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Woll, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 118, David Woll, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

John Thune, Tommy Tuberville, Bernie Moreno, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, John R. Curtis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Mike Rounds, Katie Boyd Britt, Roger Marshall, Pete Ricketts, John Boozman, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Rick Scott of Florida, Eric Schmitt, Lindsey Graham.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 165.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicholas Kent, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Education.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 165, Nicholas Kent, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Education.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Bernie Moreno, Tommy Tuberville, Kevin Cramer, Ron Johnson, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, John Barrasso, Marsha Blackburn, Roger Marshall, Jon A. Husted, Roger F. Wicker, Jim Banks, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Ted Budd, David McCormick.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS UNDER RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, the information required by rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate related to congressionally directed spending items is included in the committee reports (Senate Reports 119-37, 119-43, and 119-44) that are referenced in Senate amendment No. 3038 to H.R. 3944. I hereby incorporate that information into this disclosure by reference.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control

Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 25-0R. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 22-71 of December 6, 2022.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-0R

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(C), AECA)

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Poland.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 22-71; Date: December 6, 2022; Implementing Agency: Army.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On December 6, 2022, Congress was notified by congressional certification transmittal number 22-71 of the possible sale under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of one hundred sixteen (116) M1A1 Abrams Main Battle Tanks; twelve (12) M88A2 HERCULES Combat Recovery Vehicles; eight (8) M1110 Joint Assault Bridges; six (6) M577A3 Command Vehicles; twenty-six (26) M1152A1 High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV); twenty-six (26) M1279A1 Joint Light Tactical Vehicles (JLTV); one hundred sixteen (116) M2.50 caliber machine guns; two hundred thirty-two (232) M240 7.62mm machine guns; six (6) AGT 1500 gas turbine engines; thirty thousand nine hundred twenty-eight (30,928) 120mm M865 Target Practice, Cone Stabilized, Discarding Sabot—Tracer (TPCSDS-T) cartridges; twenty thousand eight hundred twenty-three (20,823) 120mm M1002 Target Practice Multipurpose Tracer (TPMP-T) projectiles; sixty thousand (60,000) 120mm M829A4 Armor Piercing, Fin Stabilized, Discarding Sabot—Tracer (APFSDS-T) cartridges; two thousand (2,000) 120mm M829A3 Armor Piercing, Fin Stabilized, Discarding Sabot—Tracer (APFSDS-T) cartridges; fifty thousand (50,000) 120mm M829A2 Armor Piercing, Fin Stabilized, Discarding Sabot—Tracer (APFSDS-T) cartridges; ten thousand (10,000) 120mm M830A1 High Explosive Anti-

Tank (HEAT) TP-T cartridges; sixty thousand (60,000) 120mm M908 High Explosive Obstacle Reduction-Tracer (HE-OR-T) cartridges, and seventy thousand (70,000) 120mm M1147 High Explosive Advanced Multipurpose Round cartridges. Also included were Forward Repair Systems; Next Generation (NG) Shop Equipment Maintenance Contact (SECM) shelters; communications equipment; GPS receivers; ammunition; Spare and Repair Parts; Special Tools and Test Equipment (STTE); technical manuals and publications; new equipment training; U.S. Government and contractor technical engineering, logistics, and personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total program cost was \$3.75 billion. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted \$3.25 billion of this total.

On September 25, 2024, Congress was notified by congressional certification transmittal number 24-OT of the inclusion of twenty-five (25) M1150 Assault Breacher Vehicles (ABVs); thirty-seven (37) M2 .50 caliber machine guns; sixty thousand (60,000) 120 mm M908 High Explosive Obstacle Reduction-Tracer (HE-OR-T) cartridges; thirty (30) 120 mm M865 Target Practice, Cone Stabilized, Discarding Sabot-Tracer (TPCSDS-T) cartridges; two hundred twenty-five (225) M58 linear charge demolition, high explosive Mine Clearing Line Charges (MICLICs); and twenty-five (25) M68A2 Charge, Demolition, Inert, Flexible Linear. The following non-MDE items were also included: MK22 MOD 4 5-inch rocket motors; AN/PRC-158 radios; communications equipment; Global Positioning System (GPS) receivers and precise positioning provided by Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module or M-Code; forward repair systems; spare and repair parts; Special Tools and Test Equipment (STTE); technical manuals and publications; New Equipment Training (NET); site surveys; transportation; U.S. Government and contractor technical, engineering, logistics, and personnel services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total value of the new items was \$850 million, but did not require an increase to the previously notified MDE and non-MDE values. The estimated total cost remained \$3.75 billion. MDE remained \$3.25 billion of this total.

This transmittal notifies the inclusion of the following additional MDE items: sixteen (16) M88A2 Heavy Equipment Recovery Combat Utility Lift and Evacuation System (HERCULES) recovery vehicles and fifty (50) AGT1500 M1A1 tank engines. The following non-MDE items will also be included: M88A2 and tank engine follow-on support; 120 mm ammunition rounds; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost of the new items is \$5.83 billion. The estimated MDE value will increase by \$4.86 billion. The estimated total case value will increase by \$5.83 billion to a revised \$9.58 billion. MDE will constitute \$8.11 billion of that total.

(iv) Significance: This notification is being provided as the additional MDE and non-MDE items were not enumerated in the original notification. The inclusion of these items represents an increase in capability over what was previously notified. The proposed sale will support Poland's capability to meet current and future threats by enabling a credible force that is capable of deterring adversaries and participating in NATO operations.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology: The Sensitivity of Technology Statement contained in the original notification applies to items reported here. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET. (vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 29, 2025.

ADS FOR MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ACT

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation filed a report for S. 414, ADS for Mental Health Services Act, on June 24, 2025, before receiving the formal CBO score on the bill. The committee received the CBO score today. I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying CBO score be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE (July 29, 2025)

AT A GLANCE—COMMERCE LEGISLATION

On March 12, 2025, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation ordered reported 14 bills. This document provides estimates for 3 of those bills. One bill, S. 414, was reported on June 24, 2025. Details of the estimated costs of each bill are discussed in the text.

CBO estimates that enacting each bill would increase spending subject to appropriation.

None of the bills would increase direct spending or revenues; thus, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

CBO estimates that none of the bills would increase net direct spending or on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036.

All three bills contain private-sector mandates.

Bill	Net Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit Over the 2025–2035 Period (Millions of Dollars)	Changes in Spending Subject to Appropriation Over the 2025–2030 Period (Outlays, Millions of Dollars)	Mandate Effects?
S. 289	0	2	Yes
S. 389	0	8	Yes
S. 414	0	*	Yes

* = between zero and \$500,000.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATION

On March 12, 2025, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation ordered reported 14 bills. This document provides estimates for 3 of those bills. One bill, S. 414, was reported on June 24, 2025.

S. 289 would ban the sale of certain products covered by the Consumer Product Safety Act and S. 389 would require the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) to adopt voluntary safety standards for lithium-ion batteries. S. 414 would require digital advertising platforms to report annually to the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

ESTIMATED FEDERAL COST

The costs of the legislation fall within budget functions 370 (commerce and housing credit) and 550 (health).

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

For this estimate, CBO assumes that each bill will be enacted near the end of fiscal year 2025 and that the estimated amounts will be available each year. The cost esti-

mate does not include any effects of interactions among the bills. If all three bills were combined and enacted as a single piece of legislation, the effects could be different from the sum of the separate estimates, although CBO expects that any differences would be small.

S. 289, the Youth Poisoning Protection Act, would ban the sale of products containing 10 percent or more by weight of sodium nitrite that are covered under the Consumer Product Safety Act. The legislation would not affect the sale or use of commercial or industrial products not ordinarily intended for consumer use or consumption.

Using information from the Consumer Product Safety Commission, CBO estimates that implementing S. 289 would cost \$2 million over the 2025–2030 period; any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

S. 389, the Setting Consumer Standards for Lithium-Ion Batteries Act, would require the Consumer Product Safety Commission within 180 days of enactment, to adopt certain voluntary safety standards—specifically ANSICAN/UL 2271, 2849, and 2272—concerning rechargeable lithium-ion batteries used in electric bicycles, scooters, and other micromobility devices. The bill also would require the CPSC to determine the applicable scope of covered consumer products and to monitor and evaluate future revisions to the voluntary standards and report to the Congress within five years of enactment.

Using information from the CPSC, CBO estimates that implementing S. 389 would cost \$8 million over the 2025–2030 period; any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

S. 414, the ADS for Mental Health Services Act, would require certain digital advertising platforms to report annually to the Federal Trade Commission about advertising on their platforms for certain mental health services, including information on the number, percent, and dollar value of such advertisements. Platforms that would be affected by the bill include social media platforms, public facing websites, online services, and mobile applications with more than 100 million unique monthly users. The bill also would require the FTC to report annually to the Congress summarizing that data. CBO estimates that enacting S. 414 would cost less than \$500,000 over the 2025–2030 period. Any related spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS

The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes budget-reporting and enforcement procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or revenues. None of the bills would affect direct spending or revenues; thus, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

INCREASE IN LONG-TERM NET DIRECT SPENDING AND DEFICITS

CBO estimates that enacting S. 289, S. 389 and S. 414 would not increase net direct spending or deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2036.

MANDATES

All three bills would impose private-sector mandates as defined in in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). None of the bills would impose intergovernmental mandates.

S. 289, the Youth Poisoning Protection Act, would impose a private-sector mandate as defined in UMRA by banning the sale of consumer products containing 10 percent or more of sodium nitrite by weight. The prohibition would not apply to industrial uses or to food preservation. Because there is only a small market for consumer products containing that much sodium nitrite and some states already have curtailed the sale of

products containing sodium nitrite, CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate would not exceed the private sector threshold established in UMRA (\$206 million in 2025, adjusted annually for inflation).

S. 389, the Setting Consumer Standards for Lithium-Ion Batteries Act, would impose a private-sector mandate as defined in UMRA by requiring manufacturers of electric mobility devices, including bicycles and scooters, to comply with a prospective Consumer Product Safety Commission safety standard related to the risk of fire in lithium-ion batteries. Based on voluntary compliance with the specified standard by domestic manufacturers and current state and local laws requiring compliance, CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate would not exceed the annual private-sector threshold established in UMRA (\$206 million in 2025, adjusted annually for inflation).

S. 414, the ADS for Mental Health Services Act, would require certain digital advertising platforms to report to the FTC on their public service advertisements for mental and behavioral health. That requirement would impose a private-sector mandate as defined by UMRA. CBO estimates the cost of the mandate would be small and not exceed the threshold established in UMRA (\$206 million in 2025, adjusted annually for inflation) because the mandated entities generally already possess or collect the information required to be reported under the bill.

Estimate Prepared By: Federal Costs: Cyrus Ekland (for the Consumer Product Safety Commission); Johnny Willing (for the Federal Trade Commission).

Mandates: Andrew Laughlin (for the Consumer Product Safety Commission); Rachel Austin (for the Federal Trade Commission).

Estimate Reviewed By: Sean Dunbar, Chief, Low-Income Health Programs and Prescription Drugs Cost Estimates Unit; Justin Humphrey, Chief, Finance, Housing, and Education Cost Estimates Unit; Kathleen FitzGerald, Chief, Public and Private Mandates Unit; H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis.

Estimate Approved By: Phillip L. Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

CONFIRMATION OF WILLIAM KIMMITT

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I would like to congratulate William Kimmitt on his confirmation as the next Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade. This is an outstanding appointment not just for the Department of Commerce, but also for the American people.

Mr. Kimmitt's life has been defined by service, both of his own and that of his family. His grandfather Stan Kimmitt, a decorated war veteran who served in World War II and in Korea, devoted his career to Senator Mike Mansfield and ultimately served as Secretary of the Senate from 1977–1981. His uncle Jay Kimmitt spent decades on the Appropriations Committee as a professional staff member. His aunt and godmother Judy dedicated nearly her entire professional life to serving six different Senators. This is a patriotic family who clearly values the dignity of public service. I trust that William will continue the family tradition as the Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade.

However impressive Mr. Kimmitt's family might be, his personal career

speaks volumes to the type of man he is. He served as counselor to then-United States Trade Representative Bob Lighthizer and helped implement the historic USMCA. William defended our steel and aluminum industries and worked tirelessly to ensure that America's trade policy put our workers, farmers, and manufacturers first—and not the other way around. While working for the USTR, he navigated the complex intersection of law, diplomacy, security, and commerce, while always advancing President Trump's America First agenda.

Mr. Kimmitt also brings over a decade of private sector experience as a partner at Kirkland & Ellis, where he represented U.S. companies in cases before the International Trade Commission and advised on supply chain issues. He understands, from the boardroom to the factory floor, how trade policy impacts “Forgotten Americans,” real businesses, and our long-term competitiveness against geoeconomic rivals like China.

As Under Secretary, Mr. Kimmitt will lead the International Trade Administration and will be responsible for: No. 1, promoting market access for American goods and services; and No. 2, enforcing our trade laws to combat unfair practices. Both functions are critical to our safety and prosperity.

On market access, when American farmers and manufacturers have a fair chance to compete against international firms, they always win. Whether it is automobiles from Ohio, refined chemicals from Pennsylvania, or soybeans from Iowa, our products are second to none. ITA ensures that foreign markets are open to those goods by cutting through redtape and breaking down trade barriers. That means more exports, more jobs, and stronger communities here at home.

On enforcement, ITA plays a vital role in confronting dumping practices, countering illegal subsidies, and ensuring that foreign competitors play by the rules. For too long, American workers were undercut by countries exploiting loopholes, manipulating markets, and ignoring labor standards. Under Mr. Kimmitt's leadership, we will have an Under Secretary committed to using every tool available to level the playing field and bring justice to American workers.

Mr. Kimmitt has pledged to use America's trade tools strategically, enforce our laws vigorously, and give our exporters the support they need to succeed globally. I know he will deliver on these promises. His deep understanding of how trade policy intersects with our national interest will serve this Nation well.

So today, I congratulate William Kimmitt on his confirmation as our next Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade. I thank him, his wife Heather, and their four children—Kaitlyn, Kevin, Will, and Abby—for once again answering the call to serve. I am certain that he will make the ITA

a tireless champion for the American worker.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGO. Madam President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 439, confirmation of David Wright, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 440, motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 110, Earl Matthews to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CALDWELL

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, cross-country skiing is a sport enjoyed by tens of thousands of Vermonters, including several Vermont Olympians. Just about every Vermont ski area today has groomed cross-country trails, and most schools and communities have cross-country ski programs. Where I live in Norwich, VT, cross-country skiing is as popular as riding a chair lift and skiing down. From our front door, my wife Margaret and I can put on our skis and head out across a field and into the woods, breaking our own track or following a snowmobile trail.

Many Vermont cross-country skiers today are not old enough to know how the sport got its start because, before John Caldwell—often referred to as the “father” of cross-country skiing—it was something people did in Scandinavia that hardly anyone in America knew about. That was until Caldwell wrote “The Cross-Country Ski Book.” It was published by the Stephen Greene Press in Brattleboro in eight editions from 1964 to 1987 and became one of the most widely distributed skiing books published in the United States.

John Caldwell is an Olympian himself, competing in the 1952 Winter Olympics in both cross-country and ski jumping. After graduating from Dartmouth College, he went on to coach U.S. Olympic cross-country ski teams in 1960, 1964, 1968, 1972, and 1984. Although born in Michigan and currently living in New Hampshire to be close to children and grandchildren, for all intents and purposes Caldwell has been and will always be a Vermonter; his ancestors arrived in the State in the 1740s. He attended the Putney School in Putney, VT, where he met his future wife Hep, and for more than three decades taught mathematics and coached skiing at Putney, finally retiring in 1989.

To train for ski racing his students would run cross-country in the fall and split firewood. He was demanding, but he was also a master of dry humor, and his students were devoted to him. Above all, his goal was to show them that learning the technique to be able to glide on skis under one's own power

could be great fun. Several of them went on to ski in the Olympics, including Bill Koch and his eldest son Tim who competed in four Olympic games. His granddaughter Sophie won medals in multiple World Cup races, and she and grandson Patrick competed in the Olympics. His son Sverre served for nearly four decades as Nordic director at Stratton Mountain School. His daughter Jennifer was the fastest woman of thousands who competed in the country's largest cross-country ski race in 1983.

John Caldwell's contribution to cross-country skiing in Vermont and the United States knows no equal. He brought the sport to Vermont, and from there, it spread across the country. Just a few hundred yards from where he lives today, in the winter, scores of elementary school students can be seen practicing their cross-country technique on trails around the old Dartmouth golf course.

Everyone who puts on a pair of cross-country skis today owes a debt of gratitude to John Caldwell. Cross-country skiing isn't just a sport. For those who love it, it is a passion—even a way of life. As Caldwell describes in "The Cross-Country Ski Book," it is a simple, graceful way for just about anyone of any age to have fun gliding almost silently across snow-covered fields and through woods and getting in shape in the process. All Vermonters should be proud that, thanks to John Caldwell, our State was the birthplace of cross-country skiing in America.

I ask unanimous consent that an April 11, 2025, article in the Brattleboro Reformer, entitled "John Caldwell: He wrote the book—literally—on cross-country skiing," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Brattleboro Reformer, Apr 11, 2025]

JOHN CALDWELL: HE WROTE THE BOOK—
LITERALLY—ON CROSS COUNTRY SKIING
(By Bill LeConey)

Hanover, N.H.—As the winter chill begins to fade and the snow recedes from the slopes and trails of Southern Vermont, it's a good time to look back on the history and legend of one of the areas favorite sports and recreational activities: cross-country skiing.

And that legend begins and ends with John Caldwell, who has been hailed by cross-country ski enthusiasts as the "father," "god-father," even "guru" of their sport. After all, he wrote the book on it: 1964's "The Cross-country Ski Book." It was the first time anyone had ever written a guide in English.

"It's out of print now—it went through seven or eight editions. It was a bestseller," John, now 96, said last week. "I think it sold over 500,000 copies. It's the only reason I'm not in the poorhouse."

Caldwell competed in the 1952 Winter Olympics and coached the U.S. cross-country Olympic teams in 1960, 1964, 1968, 1972, and 1984. He also coached at the Putney School from the mid-1950s until his 1989 retirement. Among the Putney students and others that he coached were Olympians Bob Gray, Martha Rockwell, Mike Gallagher, his son Tim Caldwell, and Brattleboro's Jim Galanes,

Stan Dunklee and Bill Koch, the first American to medal in cross-country skiing.

Another son, Sverre, followed in his father's footsteps, setting up the Stratton Mountain School (SMS) cross-country program and the SMS Elite Team.

Caldwell, a longtime Putney resident, now lives in a retirement community in Hanover, N.H., just up the road from Dartmouth College, the school that he and all four of his children attended and competed in cross-country skiing.

Caldwell says his first skiing recollections go back nearly 90 years, to the mid-1930s when his family lived in Somerset, Pennsylvania.

"My folks gave me a pair of skis for some reason—wood, no edges, and with toe straps. There was not a lot of snow in town and I knew of no other skiers. I stepped into the skis and started down this long hill in some fairly deep powder. I coasted to a stop, fell out of the toe straps, picked up the skis and climbed back up the hill. Next time down I went farther because the trick was to follow the original tracks and so I went faster. Fell down, found my skis, climbed back and probably did one more trip. That was the end of the start of my skiing career."

In 1941, the family moved to Southern Vermont, where John's father had gotten a job as a business manager at the Putney School, a progressive boarding school that sits on a hilltop dairy farm. Basketball had been John's sport of choice, but Putney didn't have a team. It did have a downhill ski team, which John's dad convinced him to join. The team went to a state ski meet in the winter of 1945-46 and needed a cross-country skier.

"I volunteered, got hold of my sister's five foot wooden Alpine skis, adjusted the bindings to my very flexible downhill boots (which also doubled as jumping boots) and I was ready to go. We went off to the state meet and did well enough to qualify for the New England Championships the next weekend. I thought I should get serious about training for cross-country and went out one day in the week preceding the New England's. I got tired after a few minutes of thrashing around and quit, went to the New England's and finished 48th out of 52. Those three days on my sister's alpine skis were the end of my high school cross-country career."

Like many Vermont kids at the time, Caldwell learned the four winter sports: alpine and cross-country skiing, ski jumping and biathlon, and competed in all four when he went on to Dartmouth. For the first time, he got a real pair of cross-country skis and a bit of instruction. As a senior, he went to a Nordic combined ski meet, a mix of ski jumping and cross-country. He beat some guys who'd made the Nordic combined world championship team. "So I tried Nordic combined the next year and made the Olympic team in '52."

Caldwell said he was not well-prepared for his first Olympic experience. His last-place finish (out of 22 competitors) at the Games in Oslo, Norway gave him the incentive to make sure no American would ever suffer that kind of disappointment again.

Over the next 20 years, after returning to the Putney School as a math teacher and coach, he pulled together a legendary cross-country team that included his son Tim, as well as Bill Koch. In 1972, Caldwell's team pioneered the use of one-piece uniforms. In 1976, Koch won Olympic silver in the 30 kilometer race and still holds the speed record for that event. "In the 1980 Olympic relay, we had my son Tim, Bill Koch and two Brattleboro boys, Stan Dunklee and Jim Galanes. At the time, there were only 37 members of the Putney Ski Club and membership was \$1."

Caldwell also helped coach U.S. biathlete and two-time Olympian Willie Carow of Putney, Dan Simoneau and National Geographic explorer Ned Gillette. "I always tried to make it fun," he said. "One summer I got together a group of skiers (including Gillette) and we hiked the Long Trail, end to end, in nine days—hiking out to friends' houses to stay overnight then back to the trail so we wouldn't have to carry gear."

Galanes, a three-time Olympian and 12-time national champion in cross-country and Nordic combined, said Caldwell was a "really great coach, not so much being a hands-on coach, but working on technique skiing, thinking differently about training, trying new things. Bill Koch was a great innovator, but part of that innovation stems from Bill's relationship with John Caldwell and Bob Gray and all the other people around. It fostered in us an ability to really think and question and challenge what we were doing. We certainly didn't always get it right but we were always thinking about it."

John and his wife Hester—"Hep," for short—naturally made cross-country skiing a big part of family life, putting their four children on skis even before they started walking. "They would ski around on the rugs in the living room. They liked that."

Sverre says it was never a high-pressure thing—even with a high-profile dad.

"I don't remember going, 'Oh, my dad's a big deal skier,'" said Sverre, 70, who now lives in Peru, Vermont. "We just kind of all did it as a family. In elementary school, he built a trail so we could ski down to school. It was probably about 10 kilometers, but mainly downhill. And back then we really didn't race much at all. I'm sure I never beat my older brother (Tim) in a race. My younger brother Peter and I would go back and forth, but I don't remember it as being a big stress point at all."

"I'm lucky in that I never felt any pressure or anything," says Sverre, who is now retired from coaching and teaching at Stratton. "It was just like I was brought up doing it. I enjoyed doing it. I actually was not a great competitor, but then in college I started helping coach a little, and I loved it, so I learned coaching. The sport's been good to me. I've enjoyed it all."

Tim Caldwell would go on to compete in four Olympics, finishing sixth at the 1976 Winter Games in Austria. Sister Jennifer, who passed away in 2011, won the American Birkebeiner, the largest cross-country skiing race in North America.

John's nephew, Zachary, is the founder of Caldwell Sports and a leader in cross-country ski training and equipment. Zach and his wife, Amy, operate West Hill Ski Shop in Putney.

But no one has kept the Caldwell Olympic connection going more than Sverre and wife Lilly's daughter, Sophie, who graduated from Stratton in 2012 and became the third Caldwell to ski in the Winter Olympics, in 2014 in Sochi, Russia. She was in position to contend for a medal midway through the final of the freestyle sprint when she collided with a fellow competitor, causing her to crash and finish sixth.

Sophie got her first victory in the World Cup during the 2016 edition of the Tour de Ski. She won the classic sprint in Oberstdorf, Germany in 2016, becoming only the second American woman with a World Cup victory, and the only one with a classical win.

It's all very gratifying to the matriarch of the family. "It makes me feel good," says John, who is working with Sverre and Zach on an "addendum" of sorts to his book, detailing changes in equipment and techniques over the last 25 years. "And I'm happy that my kids and grandkids and nieces and nephews have taken up the sport."

He's also happy that they've stayed true to his "main pitch" about cross-country skiing, as outlined in page 7 of the third edition of his "bible":

"Cross-country skiing should be fun for everyone," Caldwell wrote. "The range of possibilities for enjoyment is unlimited. You can ski anywhere there's snow, you can use a wide variety of equipment, you can ski alone or with a group, you can use the very best technique while wearing the clothes you just picked up from the local rummage sale, or you can wear the latest styles and invent your own technique. So pick out and use anything you want from this book—but most of all, have fun skiing x-c. Make it be your thing."

It certainly has been Caldwell's—and his family's—"thing" for nearly a century.

RECOGNIZING HENRY'S DINER

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of an iconic Vermont institution, Henry's Diner. Henry's Diner has provided delicious food, welcoming ambience, and classic consistency to the Burlington, VT, community since 1925.

Henry's Diner was founded in 1925 by Henry Couture, a beloved Burlingtonian and entrepreneur. At the time, diners were perceived as lower-class, and women hardly ever ate at them. But Mr. Couture dedicated himself to building an institution that was welcoming to everyone. He included special touches to attract female patrons, and the diner grew into a place frequented by all. Today, you can find anyone from day laborers to college students to politicians enjoying a meal under the original railroad cart ceiling.

Henry's 100-year tenure has not been without its challenges. A fire in 1969 necessitated a months-long closure and heavy renovations to the business. Still, care was taken to preserve as much of the original diner as possible, and Henry's successfully reopened the following year.

In the early 90s, a McDonald's opened directly across the street from Henry's. Some feared this signaled a cultural shift and could spell the end of the historic diner. However, the McDonald's closed years ago while Henry's remains standing proudly on Bank Street. During COVID-19, like many other Vermont businesses, the diner weathered staffing shortages and temporary closures.

In the face of all these difficulties, Henry's has persevered. For a century now, Henry's has remained a place where people from all walks of life can gather over hearty food and a hot cup of coffee. The values that characterize Henry's—community, kindness, and acceptance—are Vermont values, and our state would not be the same without Henry's sitting in the heart of Burlington.

Henry's has changed ownership multiple times across its history and was most recently bought by Patricio Ortiz in 2024. Despite changing hands, each owner has carried on the quality service that has made Henry's so beloved. I wish the Ortiz family nothing but suc-

cess in continuing Henry's legacy and look forward to another 100 years of good food and great company.

Thank you, Henry's Diner, for feeding the hearts and souls of so many Vermonters.

RECOGNIZING DAN & WHIT'S GENERAL STORE

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate the 70th anniversary of one of Vermont's most iconic general stores. Dan & Whit's has been the beating heart of the Norwich community for 70 years.

Dan & Whit's is a third-generation Vermont family business, nestled on Main Street in Norwich, VT—my hometown. The store is so integral to the people of Norwich, it is often used as a landmark: "Turn right at Dan & Whit's." The building itself is historic, too, having served as a townhall and post office before being converted into a general store. Dan Fraser and Whit Hicks, longtime friends, bought the store from its previous owners in 1955 and renamed it Dan & Whit's. The store has been run by the Fraser family ever since.

Dan & Whit's is known for their huge inventory. The store is deceptively large inside, and endless aisles are lined with a vast selection of goods, rumored to number into the hundreds of thousands. They stock everything from general store necessities, like cold beer and sandwiches; to Vermont necessities, like maple sugaring equipment; to the downright unexpected, like chicken feed and sushi. Their slogan, "If we don't have it, you don't need it," is stamped on their custom merchandise and attested to by anyone who visits.

The business is an anchor in the Norwich community. Generations of high schoolers can trace their first job back to Dan & Whit's. Customers stop by for milk and end up chatting with so many familiar faces they forget what they came in for. The store is also a leading participant in charitable giving around town. They were a pioneer of 19 Days of Norwich, an annual holiday drive where businesses donate a portion of their December sales to the local food shelf. During the rest of the year, they put on numerous fundraisers—selling creemees, pizza, and wine tastings, all to benefit local nonprofits.

The store prides itself on the Vermont values of respect and acceptance. They have made a point to be inclusive in their hiring, giving second chances to Vermonters who are exiting homelessness or incarceration. A sign hanging outside, surrounded by community notices and posters, proudly reads "Hate Does Not Grow In the Rocky Soil of Norwich, Vermont."

When faced with staffing shortages during COVID-19, it seemed likely Dan & Whit's would have to close its doors for the first time in history. The store put out a cry for help, and the call did not go unanswered. Dozens of commu-

nity members offered to pick up a shift or two. The new workers were often older Vermonters who had been retired for years, but they stocked shelves, checked out customers, and prepared sandwiches with enthusiasm. They pitched in not because they had to—many donated their salaries to charity—but because they felt the store's survival was essential to their community.

Despite the challenges they face as a small business—staffing shortages, supply chain issues, competition from online retailers—Dan & Whit's endures. The store represents the best that Vermont has to offer: a place where the person ringing up your groceries knows your name and where those running the store care more about their community than their bottom line.

I extend my deepest thanks to the Fraser family and every Dan & Whit's employee for their service to Norwich. I wish Dan & Whit's nothing but success and another 70 years of business.

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER RICHARD DUCHAINE

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I rise today to commend the lifesaving service and unwavering dedication of Officer Richard DuChaine of Kansas City, MO.

While on duty for the Kansas City Police Department, Officer DuChaine swiftly responded to a critical emergency call on Highway 71. Rushing to the scene, Officer DuChaine quickly assessed the situation alongside Detective Jacob Shroyer and helped diagnosed the urgent need for CPR, actions that played a key role in preserving a woman's life until advanced medical support could arrive.

This was not the first time Officer DuChaine's decisiveness saved an American life. Two years earlier, he received a distress call regarding a 1-month-old infant. Without hesitation, he sprinted from his patrol car, bursting through the door and taking the small child into his arms. His quick and effective actions resuscitated the infant and saved her life. He celebrated the girl's second birthday with her grateful parents, a testament to Officer DuChaine's service and impact in his community.

Officer Richard DuChaine is truly a Champion of Missouri. His actions embody dedication to the protection of the public. His consistent commitment and ability to save lives has left an indelible mark on the Kansas City community, and I wish him the best in his career.

TRIBUTE TO RAY ELDER

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I rise today to honor Captain Ray Elder of Kansas City, MO, for his dedication to recognizing and honoring all fallen KCPD firefighters on the city's firefighter memorial.

Captain Ray Elder served with the Kansas City Fire Department for 35

years, including 16 years as a captain. Once Ray retired, he became the official historian for the Kansas City Fire Historical Society. His 23 books on the department's history start with the first volunteer bucket brigades in 1858. His core mission is to register the deaths of all firefighters who died in the line of duty and ensure they are honored on the city's State memorial to fallen firefighters. Once Ray discovers a forgotten firefighter, their name is laser-cut into the tall metal panels at the Firefighters Fountain and Memorial in Penn Valley Park. Currently, 119 firefighters' names are honored, with Captain Ray Elder being responsible for over a dozen of them. Because of his hard work and dedication to the city's forgotten servicemembers, Ray has been awarded the Lifetime Contribution Award.

Captain Ray Elder is truly a Champion of Missouri. His dedication to honoring fallen firefighters reflects his unwavering sense of duty and commitment to his community. I commend Captain Elder for his service to his fellow Missourians and wish him all the best in his noble mission.

TRIBUTE TO KACK HASLAG

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I rise today to honor Mrs. Kack Haslag of Jefferson City, MO, for her service to the State of Missouri.

When I was first elected to the Missouri State Senate in 2008, knew I needed to surround myself with talented and organized staff who would help me serve the people of Missouri. Kack Haslag's impressive record made her a clear choice. Kack diligently served as an attentive public servant. As I reviewed a host of legislation, Kack was able to keep my office focused, and together, we authored tax cuts, advocated for those with special needs, and fought to end taxation by citation.

Kack provided invaluable guidance with such a kind and caring disposition to me, my wife, and my children, and we still think of her fondly as a member of our family. She served as a capable liaison for my office and allowed me to focus on being a lawmaker. Her deep knowledge of the State legislature was of tremendous help to me, and I greatly relied on her advice. She contributed so much to my early success as a legislator, and the knowledge she imparted to me continues to serve me well as I represent Missouri in the U.S. Senate.

Kack is truly a Champion of Missouri. I am indebted to Kack for the time and attention she dedicated to our success during the early years of my service to the great State of Missouri. I wish her all the best in her retirement and hope she enjoys well-deserved time with her family.

TRIBUTE TO JIM MEYER

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I rise today to honor Jim Meyer, man-

ager of the Grain Valley Community Center, for his timely and heroic act of service to save the life of a community member.

On the morning of April 7, 2025, a senior citizen collapsed and became unresponsive while using the fitness center. Fellow patrons immediately alerted the staff, and Jim Meyer, the center's manager, sprang into action. Without hesitation, he retrieved the Automated External Defibrillator, AED, and administered it to the man, delivering a shock that restored his heartbeat. This swift and decisive intervention was crucial in saving the man's life and was made possible by the frequent emergency training, including AED instruction, that the center's staff undergo. Thanks to Jim's timely response, paramedics arrived shortly after and transported the man to the hospital, where he made a full recovery. In this crisis, Meyer remained calm and focused, prioritizing the well-being of a community member over all else. Jim's heroic actions not only saved a life but also reinforced the sense of safety and community within the Grain Valley Community Center.

Jim Meyer is truly a Champion of Missouri. His decisive leadership and quick thinking kept a man alive and ensured safety in the community. I commend Jim for his service to his fellow Missourians and wish him all the best with the Grain Valley Community Center.

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL KYLE SEABAUGH

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I rise today to honor Corporal Kyle Seabaugh of the Missouri State Highway Patrol Special Victims Unit for his outstanding investigative work and leadership that saved four young children from extreme, ongoing sexual abuse.

Corporal Seabaugh was assigned to be the lead investigator in a child pornography distribution case in March of 2021. He began by organizing a team of experienced investigators to conduct two searches that helped him dig deeper and locate incriminating evidence of child sex abuse hidden in the suspect's cell phone. This led to the arrest and charging of the suspect as well as another perpetrator with multiple counts of sex trafficking, statutory sodomy, and rape. None of this would have been possible without Corporal Seabaugh's tireless efforts that spanned over 3 years. During this time, he built a strong case and collaborated with many individuals, including officers from the Clinton and Henry County Police Departments, as well as a forensic pediatrician and an FBI expert who helped to accurately identify the child victims. All this ensured that four children would not have to endure any continued abuse. The first suspect has already received 23 life sentences, and the other is currently awaiting trial.

Kyle Seabaugh is truly a Champion of Missouri. His leadership and strong

determination were critical in bringing these criminals to justice and an end to their horrific crimes. I commend Corporal Seabaugh for his service to his fellow Missourians and wish him all the best in his future efforts with the highway patrol special victim's unit.

TRIBUTE TO JACOB SHROYER

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I rise today to honor Detective Jacob Shroyer of Kansas City, MO, for his lifesaving response that went above and beyond the call of duty.

While heading home, Detective Shroyer chose to keep his radio on and noticed a vehicle with flashing lights on the far side of the highway. Shortly thereafter, he overheard a dispatch call go out. Without hesitation, Officer Shroyer made a U-turn and rushed to aid a distressed couple. Arriving at the scene, he quickly helped a woman experiencing a medical emergency be lowered to the ground. Aided by Officer Richard DuChaine, they noticed purple and blue creeping into her lips, a sign of impeded breathing. Detective Shroyer immediately administered rapid chest compressions and lifesaving CPR to the suffocating victim. His actions kept her alive until the Kansas City Fire Department arrived with emergency medical equipment.

Detective Jacob Shroyer is truly a Champion of Missouri. He exemplifies the best of Missouri law enforcement. His decisive response while off-duty and the effective execution of his training demonstrate his commitment to protecting the public—even while off the clock. Officer Shroyer received profuse thanks from the couple as they recovered in a nearby hospital. I commend Detective Shroyer for his extraordinary service and his continued excellence with the Kansas City Police Department.

TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER STEPHEN SZACHTA, JR.

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I rise today to honor CDR Stephen Szachta, Jr., of St. Charles, MO, a leader to service personnel who have served alongside him, a companion to our Japanese allies, and a true frontline warrior in our ensuing fight for global competitiveness against the Chinese Communist Party.

Commander Szachta began his career in the U.S. Navy, heeding the call to service following the attacks on September 11 and, after graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 2006, would later attend the Naval Postgraduate School, graduating with distinction and earning a master of science in systems engineering. In his distinguished naval career, he has deployed in support of counternarcotics and counterpiracy operations, as well as in key engineering roles aboard such vessels as the USS *Preble* and USS *Cape St. George*. Commander Szachta held the privilege of commanding the patrol

ship *USS Monsoon* during her mission critical deployments to the Arabian Gulf, Strait of Hormuz, and the Gulf of Oman, where his crew were awarded the coveted Battle "E" award for the ship's superb performance under Commander Szachta's leadership. Commander Szachta recently commanded over 300 sailors of the destroyer *USS Rafael Peralta* in Yokosuka, Japan, where he has found himself as part of the increasing struggle to reign in the influences of the Chinese Communist Party in the Indo-Pacific. In his career, Commander Szachta has been well-deservingly decorated with the Meritorious Service Medal, two Navy Commendation Medals, and two Navy Achievement Medals, as well as numerous other awards and decorations.

CMDR Stephen Szachta, Jr., is truly a Champion of Missouri. His selfless service to his country and fellow sailors have truly given great pride to our State, and I am truly honored to represent him and honored to call him a Champion of Missouri.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MARY DUQUETTE AND MYRA NIKITAS

• Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I am honored to recognize Mary Duquette of Hopkinton and Myra Nikitas of Nashua as July's Granite Staters of the Month. Mary and Myra are working to ensure that all children in Nashua who need dental care are able to get it.

Mary and Myra have both worked in the dental field for more than 20 years and are certified public health dental hygienists. In 2021, when Mary was working for the State of New Hampshire's oral health program, a program that performed dental screenings for third graders in New Hampshire identified Nashua as one of the areas with the highest levels of tooth decay in the State. Mary and Myra joined an existing cavity prevention program, but when funding for that program ran out, they wanted to continue providing services. They took action, applied for grants themselves, and launched their nonprofit Traveling Tooth Fairies.

Traveling Tooth Fairies' goal is to close the dental care gap. During the school year, Mary and Myra visit schools throughout the Nashua area, helping provide cavity prevention care to any child with a signed permission slip, regardless of their insurance status. Treatment is free for patients, paid for through either grant funding or through New Hampshire Medicaid if the child is eligible and enrolled. In addition to removing financial barriers, providing care directly at schools removes another critical barrier: the need for parents to take time off from work to take their child to the dentist. Traveling Tooth Fairies doesn't deny anyone care, and if a family contacts them asking for help outside of school,

Mary and Myra will work with them to get their child treatment. Traveling Tooth Fairies also attend community events and treat families in shelters.

Mary and Myra's dedication to keeping children healthy is an inspiring example of the Granite State spirit of going above and beyond to help your neighbors. Their commitment to their community is why I am proud to name them July's Granite Staters of the Month.●

RECOGNIZING HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE

• Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the remarkable legacy and ongoing contributions of Hampden-Sydney College as it celebrates the 250th anniversary of its founding on November 10, 2025.

Founded in 1775 on the eve of the American Revolution, Hampden-Sydney is our Nation's 10th-oldest college and the oldest privately chartered college in the southern United States. Its founding mission, "to form good men and good citizens," has remained steadfast for two and a half centuries, shaping generations of young men who have gone on to serve their communities, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Nation with distinction.

Hampden-Sydney College has also played a formative role in the development of other important institutions. Both the Union Theological Seminary and the Medical College of Virginia, now part of Virginia Commonwealth University, trace their roots back to Hampden-Sydney. These connections underscore the college's far-reaching impact on education, health, and public service in the Commonwealth and beyond.

The college's liberal arts curriculum continues to foster critical thinking, moral character, and civil discourse. Through its nationally respected rhetoric program, Hampden-Sydney places a premium on clear communication, thoughtful debate, and lifelong learning—values more vital today than ever. The college also remains home to the Union-Philanthropic Literary Society, the second-oldest college debating society in the United States.

For 250 years, Hampden-Sydney has prepared students for leadership in fields ranging from law and medicine to education, science, religion, business, the arts, and the military. Its alumni include statesmen, scholars, public servants, and countless individuals whose quiet contributions have strengthened the civic and cultural fabric of our society.

As it steps into the next era of its proud tradition, Hampden-Sydney College remains deeply committed to its founding ideals. Its pursuit of excellence in education, its cultivation of civic responsibility and character, and its unwavering defense of free expression ensure that it will continue to play a meaningful role in shaping the leaders of tomorrow.

I extend my heartfelt congratulations to the leadership, faculty, alumni, and students of Hampden-Sydney College on this milestone anniversary. Thank you for your enduring service to the Commonwealth and to our country.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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-1393. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 8451a, the report of an officer departing their position prior to completing three years of service to serve in another position for which they have been nominated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1394. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 119th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1395. A communication from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Livestock Relief Program (ELRP) 2023 and 2024" (RIN0560-A173) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1396. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Afidopyropen; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 12842-01-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1397. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Major Capital Investment Projects" (RIN2132-AB55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1398. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order

13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1399. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel, General Law and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Financial Institutions, Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1400. A communication from the Manager of Delisting and Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of Roanoke Loggerch From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (RIN1018-BH61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1401. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative False Claims Act of 2023" (RIN3150-AL31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1402. A communication from the Assistant for Legislative Affairs, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Implementing NEPA; Processing of Department of the Army Permits" (RIN0710-AB20) received in the office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1403. A communication from the Assistant for Legislative Affairs, Army Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Implementing NEPA; Removal" (RIN0710-AB28) received in the office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1404. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities; CCR Management Unit Deadline Extension Rule" (RIN2050-AH36) (FRL No. 7814.2-02-OLEM) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1405. A communication from the Acting President and Chairman, Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Kazakhstan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1406. 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; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan for the Liberty-Clairton Area for the 1997 Annual and 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard and Maintenance Plan for the Allegheny County Area for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 10536-02-R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1407. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection

Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (23-3.5e); Correction" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 11825-03-OCSP)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1408. 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; Maryland; Nitrogen Oxides Ozone Season Emissions Caps for Non-Trading Large Nitrogen Oxides Units; Amendments" (FRL No. 12099-02-R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1409. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (24-2.5e); Correction" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 12348-03-OCSP)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1410. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Final Determination to Stay or Defer Sanctions; California; Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 12877-01-R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1411. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director of Offshore Regulatory Programs, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Correcting amendment; Final rule: Bonding Requirements when Filing an Appeal of a Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement Civil Penalty" (RIN1014-AA57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1412. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Critical Infrastructure Protection Reliability Standard CIP-015-1 - Cyber Security - Internal Network Security Monitoring" ((RIN1902-AG23) (Docket No. RM24-7-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1413. A communication from the Regional Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA-172-FOR]" (30 CFR Part 938) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1414. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Ruling: Withholding and Reporting With Respect to Uncashed Retirement Plan Distribution Checks (and Subsequent Checks)" (Rev. Rul. 2025-15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1415. 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 "Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological and Ethnological Material of India" (RIN1685-AA33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1416. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel, General Law and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Tax Policy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1417. A communication from the Regional Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustments" ((RIN1029-AC97) (Docket ID OSM-2025-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1418. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Gross Proceeds Reporting by Brokers that Regularly Provide Services Effectuating Digital Asset Sales" (RIN1545-BR39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 28, 2025; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1419. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to nominations, vacancies, designation of service in acting roles, discontinuation of service in an acting role and an action on nomination for positions covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 289. A bill to ban the sale of products with a high concentration of sodium nitrate to individuals, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-49).

By Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment:

S. 389. A bill to establish consumer standards for lithium-ion batteries (Rept. No. 119-50).

By Mr. COTTON, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Report to accompany S. 2342, An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-51).

By Ms. ERNST, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1555. A bill to increase loan limits for loans made to small manufacturers, and for other purposes.

By Ms. ERNST, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 1703. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to improve access to disaster assistance for individuals located in rural areas, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Frank M. Bradley, to be Admiral.

*Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Dagvin R.M. Anderson, to be General.

*Navy nomination of Adm. Daryl L. Caudle, to be Admiral.

Army nomination of Col. Woodrow D. Miner, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Maj. Gen. David J. Bligh, to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

*Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Stephen L. Davis, to be General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Wendy S. Armijo and ending with Col. Manuel A. ColonDeJesus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 15, 2025.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Travis T. Boltjes and ending with Col. Anthony J. Pasquale, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 15, 2025.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. David M. Hodne, to be General.

*Army nominations beginning with Maj. Gen. Marcus S. Evans and ending with Brig. Gen. Max E. Pearson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 15, 2025.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Wilkem D. Mollfulleda and ending with Col. Christopher J. Niewind, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 15, 2025.

*Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. Jeffrey J. Czerewko and ending with Maj. Gen. Christian F. Wortman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 15, 2025.

*Space Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Shawn N. Bratton, to be General.

*Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Michael J. Borgschulte, to be Lieutenant General.

*Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Yvette M. Davids, to be Vice Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Jennifer Hammerstedt, to be Major General.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Anthony J. Aceto and ending with Eric M. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 28, 2025.

Air Force nomination of Ben M. Rudolphi, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Lane M. Kemp, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Allen E. Elshire, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Theodore A. Ornelas, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of John D. Rossi, to be Major.

Army nomination of Clayton T. Manning, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tok H. Kim, to be Major.

Army nomination of Sara B. Mullaney, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Marisol A. Chalas, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Amir Soofi, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Mitchell J. Akey and ending with Jordan M. Yee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2025.

Army nominations beginning with Zachary C. Affrin and ending with 0003230212, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2025.

Army nomination of Jeffrey A. Paul, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Thomas W. Carey, to be Colonel.

Navy nomination of David J. Vandyke, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of John H. Ross, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Jake L. Brosnan and ending with Stephanie A. Ramirez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2025.

Navy nominations beginning with Dustin L. Boeding and ending with Leslie H. Wallace, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 9, 2025.

Navy nominations beginning with Caroline T. Cahill and ending with Alex M. Hendon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 21, 2025.

Space Force nomination of Robert L. Bond, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Space Force nomination of Tenaugrie S. Redley, to be Major.

*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. Kaine (for himself and Mr. Kim):

S. 2490. A bill to improve the Long-Term Care Ombudsman program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. Marshall):

S. 2491. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the regulatory review process to determine the safety and effectiveness of nonprescription drugs intended for topical administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. Young):

S. 2492. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to examine the ability of the Federal Government to respond to potential fiscal shocks, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. Murphy):

S. 2493. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve matters relating to medical examinations for veterans disability compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 2494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to hiring veterans who are receiving educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or Defense; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GALLEGOS (for himself and Mr. Justice):

S. 2495. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 2496. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for continuous eligibility for certain children under the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. Marshall):

S. 2497. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require a separate identification number and an attestation for each off-campus outpatient department of a provider; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. Budd):

S. 2498. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to extend certain leases within units of the National Park System without opening the lease to bidding; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. Cruz):

S. 2499. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to strike a provision relating to earnings on balances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. Booker, Mr. Whitehouse, Mr. Wyden, and Mr. Van Hollen):

S. 2500. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to include as a high-priority research and extension area research on microplastics in land-applied biosolids on farmland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. Boozman, and Mr. King):

S. 2501. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Veterans Scam and Fraud Evasion Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 2502. A bill to deny entry into the United States of current or former government officials engaged in the forced repatriation of Uyghurs and other designated aliens to the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. SHEEHY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2503. A bill to require all aircraft to be equipped with Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast In, to improve aviation safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. KING):

S. 2504. A bill to require that certain agencies only procure cut flowers and cut greens grown in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 2505. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to clarify the requisite timeline for making a decision on the approval or disapproval of a State underground injection control program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BOOZEMAN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2506. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish and carry out a program to enable the rapid development, testing, and scalable manufacture of small unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2507. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2508. A bill to give effect to a final rule of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration relating to gas pipeline leak detection and repair, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 2509. A bill to ensure that parents are aware of foreign influence in their child's public school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2510. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require training on increasing contract awards to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. ERNST, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 2511. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2512. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to remove certain eligibility disqualifications that restrict otherwise eligible students from participating in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 2513. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to transparency and reporting regarding over-the-counter drug monograph activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms.

SLOTKIN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. FETTERMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2514. A bill to authorize appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. KING, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2515. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to limit the authority of corporations to establish and operate separate segregated funds utilized for political purposes, including the establishment or operation of a political committee, to nonprofit corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. 2516. A bill to prohibit the National Education Association from engaging in lobbying activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2517. A bill to impose criminal penalties for camping on public property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2518. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise payment for air ambulance services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2519. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the inclusion of medical debt on a consumer report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2520. A bill to establish a State rail formula grant program, to direct Federal Railroad Administration to create a Green Railroads Fund, to expand passenger rail programs, to address air quality concerns, to establish rail workforce training centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2521. A bill to allow participants in the National Health Service Corps to defer their

obligated service in order to receive training in palliative care services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2522. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate the use of cell-site simulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr.

WARNOCK, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. KELLY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. ALSOBROOKS):

S. 2523. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mrs. MUR-

RAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2524. A bill to amend Public Law 119-21 to repeal the prohibition on making payments under the Medicaid program to certain entities; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2525. A bill to address transnational repression by foreign governments against private individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 2526. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the enlistment of certain aliens in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 2527. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to enhance protections for whistleblowers in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. KING):

S. 2528. A bill to establish AI Innovation Labs that permit certain persons to experiment with artificial intelligence without expectation of enforcement actions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. JOHN-SON):

S. Res. 340. A resolution designating July 30, 2025, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEG0:

S. Res. 341. A resolution reaffirming that immigration officers under the direction of the Department of Homeland Security are not authorized to arrest, detain, interrogate, or deport United States citizens and must implement stronger measures to prevent future wrongful enforcement actions against such citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 342. A resolution honoring the contributions of small manufacturers of firearms to the economy, culture, and recreational heritage of the United States and recognizing August 2025 as “National Shooting Sports Month”; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 343. A resolution recognizing the important work of the United States Preventive Services Task Force; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 344. A resolution observing the 20th anniversary of the date on which Hurricane Katrina devastated the Gulf Coast and recognizing the progress of efforts to rebuild the affected Gulf Coast region; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 345. A resolution congratulating the Oklahoma City Thunder on winning the 2025 National Basketball Association Finals; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 94

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 94, a bill to award 3 Congressional Gold Medals to the members of the 1980 United States Olympic Men's Ice Hockey Team, in recognition of their extraordinary achievement at the XIII Olympic Winter Games where, being comprised of amateur collegiate players, they defeated the dominant Soviet ice hockey team in the historic “Miracle on Ice”, revitalizing morale in the United States at the height of the Cold War, inspiring generations, and trans-

forming the sport of ice hockey in the United States.

S. 138

At the request of Mr. SHEEHY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 138, a bill to require each enterprise to include on the Uniform Residential Loan Application a disclaimer to increase awareness of the direct and guaranteed home loan programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 237

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 237, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide public safety officer benefits for exposure-related cancers, and for other purposes.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Florida (Mrs. MOODY) were added as cosponsors of S. 269, a bill to improve coordination between Federal and State agencies and the Do Not Pay working system.

S. 332

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) 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 Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) 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. 539

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to reauthorize the PROTECT Our Children Act of 2008, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the mileage rate offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs through their Beneficiary Travel program for health related travel, and for other purposes.

S. 726

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 726, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 1318

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms.

HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to direct the American Battle Monuments Commission to establish a program to identify American-Jewish servicemembers buried in United States military cemeteries overseas under markers that incorrectly represent their religion and heritage, and for other purposes.

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to nonprofit entities to assist such entities in carrying out programs to provide service dogs to eligible veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1528

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to ensure that businesses and organizations that work with vulnerable populations are able to request background checks for their contractors who work with those populations, as well as for individuals that the businesses or organizations license or certify to provide care for those populations.

S. 1538

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1538, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to expand and improve the enforcement capabilities of the Attorney General, and for other purposes.

S. 1547

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1547, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to reauthorize the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1644

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1644, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish improvements and structural alterations as part of home health services for disabled veterans.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1728, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to expand the membership of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans to include representatives of employee ownership organiza-

S. 1756

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1892

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1892, a bill to clarify that amounts from declinations should be deposited in the Crime Victims Fund and to temporarily provide additional deposits into the Crime Victims Fund.

S. 2071

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2071, a bill to provide Medicaid assistance to individuals and families affected by a disaster or emergency, and for other purposes.

S. 2130

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2130, a bill to make improvements to the AUKUS partnership, and for other purposes.

S. 2180

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2180, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for violations of the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex (LGBTQI) individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2195

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2195, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the brave women who served in World War II as members of the U.S. Army Nurse Corps and U.S. Navy Nurse Corps.

S. 2196

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2196, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to define intimate partner to include someone with whom there is or was a dating relationship, and for other purposes.

S. 2240

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2240, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand authorities for intergovernmental support agreements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 2252

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 2252, a bill to require United States foreign assistance commodities to be made available for their intended purposes before they expire.

S. 2292

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2292, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user fee program for over-the-counter monograph drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 2298

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2298, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to promulgate an occupational safety and health standard to protect workers from heat-related injuries and illnesses.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2308, a bill to amend the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to collect a surcharge from international visitors to units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to support the recruitment and retention of paraprofessionals in public elementary schools, secondary schools, and preschool programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2337

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2337, a bill to establish a grant program to provide child care services for the minor children of law enforcement officers to accommodate the shift work and nontraditional work hours of such officers, and to enhance recruitment and retention of such officers.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2372, a bill to ensure accessibility of drugs furnished through the drug discount program under section 340B of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2398

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL)

and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2398, a bill to reauthorize the Kay Hagan Tick Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2442

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2442, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide support for organic dairy producers and processors, and for other purposes.

S. 2447

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2447, a bill to repeal changes to Medicaid cost sharing requirements and the exclusion for orphan drugs under the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program.

S.J. RES. 34

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 34, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. RES. 41

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 41, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export of certain defense articles to Israel.

S.J. RES. 69

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 69, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to "Record of Decision for the Barred Owl Management Strategy; Washington, Oregon, and California".

S.J. RES. 70

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 70, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export of certain defense articles to Israel.

AMENDMENT NO. 2963

At the request of Mrs. MOODY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2963 intended to be proposed to S. 2296, an original bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2968

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and the

Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2968 intended to be proposed to S. 2296, an original bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2969

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2969 intended to be proposed to S. 2296, an original bill 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2972

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2972 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3944, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2974

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2974 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3944, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3019

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3019 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3944, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. REED, Mr. KIM, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr.

OSSOFF, Mr. KELLY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. ALSOBROOKS):

S. 2523. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2523

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2025”.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

SEC. 101. VOTE DILUTION, DENIAL, AND ABRIDGMENT CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after “applied by any State or political subdivision” the following: “for the purpose of, or”; and

(2) by striking “as provided in subsection (b), (c), (d), or (e)”.

(b) VOTE DILUTION.—Section 2 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10301), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

“(b) A violation of subsection (a) for vote dilution is established if, based on the totality of circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice. The extent to which members of a protected class have been elected to office in the State or political subdivision is one circumstance which may be considered: *Provided*, That nothing in this section establishes a right to have members of a protected class elected in numbers equal to their proportion in the population. The legal standard articulated in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986), governs claims under this subsection. For purposes of this subsection a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) may include a cohesive coalition of members of different racial or language minority groups.”.

(c) VOTE DENIAL OR ABRIDGEMENT.—Section 2 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10301), as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c)(1) A violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment is established if the challenged standard, practice, or procedure imposes a discriminatory burden on members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a), meaning that—

“(A) members of the protected class face greater difficulty in complying with the standard, practice, or procedure, considering the totality of the circumstances; and

“(B) such greater difficulty is, at least in part, caused by or linked to social and his-

torical conditions that have produced or currently produce discrimination against members of the protected class.

“(2) The challenged standard, practice, or procedure need only be a but-for cause of the discriminatory burden or perpetuate a pre-existing discriminatory burden.

“(3)(A) The totality of the circumstances for consideration relative to a violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment shall include the following factors, which, individually and collectively, show how a voting standard, practice, or procedure can function to amplify the effects of past or present racial discrimination:

“(i) The history of official voting-related discrimination in the State or political subdivision.

“(ii) The extent to which voting in the elections of the State or political subdivision is racially polarized.

“(iii) The extent to which the State or political subdivision has used unduly burdensome photographic voter identification requirements, documentary proof of citizenship requirements, documentary proof of residence requirements, or other voting standards, practices, or procedures beyond those required by Federal law that may impair the ability of members of the protected class to participate fully in the political process.

“(iv) The extent to which members of the protected class bear the effects of discrimination in areas such as education, employment, and health, which hinder the ability of those members to participate effectively in the political process.

“(v) The use of overt or subtle racial appeals either in political campaigns or surrounding the adoption or maintenance of the challenged standard, practice, or procedure.

“(vi) The extent to which members of the protected class have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction, except that the fact that the protected class is too small to elect candidates of its choice shall not defeat a claim of vote denial or abridgment under this section.

“(vii) Whether there is a lack of responsiveness on the part of elected officials to the particularized needs of members of the protected class.

“(viii) Whether the policy underlying the State or political subdivision’s use of the challenged qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure has a tenuous connection to that qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure.

“(B) A particular combination or number of factors under subparagraph (A) shall not be required to establish a violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment.

“(C) The totality of the circumstances for consideration relative to a violation of subsection (a) for vote denial or abridgment shall not include the following factors:

“(i) The total number or share of members of a protected class on whom a challenged standard, practice, or procedure does not impose a material burden.

“(ii) The degree to which the challenged standard, practice, or procedure has a long pedigree or was in widespread use at some earlier date.

“(iii) The use of an identical or similar standard, practice, or procedure in other States or political subdivisions.

“(iv) The availability of other forms of voting unimpacted by the challenged standard, practice, or procedure to all members of the electorate, including members of the protected class, unless the State or political subdivision is simultaneously expanding those other standards, practices, or procedures to eliminate any disproportionate burden imposed by the challenged standard, practice, or procedure.

“(v) A prophylactic impact on potential criminal activity by individual voters, if such crimes have not occurred in the State or political subdivision in substantial numbers.”

“(vi) Mere invocation of interests in voter confidence or prevention of fraud.”.

(d) INTENDED VOTE DILUTION OR VOTE DENIAL OR ABRIDGMENT.—Section 2 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10301), as amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) A violation of subsection (a) is also established if a challenged qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure is intended, at least in part, to dilute the voting strength of a protected class or to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2).

“(2) Discrimination on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2), need only be one purpose of a qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in order to establish a violation of subsection (a), as described in this subsection. A qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure intended to dilute the voting strength of a protected class or to make it more difficult for members of a protected class to cast a ballot that will be counted constitutes a violation of subsection (a), as described in this subsection, even if an additional purpose of the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure is to benefit a particular political party or group.

“(3) Recent context, including actions by official decisionmakers in prior years or in other contexts preceding the decision responsible for the challenged qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure, and including actions by predecessor government actors or individual members of a decisionmaking body, may be relevant to making a determination about a violation of subsection (a), as described under this subsection.

“(4) A claim that a violation of subsection (a) has occurred, as described under this subsection, shall require proof of a discriminatory impact but shall not require proof of violation of subsection (b) or (c).”.

SEC. 102. RETROGRESSION.

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), as amended by section 101 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) A violation of subsection (a) is established when a State or political subdivision enacts or seeks to administer any qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting in any election that has the purpose of or will have the effect of diminishing the ability of any citizens of the United States on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2), to participate in the electoral process or elect their preferred candidates of choice. This subsection applies to any action taken on or after January 1, 2021, by a State or political subdivision to enact or seek to administer any such qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice or procedure.

“(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (e), final decisions of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia on applications or petitions by States or political subdivisions for preclearance under section 5 of any changes in voting prerequisites, standards, practices, or procedures, supersede the provisions of subsection (e).”.

SEC. 103. VIOLATIONS TRIGGERING AUTHORITY OF COURT TO RETAIN JURISDICTION.

(a) TYPES OF VIOLATIONS.—Section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) is amended by striking “violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment” and inserting “violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10302(a)) is amended by striking “violations of the fourteenth or fifteenth amendment” and inserting “violations of the 14th or 15th Amendment, violations of this Act, or violations of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination in voting on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group.”.

SEC. 104. CRITERIA FOR COVERAGE OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.

(a) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO SECTION 4(a).—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10303(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) EXISTENCE OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS DURING PREVIOUS 25 YEARS.—

“(A) STATEWIDE APPLICATION.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a State and all political subdivisions within the State during a calendar year if—

“(i) fifteen or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years; or

“(ii) ten or more voting rights violations occurred in the State during the previous 25 calendar years, at least one of which was committed by the State itself (as opposed to a political subdivision within the State).

“(B) APPLICATION TO SPECIFIC POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a political subdivision as a separate unit during a calendar year if three or more voting rights violations occurred in the subdivision during the previous 25 calendar years.

“(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if, pursuant to paragraph (1), subsection (a) applies with respect to a State or political subdivision during a calendar year, subsection (a) shall apply with respect to such State or political subdivision for the period—

“(i) that begins on January 1 of the year in which subsection (a) applies; and

“(ii) that ends on the date which is 10 years after the date described in clause (i).

“(B) NO FURTHER APPLICATION AFTER DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—

“(1) STATES.—If a State obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such State and all political subdivisions in the State pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(A) applies to the State solely on the basis of voting rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

“(ii) POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.—If a political subdivision obtains a declaratory judgment under subsection (a), and the judgment remains in effect, subsection (a) shall no longer apply to such political subdivision pursuant to paragraph (1), including pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) (relating to the statewide application of subsection (a)), unless, after the issuance of the declaratory judgment, paragraph (1)(B) applies to the political subdivision solely on the basis of vot-

ing rights violations occurring after the issuance of the declaratory judgment.

“(3) DETERMINATION OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a voting rights violation occurred in a State or political subdivision if any of the following applies:

“(A) JUDICIAL RELIEF; VIOLATION OF THE 14TH OR 15TH AMENDMENT.—Any final judgment (that was not reversed on appeal) occurred, in which the plaintiff prevailed and in which any court of the United States determined that a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group occurred, or that a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting created an undue burden on the right to vote in connection with a claim that the law unduly burdened voters of a particular race, color, or language minority group, in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, anywhere within the State or subdivision.

“(B) JUDICIAL RELIEF; VIOLATIONS OF THIS ACT.—Any final judgment (that was not reversed on appeal) occurred in which the plaintiff prevailed and in which any court of the United States determined that a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting was imposed or applied or would have been imposed or applied anywhere within the State or subdivision in a manner that resulted or would have resulted in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, in violation of subsection (e) or (f) or section 2, 201, or 203.

“(C) FINAL JUDGMENT; DENIAL OF DECLARATORY JUDGMENT.—In a final judgment (that was not been reversed on appeal), any court of the United States has denied the request of the State or subdivision for a declaratory judgment under section 3(c) or section 5, and thereby prevented a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting from being enforced anywhere within the State or subdivision.

“(D) OBJECTION BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The Attorney General has interposed an objection under section 3(c) or section 5, and thereby prevented a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting from being enforced anywhere within the State or subdivision. A violation under this subparagraph has not occurred where an objection has been withdrawn by the Attorney General, unless the withdrawal was in response to a change in the law or practice that served as the basis of the objection. A violation under this subparagraph has not occurred where the objection is based solely on a State or political subdivision's failure to comply with a procedural process that would not otherwise count as an independent violation of this Act.

“(E) CONSENT DECREE, SETTLEMENT, OR OTHER AGREEMENT.—

“(i) AGREEMENT.—A consent decree, settlement, or other agreement was adopted or entered by a court of the United States that contains an admission of liability by the defendants, which resulted in the alteration or abandonment of a voting practice anywhere in the territory of such State or subdivision that was challenged on the ground that the practice denied or abridged the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of subsection (e) or (f) or section 2, 201, or 203, or the 14th or 15th Amendment.

“(ii) INDEPENDENT VIOLATIONS.—A voluntary extension or continuation of a consent decree, settlement, or agreement described in clause (i) shall not count as an independent violation under this subparagraph. Any other extension or modification of such a consent decree, settlement, or agreement, if the consent decree, settlement, or agreement has been in place for ten years or longer, shall count as an independent violation under this subparagraph. If a court of the United States finds that a consent decree, settlement, or agreement described in clause (i) itself denied or abridged the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, violated subsection (e) or (f) or section 2, 201, or 203, or created an undue burden on the right to vote in connection with a claim that the consent decree, settlement, or other agreement unduly burdened voters of a particular race, color, or language minority group, that finding shall count as an independent violation under this subparagraph.

“(F) MULTIPLE VIOLATIONS.—Each instance in which a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, including each redistricting plan, is found to be a violation by a court of the United States pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B), or prevented from being enforced pursuant to subparagraph (C) or (D), or altered or abandoned pursuant to subparagraph (E) shall count as an independent violation under this paragraph. Within a redistricting plan, each violation under this paragraph found to discriminate against any group of voters based on race, color, or language minority group shall count as an independent violation under this paragraph.

“(4) TIMING OF DETERMINATIONS.—

“(A) DETERMINATIONS OF VOTING RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.—As early as practicable during each calendar year, the Attorney General shall make the determinations required by this subsection, including updating the list of voting rights violations occurring in each State and political subdivision for the previous calendar year.

“(B) EFFECTIVE UPON PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.—A determination or certification of the Attorney General under this section or under section 8 or 13 shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the first sentence of the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “any State with respect to which” and all that follows through “unless” and inserting “any State to which this subsection applies during a calendar year pursuant to determinations made under subsection (b), or in any political subdivision of such State (as such subdivision existed on the date such determinations were made with respect to such State), though such determinations were not made with respect to such subdivision as a separate unit, or in any political subdivision with respect to which this subsection applies during a calendar year pursuant to determinations made with respect to such subdivision as a separate unit under subsection (b), unless”;

(B) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking the second sentence;

(C) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking “(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)”;

(D) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)”;

(E) in paragraph (3), by striking “(in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)”;

(F) in paragraph (5), by striking “(in the case of a State or subdivision which sought a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection)”;

(G) by striking paragraphs (7) and (8); and

(H) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (7).

(b) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—Section 4(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(a)(1)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended, in the first sentence, by striking “race or color,” and inserting “race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2).”.

(c) FACILITATING BALLOT.—Section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10303(a)), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1)(C) and redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (F) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively;

(2) by inserting at the beginning of paragraph (7), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)(H), the following: “Any plaintiff seeking a declaratory judgment under this subsection on the grounds that the plaintiff meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may request that the Attorney General consent to entry of judgment.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) If a political subdivision is subject to the application of this subsection, due to the applicability of subsection (b)(1)(A), the political subdivision may seek a declaratory judgment under this section if the subdivision demonstrates that the subdivision meets the criteria established by the subparagraphs of paragraph (1), for the 10 years preceding the date on which subsection (a) applied to the political subdivision under subsection (b)(1)(A).

“(9) If a political subdivision was not subject to the application of this subsection by reason of a declaratory judgment entered prior to the date of enactment of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2025, and is not, subsequent to that date of enactment, subject to the application of this subsection under subsection (b)(1)(B), then that political subdivision shall not be subject to the requirements of this subsection.”.

SEC. 105. DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE FOR COVERED PRACTICES.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) is further amended by inserting after section 4 the following:

“SEC. 4A. DETERMINATION OF STATES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE FOR COVERED PRACTICES.

“(a) PRACTICE-BASED PRECLEARANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State and each political subdivision shall—

“(A) identify any newly enacted or adopted law, regulation, or policy that includes a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or a standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, that is a covered practice described in subsection (b); and

“(B) ensure that no such covered practice is implemented unless or until the State or political subdivision, as the case may be, complies with subsection (c).

“(2) DETERMINATIONS OF CHARACTERISTICS OF VOTING-AGE POPULATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—As early as practicable during each calendar year, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Census and the heads of other relevant offices of the government, shall make the determinations required by

this section regarding voting-age populations and the characteristics of such populations, and shall publish a list of the States and political subdivisions to which a voting-age population characteristic described in subsection (b) applies.

“(B) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—A determination (including a certification) of the Attorney General under this paragraph shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

“(b) COVERED PRACTICES.—To assure that the right of citizens of the United States to vote is not denied or abridged on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group as a result of the implementation of certain qualifications or prerequisites to voting, or standards, practices, or procedures with respect to voting, newly adopted in a State or political subdivision, the following shall be covered practices subject to the requirements described in subsection (a):

“(1) CHANGES TO METHOD OF ELECTION.—Any change to the method of election—

“(A) to add seats elected at-large in a State or political subdivision where—

“(i) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population in the State or political subdivision, respectively; or

“(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the State or political subdivision; or

“(B) to convert one or more seats elected from a single-member district to one or more at-large seats or seats from a multi-member district in a State or political subdivision where—

“(i) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population in the State or political subdivision, respectively; or

“(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the State or political subdivision.

“(2) CHANGES TO POLITICAL SUBDIVISION BOUNDARIES.—Any change or series of changes within a year to the boundaries of a political subdivision that reduces by 3 or more percentage points the percentage of the political subdivision's voting-age population that is comprised of members of a single racial group or language minority group in the political subdivision where—

“(A) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the political subdivision's voting-age population; or

“(B) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision.

“(3) CHANGES THROUGH REDISTRICTING.—Any change to the boundaries of districts for Federal, State, or local elections in a State or political subdivision where any racial group or language minority group that is not the largest racial group or language minority group in the jurisdiction and that represents 15 percent or more of the State or political subdivision's voting-age population experiences a population increase of at least 20 percent of its voting-age population, over the preceding decade (as calculated by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census), in the jurisdiction.

“(4) CHANGES IN DOCUMENTATION OR QUALIFICATIONS TO VOTE.—Any change to requirements for documentation or proof of identity to vote or register to vote in elections for

Federal, State, or local offices that will exceed or be more stringent than such requirements under State law on the day before the date of enactment of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2025.

“(5) CHANGES TO MULTILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.—Any change that reduces multilingual voting materials or alters the manner in which such materials are provided or distributed, where no similar reduction or alteration occurs in materials provided in English for such election.

“(6) CHANGES THAT REDUCE, CONSOLIDATE, OR RELOCATE VOTING LOCATIONS, OR REDUCE VOTING OPPORTUNITIES.—Any change that reduces, consolidates, or relocates voting locations in elections for Federal, State, or local office, including early, absentee, and election-day voting locations, or reduces days or hours of in-person voting on any Sunday during a period occurring prior to the date of an election for Federal, State, or local office during which voters may cast ballots in such election, or prohibits the provision of food or non-alcoholic drink to persons waiting to vote in an election for Federal, State, or local office, except where the provision would violate prohibitions on expenditures to influence voting, if the location change, reduction in days or hours, or prohibition applies—

“(A) in one or more census tracts in which two or more language minority groups or racial groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population; or

“(B) on Indian lands in which at least 20 percent of the voting-age population belongs to a single language minority group.

“(7) NEW LIST MAINTENANCE PROCESS.—Any change to the maintenance process for voter registration lists that adds a new basis for removal from the list of active voters registered to vote in elections for Federal, State, or local office, or that incorporates new sources of information in determining a voter's eligibility to vote in elections for Federal, State, or local office, if such a change would have a statistically significant disparate impact, concerning the removal from voter rolls, on members of racial groups or language minority groups that constitute greater than 5 percent of the voting-age population—

“(A) in the case of a political subdivision imposing such change if—

“(i) two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population of the political subdivision; or

“(ii) a single language minority group represents 20 percent or more of the voting-age population on Indian lands located in whole or in part in the political subdivision; or

“(B) in the case of a State imposing such change, if two or more racial groups or language minority groups each represent 20 percent or more of the voting-age population of—

“(i) the State; or

“(ii) a political subdivision in the State, except that the requirements under subsections (a) and (c) shall apply only with respect to each such political subdivision individually.

“(c) PRECLEARANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) ACTION.—Whenever a State or political subdivision with respect to which the requirements set forth in subsection (a) are in effect shall enact, adopt, or seek to implement any covered practice described under subsection (b), such State or subdivision may institute an action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment that such covered practice neither has the purpose nor will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race, color, or

membership in a language minority group, and unless and until the court enters such judgment such covered practice shall not be implemented.

“(B) SUBMISSION TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), such covered practice may be implemented without such proceeding if the covered practice has been submitted by the chief legal officer or other appropriate official of such State or subdivision to the Attorney General and the Attorney General has not interposed an objection within 60 days after such submission, or upon good cause shown, to facilitate an expedited approval within 60 days after such submission, the Attorney General has affirmatively indicated that such objection will not be made. For purposes of determining whether expedited consideration of approval is required under this subparagraph or section 5(a), an exigency such as a natural disaster, that requires a change in a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting during the period of 30 days before a Federal election, shall be considered to be good cause requiring that expedited consideration.

“(ii) EFFECT OF INDICATION.—Neither an affirmative indication by the Attorney General that no objection will be made, nor the Attorney General's failure to object, nor a declaratory judgment entered under this subsection shall bar a subsequent action to enjoin implementation of such covered practice. In the event the Attorney General affirmatively indicates that no objection will be made within the 60-day period following receipt of a submission, the Attorney General may reserve the right to reexamine the submission if additional information comes to the Attorney General's attention during the remainder of the 60-day period which would otherwise require objection in accordance with this subsection.

“(C) COURT.—Any action under this subsection shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges in accordance with the provisions of section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, and any appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court.

“(2) DENYING OR ABRIDGING THE RIGHT TO VOTE.—Any covered practice described in subsection (b) that has the purpose of or will have the effect of diminishing the ability of any citizens of the United States on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, to elect their preferred candidates of choice denies or abridges the right to vote within the meaning of paragraph (1).

“(3) PURPOSE DEFINED.—The term ‘purpose’ in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall include any discriminatory purpose.

“(4) PURPOSE OF PARAGRAPH (2).—The purpose of paragraph (2) is to protect the ability of such citizens to elect their preferred candidates of choice.

“(d) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General or any aggrieved citizen may file an action in a district court of the United States to compel any State or political subdivision to satisfy the obligations set forth in this section. Such an action shall be heard and determined by a court of three judges under section 2284 of title 28, United States Code. In any such action, the court shall provide as a remedy that implementation of any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, that is the subject of the action under this subsection be enjoined unless the court determines that—

“(1) the voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, is not a covered practice described in subsection (b); or

“(2) the State or political subdivision has complied with subsection (c) with respect to the covered practice at issue.

“(e) COUNTING OF RACIAL GROUPS AND LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—For purposes of this section, the calculation of the population of a racial group or a language minority group shall be carried out using the methodology in the guidance of the Department of Justice entitled ‘Guidance Concerning Redistricting Under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act; Notice’ (76 Fed. Reg. 7470 (February 9, 2011)).

“(f) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of determinations under this section, any data provided by the Bureau of the Census, whether based on estimation from a sample or actual enumeration, shall not be subject to challenge or review in any court.

“(g) MULTILINGUAL VOTING MATERIALS.—In this section, the term ‘multilingual voting materials’ means registration or voting notices, forms, instructions, assistance, or other materials or information relating to the electoral process, including ballots, provided in the language or languages of one or more language minority groups.”

SEC. 106. PROMOTING TRANSPARENCY TO ENFORCE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT.

(a) TRANSPARENCY.—The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 5 the following:

“SEC. 6. TRANSPARENCY REGARDING CHANGES TO PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS.

“(a) NOTICE OF ENACTED CHANGES.—

“(1) NOTICE OF CHANGES.—If a State or political subdivision makes any change in any qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting in any election for Federal office that will result in the qualification or prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure being different from that which was in effect as of 180 days before the date of the election for Federal office, the State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of the State or political subdivision, of a concise description of the change, including the difference between the changed qualification or prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure and the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure which was previously in effect. The public notice described in this paragraph, in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

“(2) DEADLINE FOR NOTICE.—A State or political subdivision shall provide the public notice required under paragraph (1) not later than 48 hours after making the change involved.

“(b) TRANSPARENCY REGARDING POLLING PLACE RESOURCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to identify any changes that may impact the right to vote of any person, prior to the 30th day before the date of an election for Federal office, each State or political subdivision with responsibility for allocating registered voters, voting machines, and official poll workers to particular precincts and polling places shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, of the information described in paragraph (2) for precincts and polling places within such State or political subdivision. The public notice described in this paragraph, in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

“(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph with respect to a precinct or polling place is each of the following:

“(A) The name or number.

“(B) In the case of a polling place, the location, including the street address, and whether such polling place is accessible to persons with disabilities.

“(C) The voting-age population of the area served by the precinct or polling place, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to such State or political subdivision.

“(D) The number of registered voters assigned to the precinct or polling place, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to such State or political subdivision.

“(E) The number of voting machines assigned, including the number of voting machines accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

“(F) The number of official paid poll workers assigned.

“(G) The number of official volunteer poll workers assigned.

“(H) In the case of a polling place, the dates and hours of operation.

“(3) UPDATES IN INFORMATION REPORTED.—If a State or political subdivision makes any change in any of the information described in paragraph (2), the State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, of the change in the information not later than 48 hours after the change occurs or, if the change occurs fewer than 48 hours before the date of the election for Federal office, as soon as practicable after the change occurs. The public notice described in this paragraph and published on the website of a State or political subdivision shall be in a format that is reasonably convenient and accessible to persons with disabilities who are eligible to vote, including persons who have low vision or are blind.

“(c) TRANSPARENCY OF CHANGES RELATING TO DEMOGRAPHICS AND ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.—

“(1) REQUIRING PUBLIC NOTICE OF CHANGES.—Not later than 10 days after making any change in the constituency that will participate in an election for Federal, State, or local office or the boundaries of a voting unit or electoral district in an election for Federal, State, or local office (including through redistricting, reapportionment, changing from at-large elections to district-based elections, or changing from district-based elections to at-large elections), a State or political subdivision shall provide reasonable public notice in such State or political subdivision and on the website of a State or political subdivision, of the demographic and electoral data described in paragraph (3) for each of the geographic areas described in paragraph (2).

“(2) GEOGRAPHIC AREAS DESCRIBED.—The geographic areas described in this paragraph are as follows:

“(A) The State as a whole, if the change applies statewide, or the political subdivision as a whole, if the change applies across the entire political subdivision.

“(B) If the change includes a plan to replace or eliminate voting units or electoral districts, each voting unit or electoral district that will be replaced or eliminated.

“(C) If the change includes a plan to establish new voting units or electoral districts, each such new voting unit or electoral district.

“(3) DEMOGRAPHIC AND ELECTORAL DATA.—The demographic and electoral data described in this paragraph with respect to a

geographic area described in paragraph (2) are each of the following:

“(A) The voting-age population, broken down by demographic group.

“(B) The number of registered voters, broken down by demographic group if such breakdown is reasonably available to the State or political subdivision involved.

“(C)(i) If the change applies to a State, the actual number of votes, or (if it is not reasonably practicable for the State to ascertain the actual number of votes) the estimated number of votes received by each candidate in each statewide election held during the 5-year period which ends on the date the change involved is made; and

“(ii) if the change applies to only one political subdivision, the actual number of votes, or (if it is not reasonably practicable for the political subdivision to ascertain the actual number of votes) the estimated number of votes in each subdivision-wide election held during the 5-year period which ends on the date the change involved is made.

“(4) VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE BY SMALLER JURISDICTIONS.—Compliance with this subsection shall be voluntary for a political subdivision of a State unless the subdivision is one of the following:

“(A) A county or parish.

“(B) A municipality with a population greater than 10,000, as determined by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census.

“(C) A school district with a population greater than 10,000, as determined by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census. For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘school district’ means the geographic area under the jurisdiction of a local educational agency (as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965).

“(d) RULES REGARDING FORMAT OF INFORMATION.—The Attorney General may issue rules specifying a reasonably convenient and accessible format that States and political subdivisions shall use to provide public notice of information under this section.

“(e) NO DENIAL OF RIGHT TO VOTE.—The right to vote of any person shall not be denied or abridged because the person failed to comply with any change made by a State or political subdivision to a voting qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure if the State or political subdivision involved did not meet the applicable requirements of this section with respect to the change.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘demographic group’ means each group which section 2 protects from the denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth in section 4(f)(2);

“(2) the term ‘election for Federal office’ means any general, special, primary, or runoff election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress; and

“(3) the term ‘persons with disabilities’ means individuals with a disability, as defined in section 3 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to changes which are made on or after the expiration of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 107. AUTHORITY TO ASSIGN OBSERVERS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY IN POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE.—Section 8(a)(2)(B) of the

Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10305(a)(2)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) in the Attorney General’s judgment, the assignment of observers is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 14th or 15th Amendment or any provision of this Act or any other Federal law protecting the right of citizens of the United States to vote; or”.

(b) ASSIGNMENT OF OBSERVERS TO ENFORCE BILINGUAL ELECTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 8(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10305(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) the Attorney General certifies with respect to a political subdivision that—

“(A) the Attorney General has received written meritorious complaints from residents, elected officials, or civic participation organizations that efforts to violate section 203 are likely to occur; or

“(B) in the Attorney General’s judgment, the assignment of observers is necessary to enforce the guarantees of section 203;” and

(3) by moving the margin for the continuation text following paragraph (3), as added by paragraph (2) of this subsection, 2 ems to the left.

(c) TRANSFERRAL OF AUTHORITY OVER OBSERVERS TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

(1) ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS.—Section 3(a) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(a)) is amended by striking “United States Civil Service Commission in accordance with section 6” and inserting “Attorney General in accordance with section 8”.

(2) OBSERVERS; APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—Section 8 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10305) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the flush matter at the end, by striking “Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall assign as many observers for such subdivision as the Director” and inserting “Attorney General shall assign as many observers for such subdivision as the Attorney General”; and

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “Director of the Office of Personnel Management” and inserting “Attorney General”; and

(C) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: “The Director of the Office of Personnel Management may, with the consent of the Attorney General, assist in the selection, recruitment, hiring, training, or deployment of these or other individuals authorized by the Attorney General for the purpose of observing whether persons who are entitled to vote are being permitted to vote and whether those votes are being properly tabulated.”

(3) TERMINATION OF CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS OF OBSERVERS.—Section 13(a)(1) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10309(a)(1)) is amended by striking “notifies the Director of the Office of Personnel Management,” and inserting “determines.”

SEC. 108. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO SEEK RELIEF.

(a) POLL TAX.—Section 10(b) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10306(b)) is amended by striking “the Attorney General is authorized and directed to institute forthwith in the name of the United States such actions,” and inserting “an aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute such actions”.

(b) CAUSE OF ACTION.—Section 12(d) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10308(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d)(1) Whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person has engaged in, or is about to engage in, any act or practice that would (1) deny any citizen the right to register, to cast a ballot, or to have

that ballot counted properly and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast in violation of the 14th, 15th, 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, (2) violate subsection (a) or (b) of section 11, or (3) violate any other provision of this Act or any other Federal voting rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group, an aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute an action for preventive relief, including an application for a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order, or other appropriate order. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to create a cause of action for civil enforcement of criminal provisions of this or any other Act.”.

(c) JUDICIAL RELIEF.—Section 204 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10504) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “Whenever there are reasonable grounds to believe that a State or political subdivision has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice prohibited by a provision of this title, an aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute an action in a district court of the United States, for a restraining order, a preliminary or permanent injunction, or such other order as may be appropriate.”.

(d) ENFORCEMENT OF TWENTY-SIXTH AMENDMENT.—Section 301(a)(1) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10701(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a)(1) An aggrieved person or (in the name of the United States) the Attorney General may institute an action in a district court of the United States, for a restraining order, a preliminary or permanent injunction, or such other order as may be appropriate to implement the 26th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.”.

SEC. 109. PREVENTIVE RELIEF.

Section 12(d) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10308(d)), as amended by section 108, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) In considering any motion for preliminary relief in any action for preventive relief described in this subsection, the court shall grant the relief if the court determines that the complainant has raised a serious question as to whether the challenged voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure violates any of the provisions listed in section 111(a)(1) of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2025 and, on balance, the hardship imposed on the defendant by the grant of the relief will be less than the hardship which would be imposed on the plaintiff if the relief were not granted.

“(B) In making its determination under this paragraph with respect to a change in any voting qualification, prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, the court shall consider all relevant factors and give due weight to the following factors, if they are present:

“(i) Whether the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in effect prior to the change was adopted as a remedy for a Federal court judgment, consent decree, or admission regarding—

“(I) discrimination on the basis of race or color in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

“(II) a violation of the 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

“(III) a violation of this Act; or

“(IV) voting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language mi-

nority group in violation of any other Federal or State law.

“(ii) Whether the qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure in effect prior to the change served as a ground for the dismissal or settlement of a claim alleging—

“(I) discrimination on the basis of race or color in violation of the 14th or 15th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

“(II) a violation of the 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

“(III) a violation of this Act; or

“(IV) voting discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in violation of any other Federal or State law.

“(iii) Whether the change was adopted fewer than 180 days before the date of the election with respect to which the change is to take or takes effect.

“(iv) Whether the defendant has failed to provide timely or complete notice of the adoption of the change as required by applicable Federal or State law.

“(3) A jurisdiction's inability to enforce its voting or election laws, regulations, policies, or redistricting plans, standing alone, shall not be deemed to constitute irreparable harm to the public interest or to the interests of a defendant in an action arising under the Constitution or any Federal law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or membership in a language minority group in the voting process, for the purposes of determining whether a stay of a court's order or an interlocutory appeal under section 1253 of title 28, United States Code, is warranted.”.

SEC. 110. BILINGUAL ELECTION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 203(b)(1) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10503(b)(1)) is amended by striking “2032” and inserting “2037”.

SEC. 111. RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF VOTING RIGHTS LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) RELIEF FOR VIOLATIONS OF VOTING RIGHTS LAWS.—In this section, the term “prohibited act or practice” means—

(A) any act or practice—

(i) that creates an undue burden on the fundamental right to vote in violation of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States or violates the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; or

(ii) that is prohibited by the 15th, 19th, 24th, or 26th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10101), the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.), the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.), the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.), the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (52 U.S.C. 20101 et seq.), or section 2003 of the Revised Statutes (52 U.S.C. 10102); and

(B) any act or practice in violation of any Federal law that prohibits discrimination with respect to voting, including the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to diminish the authority or scope of authority of any person to bring an action under any Federal law.

(3) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended by inserting “a provision described in section 111(a)(1) of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2025,” after “title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,”.

(b) GROUNDS FOR EQUITABLE RELIEF.—In any action for equitable relief pursuant to a law listed under subsection (a), proximity of the action to an election shall not be a valid reason to deny such relief, or stay the operation of or vacate the issuance of such relief, unless the party opposing the issuance or continued operation of relief meets the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the issuance of the relief would be so close in time to the election as to cause irreparable harm to the public interest or that compliance with such relief would impose serious burdens on the party opposing relief.

(1) IN GENERAL.—In considering whether to grant, deny, stay, or vacate any order of equitable relief, the court shall give substantial weight to the public's interest in expanding access to the right to vote. A State's generalized interest in enforcing its enacted laws shall not be a relevant consideration in determining whether equitable relief is warranted.

(2) PRESUMPTIVE SAFE HARBOR.—Where equitable relief is sought either within 30 days of the adoption or reasonable public notice of the challenged policy or practice, or more than 45 days before the date of an election to which the relief being sought will apply, proximity to the election will be presumed not to constitute a harm to the public interest or a burden on the party opposing relief.

(c) GROUNDS FOR STAY OR VACATUR IN FEDERAL CLAIMS INVOLVING VOTING RIGHTS.—

(1) PROSPECTIVE EFFECT.—In reviewing an application for a stay or vacatur of equitable relief granted pursuant to a law listed in subsection (a), a court shall give substantial weight to the reliance interests of citizens who acted pursuant to such order under review. In fashioning a stay or vacatur, a reviewing court shall not order relief that has the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote of any citizen who has acted in reliance on the order.

(2) WRITTEN EXPLANATION.—No stay or vacatur under this subsection shall issue unless the reviewing court makes specific findings that the public interest, including the public's interest in expanding access to the ballot, will be harmed by the continuing operation of the equitable relief or that compliance with such relief will impose serious burdens on the party seeking such a stay or vacatur such that those burdens substantially outweigh the benefits to the public interest. In reviewing an application for a stay or vacatur of equitable relief, findings of fact made in issuing the order under review shall not be set aside unless clearly erroneous.

SEC. 112. PROTECTION OF TABULATED VOTES.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10307) is amended—

(1) in section 11—

(A) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) No person acting under color of law shall—

“(1) fail or refuse to permit any person to vote who is entitled to vote under Federal law or is otherwise qualified to vote;

“(2) willfully fail or refuse to tabulate, count, and report such person's vote; or

“(3) willfully fail or refuse to certify the aggregate tabulations of such persons' votes or certify the election of the candidates receiving sufficient such votes to be elected to office.”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting “subsection (a) or” after “duties under”; and

(2) in section 12—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “a year following an election in a political subdivision in which an observer has been assigned” and inserting “22 months following an election for Federal office”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: "Whenever the Attorney General has reasonable grounds to believe that any person has engaged in or is about to engage in an act in violation of this subsection, the Attorney General may institute (in the name of the United States) a civil action in Federal district court seeking appropriate relief.";

(B) in subsection (c), by inserting "or solicits a violation of" after "conspires to violate"; and

(C) in subsection (e), by striking the first and second sentences and inserting the following: "If, after the closing of the polls in an election for Federal office, persons allege that notwithstanding (1) their registration by an appropriate election official and (2) their eligibility to vote in the political subdivision, their ballots have not been counted in such election, and if upon prompt receipt of notifications of these allegations, the Attorney General finds such allegations to be well founded, the Attorney General may forthwith file with the district court an application for an order providing for the counting and certification of the ballots of such persons and requiring the inclusion of their votes in the total vote for all applicable offices before the results of such election shall be deemed final and any force or effect given thereto.".

SEC. 113. ENFORCEMENT OF VOTING RIGHTS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Section 12 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10308), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) VOTING RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to fulfill the Attorney General's responsibility to enforce this Act and other Federal laws that protect the right to vote, the Attorney General (or upon designation by the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights) is authorized, before commencing a civil action, to issue a demand for inspection and information in writing to any State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, with respect to any relevant documentary material that the Attorney General has reason to believe is within their possession, custody, or control. A demand by the Attorney General under this subsection may require—

"(A) the production of such documentary material for inspection and copying;

"(B) answers in writing to written questions with respect to such documentary material; or

"(C) both the production described under subparagraph (A) and the answers described under subparagraph (B).

"(2) CONTENTS OF AN ATTORNEY GENERAL DEMAND.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Any demand issued under paragraph (1), shall include a sworn certificate to identify the voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting, or other voting related matter or issue, whose lawfulness the Attorney General is investigating and to identify the Federal law that protects the right to vote under which the investigation is being conducted. The demand shall be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of documentary material and information relevant to such investigation. Documentary material includes any material upon which relevant information is recorded, and includes written or printed materials, photographs, tapes, or materials upon which information is electronically or magnetically recorded. Such demands shall be aimed at the Attorney General having the ability to inspect and obtain copies of relevant materials (as well as obtain information) related to voting and are not aimed at

the Attorney General taking possession of original records, particularly those that are required to be retained by State and local election officials under Federal or State law.

"(B) NO REQUIREMENT FOR PRODUCTION.—Any demand issued under paragraph (1) may not require the production of any documentary material or the submission of any answers in writing to written questions if such material or answers would be protected from disclosure under the standards applicable to discovery requests under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in an action in which the Attorney General or the United States is a party.

"(C) DOCUMENTARY MATERIAL.—If the demand issued under paragraph (1) requires the production of documentary material, it shall—

"(i) identify the class of documentary material to be produced with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such material to be fairly identified; and

"(ii) prescribe a return date for production of the documentary material at least 20 days after issuance of the demand to give the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, a reasonable period of time for assembling the documentary material and making it available for inspection and copying.

"(D) ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS.—If the demand issued under paragraph (1) requires answers in writing to written questions, it shall—

"(i) set forth with specificity the written question to be answered; and

"(ii) prescribe a date at least 20 days after the issuance of the demand for submitting answers in writing to the written questions.

"(E) SERVICE.—A demand issued under paragraph (1) may be served by a United States marshal or a deputy marshal, or by certified mail, at any place within the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United States.

"(3) RESPONSES TO AN ATTORNEY GENERAL DEMAND.—A State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, shall, with respect to any documentary material or any answer in writing produced under this subsection, provide a sworn certificate, in such form as the demand issued under paragraph (1) designates, by a person having knowledge of the facts and circumstances relating to such production or written answer, authorized to act on behalf of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, upon which the demand was served. The certificate—

"(A) shall state that—

"(i) all of the documentary material required by the demand and in the possession, custody, or control of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, has been produced;

"(ii) with respect to every answer in writing to a written question, all information required by the question and in the possession, custody, control, or knowledge of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, has been submitted; or

"(iii) the requirements described in both clause (i) and clause (ii) have been met; or

"(B) provide the basis for any objection to producing the documentary material or answering the written question.

To the extent that any information is not furnished, the information shall be identified and reasons set forth with particularity regarding the reasons why the information was not furnished.

"(4) JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.—

"(A) PETITION FOR ENFORCEMENT.—Whenever any State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent,

fails to comply with demand issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1), the Attorney General may file, in a district court of the United States in which the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, is located, a petition for a judicial order enforcing the Attorney General demand issued under paragraph (1).

"(B) PETITION TO MODIFY.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Any State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, that is served with a demand issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) may file in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia a petition for an order of the court to modify or set aside the demand of the Attorney General.

"(ii) PETITION TO MODIFY.—Any petition to modify or set aside a demand of the Attorney General issued under paragraph (1) must be filed within 20 days after the date of service of the Attorney General's demand or at any time before the return date specified in the Attorney General's demand, whichever date is earlier.

"(iii) CONTENTS OF PETITION.—The petition shall specify each ground upon which the petitioner relies in seeking relief under clause (i), and may be based upon any failure of the Attorney General's demand to comply with the provisions of this section or upon any constitutional or other legal right or privilege of the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent. During the pendency of the petition in the court, the court may stay, as it deems proper, the running of the time allowed for compliance with the Attorney General's demand, in whole or in part, except that the State or political subdivision, or other governmental representative or agent, filing the petition shall comply with any portions of the Attorney General's demand not sought to be modified or set aside."

SEC. 114. DEFINITIONS.

Title I of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 21. DEFINITIONS.

"In this Act:

"(1) INDIAN.—The term 'Indian' has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

"(2) INDIAN LANDS.—The term 'Indian lands' means—

"(A) any Indian country of an Indian tribe, as such term is defined in section 1151 of title 18, United States Code;

"(B) any land in Alaska that is owned, pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, by an Indian tribe that is a Native village (as such term is defined in section 3 of such Act), or by a Village Corporation that is associated with the Indian tribe (as such term is defined in section 3 of such Act);

"(C) any land on which the seat of government of the Indian tribe is located; and

"(D) any land that is part or all of a tribal designated statistical area associated with the Indian tribe, or is part or all of an Alaska Native village statistical area associated with the tribe, as defined by the Bureau of the Census for the purposes of the most recent decennial census.

"(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' or 'tribe' has the meaning given the term 'Indian tribe' in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

"(4) TRIBAL GOVERNMENT.—The term 'Tribal Government' means the recognized governing body of an Indian Tribe.

"(5) VOTING-AGE POPULATION.—The term 'voting-age population' means the numerical

size of the population within a State, within a political subdivision, or within a political subdivision that contains Indian lands, as the case may be, that consists of persons age 18 or older, as calculated by the Bureau of the Census under the most recent decennial census.”.

SEC. 115. ATTORNEYS' FEES.

Section 14(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10310(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) The term ‘prevailing party’ means a party to an action that receives at least some of the benefit sought by such action, states a colorable claim, and can establish that the action was a significant cause of a change to the status quo.”.

SEC. 116. OTHER TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ACTIONS COVERED UNDER SECTION 3.—Section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking “any proceeding instituted by the Attorney General or an aggrieved person under any statute to enforce” and inserting “any action under any statute in which a party (including the Attorney General) seeks to enforce”; and

(2) by striking “at the time the proceeding was commenced” and inserting “at the time the action was commenced”.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF LANGUAGE MINORITY GROUPS.—Section 4(f) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10303(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking the second sentence; and

(2) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).

(c) PERIOD DURING WHICH CHANGES IN VOTING PRACTICES ARE SUBJECT TO PRECLEARANCE UNDER SECTION 5.—Section 5 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10304) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “based upon determinations made under the first sentence of section 4(b) are in effect” and inserting “are in effect during a calendar year”;;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “November 1, 1964” and all that follows through “November 1, 1972” and inserting “the applicable date of coverage”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) The term ‘applicable date of coverage’ means, with respect to a State or political subdivision—

“(1) June 25, 2013, if the most recent determination for such State or subdivision under section 4(b) was made on or before December 31, 2021; or

“(2) the date on which the most recent determination for such State or subdivision under section 4(b) was made, if such determination was made after December 31, 2021.”.

(d) REVIEW OF PRECLEARANCE SUBMISSION UNDER SECTION 5 DUE TO EXIGENCY.—Section 5 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 10304) is amended, in subsection (a), by inserting “An exigency, including a natural disaster, inclement weather, or other unforeseeable event, requiring such different qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice, or procedure within 30 days of a Federal, State, or local election shall constitute good cause requiring the Attorney General to expedite consideration of the submission.” after “will not be made.”.

SEC. 117. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of the John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2025 or any amendment made by this title, or the application of such a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional or is otherwise enjoined or unenforceable, the remainder of this title and amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amend-

ments to any other person or circumstance, and any remaining provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), shall not be affected by the holding. In addition, if any provision of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), or any amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, or the application of such a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional or is otherwise enjoined or unenforceable, the application of the provision and amendment to any other person or circumstance, and any remaining provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 118. GRANTS TO ASSIST WITH NOTICE REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall make grants each fiscal year to small jurisdictions who submit applications under subsection (b) for purposes of assisting such small jurisdictions with compliance with the requirements of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to submit or publish notice of any change to a qualification, prerequisite, standard, practice or procedure affecting voting.

(b) APPLICATION.—To be eligible for a grant under this section, a small jurisdiction shall submit an application to the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may require regarding the compliance of such small jurisdiction with the provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

(c) SMALL JURISDICTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “small jurisdiction” means any political subdivision of a State with a population of 10,000 or less.

TITLE II—ELECTION WORKER AND POLLING PLACE PROTECTION

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Election Worker and Polling Place Protection Act”.

SEC. 202. PROHIBITION ON INTERFERENCE AND INTIMIDATION.

Section 11 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10307) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1)(A) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force, or by violence or threat of violence to any person or property, willfully interferes with or attempts to interfere with, the ability of any person or any class of persons to vote or qualify to vote, or to qualify or act as a poll watcher or as any legally authorized election official, in any primary, special, or general election, or any person who is, or is employed by, an agent, contractor, or vendor of a legally authorized election official assisting in the administration of any primary, special, or general election to assist in that administration, shall be fined not more than \$2,500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

“(B) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force, or by violence or threat of violence to any person or property, willfully intimidates or attempts to intimidate, any person or any class of persons seeking to vote or qualify to vote, or to qualify or act as a poll watcher or as any legally authorized election official, in any primary, special, or general election, or any person who is, or is employed by, an agent, contractor, or vendor of a legally authorized election official assisting in the administration of any primary, special, or general election, shall be fined not more than \$2,500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

“(C) If bodily injury results from an act committed in violation of this paragraph or if such act includes the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, an

explosive, or fire, then, in lieu of the remedy described in subparagraph (A) or (B), the violator shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

“(2)(A) Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, willfully physically damages or threatens to physically damage any physical property being used as a polling place or tabulation center or other election infrastructure, with the intent to interfere with the administration of a primary, general, or special election or the tabulation or certification of votes for such an election, shall be fined not more than \$2,500, or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both.

“(B) If bodily injury results from an act committed in violation of this paragraph or if such act includes the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, an explosive, or fire, then, in lieu of the remedy described in subparagraph (A), the violator shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

“(3) For purposes of this subsection, de minimus damage or a threat of de minimus damage to physical property shall not be considered a violation of this subsection.

“(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘election infrastructure’ means any office of a legally authorized election official, or a staffer, worker, or volunteer, assisting such an election official or any physical, mechanical, or electrical device, structure, or tangible item, used in the process of creating, distributing, voting, returning, counting, tabulating, auditing, storing, or other handling of voter registration or ballot information.

“(g) No prosecution of any offense described in subsection (f) may be undertaken by the United States, except under the certification in writing of the Attorney General, or a designee, that—

“(1) the State does not have jurisdiction;

“(2) the State has requested that the Federal Government assume jurisdiction; or

“(3) a prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 340—DESIGNATING JULY 30, 2025, AS “NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 340

Whereas, in 1777, before the passage of the Bill of Rights, 10 sailors and marines blew the whistle on fraud and misconduct that was harmful to the United States;

Whereas the Founding Fathers unanimously supported the whistleblowers in words and deeds, including by releasing government records and providing monetary assistance for the reasonable legal expenses necessary to prevent retaliation against the whistleblowers;

Whereas, on July 30, 1778, in demonstration of their full support for whistleblowers, the members of the Continental Congress unanimously passed the first whistleblower legislation in the United States that read: “Resolved, That it is the duty of all persons in

the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge" (legislation of July 30, 1778, reprinted in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*, ed. Worthington C. Ford et al. (Washington, DC, 1904-37), 11:732);

Whereas whistleblowers risk their careers, jobs, and reputations by reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to the proper authorities;

Whereas, in providing the proper authorities with lawful disclosures, whistleblowers save the taxpayers of the United States billions of dollars each year and serve the public interest by ensuring that the United States remains an ethical and safe place; and

Whereas it is the public policy of the United States to encourage, in accordance with Federal law (including the Constitution of the United States, rules, and regulations) and consistent with the protection of classified information (including sources and methods of detection of classified information), honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, and other crimes to the appropriate authority at the earliest time possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 30, 2025, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; and

(2) ensures that the Federal Government implements the intent of the Founding Fathers, as reflected in the legislation passed on July 30, 1778 (relating to whistleblowers), by encouraging each executive agency to recognize National Whistleblower Appreciation Day by—

(A) informing employees, contractors working on behalf of the taxpayers of the United States, and members of the public about the legal right of a United States citizen to "blow the whistle" to the appropriate authority by honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, or other crimes; and

(B) acknowledging the contributions of whistleblowers to combating waste, fraud, abuse, and violations of laws and regulations of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 341—RE-AFFIRMING THAT IMMIGRATION OFFICERS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY ARE NOT AUTHORIZED TO ARREST, DETAIN, INTERROGATE, OR DEPORT UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND MUST IMPLEMENT STRONGER MEASURES TO PREVENT FUTURE WRONGFUL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS AGAINST SUCH CITIZENS

Mr. GALLEGO submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 341

Whereas the United States was founded on the axiom that all individuals possess natural rights, which cannot be taken away and must be protected by the Government;

Whereas the Framers of the United States Constitution codified this ethos in the Bill of Rights, including in the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, which—

(1) protects individuals from unreasonable searches and seizures; and

(2) therefore requires reasonable suspicion or probable cause of a violation of the law to detain or arrest any person;

Whereas U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and other immigration officers under the direction of the Department of Homeland Security have no authority to arrest, detain, interrogate, or deport United States citizens when conducting civil immigration enforcement;

Whereas U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's internal guidance, designated as Policy Number 10074.2, states, "As a matter of law, ICE cannot assert its civil immigration enforcement authority to arrest and/or detain a U.S. citizen.";

Whereas despite this legal prohibition, there have been numerous recent reports of United States citizens, including children, veterans, and disabled individuals, being illegally arrested, detained, and interrogated by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and other immigration officers based on their occupation, physical appearance, or refusal to speak with officers, a right guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas such conduct violates the constitutional rights of United States citizens, erodes the rule of law, puts law enforcement officer safety at risk, and reduces trust in law enforcement; and

Whereas a government that unlawfully arrests, detains, and interrogates its own citizens is antithetical to an open and transparent society.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate reaffirms that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and other immigration officers under the direction of the Department of Homeland Security—

(1) are not authorized to arrest, detain, interrogate, or deport United States citizens; and

(2) must implement stronger measures to prevent future wrongful enforcement actions against such citizens.

SENATE RESOLUTION 342—HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SMALL MANUFACTURERS OF FIREARMS TO THE ECONOMY, CULTURE, AND RECREATIONAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND RECOGNIZING AUGUST 2025 AS "NATIONAL SHOOTING SPORTS MONTH"

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 342

Whereas locally owned and operated small businesses that manufacture handguns, rifles, shotguns, ammunition, and accessories (referred to in this preamble as "small manufacturers of firearms"), are the backbone of the shooting sports community and a critical part of the manufacturing base of the United States;

Whereas small manufacturers of firearms serve as anchors in rural and small-town communities across the United States, preserving the craftsmanship, entrepreneurship, and innovation of the United States;

Whereas small manufacturers of firearms contribute significantly to the national and

local economy, forming an essential part of a broader industry that supports 380,000 jobs and generates more than \$91,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas small manufacturers of firearms are essential conduits for the exercise of Second Amendment rights by individuals in the United States and provide products, training, and community engagement to sportsmen in the United States;

Whereas shooting sports, including target shooting, hunting, and competitive marksmanship, are time-honored traditions in the United States and are enjoyed by millions of law-abiding citizens;

Whereas shooting sports promote safe and responsible firearm handling, outdoor stewardship, and civic engagement through local clubs, ranges, and competitions; and

Whereas small manufacturers of firearms in the United States play an indispensable role in preserving these recreational traditions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the role of small businesses that manufacture firearms in supporting domestic manufacturing and economic opportunity in communities across the United States;

(2) supports policies that strengthen the ability of such small businesses to innovate, grow, and preserve the recreational shooting traditions of the United States; and

(3) recognizes August 2025 as "National Shooting Sports Month".

SENATE RESOLUTION 343—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT WORK OF THE UNITED STATES PREVENTIVE SERVICES TASK FORCE

Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 343

Whereas the United States Preventive Services Task Force (referred to in this preamble as the "Task Force") is a scientifically independent, statutorily authorized panel comprised of voluntary, non-Federal experts in disease prevention and evidence-based medicine;

Whereas, since 1984, the mission of the Task Force has been to improve the health of the people of the United States by making evidence-based recommendations about health promotion and the effectiveness of clinical primary and secondary preventive services;

Whereas steps to arrive at an official Task Force recommendation include—

(1) assessing the adequacy of evidence at the key question level;

(2) assessing the adequacy of evidence at the linkage level;

(3) estimating the magnitude of benefit and harm of the preventive service;

(4) evaluating the certainty of the evidence of net benefit for the preventive service;

(5) estimating the magnitude of the net benefit of the preventive service; and

(6) developing a recommendation grade for the preventive service in the relevant population, based on the parameters described in paragraphs (1) through (5);

Whereas the Task Force documents its methods in a procedure manual and other resources to ensure that the recommendations and evidence reviews are consistently of high quality, methodologically sound, scientifically defensible, reproducible, and unbiased;

Whereas the Task Force invites and carefully considers public comment in the development process for all Task Force research plans, evidence reviews, and recommendation statements to increase the transparency and utility of the outputs of the Task Force;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) (referred to in this preamble as the “ACA”) reauthorized the Task Force and required insurers to cover, without deductible or copay, preventive services that are recommended by the Task Force with a grade of “A” or “B”, along with those preventive services recommended by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this preamble as “ACIP”), Bright Futures, and the Health Resources and Services Administration’s guidelines for women’s health;

Whereas the ACA prohibits most health plans, including private health insurance plans, Medicare, and Medicaid, from imposing cost-sharing on patients for preventive services when the services are delivered by an in-network provider;

Whereas the Task Force comprehensively assesses evidence and makes recommendations about the effectiveness of clinical primary and secondary preventive services, including screening tests, counseling about healthy behaviors, and preventive medications for children, adolescents, adults, older adults, and pregnant women, which collectively includes 54 recommended preventive services and medicines that are covered without cost-sharing;

Whereas such recommended services include preventive health services such as screenings for heart disease, screenings for breast, colorectal, cervical, and lung cancer, and folic acid supplements for women to prevent birth defects in their babies;

Whereas the most common causes of chronic disease in the United States include smoking, obesity, high blood sugar, hypertension, and high cholesterol, and the Task Force has made recommendations regarding prevention of all of those causes for both children and adults;

Whereas the Task Force recommendations are entirely based on the strength of the evidence and the balance of benefits and harms of a preventive service;

Whereas the Task Force has saved hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of lives due to its often simple and inexpensive recommendations;

Whereas preventive services can help people avoid acute illness, identify and treat chronic conditions, prevent cancer or lead to earlier detection, improve health outcomes, and reduce the burden of end-stage chronic disease;

Whereas the Task Force is comprised of members selected, reviewed, and appointed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services;

Whereas nominations for members of the Task Force are open to the public, and qualification includes demonstrated knowledge, expertise, and national leadership in areas including—

(1) the critical evaluation of research published in peer-reviewed literature and in the methods of evidence review;

(2) clinical prevention, health promotion, and primary health care;

(3) implementation of evidence-based recommendations in clinical practice, including at the clinician-patient level, practice level, and health system level; and

(4) experience in methodological issues, such as meta-analysis, analytic modeling, or clinical epidemiology, for members without primary health care clinical experience;

Whereas the members of the Task Force are appointed for staggered 4-year terms, with potential 1-year extensions, to allow new perspectives into the Task Force while ensuring continuity in its mission;

Whereas applicants for the Task Force are required to not have substantial conflicts of interest, whether financial, professional, or intellectual, that would impair the scientific integrity of the work of the Task Force, and must complete regular conflict of interest disclosures;

Whereas the Task Force is assisted in fulfilling its mission by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (referred to in this preamble as the “AHRQ”), which provides scientific, administrative, and dissemination support to the Task Force, and by AHRQ-designated Evidence-based Practice Centers, which develop the evidence reviews, evidence summaries, and other documents that inform the deliberations of the Task Force;

Whereas recent funding and staffing reductions at AHRQ have significantly impacted its ability to support the Task Force;

Whereas the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Kennedy v. Braidwood Management, Inc.*, upheld the constitutionality of the Task Force;

Whereas the Braidwood decision reaffirmed the power of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to appoint or remove members of the Task Force and review their recommendations;

Whereas the Task Force meets 3 times a year, in March, July, and November;

Whereas, on July 7, 2025, the Secretary of Health and Human Services Robert F. Kennedy (referred to in this preamble as “Secretary Kennedy”) abruptly cancelled a meeting of the Task Force scheduled for July 10, 2025; and

Whereas Task Force meetings are necessary for formal votes to consider, reconsider or move forward Task Force recommendations and material development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) to ensure access for the people of the United States to life-saving, evidence-based preventive care and services, the operations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force (referred to in this resolution as the “Task Force”), including working with the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Evidence-based Practice Centers, and related stakeholders, should not be subject to any interruption, delay, or funding disruption;

(2) the members of the Task Force currently comprised of experts in primary care and preventive medicine serving staggered 4-year terms have been charged by Congress to make evidence-based recommendations about preventive health services, and do so transparently using the best available scientific evidence;

(3) the members of the Task Force should continue to serve their 4-year terms to completion;

(4) the work of the Task Force must continue to be grounded in transparent, evidence-based review that is based on vetted, proven, and scientifically demonstrated studies; and

(5) the Department of Health and Human Services, as required by section 915 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 299b-4), must reconvene the Task Force and move the work of the Task Force forward without delay.

SENATE RESOLUTION 344—OBSERVING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DATE ON WHICH HURRICANE KATRINA DEVASTATED THE GULF COAST AND RECOGNIZING THE PROGRESS OF EFFORTS TO REBUILD THE AFFECTED GULF COAST REGION

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 344

Whereas, on August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina, a Category 3 hurricane and 1 of the 5 deadliest hurricanes in United States history, hit the Gulf Coast and caused 1,833 recorded fatalities, including 1,577 in Louisiana, 238 in Mississippi, 14 in Florida, 2 in Georgia, and 2 in Alabama, according to the National Hurricane Center;

Whereas Hurricane Katrina inflicted catastrophic damage, estimated at \$161,000,000,000 in the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida;

Whereas more than 1,200,000 people were under some type of evacuation order, including New Orleans’ first mandatory evacuation in the city’s history;

Whereas more than 1,000,000 Gulf Coast residents were displaced, and many remain displaced to this day;

Whereas hundreds of thousands were unemployed as a result of the devastation to businesses;

Whereas more than 200,000 homes and 20,000 businesses from Louisiana to Florida were destroyed;

Whereas an estimated 5,000,000 people were left without power, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

Whereas major highways were destroyed, including the Interstate 10 Twin Span Bridge connecting the cities of New Orleans and Slidell in Louisiana and United States Highway 90 bridges connecting Bay St. Louis to Pass Christian and Biloxi to Ocean Springs in Mississippi;

Whereas the Louisiana Superdome sheltered an estimated 25,000 to 30,000 evacuees and suffered roof leaks and other significant damage from strong winds;

Whereas neighboring cities and States took in thousands of displaced residents and provided medical care and shelter at makeshift hospitals, such as the Katrina Clinic at the Astrodome (formerly named the Reliant Center) in Houston, Texas;

Whereas the United States Coast Guard rescued more than 33,544 people and assisted with the evacuation of 9,409 patients and medical personnel from 11 hospitals;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces orchestrated one of the largest domestic rescue operations in history, with command centers at the Emergency Operations Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana; the Louis Armstrong New Orleans International Airport in New Orleans, Louisiana; the Naval Air Station in Pensacola, Florida; and Camp Shelby in Hattiesburg, Mississippi;

Whereas the American Red Cross, Habitat for Humanity, Salvation Army, America’s Second Harvest (now known as Feeding America), Catholic Charities, National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster, Southern Baptist Disaster Relief, United Way, and other religious and charitable organizations provided crucial food, water, and hygiene products to victims;

Whereas countless first responders, such as police officers, emergency medical personnel, and firefighters, from across the United States worked around the clock to

provide care for and to protect the safety of residents from the affected communities;

Whereas those affected have shown great resilience and strength to rebuild and restore their communities;

Whereas the resident population of the Gulfport-Biloxi-Pascagoula, Mississippi metropolitan statistical area was 421,916 in March 2024, an 87 percent increase over its lowest point of 225,681 in 2006;

Whereas the number of tourists who visited New Orleans was 17,500,000 in 2022, up from 3,700,000 tourists in 2006; and

Whereas, although significant progress has been made in the Gulf Coast region, there is still more work to be done to address the challenges still attributable to the devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support to the victims of Hurricane Katrina;

(2) commends the courageous efforts of those who assisted in the recovery progress;

(3) recognizes the contributions of communities in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and Georgia to the United States; and

(4) reaffirms its commitment to rebuild, renew, and restore the Gulf Coast region.

SENATE RESOLUTION 345—CONGRATULATING THE OKLAHOMA CITY THUNDER ON WINNING THE 2025 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION FINALS

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. MULLIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 345

Whereas, on Sunday, June 22, 2025, the Oklahoma City Thunder (referred to in this preamble as the “Thunder”) won the 2025 National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NBA”) Finals, defeating the Indiana Pacers in Game 7 with a final score of 103-91 to win the series 4-3;

Whereas, in 2008, the Seattle SuperSonics relocated to Oklahoma City, changing the name of the franchise to the Thunder on arrival;

Whereas the 2008-2009 NBA season was the inaugural season of the Thunder in Oklahoma City;

Whereas the Thunder defeated the Memphis Grizzlies, Denver Nuggets, and Minnesota Timberwolves en route to the 2025 NBA Finals;

Whereas, on winning the 2025 NBA Finals, the Thunder secured the first NBA championship for the franchise since relocating to Oklahoma City;

Whereas the Thunder finished the 2024-2025 NBA regular season with 68 wins and 14 losses, a winning percentage of .829;

Whereas the 2025 NBA Finals was the first NBA Finals since 2016 to reach a Game 7;

Whereas, in Game 7 of the 2025 NBA Finals, the Thunder—

(1) trailed the Indiana Pacers 48-47 at halftime, making an incredible comeback in the second half to secure the win and championship; and

(2) shut down the Pacers offense, causing the Pacers to score its fewest points of any postseason game;

Whereas Shai Gilgeous-Alexander was named the Most Valuable Player of the NBA for the 2024-2025 regular season and the 2025 NBA Finals, scoring 29 points and 12 assists in Game 7 of the 2025 NBA Finals;

Whereas, during the 2024-2025 NBA season, the Thunder averaged 120.5 points per game, ranking fourth in the NBA, and only allowed

their opponents to score an average of 107.6 points per game, outscoring their opponents by an average of 12.8 points per game, the best margin in the NBA during that season;

Whereas the Thunder victory parade passed in front of the Oklahoma City National Memorial, with 2025 marking the 30-year anniversary of the tragic 1995 Oklahoma City bombing;

Whereas an estimated 500,000 Thunder fans descended on Oklahoma City to attend the victory parade; and

Whereas the entire State of Oklahoma rallied behind the Thunder to celebrate the historic win of the Thunder in the 2025 NBA Finals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Oklahoma City Thunder (referred to in this resolution as the “Thunder”) on winning the 2025 National Basketball Association Finals; and

(2) recognizes the Thunder for—

(A) its hard work and dedication to basketball; and

(B) the excitement the Thunder bring to the State of Oklahoma and fans everywhere.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3070. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3071. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2977 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3072. Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3073. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3074. Mr. Kaine 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.

SA 3075. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3076. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3077. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3078. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3079. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for mili-

tary construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3080. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3081. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3082. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3083. Mr. SCHATZ 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.

SA 3084. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. JUSTICE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3085. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3086. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3087. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3088. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3089. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3090. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3091. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3092. Mr. PAUL 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.

SA 3093. Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO) submitted an amendment intended

to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3094. Mr. CRUZ 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.

SA 3095. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3096. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3097. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3098. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3099. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3100. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. FETTERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3101. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3102. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3103. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3104. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3105. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3106. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3107. Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3108. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3109. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activi-

ties 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 3110. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3111. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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.

SA 3112. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3113. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3114. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3115. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3070. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 781 of division B.

SA 3071. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2977 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 216, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 219, line 4, and insert the following:

“(1) HEMP.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘hemp’ means the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. and any part of that plant, including the seeds thereof and all derivatives, extracts, cannabinoids, iso-

mers, acids, salts, and salts of isomers, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent in the plant on a dry weight basis.

“(B) INCLUSION.—Such term includes industrial hemp.

“(C) EXCLUSIONS.—Such term does not include—

“(i) any viable seeds from a *Cannabis sativa* L. plant that exceeds a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of 0.3 percent in the plant on a dry weight basis; or

“(ii) any hemp-derived cannabinoid products containing—

“(I) cannabinoids that are not capable of being naturally produced by a *Cannabis sativa* L. plant;

“(II) cannabinoids that—

“(aa) are capable of being naturally produced by a *Cannabis sativa* L. plant; and

“(bb) were synthesized or manufactured outside the plant; or

“(III) a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of more than 0.3 percent, as determined based on the substance, form, manufacture, or article of the product.

“(2) INDUSTRIAL HEMP.—The term ‘industrial hemp’ means hemp—

“(A) grown for the use of the stalk of the plant, fiber produced from such a stalk, or any other non-cannabinoid derivative, mixture, preparation, or manufacture of such a stalk;

“(B) grown for the use of the whole grain, oil, cake, nut, hull, or any other noncannabinoid compound, derivative, mixture, preparation, or manufacture of the seeds of such plant;

“(C) grown for purposes of producing microgreens or other edible hemp leaf products intended for human consumption that are harvested from an immature hemp plant that is grown from seeds that do not exceed the threshold for delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration specified in paragraph (1)(C)(i);

SA 3072. Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 74, line 21, strike “programs.” and insert “programs; and, \$709,573,000 shall be made available for opioid prevention and treatment programs.”.

SA 3073. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REPORT ON NEW WORLD SCREWORM READINESS AND RESPONSE.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report on the New World Screwworm domestic readiness and response initiative of the Animal

and Plant Health Inspection Service, with a particular focus on—

(1)(A) domestic readiness, including the construction of a domestic production facility in the event of a threat of a domestic outbreak; and

(B) exploring partnerships with States and industry with respect to that construction and other domestic preparedness efforts;

(2) sterile fly production technology and other eradication tools and technologies; and

(3) the benefits of and barriers, including timelines and costs, to enhanced domestic, as compared to international, sterile fly production.

SA 3074. Mr. KAINE 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 division A, add the following:

TITLE XVII—PROTECTING GLOBAL FISHERIES ACT OF 2025

SEC. 1701. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Protecting Global Fisheries Act of 2025”.

SEC. 1702. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN; LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE.**—The terms “admission”, “admitted”, “alien”, and “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(3) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person” means an individual or entity that is not a United States person.

(4) **ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED, OR UNREGULATED FISHING.**—The term “illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing” means activities described as illegal fishing, unreported fishing, or unregulated fishing in paragraph 3 of the International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, adopted at the 24th Session of the Committee on Fisheries in Rome on March 2, 2001.

(5) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States;

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity; or

(C) any person located in the United States.

SEC. 1703. INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION RELATED TO COUNTERING ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED, OR UNREGULATED FISHING.

(a) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States to prioritize collaboration with friendly countries, and through appropriate international institutions, to com-

bat illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing.

(b) **ACTIONS BY SECRETARY OF STATE.**—The Secretary of State shall take such actions as may be necessary to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States in all appropriate international fora and with appropriate countries that are allies or partners of the United States—

(1) to ensure that cutting edge technology is deployed in accordance to existing or future maritime law enforcement agreements the United States may enter or has entered into; and

(2) to hold accountable those individuals or entities that are responsible or complicit in illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing, with a particular focus on the harmful actions of the People’s Republic of China.

(c) **ADVOCACY AT UNITED NATIONS.**—The President may direct the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to urge the United Nations to take greater action with respect to collaborative global efforts to counter illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing.

SEC. 1704. AUTHORIZATION OF IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED, OR UNREGULATED FISHING AND TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person or foreign vessel (regardless of ownership) that the President determines—

(1) is responsible for or complicit in—

(A) illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing; or

(B) except as part of a conservation effort, the sale, supply, purchase, or transfer (including transportation) of endangered species, as defined in section 3(6) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532(6));

(2) is a leader or official of an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or the members of which have engaged in, any of the activities described in paragraph (1) during the tenure of the leader or official;

(3) has ever owned, operated, chartered, or controlled a vessel during which time the personnel of the vessel engaged in any of the activities described in paragraph (1); or

(4) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services in support of—

(A) any of the activities described in paragraph (1); or

(B) any foreign person engaged in any such activity.

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions that may be imposed under subsection (a) with respect to a foreign person or foreign vessel are the following:

(1) **BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.**—Notwithstanding section 202 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701), the exercise of all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of a foreign person described in subsection (a), if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) **INADMISSIBILITY TO THE UNITED STATES.**—In the case of an alien described in subsection (a), or any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, a foreign person described in subsection (a) that is an entity—

(A) ineligibility for a visa and inadmissibility to the United States; and

(B) revocation of any valid visa or travel documentation in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)).

(3) **LOANS FROM UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.**—The President may prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to a foreign person described in subsection (a).

(4) **FOREIGN EXCHANGE.**—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which a foreign person or foreign vessel described in subsection (a) has any interest.

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit a report on the imposition of sanctions under this section to—

(1) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(d) **NATIONAL INTEREST WAIVER.**—The President may waive the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) with respect to a foreign person or foreign vessel if the President determines that such a waiver is in the national interests of the United States.

(e) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(1) **EXCEPTIONS FOR AUTHORIZED INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—Sanctions under this section shall not apply with respect to activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence, law enforcement, or national security activities of the United States.

(2) **EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS.**—Sanctions under subsection (b)(2) shall not apply with respect to the admission of an alien to the United States if such admission is necessary to comply with the obligations of the United States under the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success on June 26, 1947, and entered into force on November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna on April 24, 1963, and entered into force on March 19, 1967, or other international obligations.

(3) **EXCEPTION FOR SAFETY OF VESSELS AND CREW.**—Sanctions under this section shall not apply with respect to a person providing provisions to a vessel if such provisions are intended for the safety and care of the crew aboard the vessel or the maintenance of the vessel to avoid any environmental or other significant damage.

(4) **HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the President may not impose sanctions under this section with respect to any person for conducting or facilitating a transaction for the sale of agricultural commodities, food, medicine, or medical devices or for the provision of humanitarian assistance.

(B) **EXCLUSION.**—The exception under subparagraph (A) does not include transactions for the sale of food or agricultural commodities obtained through illegal, unreported, or unregulated fishing.

(f) **IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.**—

(1) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this section or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this section shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(g) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of any Federal agency responsible for the implementation of this section may promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section (which may include regulatory exceptions), including under section 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1704).

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the President pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

SA 3075. Mr. Kaine 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 subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1067. NATIONAL REGISTRY OF KOREAN AMERICAN DIVIDED FAMILIES.

(a) NATIONAL REGISTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Special Envoy on North Korean Human Rights Issues, the Assistant Secretary of State for Consular Affairs, or such other individual as the Secretary may designate, shall—

(A) engage, to the extent practicable, Korean American families who wish to be reunited with family members residing in North Korea from which such Korean American families were divided after the signing of the Agreement Concerning a Military Armistice in Korea, signed at Panmunjom July 27, 1953 (commonly referred to as the “Korean War Armistice Agreement”), in anticipation of future reunions for such families and family members, including in-person and video reunions; and

(B) establish a private, internal national registry of the names and other relevant information of such Korean American families—

(i) to facilitate such future reunions; and
(ii) to provide for a repository of information about such Korean American families and family members in North Korea, including information about individuals who may be deceased.

(2) DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State may enter into agreements with Korean individuals and families, academic institutions, or other members of the public, as appropriate, to share, in whole or in part, information collected and housed in the database if—

(A) the United States person whose personally identifiable information would be disclosed as a result of an agreement has provided consent to such disclosure; and

(B) the agreement outlines reasonable steps and commitments to ensure that any information disclosed as a result of such agreement is—

(i) kept private and confidential; and

(ii) will not be disclosed improperly to other parties outside the agreement.

(b) ACTIONS TO FACILITATE DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND NORTH KOREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State should take steps to ensure that any direct dialogue between the United States and North Korea includes progress towards holding future reunions for Korean American families and their family members in North Korea.

(2) CONSULTATIONS.—The Secretary of State shall consult with the Government of the Republic of Korea, as appropriate, in carrying out this subsection.

(3) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, acting through the Special Envoy on North Korean Human Rights Issues, shall include in each report required under section 107(d) of the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004 (22 U.S.C. 7817(d)) a description of the consultations described in paragraph (2) conducted during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The reporting required under subparagraph (A) should include—

(i) the status of the national registry established pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(B);

(ii) the number of individuals included on the registry who—

(I) have met their family members in North Korea during previous reunions; and

(II) have yet to meet their family members in North Korea;

(iii) a summary of responses by North Korea to requests by the United States Government to hold reunions of divided families; and

(iv) a description of actions taken by North Korea that prevent the emigration of family members of Korean American families.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 3076. Mr. Kaine 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 title XII, add the following:

Subtitle F—Caribbean Basin Security Initiative

SEC. 1271. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Caribbean Basin Security Initiative Authorization Act”.

SEC. 1272. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) BENEFICIARY COUNTRIES.—The term “beneficiary countries” means—

(A) Antigua and Barbuda;

(B) the Bahamas;

(C) Barbados;

(D) Dominica;

(E) the Dominican Republic;

(F) Grenada;

(G) Guyana;

(H) Jamaica;

(I) Saint Lucia;

(J) Saint Kitts and Nevis;

(K) Saint Vincent and the Grenadines;

(L) Suriname; and

(M) Trinidad and Tobago.

SEC. 1273. AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CARIBBEAN BASIN SECURITY INITIATIVE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR THE CARIBBEAN BASIN SECURITY INITIATIVE.—The Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development may carry out an initiative, to be known as the “Caribbean Basin Security Initiative”, in beneficiary countries to achieve the purposes described in subsection (b).

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes described in this subsection are the following:

(1) To promote citizen safety, security, and the rule of law in the Caribbean through increased strategic engagement with—

(A) the governments of beneficiary countries; and

(B) elements of local civil society, including the private sector, in such countries.

(2) To counter transnational criminal organizations and local gangs in beneficiary countries, including through—

(A) maritime and aerial security cooperation, including—

(i) assistance to strengthen capabilities of maritime and aerial interdiction operations in the Caribbean; and

(ii) the provision of support systems and equipment, training, and maintenance;

(B) cooperation on border and port security, including support to strengthen capacity for screening and intercepting narcotics, weapons, bulk cash, and other contraband at airports and seaports; and

(C) capacity building and the provision of equipment and support for operations targeting—

(i) the finances and illegal activities of such organizations and gangs; and

(ii) the recruitment by such organizations and gangs of at-risk youth.

(3) To advance law enforcement and justice sector capacity building and rule of law initiatives in beneficiary countries, including by—

(A) strengthening special prosecutorial offices and providing technical assistance—

(i) to combat—

(I) corruption;

(II) money laundering;

(III) human, firearms, and wildlife trafficking;

(IV) human smuggling;

(V) financial crimes; and

(VI) extortion; and

(ii) to conduct asset forfeitures and criminal analysis;

(B) supporting training for civilian police and appropriate security services in criminal investigations, best practices for citizen security, and the protection of human rights;

(C) supporting capacity building for law enforcement and military units, including professionalization, anti-corruption and human rights training, vetting, and community-based policing;

(D) supporting justice sector reform and strengthening of the rule of law, including—

(i) capacity building for prosecutors, judges, and other justice officials; and

(ii) support to increase the efficacy of criminal courts; and

(E) strengthening cybersecurity and cybercrime cooperation, including capacity building and support for cybersecurity systems.

(4) To promote crime prevention efforts in beneficiary countries, particularly among

at-risk-youth and other vulnerable populations, including through—

(A) improving community and law enforcement cooperation to improve the effectiveness and professionalism of police and increase mutual trust;

(B) increasing economic opportunities for at-risk youth and vulnerable populations, including through workforce development training and remedial education programs for at-risk youth;

(C) improving juvenile justice sectors through regulatory reforms, separating youth from traditional prison systems, and improving support and services in juvenile detention centers; and

(D) the provision of assistance to populations vulnerable to being victims of extortion and crime by criminal networks.

(5) To strengthen the ability of the security sector in beneficiary countries to respond to and become more resilient in the face of natural disasters, including by—

(A) carrying out training exercises to ensure critical infrastructure and ports are able to come back online rapidly following natural disasters; and

(B) providing preparedness training to police and first responders.

(6) To prioritize efforts to combat corruption and include anti-corruption components in programs in beneficiary countries, including by—

(A) building the capacity of national justice systems and attorneys general to prosecute and try acts of corruption;

(B) increasing the capacity of national law enforcement services to carry out anti-corruption investigations; and

(C) encouraging cooperative agreements among the Department of State, other relevant Federal departments and agencies, and the attorneys general of relevant countries.

(7) To promote the rule of law in beneficiary countries and counter malign influence from authoritarian regimes, including China, Russia, Iran, Venezuela, Nicaragua, and Cuba, by—

(A) monitoring security assistance from such authoritarian regimes and taking steps necessary to ensure that such assistance does not undermine or jeopardize United States security assistance;

(B) evaluating and, as appropriate, restricting the involvement of the United States in investment and infrastructure projects financed by authoritarian regimes that might obstruct or otherwise impact United States security assistance to beneficiary countries;

(C) monitoring and restricting equipment and support from high-risk vendors of telecommunications infrastructure in beneficiary countries;

(D) countering disinformation by promoting transparency and accountability from beneficiary countries; and

(E) eliminating corruption linked to investment and infrastructure facilitated by authoritarian regimes through support for investment screening, competitive tendering and bidding processes, the implementation of investment law, and contractual transparency.

(8) To support the effective branding and messaging of United States security assistance and cooperation in beneficiary countries, including by developing and implementing a public diplomacy strategy for informing citizens of beneficiary countries about the benefits to their respective countries of United States security assistance and cooperation programs.

(C) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State \$88,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2030 to carry out the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative to

achieve the purposes described in subsection (b).

SEC. 1274. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an implementation plan that includes a timeline and stated objectives for actions to be taken in beneficiary countries with respect to the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The implementation plan required by subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A multi-year strategy with a timeline, overview of objectives, and anticipated outcomes for the region and for each beneficiary country, with respect to each purpose described in section 1273.

(2) Specific, measurable benchmarks to track the progress of the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative toward accomplishing the outcomes included under paragraph (1).

(3) A list of all Federal departments or agencies involved in carrying out the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative, and a plan for the delineation of the roles of those departments and agencies in carrying out the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative to prevent overlap and unintended competition between activities and resources.

(4) A plan to coordinate and track all activities carried out under the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative among all relevant Federal departments and agencies, in accordance with the publication requirements described in section 4 of the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 2394c).

(5) An assessment of steps taken, as of the date on which the plan is submitted, to increase regional coordination and collaboration between the law enforcement agencies of beneficiary countries and the Haitian National Police, and a framework with benchmarks for increasing such coordination and collaboration, in order to address the urgent security crisis in Haiti.

(c) **ANNUAL PROGRESS UPDATE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the implementation plan required by subsection (a) is submitted, and annually thereafter through fiscal year 2030, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written description of results achieved through the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative, including with respect to—

(1) the implementation of the strategy and plans described in paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) of subsection (b);

(2) compliance with, and progress related to, meeting the benchmarks described in paragraph (2) of subsection (b); and

(3) funding statistics for the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative for the preceding year, disaggregated by country.

SEC. 1275. PROGRAMS AND STRATEGY TO INCREASE NATURAL DISASTER RESPONSE AND RESILIENCE.

(a) **PROGRAMS.**—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Inter-American Foundation, shall promote natural disaster response and resilience in beneficiary countries by carrying out programs for the following purposes:

(1) Encouraging coordination between beneficiary countries and relevant Federal de-

partments and agencies to provide expertise and information sharing.

(2) Supporting the sharing of best practices on natural disaster resilience, including on constructing resilient infrastructure and rebuilding after natural disasters.

(3) Improving rapid-response mechanisms and cross-government organizational preparedness for natural disasters.

(b) **STRATEGY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and in consultation with the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Inter-American Foundation and nongovernmental organizations in beneficiary countries and in the United States, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a strategy that incorporates specific, measurable benchmarks—

(1) to achieve the purposes described in subsection (a); and

(2) to inform citizens of beneficiary countries about the extent and benefits of United States assistance to such countries.

(c) **ANNUAL PROGRESS UPDATE.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the strategy required by subsection (b) is submitted, and annually thereafter through fiscal year 2030, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a written description of the progress made as of the date of such submission in meeting the benchmarks included in the strategy.

SA 3077. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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 B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 718. EXPANSION OF HEALTH CARE LICENSE PORTABILITY FOR HEALTH-CARE PROFESSIONALS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD.

Section 1094(d)(3)(B) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking “under” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “under title 32.”.

SA 3078. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) 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:

Strike section 1033 and insert the following:

SEC. 1033. SUPPORT FOR COUNTERDRUG ACTIVITIES AND ACTIVITIES TO COUNTER TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME.

Subsection (h) of section 284 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before subparagraph (B), as redesignated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, the following new subparagraph:

“(A) In the case of support for a purpose described in subsection (b)—

“(i) the agency to which support is provided;

“(ii) the budget, and anticipated delivery schedule for support;

“(iii) the source of funds provided for the project or purpose;

“(iv) a description of the arrangements, if any, for the sustainment of the project or purpose and the source of funds to support sustainment of the capabilities and performance outcomes achieved using such support, if applicable;

“(v) a description of the objectives for the project or purpose; and

“(vi) information, including the amount, type, and purpose, about the support provided the agency during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year for which the support covered by the notice is provided under this section with respect to—

“(I) this section;

“(II) counterdrug activities authorized by section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105-85; 111 Stat. 1811); or

“(III) any other significant program, account, or activity for the provision of security assistance that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State consider appropriate.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B)(i), by striking “the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives” and inserting “the congressional defense committees”.

SA 3079. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 3, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 4, line 24, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 5, line 24, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 7, line 2, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 7, line 22, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 8, line 18, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 9, line 14, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 10, line 24, insert “, subject to section 414 of this Act,” after “*That*”.

On page 89, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 414. (a) Funds provided in this Act for a congressionally directed spending item shall be rescinded if a member of Congress who requested and received funding in this Act makes a disclosure of the congressionally directed spending item outside of official debate of this Act in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(b) For the purposes of this section, disclosure is defined as a mention or reference in

any communications sent from the official office of the member of Congress, any debate of a bill other than this Act in a congressional committee or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives, any media interview or appearance, any public speaking engagement, or any public communications pursuant to a political campaign.

(c) The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives about any rescission of funds not later than 15 days after such rescission.

On page 100, line 17, strike “For” and insert “Subject to section 783 of this Act, for”.

On page 101, line 12, insert “, subject to section 783 of this Act,” after “*Provided, That*”.

On page 104, line 16, insert “subject to section 783 of this Act,” after “amounts,”.

On page 118, line 21, insert “subject to section 783 of this Act,” after “amounts,”.

On page 132, line 5, insert “, subject to section 783 of this Act,” after “amounts”.

On page 144, line 25, insert “subject to section 783 of this Act,” after “amounts,”.

On page 219, after line 25, insert the following:

SEC. 783. (a) Funds provided in this Act for a congressionally directed spending item shall be rescinded if a member of Congress who requested and received funding in this Act makes a disclosure of the congressionally directed spending item outside of official debate of this Act in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(b) For the purposes of this section, disclosure is defined as a mention or reference in any communications sent from the official office of the member of Congress, any debate of a bill other than this Act in a congressional committee or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives, any media interview or appearance, any public speaking engagement, or any public communications pursuant to a political campaign.

(c) The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives about any rescission of funds not later than 15 days after such rescission.

On page 231, line 19, insert “, subject to section 115 of this Act,” after “*Provided, That*”.

On page 232, line 24, “, subject to section 115 of this Act,” after “*Provided, That*”.

On page 235, line 12, “, subject to section 115 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 246, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 115. (a) Funds provided in this Act for a congressionally directed spending item shall be rescinded if a member of Congress who requested and received funding in this Act makes a disclosure of the congressionally directed spending item outside of official debate of this Act in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(b) For the purposes of this section, disclosure is defined as a mention or reference in any communications sent from the official office of the member of Congress, any debate of a bill other than this Act in a congressional committee or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives, any media interview or appearance, any public speaking engagement, or any public communications pursuant to a political campaign.

(c) The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and

the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives about any rescission of funds not later than 15 days after such rescission.

On page 280, line 6, insert “subject to section 225 of this Act,” before “\$152,146,000”.

On page 295, line 14, insert “subject to section 225 of this Act,” before “\$133,167,000”.

On page 306, after line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 225. (a) Funds provided in this Act for a congressionally directed spending item shall be rescinded if a member of Congress who requested and received funding in this Act makes a disclosure of the congressionally directed spending item outside of official debate of this Act in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(b) For the purposes of this section, disclosure is defined as a mention or reference in any communications sent from the official office of the member of Congress, any debate of a bill other than this Act in a congressional committee or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives, any media interview or appearance, any public speaking engagement, or any public communications pursuant to a political campaign.

(c) The Attorney General shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives about any rescission of funds not later than 15 days after such rescission.

On page 313, line 10, insert “, subject to section 543 of this Act,” after “*Provided further, That*”.

On page 362, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. 543. (a) Funds provided in this Act for a congressionally directed spending item shall be rescinded if a member of Congress who requested and received funding in this Act makes a disclosure of the congressionally directed spending item outside of official debate of this Act in the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(b) For the purposes of this section, disclosure is defined as a mention or reference in any communications sent from the official office of the member of Congress, any debate of a bill other than this Act in a congressional committee or on the floor of the Senate or the House of Representatives, any media interview or appearance, any public speaking engagement, or any public communications pursuant to a political campaign.

(c) The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives about any rescission of funds not later than 15 days after such rescission.

SA 3080. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a)(1) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Defense Health Agency

shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report detailing the current and projected capacity, patient load, staffing requirements, and outstanding infrastructure needs at the General Leonard Wood Army Community Hospital in Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

(2) The report required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) assess the role of the hospital specified in such paragraph in supporting medical readiness and emergency care for active duty members of the Armed Forces, dependents of such members, and retirees;

(B) evaluate potential impacts to access and quality of care, including in the surrounding community, if the hospital were to be realigned, downgraded, or have its scope of services reduced; and

(C) assess how the hospital supports the functions and mission of Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, including training activities and programs.

(b)(1) Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report detailing the current condition of military family housing at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, including ongoing or planned renovation and upgrade projects, timelines for completion, and any challenges affecting such improvements.

(2) The report required by paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the total estimated cost of conducting all necessary renovation and replacement activities for deficient family housing units, the number of units in need of replacement, and a detailed plan for carrying out those activities; and

(B) an assessment of the impact of housing conditions on quality of life and readiness of members of the Armed Forces and their dependents;

(C) recommendations for addressing any identified shortcomings; and

(D) the findings from consultations with military families who live in housing units at Fort Leonard Wood.

SA 3081. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION SURVEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall continue to—

(1) administer the customer service survey of the National Cemetery Administration to veterans, families, and funeral homes through ongoing survey activities; and

(2) publish the results of such survey.

(b) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 30 days before the date on which any change is made to the survey described in subsection (a), including with respect to methodology, participants, or scope, the Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs shall submit a description of such change to—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 3082. Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ INTERMENT SCHEDULE AVAILABILITY AT CEMETERIES UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall maintain, on the publicly accessible website landing page of the National Cemetery Administration, a spreadsheet or similar document displaying the most recent interment schedule availability for each operational cemetery under the control of the National Cemetery Administration.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, make the spreadsheet or similar document described in subsection (a) available as required by such subsection; and

(2) once every 30 days thereafter, update such spreadsheet or similar document.

(c) DEFINITION OF INTERMENT SCHEDULE AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a proposed definition for the term “interment schedule availability” that—

(1) generally means the number of business days between the establishment of a case for a deceased individual and the first availability for the interment of the individual; and

(2) takes into account the ability to meet the family's preferred dates, days of the week, and times for scheduling the interment.

(d) REPORT ON HISTORICAL DATA.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on data for interment schedule availability during the five-year period ending on the date on which the report is submitted.

(e) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 3083. Mr. SCHATZ 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 mili-

tary 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 B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 320A. WORKING GROUP ON MARINE BIOSECURITY AT JOINT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM, HAWAII.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall participate in good faith with a working group on marine biosecurity at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii (in this section referred to as the “working group”).

(b) EXISTING OR NEW ENTITY.—The working group may be either a newly-constituted entity or an existing entity.

(c) MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to facilitate cooperation among the members of the working group, the Secretary of the Navy shall seek to enter into a memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources.

(2) ELEMENTS.—A memorandum of agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall contain, at a minimum, the commitment of the Department of Defense—

(A) to work collaboratively and in good faith with all members of the working group;

(B) to the eradication of invasive corals discovered at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam in 2020;

(C) to supporting the health of the coastal and marine ecosystem of Hawaii; and

(D) to creating a mechanism for an independent third party, approved by the Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources, to verify and, as warranted, oversee efforts by the Department of Defense to eradicate invasive corals from Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam.

SA 3084. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. JUSTICE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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 C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 724. EVALUATION OF CERTAIN RESEARCH RELATED TO MENOPAUSE, PERIMENOPAUSE, OR MID-LIFE WOMEN'S HEALTH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall evaluate—

(1) the results of completed research related to menopause, perimenopause, or mid-life women's health among women who are members of the uniformed services or veterans;

(2) the status of such research that is ongoing;

(3) any gaps in knowledge and research on—

(A) treatments for menopause-related symptoms, including hormone and non-hormone treatments;

(B) the safety and effectiveness of treatments for menopause-related symptoms;

(C) the relation of service in the uniformed services to perimenopause and menopause and the impact of such service on perimenopause and menopause; and

(D) the impact of perimenopause and menopause on the mental health of women who are members of the uniformed services or veterans;

(4) the availability of and uptake of professional training resources for covered providers relating to mid-life women's health with respect to the care, treatment, and management of perimenopause and menopausal symptoms, and related support services; and

(5) the availability of and uptake of treatments for women who are members of the uniformed services or veterans who are experiencing perimenopause or menopause.

(b) **REPORT; STRATEGIC PLAN.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall each submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) the findings of the evaluation conducted under subsection (a);

(2) recommendations for improving professional training resources described in subsection (a)(4) for covered providers; and

(3) a strategic plan that—

(A) resolves the gaps in knowledge and research identified in the report; and

(B) identifies topics in need of further research relating to potential treatments for menopause-related symptoms of women who are members of the uniformed services or veterans.

(c) **NONDUPLICATION AND SUPPLEMENTATION OF EFFORTS.**—In carrying out activities under this section, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that such activities minimize duplication and supplement, not supplant, existing information-sharing efforts of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(d) **SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ADDITIONAL RESEARCH RELATED TO MENOPAUSE, PERIMENOPAUSE, OR MID-LIFE WOMEN'S HEALTH.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs should each conduct research related to menopause, perimenopause, or mid-life health regarding women who are members of the uniformed services or veterans.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED PROVIDER.**—The term “covered provider” means a health care provider employed by the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) **MENOPAUSE.**—The term “menopause” means the stage of a woman's life—

(A) when menstrual periods stop permanently and she can no longer get pregnant; and

(B) that is not a disease state, but a normal part of aging for women.

(3) **MID-LIFE.**—The term “mid-life” means a life stage that—

(A) coincides with the menopausal transition in women, which may be physical or emotional;

(B) encompasses the late reproductive age, which can begin at approximately 35 years of age, to the late postmenopausal stages of reproductive aging, which can extend to approximately 65 years of age; and

(C) often marks the onset of many chronic diseases.

(4) **PERIMENOPAUSE.**—The term “perimenopause” means the time during a woman's life when levels of the hormone estrogen fall unevenly in a woman's body and is also called the menopausal transition.

(5) **POSTMENOPAUSAL.**—The term “postmenopausal” means the stage of a woman's life after a woman has been without a menstrual period for 12 months that lasts for the rest of a woman's life and reflects a time when women are at increased risk for osteoporosis and heart disease.

SA 3085. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS) 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ANTI-RETALIATION PROTECTION FOR AI WHISTLEBLOWERS.

(a) **PROHIBITION AGAINST RETALIATION.**—No employer may, directly or indirectly, discharge, demote, suspend, threaten, blacklist, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against a covered individual in the terms and conditions of employment or post-employment of the covered individual (or the terms and conditions of work provided by the covered individual as an independent contractor) because of any lawful act done by the covered individual—

(1) in providing information regarding an AI security vulnerability or AI violation, or any conduct that the covered individual reasonably believes constitutes an AI security vulnerability or AI violation, to—

(A) the appropriate regulatory official or the Attorney General;

(B) a regulatory or law enforcement agency; or

(C) any Member of Congress or any committee of Congress;

(2) in initiating, testifying in, or assisting in any investigation or judicial or administrative action of an appropriate regulatory or law enforcement agency or the Department of Justice, or any investigation of Congress, based upon or related to the information described in paragraph (1); or

(3) in providing information regarding an AI security vulnerability or AI violation, or any conduct that the covered individual reasonably believes constitutes an AI security vulnerability or AI violation, to—

(A) a person with supervisory authority over the covered individual at the employer of the covered individual; or

(B) another individual working for the employer described in subparagraph (A) whom the covered individual reasonably believes has the authority to—

(i) investigate, discover, or terminate the misconduct; or

(ii) take any other action to address the misconduct.

(b) **ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A covered individual who alleges they are aggrieved by a violation of subsection (a) may seek relief under paragraph (3) by—

(A) filing a complaint with the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the requirements of paragraph (2)(A); or

(B) if the Secretary of Labor has not issued a final decision in accordance with such paragraph within 180 days of the filing of a complaint under subparagraph (A), and there is no showing that such a delay is due to the bad faith of the covered individual, bringing an action against the employer at law or in equity in the appropriate district court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction over such an action without regard to the amount in controversy.

(2) **PROCEDURE.**—

(A) **DEPARTMENT OF LABOR COMPLAINTS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii) and paragraph (3), a complaint filed with the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (1)(A) shall be governed by the rules and procedures set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code, including the legal burdens of proof described in such section.

(ii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—With respect to a complaint filed under paragraph (1)(A), notification required under section 42121(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, shall be made to each person named in the complaint, including the employer.

(B) **DISTRICT COURT ACTIONS.**—

(i) **JURY TRIAL.**—A party to an action brought under paragraph (1)(B) shall be entitled to trial by jury.

(ii) **STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—An action may not be brought under paragraph (1)(B)—

(aa) more than 6 years after the date on which the violation of subsection (a) occurs; or

(bb) more than 3 years after the date on which facts material to the right of action are known, or reasonably should have been known, by the covered individual bringing the action.

(II) **REQUIRED ACTION WITHIN 10 YEARS.**—Notwithstanding subclause (I), an action under paragraph (1)(B) may not in any circumstance be brought more than 10 years after the date on which the violation occurs.

(3) **RELIEF.**—Relief for a covered individual prevailing with respect to a complaint filed under paragraph (1)(A) or an action under paragraph (1)(B) shall include—

(A) reinstatement with the same seniority status that the covered individual would have had, but for the violation;

(B) 2 times the amount of back pay otherwise owed to the covered individual, with interest;

(C) the payment of compensatory damages, which shall include compensation for litigation costs, expert witness fees, and reasonable attorneys' fees; and

(D) any other appropriate remedy with respect to the violation as determined by the Secretary of Labor in a complaint under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) or by the court in an action under subparagraph (B) of such paragraph.

(c) **NONENFORCEABILITY WAIVERS OF RIGHTS OR REMEDIES.**—The rights and remedies provided for in this section may not be waived or altered by any contract, agreement, policy form, or condition of employment (or condition of work as an independent contractor), including by any agreement requiring a covered individual to engage in arbitration, mediation, or any other alternative dispute resolution process prior to seeking relief under subsection (b).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AI SECURITY VULNERABILITY.**—The term “AI security vulnerability” means any failure or lapse in security that could potentially allow emerging artificial intelligence technology to be acquired by a person (including a foreign entity) by theft or other means.

(2) **AI VIOLATION.**—The term “AI violation” means—

(A) any violation of Federal law, including rules and regulations, related to or committed during the development, deployment, or use of artificial intelligence; or

(B) any failure to appropriately respond to a substantial and specific danger that the development, deployment, or use of artificial intelligence may pose to public safety, public health, or national security.

(3) **ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE.**—The term “artificial intelligence” includes any of the following:

(A) An artificial system that performs tasks under varying and unpredictable circumstances without significant human oversight, or that can learn from experience and improve performance when exposed to data sets.

(B) An artificial system developed in computer software, physical hardware, or other context that solves tasks requiring human-

like perception, cognition, planning, learning, communication, or physical action.

(C) An artificial system designed to think or act like a human, including cognitive architectures and neural networks.

(D) A set of techniques, including machine learning, that are designed to approximate a cognitive task.

(E) An artificial system designed to act rationally, including an intelligent software agent or embodied robot that achieves goals using perception, planning, reasoning, learning, communicating, decision making, and acting.

(4) **ARTIFICIAL SYSTEM.**—The term “artificial system”—

(A) means any data system, software, application, tool, or utility that operates in whole or in part using dynamic or static machine learning algorithms or other forms of artificial intelligence, including in the case—

(i) the data system, software, application, tool, or utility is established primarily for the purpose of researching, developing, or implementing artificial intelligence technology; or

(ii) artificial intelligence capability is integrated into another system or agency business process, operational activity, or technology system; and

(B) does not include any common commercial product within which artificial intelligence is embedded, such as a word processor or map navigation system.

(5) **COMMERCE.**—The terms “commerce” and “industry or activity affecting commerce” mean any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce, and include “commerce” and any “industry affecting commerce”, as defined in paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 501 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 142 (1) and (3)).

(6) **COVERED INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “covered individual” includes—

(A) an employee, including a former employee; and

(B) an independent contractor, including a former independent contractor.

(7) **EMERGING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY.**—The term “emerging artificial intelligence technology”, with respect to an AI security vulnerability, means any artificial system that exhibits a level of performance, complexity, or autonomy that is comparable to or exceeds capabilities that are generally considered state-of-the-art as of the time of the AI security vulnerability.

(8) **EMPLOYER.**—The term “employer” means any person (including any officer, employee, contractor, subcontractor, agent, company, partnership, or other individual or entity) engaged in commerce or an industry or activity affecting commerce who pays any compensation to a covered individual in exchange for the covered individual providing work to the person.

SA 3086. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) 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 subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 12. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSFERS OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES AMONG BALTIC STATES.

(a) **EXEMPTIONS FROM REQUIREMENT FOR CONSENT TO TRANSFER.**—

(1) **ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.**—Section 3(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(a)(2)) is amended by inserting “except in the case of Estonia, Lithuania, or Latvia,” before “the country”.

(2) **FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT.**—Section 505(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2314(a)(1)) is amended by inserting “except in the case of Estonia, Lithuania, or Latvia,” before “it will not.”.

(3) **AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **CONSENT TO TRANSFER NOT REQUIRED.**—An agreement between the United States and a Baltic State under section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(a)) with respect to defense articles or defense services provided by the United States shall not require the Baltic state to seek approval from the United States to transfer the defense article or defense service to any other Baltic State.

(B) **MODIFICATION.**—With respect to any agreement under section 3(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(a)(2)) in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act that requires the consent of the President before a Baltic state may transfer a defense article or defense service provided by the United States, at the request of any Baltic state, the United States shall modify such agreement so as to remove such requirement with respect to such a transfer to any other Baltic state.

(b) **COMMON COALITION KEY.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish among the Baltic states a common coalition key or other technological solution within the Baltic states for the purpose of sharing ammunition for High Mobility Artillery Rocket Systems (HIMARS) among the Baltic states for training and operational purposes.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **BALTIC STATE.**—The term “Baltic state” means the following:

(A) Estonia.

(B) Lithuania.

(C) Latvia.

(2) **DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE.**—The terms “defense article” and “defense service” have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

SA 3087. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. OSSOFF) 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 subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1067. TRAINING ON INCREASING CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SERVICE-DISABLED VETERANS.

Section 36 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j) **TRAINING ON INCREASING CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SERVICE-DISABLED VETERANS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator, in consultation with the Office of Veterans Business Development, shall provide to cov-

ered employees at each Federal agency that has not met the goal established under section 15(g)(1)(A)(ii) training on how to increase the number of contracts awarded to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans.

“(2) **GUIDANCE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator, in consultation with the Office of Veterans Business Development, shall issue guidance and best practices on increasing the number of contracts awarded to small businesses owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans for Federal agencies to which the goal established under section 15(g)(1)(A)(ii) applies.

“(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Administration shall submit to Congress a report detailing, for the fiscal year covered by the report—

“(A) a list of each Federal agency that failed to meet the goal established under section 15(g)(1)(A)(ii);

“(B) the number of trainings provided to each Federal agency described in paragraph (1); and

“(C) an overview of the content included in the training sessions described in subparagraph (B).”.

SA 3088. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, after line 19, add the following:

SEC. 4. REDUCTION IN AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS TO BE 2 PERCENT LESS THAN FISCAL YEAR 2025.

The discretionary appropriations made available under divisions B and C of this Act are reduced, on a pro rata basis—

(1) for division B, by the amount necessary to reduce the amount of discretionary appropriations made available under such division to be 2 percent less than the amount of discretionary appropriations made available under section 1101(a)(1) of the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2025 (division A of Public Law 119-4; 139 Stat. 9); and

(2) for division C, by the amount necessary to reduce the amount of discretionary appropriations made available under such division to be 2 percent less than the amount of discretionary appropriations made available under section 1101(a)(2) of the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2025 (division A of Public Law 119-4; 139 Stat. 9).

SA 3089. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, after line 19, add the following:

SEC. 4. ACROSS THE BOARD 2 PERCENT REDUCTION FOR THE AGRICULTURE AND COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND SCIENCE DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.

For divisions B and C of this Act, each discretionary appropriation made under such

division is reduced, on a pro rata basis, by the amount necessary to reduce the amount of discretionary appropriations made available under such division, but for this section, by 2 percent.

SA 3090. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 163, line 24, strike “programs.” and insert “programs; and, \$6,356,000,000 shall be made available for telehealth for veterans.”.

SA 3091. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this title shall be used to prohibit a woman veteran from accessing abortion services or abortion counseling if determined medically necessary by a health care professional when the life or the health of the pregnant woman would be endangered if the pregnancy were continued or if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SA 3092. Mr. PAUL 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. **PROHIBITION ON EARNINGS.**

Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (12) and inserting the following:

“(12) **EARNINGS ON BALANCES.**—No Federal Reserve bank may pay earnings on balances maintained at a Federal Reserve bank by or on behalf of a depository institution.”.

SA 3093. Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. GALLEG0) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. ____. It is the sense of Congress that Congress—

(1) supports funding of community-based organizations that serve as part of a public-private partnership with the Department of Veterans Affairs to address upstream suicide prevention needs of veterans; and

(2) encourages the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to fund community-based, nonprofit organizations that serve in a State-wide capacity and have and coordinate an extensive network of public and private sector partners to increase access to critical services for veterans with the goals of preventing suicide, increasing access to care and services, and improving well-being outcomes for veterans.

SA 3094. Mr. CRUZ 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 appropriate place in title XII, insert the following:

SEC. 12 ____. **REVIEW BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES OF REAL ESTATE PURCHASES OR LEASES NEAR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR MILITARY AIRSPACE.**

(a) **INCLUSION IN DEFINITION OF COVERED TRANSACTION.**—Section 721(a)(4) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(a)(4)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) any transaction described in subparagraph (B)(vi) that is proposed, pending, or completed on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) Notwithstanding clause (ii) or subparagraph (C), the purchase or lease by, or a concession to, a foreign person of private or public real estate—

“(I) that is located in the United States and within—

“(aa) 100 miles of a military installation (as defined in section 2801(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code); or

“(bb) 50 miles of—

“(AA) a military training route (as defined in section 183a(h) of title 10, United States Code);

“(BB) airspace designated as special use airspace under part 73 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), and managed by the Department of Defense;

“(CC) a controlled firing area (as defined in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)) used by the Department of Defense; or

“(DD) a military operations area (as defined in section 1.1 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation)); and

“(II) if the foreign person is owned or controlled by, is acting for or on behalf of, or receives subsidies from—

“(aa) the Government of the Russian Federation;

“(bb) the Government of the People’s Republic of China;

“(cc) the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran; or

“(dd) the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.”.

(b) **MANDATORY UNILATERAL INITIATION OF REVIEWS.**—Section 721(b)(1)(D) of the Defense

Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(b)(1)(D)) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by redesignating subclauses (I), (II), and (III) as items (aa), (bb), and (cc), respectively, and by moving such items, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) as subclauses (I), (II), and (III), respectively, and by moving such subclauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “Subject to” and inserting the following:

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **MANDATORY UNILATERAL INITIATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.**—The Committee shall initiate a review under subparagraph (A) of a covered transaction described in subsection (a)(4)(B)(vi).”.

(c) **CERTIFICATIONS TO CONGRESS.**—Section 721(b)(3)(C)(iii) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(b)(3)(C)(iii)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (IV), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subclause (V), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) with respect to covered transactions described in subsection (a)(4)(B)(vi), to the Members of the Senate from the State in which the military installation, military training route, special use airspace, controlled firing area, or military operations area is located, and the Member of the House of Representatives from the Congressional District in which such installation, route, airspace, or area is located.”.

SA 3095. Mr. CRUZ 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 subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1265. **LIMITATION ON ENGAGEMENT WITH MEXICO UNTIL MEXICO PROVIDES WATER PURSUANT TO TREATY OBLIGATIONS.**

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report regarding deliveries of water by Mexico pursuant to the Treaty relating to the Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande, signed at Washington February 3, 1944 (9 Bevans 1166), between the United States and Mexico (in this section referred to as the “Treaty”).

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a determination of whether Mexico has, during the calendar year preceding the submission of the report, delivered to the United States 350,000 acre-feet of water;

(B) an assessment of Mexico’s capabilities for delivering 1,750,000 acre-feet of water by the final year of the five-year cycle described in the Treaty within which the previous calendar year fell; and

(C) an identification of significant economic sectors or activities in Mexico that are situated in, or substantially dependent upon, irrigation districts that benefit from—

(i) water delivered to Mexico by the United States; or

(ii) the 6 tributaries of the Rio Grande from which Mexico is obligated to deliver water pursuant to the Treaty.

(b) LIMITATION ON ENGAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, in a report required by subsection (a), the Secretary makes a negative determination under paragraph (2)(A) of that subsection, the President—

(A) shall deny all non-Treaty requests by Mexico; and

(B) may limit or terminate engagement with the Government of Mexico related to the sectors or activities in Mexico identified under subsection (a)(2)(C), other than engagement to counter the flow of fentanyl, fentanyl precursors, xylazine, and other synthetic drugs into the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The limitation described in paragraph (1)(A) shall not apply to a non-Treaty request by Mexico if the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress, not later than 120 days after the submission of the report described in paragraph (1), and every 120 days thereafter, a certification that—

(A) the water delivered through such channels—

(i) will be used exclusively to address an ongoing ecological, environmental, or humanitarian emergency; and

(ii) will not be used for—

(I) municipal purposes;

(II) industrial purposes;

(III) normal water supply needs;

(IV) water infrastructure deficiencies; or

(V) maintenance work; and

(B) fulfilling the request is vital to the national interests of the United States.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) NON-TREATY REQUEST.—The term “non-Treaty request” means an emergency request for special delivery channels for the delivery of water made pursuant to any current or future Minute of the International Boundary and Water Commission based on the principles established in Commission Minute No. 240, entitled “Emergency Deliveries of Colorado River Waters for Use in Tijuana”, dated June 13, 1972, as subsequently amended and extended, most recently by Commission Minute No. 327, entitled “Emergency Deliveries of Colorado River Waters For Use In The City of Tijuana, Baja California”, dated January 28, 2022.

SA 3096. Mr. CRUZ 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 subtitle B of title I, add the following:

SEC. 112. AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE EARLY PRODUCTION OF FUTURE LONG RANGE ASSAULT AIRCRAFT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary of the Army may enter into contracts, in advance of full-rate production, for the procurement of not more than 24 future long range assault aircraft as part of an accelerated low-rate early production effort.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—In carrying out the early production effort described in subsection (a),

the Secretary of the Army shall pursue the following objectives:

(1) To expedite delivery of future long range assault aircraft operational capability to the warfighter.

(2) To maintain momentum and learning continuity between test article completion and full production ramp-up.

(3) To stabilize and retain the specialized workforce and industrial base supporting future long range assault aircraft, including critical suppliers and production facilities in Texas, Kansas, and other States.

(4) To mitigate cost escalation risks and improve program affordability across the life cycle.

(c) CONSIDERATIONS.—In executing the authority provided by subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) prioritize program continuity, cost-efficiency, and workforce retention across the supply chain for tiltrotor aircraft;

(2) ensure that aircraft procured as part of the early production effort described in subsection (a) incorporate lessons learned from test article evaluations; and

(3) maintain flexibility in design to accommodate future upgrades through the modular open systems architecture and digital backbone.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing—

(1) the implementation plan and timeline for the procurement and early production effort described in subsection (a);

(2) the status of industrial base readiness and supply chain coordination; and

(3) estimated long-term cost savings and operational benefits derived from such early production effort.

SA 3097. Mr. CRUZ 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 subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 724. PRESERVATION OF DEDICATED AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION CAPABILITY OF MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Medical Service Corps of the Army shall maintain a dedicated aeromedical evacuation capability, including personnel, training, doctrine, and aircraft specifically configured for aeromedical evacuation missions.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Army shall ensure that—

(1) the aviation branch of the Army has the authority to organize, train, and equip aviation assets in accordance with operational requirements; and

(2) the medical department of the Army, under the authority delegated to such department by the Surgeon General of the Army, has the authority for medical command and control, patient care responsibilities, and clinical standards for aeromedical evacuation operations.

(c) ELEMENTS OF CAPABILITY.—The Secretary of the Army shall maintain the capability required under subsection (a)—

(1) in alignment with the sufficiency analysis of the Surgeon General of the Army;

(2) consistent with medical evacuation doctrine and operational planning assumptions of the Army; and

(3) in support of—

(A) the commanders of the combatant commands;

(B) contingency operations and operational plans;

(C) civil authorities;

(D) chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear response force missions;

(E) humanitarian assistance and disaster response operations; and

(F) garrison emergency medical response operations at installations of the Department of Defense.

(d) CHANGE IN STRUCTURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The capability required under subsection (a) shall remain a distinct component within the Medical Service Corps of the Army and may not be restructured into general-purpose aviation elements or dual-use configurations without prior notification to the congressional defense committees, which shall—

(A) be accompanied by a formal risk assessment on—

(i) operational medical readiness of the Medical Service Corps; and

(ii) readiness of the Medical Service Corps to support the joint force and missions specified under subsection (c)(3); and

(B) contain a report that—

(i) is based on the force structure authorizations outlined in the most current Army Structure Message;

(ii) is informed by the most current Total Army Analysis approved by the Secretary of the Army; and

(iii) does not propose or assume any changes to the aircraft authorizations reflected in the documents specified in clauses (i) and (ii).

(2) OPERATIONAL MEDICAL REQUIREMENTS AND JOINT FORCE NEEDS.—Any adjustments made to the force structure of the Army must account for operational medical requirements and joint force needs where the Surgeon General of the Army retains authority over the medical force structure, staffing, clinical oversight, and doctrinal development for aeromedical evacuation units.

(e) CHANGE TO ALLOCATIONS.—The Secretary of the Army may not make any changes to allocations for the Medical Service Corps of the Army that is inconsistent with the requirements of this section without prior consultation with the Surgeon General of the Army, who shall certify that the proposed changes are supported by a sufficiency analysis and that the revised platform levels remain adequate to support all mission categories requiring aeromedical evacuation, consistent with medical evacuation doctrine and operational planning assumptions of the Army.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit augmentation of military patient movement operations with combatant, commercial, or allied assets in contingency or humanitarian operations, as determined necessary by the Secretary of Defense.

SA 3098. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CORNYN) 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SKYFOUNDRY PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) **PROGRAM REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and carry out a program to enable the rapid development, testing, and scalable manufacture of small unmanned aircraft systems, with potential expansion to associated energetics and other autonomous systems as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **DESIGNATION.**—The program established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be known as the “SkyFoundry Program” (in this section the “Program”).

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) administer the Program through the Secretary of the Army; and

(B) establish the Program as part of the Defense Industrial Resilience Consortium.

(b) **ALTERNATIVE ACQUISITION MECHANISM.**—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall leverage alternative acquisition mechanisms to accelerate development and production. Such mechanisms shall include the use of other transaction authority under section 4022 of title 10, United States Code, and the use of the middle tier of acquisition pathway for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding as authorized by section 3602 of such title.

(c) **COMPONENTS.**—The Program shall have two components as follows:

(1) **INNOVATION FACILITY.**—A Government-owned innovation facility for the development of small unmanned aircraft systems that is operated by the United States Army Materiel Command in coordination with United States Futures Command and serves as the research, development, and testing hub, integrating lessons learned from global conflicts to rapidly evolve United States small unmanned aircraft systems designs.

(2) **PRODUCTION FACILITY.**—The Commander of United States Army Materiel Command shall identify a Government-owned production facility with the competencies for producing various forms of small unmanned aircraft systems. The facility shall be operated by United States Army Materiel Command and have the capability to produce 1,000,000 small unmanned aircraft systems annually once fully established.

(d) **GOVERNMENT OWNED GOVERNMENT OPERATED CONTRACTOR AUGMENTED MODEL.**—The Secretary may—

(1) enter into multiyear contracts or agreements for contractor augmented support to the Program, including integrating specialized contractor personnel within Program facilities as part of hybrid teams alongside military and civilian personnel; and

(2) enter into public-private partnership agreements with private industry, academic institutions, and nonprofit entities in support of the Program.

(e) FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall prioritize utilizing or modifying existing Army Depot facilities and select at least two separate sites for the Program, one to house the innovation facility required by subsection (b)(1) and one to house the production facility required by subsection (b)(2).

(2) **AUTHORITY TO RENOVATE, EXPAND, AND CONSTRUCT.**—The Secretary may renovate, expand, or construct facilities for the Program using available funds, notwithstanding chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) **SELECTION OF SITES.**—When selecting sites for the Program, the Secretary shall consider that the production facility required by subsection (b)(2) shall be housed at

an existing Army Depot that meets the following requirements:

(A) The Army Depot shall be comprised of 15,000 acres of land.

(B) The Army Depot shall have approximately 10,000 buildable acres of land.

(C) The Army Depot shall have approximately 8,000,000 square feet of facilities.

(D) The Army Depot shall be located within 50 miles of four States.

(f) **INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the United States retains appropriate intellectual property and technical data rights for any systems or technologies developed under the Program. At a minimum, the Secretary shall secure Government purpose rights in intellectual property developed jointly with contractors, to enable the Government’s continued production, sustainment, modification, and competitive procurement of such systems.

(g) **DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT DESIGNATION.**—The President (or the Secretary of Defense under delegated authority) shall utilize authorities under title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4531 et seq.) to prioritize and support domestic industrial base capacity for small unmanned aircraft systems and associated energetics and autonomous systems. Such items shall be deemed essential for the national defense industrial base, and Title III efforts may include investments in production scale-up, establishment of strategic materials stockpiles, and surge manufacturing capacity for these systems and components.

(h) **EXPEDITED APPROVALS AND WAIVERS.**—The Secretary, or the Secretary of the Army under explicit delegated authority, may expedite, and as appropriate to waive or modify Department of Defense regulatory requirements and internal procedures that would otherwise impede the rapid development, acquisition, or production activities of the Program.

SA 3099. Mr. CRUZ 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 subtitle C of title XXVIII, insert the following:

SEC. 2833. CLARIFICATION OF LAND CONVEYANCE, FORT HOOD, TEXAS.

Section 2848(a) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375; 118 Stat. 2140) is amended by striking “an upper level (junior, senior, and graduate) university” and inserting “a university”.

SA 3100. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. FETTERMAN) 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 subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1067. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN EXPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting

after section 163 (42 U.S.C. 6243) the following:

“SEC. 164. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN EXPORTS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall prohibit the export or sale of petroleum products drawn down from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, under any provision of law, to—

“(1) the People’s Republic of China;

“(2) the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea;

“(3) the Russian Federation;

“(4) the Islamic Republic of Iran; and

“(5) any entity that is under the ownership or control of—

“(A) a country referred to in any of paragraphs (1) through (4); or

“(B) the Chinese Communist Party.

“(b) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may issue a waiver of the prohibition described in subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies that any export or sale authorized pursuant to the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

“(c) **RULE.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026, the Secretary shall issue a rule to carry out this section.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) **DRAWDOWN AND SALE OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS.**—Section 161(a) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6241(a)) is amended by inserting “and section 164” before the period at the end.

(2) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents for the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 163 the following:

“Sec. 164. Prohibition on certain exports.”

(3) **NATIONAL POLICY ON OIL EXPORT RESTRICTION.**—Section 101(b) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (42 U.S.C. 6212a(b)) is amended by inserting “and section 164 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act” after “and (d)”.

SA 3101. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) 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 appropriate place in subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10 ____ . STUDY ON NEW TECHNOLOGIES TO RECYCLE SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) **NATIONAL LABORATORY.**—The term “National Laboratory” has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801).

(2) **NUCLEAR WASTE.**—The term “nuclear waste” means spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste (as defined in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101)).

(3) **RECYCLING.**—The term “recycling” means the recovery of valuable radionuclides, including fissile materials, from nuclear waste, and any subsequent processes, such as enrichment and fuel fabrication, necessary for reuse in nuclear reactors or other commercial applications.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Energy.

(5) **SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL.**—The term “spent nuclear fuel” has the meaning given the

term in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall assemble an independent committee of experts to carry out the study described in this subsection.

(2) INDIVIDUALS NOT TO BE INCLUDED.—The independent committee of experts assembled under paragraph (1) shall not include any of the same individuals who authored the report of the National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine entitled “Merits and Viability of Different Nuclear Fuel Cycles and Technology Options and the Waste Aspects of Advanced Nuclear Reactors” and dated 2023, but those same individuals may advise the independent committee of experts.

(3) INDEPENDENT COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS.—The independent committee of experts assembled under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) consist of subject matter experts from stakeholders, such as the Office of Nuclear Energy of the Department of Energy, the National Laboratories, academia, industry, and other relevant stakeholder groups, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) carry out a study—

(i) to analyze the practicability, potential benefits, costs, and risks, including proliferation, of using dedicated recycling facilities to convert spent nuclear fuel, including spent high-assay low-enriched uranium fuel, into useable nuclear fuels, such as those for—

(I) commercial light water reactors;

(II) advanced nuclear reactors; and

(III) medical, space-based, advanced-battery, and other non-reactor applications, as determined by the Secretary;

(ii)(I) to analyze the practicability, potential benefits, costs, and risks of recycling spent nuclear fuel, which is taken from temporary storage sites throughout the United States, and using it as fuel or input for advanced nuclear reactors, existing reactors, or commercial applications;

(II) to compare such practicability, potential benefits, costs, and risks of recycling spent nuclear fuel with the practicability, potential benefits, costs, and risks of the once-through fuel cycle, including temporary and permanent storage requirements; and

(III) to analyze the practicability, potential benefits, costs, and risks of aqueous (such as PUREX and the derivatives of PUREX) recycling processes with the practicability, potential benefits, costs, and risk of non-aqueous (such as pyro-electrochemistry) recycling processes;

(iii) to analyze the technical and economic feasibility of utilizing nuclear waste processing to extract certain isotopes needed for domestic and international use, including medical, industrial, space-based power source, and advanced-battery applications;

(iv) to analyze the practicability, potential benefits, costs, risks, and potential approaches for coupling or collocating recycling facilities with other pertinent facilities, such as advanced nuclear reactors (that can use the recycled fuel), interim storage, and fuel-fabrication facilities, including through—

(I) relevant analyses, such as capital and operating cost estimates, public-private partnerships to encourage investment, infrastructure requirements, timeline to full-scale commercial deployment, and distinguishing characteristics or requirements of such facilities;

(II) input from interested private technology developers and relevant assumptions regarding cost; and

(III) comparison with the practicability, potential benefits, costs, and risks of the once-through fuel cycle, including temporary and permanent storage requirements;

(v) to identify parties, including individuals, communities, businesses, and local and Tribal governments, that are impacted economically, or through health, safety, or environmental risks, by the current practice of indefinite temporary storage of spent nuclear fuel, and assess potential risks and benefits for those parties should spent nuclear fuel be removed from their sites for the purposes of nuclear waste recycling;

(vi) to assess different approaches for siting and sizing nuclear waste recycling facilities, including a centralized national facility, regional facilities, on-site facilities where spent nuclear fuel is currently stored, and on-site facilities where newly recycled fuel can be used by an on-site reactor, and recommend one or more approaches that consider environmental, transportation, infrastructure, capital, and other risks;

(vii) to identify tracking and accountability methods for new recycled fuel and radioactive waste streams for byproducts of the recycling process;

(viii)(I) to identify any regulatory gaps related to nuclear waste management and recycling, including accuracy and consistency of relevant definitions for radioactive waste (including “high-level radioactive waste”, “spent nuclear fuel”, “low-level radioactive waste”, “reprocessing”, “recycling”, and “vitrification”) and classifications of radioactive waste that exist in Federal law on the date of enactment of this Act;

(II) to compare such definitions to those used by other nations that manage radioactive waste; and

(III) to make recommendations for modernizing such definitions; and

(ix) to evaluate—

(I) potential Federal and State-level policy changes to support development and deployment of recycling and waste-utilizing reactor technologies; and

(II) impacts of spent nuclear fuel recycling on requirements for domestic nuclear waste storage.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the agreement described under subsection (b) is entered, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, a report that complies with each of the following:

(1) Describes the results of the study.

(2) Is released to the public.

(3) Totals not more than 120 pages (excluding Front Matter, References, and Appendices) written and formatted to facilitate review by a nonspecialist readership, including the following sections:

(A) A Front Matter section that includes a cover page with identifying information, tables of contents, figures, and tables.

(B) An Executive Summary section.

(C) An Introductory section that includes a historical overview that also explains why recycling is not performed in the United States today, such as economic, political, or technological obstacles.

(D) Results and Findings sections that summarize the results and findings of the study described in subsection (b).

(E) A Key Remaining Challenges and Barriers section that identifies key technical and nontechnical (such as economic) challenges and barriers that need to be addressed

to enable scale-up and commercial adoption of spent nuclear fuel recycling, with preference given to secure, proliferation resistant, environmentally safe, and economical recycling methods.

(F) A Policy Recommendations section that—

(i) lists policy recommendations to address remaining technical and nontechnical (such as economic) challenges and barriers to enable scale-up and commercial adoption of spent nuclear fuel recycling, including with government support;

(ii) contrasts the potential benefits and risks of each policy; and

(iii) compares benefits to current or past policies.

(G) An Other section in which other relevant information may be added.

(H) A References section.

(I) An Appendices section.

SA 3102. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her 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, insert the following:

SEC. 1067. FIRST RESPONDERS MENTAL HEALTH HOTLINE.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 399V–8. FIRST RESPONDERS MENTAL HEALTH HOTLINE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Use, shall maintain, directly or by contract or grant, a national first responders emergency hotline to provide peer and emotional support, information, brief intervention, and mental and behavioral health and substance use disorder resources and referrals to first responders and to their families or household members.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR HOTLINE.—The hotline established under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) operate as a separate, widely recognizable number with bidirectional transfer options with the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline established pursuant to section 520E–3;

“(2) provide 24/7 toll-free, real-time, live assistance;

“(3) provide voice and text support;

“(4) be sufficiently staffed by, at a minimum, culturally competent first responder peer specialists or first responder mental health services providers; and

“(5) provide peer support, mental and behavioral health and substance use disorder assistance, and referral services to meet the needs of first responders and family members or household members at risk of experiencing mental or behavioral health or substance use disorders.

“(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In maintaining the hotline under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(A) consult with the National Domestic Violence Hotline, the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline, and the Veterans Crisis Line to ensure that first responders are connected in real-time to the appropriate specialized hotline service, when applicable;

“(B) conduct a public awareness campaign for the hotline under subsection (a) in coordination and consultation with Federal departments and agencies, including the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and the Department of Justice; and

“(C) consult with organizations that operate existing crisis or peer support hotlines for first responders with respect to best practices for operating such hotlines.

“(2) EXISTING HOTLINES.—The Secretary or an entity receiving a grant or contract under subsection (a), as applicable, shall form partnerships between the existing national first responders mental health hotline and other first responder helplines and websites.

“(3) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall ensure that calls from public safety personnel received through the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline are appropriately referred to the hotline under subsection (a).

“(4) MINIMUM STANDARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall implement, in coordination with mental health providers and first responder associations or personnel, trauma-informed and culturally competent training, guidance, and standards for culturally competent peer specialists and 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline network center personnel on the unique concerns, resources, linkages, and stressors of first responders.

“(B) MINIMUM TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.—Culturally competent first responder peer specialists and 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline network center personnel shall complete not less than 20 hours of foundation training, which shall include instruction on—

“(i) the essential functions of first responders and public safety organizations;

“(ii) the behavioral health conditions common to first responders;

“(iii) common and novel stressors inherent in public safety and emergency response work;

“(iv) normal and abnormal adaptation to occupational stress and trauma;

“(v) the principles of confidentiality, testimonial privilege, and ethical considerations;

“(vi) crisis intervention strategies;

“(vii) action planning, resource navigation, and referral processes;

“(viii) general risk assessment, including suicide risk indicators and safety planning intervention strategies; and

“(ix) first responders outreach and engagement practices.

“(C) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—Culturally competent first responder peer specialists and 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline network center personnel shall complete a minimum of 8 hours annually of continuing education focused on emerging behavioral health topics, best practices in peer support, and updates in crisis intervention and referral protocols.

“(D) IDENTIFICATION OF QUALIFIED TRAINING PARTNERS.—To support the development, implementation, and continuous evaluation of peer support training programs designed to promote the safety, mental wellness, and operational readiness of first responders and emergency service personnel, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, collaborate with nationally recognized nonprofit organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that demonstrate—

“(i) expertise in training related to emergency response and behavioral health with the first responder community; and

“(ii) documented cultural competency regarding the unique operational environments, occupational stressors, and behavioral health challenges faced by first responders.

“(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress on the hotline under subsection (a) and implementation of this section, including—

“(1) an evaluation of the effectiveness of activities conducted or supported under subsection (a);

“(2) an evaluation of staffing levels necessary to maintain adequate services;

“(3) a directory of entities or organizations to which staff maintaining the hotline funded under this section may make referrals; and

“(4) such additional information as the Secretary determines appropriate.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CULTURALLY COMPETENT FIRST RESPONDER PEER SPECIALIST.—The term ‘culturally competent first responder peer specialist’ means an individual—

“(A) with familiarity with, and understanding of, the duties and unique stressors of first responders, which may include experience working as a first responder; and

“(B) who completed a trauma-informed and culturally competent training developed pursuant to subsection (c)(4).

“(2) FIRST RESPONDER.—The term ‘first responder’—

“(A) means—

“(i) a law enforcement officer, firefighter, or member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew (as such terms are defined in section 1204 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968); or

“(ii) a public safety telecommunicator, including 9-1-1 operators and dispatchers; and

“(B) includes a retired first responder.

“(3) FIRST RESPONDER MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDER.—The term ‘first responder mental health services provider’ includes a State-licensed or State-certified counselor, trauma counselor, psychologist or other State licensed or certified mental health professional who—

“(A) is qualified under State law to provide mental or behavioral health services; and

“(B) who completed a trauma-informed and culturally competent training developed pursuant to subsection (c)(4).

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2032.”

SA 3103. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina 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 subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1265. REPORTS ON FOREIGN BOYCOTTS OF ISRAEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the head of the Office of Antiboycott Compliance of the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on foreign boycotts described in section 1773(a) of the Anti-Boycott Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4842(a)) targeted at the State of Israel that includes a description of—

(1) those foreign boycotts; and

(2) the steps taken by the Department of Commerce to enforce the provisions of the

Anti-Boycott Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4841 et seq.) with respect to those foreign boycotts.

(b) TERMINATION.—The requirement to submit reports under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3104. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . FINANCIAL INTEGRITY AND REGULATION MANAGEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the primary objective of financial regulation and supervision by the Federal banking agencies is to promote the safety and soundness of depository institutions;

(2) all federally legal businesses and law-abiding citizens regardless of political ideology should have equal opportunity to obtain financial services and should not face unlawful discrimination in obtaining such services;

(3) financial service providers are private entities entitled to provide services to whichever customers they so choose, provided that those decisions do not violate the law;

(4) financial service providers should strive to ensure that all business decisions are based on factors free from unlawful prejudice or political influence;

(5) the use of reputational risk in supervisory frameworks encourages Federal banking agencies to regulate depository institutions based on the subjective view of negative publicity and provides cover for the agencies to implement their own political agenda unrelated to the safety and soundness of a depository institution;

(6) Federal banking agencies have in fact used reputational risk to limit access of federally legal businesses and law-abiding citizens to financial services in 2018 when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation acknowledged that the agency used reputational risk reviews to limit access to financial services by certain industries, commonly known as “Operation Choke Point”; and

(7) reputational risk does not appear in any statute and is an unnecessary and improper use of supervisory authority that does not contribute to the safety and soundness of the financial system.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term “depository institution”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) includes an insured credit union.

(2) FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term “Federal banking agency”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) includes—

(i) the National Credit Union Administration; and

(ii) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

(3) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(4) **REPUTATIONAL RISK.**—The term “reputational risk” means the potential that negative publicity or negative public opinion regarding an institution’s business practices, whether true or not, will cause a decline in confidence in the institution or a decline in the customer base, costly litigation, or revenue reductions or otherwise adversely impact the depository institution.

(c) **REMOVAL OF REPUTATIONAL RISK AS A CONSIDERATION IN THE SUPERVISION OF DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.**—Each Federal banking agency shall remove from any guidance, rule, examination manual, or similar document established by the agency any reference to reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, regarding the supervision of depository institutions such that reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, is no longer taken into consideration by the Federal banking agency when examining and supervising a depository institution.

(d) **PROHIBITION.**—No Federal banking agency may engage in any activity concerning or related to the regulation, supervision, or examination, of the reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, or the management thereof, of a depository institution, including by—

(1) establishing any rule, regulation, requirement, standard, or supervisory expectation concerning or related to the reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, or the management thereof, of a depository institution whether binding or not;

(2) conducting any examination, assessment, data collection, or other supervisory exercise concerning or related to reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, or the management thereof, of a depository institution;

(3) issuing any examination finding, supervisory criticism, or other supervisory or examination communication concerning or related to reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, or the management thereof, of a depository institution;

(4) making any supervisory ratings decision or determination that is based, in whole or in part, on any matter concerning or related to reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, or the management thereof, of a depository institution; and

(5) taking any formal or informal enforcement action that is based, in whole or in part, on any matter concerning or related to reputational risk, or any term substantially similar, or the management thereof, of a depository institution.

(e) **TAKING ACCOUNT OF INSTITUTIONS WITH LOW OPERATIONAL RISK.**—

(1) **TAILORING REGULATION TO BUSINESS MODEL AND RISK.**—

(A) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph—

(i) the term “Federal financial institutions regulatory agency” means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; and

(ii) the term “regulatory action”—

(I) means any proposed, interim, or final rule or regulation; and

(II) does not include any action taken by a Federal financial institutions regulatory agency that is solely applicable to an individual institution, including an enforcement action or order.

(B) **CONSIDERATION AND TAILORING.**—For any regulatory action occurring after the date of enactment of this Act, each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall—

(i) take into consideration the risk profile and business models of each type of institu-

tion or class of institutions subject to the regulatory action; and

(ii) tailor the regulatory action applicable to an institution, or type of institution, in a manner that limits the regulatory impact, including cost, human resource allocation, and other burdens, on the institution or type of institution as is appropriate for the risk profile and business model involved.

(C) **FACTORS TO CONSIDER.**—In carrying out the requirements of subparagraph (B), each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall consider—

(i) the aggregate impact of all applicable regulatory actions on the ability of institutions to flexibly serve their customers and local markets after the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) the potential impact that efforts to implement the applicable regulatory action and third-party service provider actions may work to undercut efforts to tailor the regulatory action described in subparagraph (B)(i); and

(iii) the statutory provision authorizing the applicable regulatory action, the congressional intent with respect to the statutory provision, and the underlying policy objectives of the regulatory action.

(D) **NOTICE OF PROPOSED AND FINAL RULEMAKING.**—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall disclose and document in every notice of proposed rulemaking and in every final rulemaking for a regulatory action how the agency has applied subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(E) **LIMITED LOOK-BACK APPLICATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall—

(I) conduct a review of all regulations issued in final form pursuant to statutes enacted during the period beginning on the date that is 7 years before the date on which this Act is introduced in the Senate and ending on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(II) apply the requirements of this paragraph to the regulations described in subclause (I).

(ii) **REVISION.**—Any regulation revised under clause (i) shall be revised not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(F) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the specific actions taken to tailor the regulatory actions of the Federal financial institutions regulatory agency pursuant to the requirements of this paragraph.

(2) **SHORT-FORM CALL REPORTS FOR ALL BANKS ELIGIBLE FOR THE COMMUNITY BANK LEVERAGE RATIO.**—The appropriate Federal banking agencies, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813), shall promulgate regulations establishing a reduced reporting requirement for all banks eligible for the Community Bank Leverage Ratio, as defined in section 201(a) of the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5371 note), when making the first and third report of condition of a year, as required by section 7(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(a)).

(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS ON MODERNIZATION OF SUPERVISION.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the appropriate Federal banking agencies, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813), in consultation with State bank supervisors, shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Com-

mittee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the modernization of bank supervision, including the following factors:

(A) Changing bank business models.

(B) Examiner workforce and training.

(C) The structure of supervisory activities within banking agencies.

(D) Improving bank-supervisor communication and collaboration.

(E) The use of supervisory technology.

(F) Supervisory factors uniquely applicable to community banks.

(G) Changes in statutes necessary to achieve more effective supervision.

(f) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each Federal banking agency shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that—

(1) confirms implementation of this section; and

(2) describes any changes made to internal policies as a result of this section.

SA 3105. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina 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 title XII, add the following:

Subtitle F—Sanctions With Respect to Facilitation of Unlawful Immigration

SEC. 1271. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Stifling Transnational Operations and Proliferators by Mitigating Activities that Drive Narcotics, Exploitation, and Smuggling Sanctions Act” or the “STOP MADNESS Act”.

SEC. 1272. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) migrants who have unlawfully entered the United States—

(A) are a threat to national security; and

(B) should be repatriated to their countries of origin;

(2) if a country of origin resists repatriation of its citizens that unlawfully entered the United States, that country should be subject to economic sanctions, denying the country access to the United States financial system; and

(3) any country, entity, or individual that knowingly facilitates unlawful immigration into the United States should be subject to economic sanctions, denying them access to the United States financial system.

SEC. 1273. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) **FOREIGN GOVERNMENT.**—The term “foreign government”—

(A) means any governing body or political organization that exercises control over a foreign country or a substantial portion of a foreign country; and

(B) includes—

(i) a ministry, department, agency, or instrumentality of a body or organization described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) an official, representative, or other individual acting on behalf of such a body or organization, including an individual who holds a formal or informal role of authority; and

(iii) an entity—

(I) owned or controlled by such a body or organization; or

(II) that acts on behalf of or is directed by such a body or organization.

(3) **FOREIGN PERSON.**—The term “foreign person”—

(A) means an individual or entity that is not a United States person; and

(B) does not include a foreign government.

(4) **KNOWINGLY.**—The term “knowingly”, with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(5) **UNITED STATES PERSON.**—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States;

(C) an alien lawfully admitted to the United States, including any alien admitted for temporary residence, tourism, or employment, or to pursue a course of study; or

(D) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 1274. SENSE OF CONGRESS; STATEMENT OF POLICY.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) foreign governments that refuse or obstruct the efforts of the United States to repatriate their citizens who have unlawfully entered the United States constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, and pose a national emergency; and

(2) foreign governments and foreign persons that knowingly facilitate unlawful immigration into the United States constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, and pose a national emergency.

(b) **STATEMENT OF POLICY.**—It is the policy of the United States, in order to protect the national security of the United States, to apply economic and other financial sanctions with respect to—

(1) foreign governments that resist efforts to repatriate their citizens who have unlawfully entered the United States; and

(2) foreign governments and foreign persons that knowingly facilitate unlawful immigration into the United States.

SEC. 1275. USE OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY AUTHORITIES; REPORTING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this subtitle.

(b) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 7 years after such date of enactment, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on actions taken by the executive branch pursuant to this subtitle and any national emergency declared with respect to the facilitation of unlawful immigration to the United States, including—

(A) the issuance of any new or revised regulations, policies, or guidance;

(B) the imposition of sanctions;

(C) the collection of relevant information from outside parties;

(D) the issuance or termination of general licenses, specific licenses, and statements of licensing policy by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury;

(E) any pending enforcement actions; or

(F) the implementation of mitigation procedures.

(2) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include the matters required by subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), and (F) of that paragraph in a classified annex.

SEC. 1276. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO EFFORTS TO RESIST REPATRIATION OR FACILITATE UNLAWFUL IMMIGRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to—

(1) any foreign government the President determines knowingly refuses or obstructs the efforts of the United States to repatriate its citizens who have unlawfully entered the United States; and

(2) any foreign government or foreign person the President determines knowingly facilitates unlawful immigration into the United States.

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The President may, pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign government or foreign person described in subsection (a) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(c) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 7 years after such date of enactment, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on actions taken by the executive branch with respect to the foreign governments and foreign persons identified under subsection (a).

SEC. 1277. PENALTIES; WAIVERS; EXCEPTIONS.

(a) **PENALTIES.**—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this subtitle or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this subtitle shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(b) **NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.**—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this subtitle with respect to a foreign government or foreign person if the President determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(c) **EXCEPTIONS FOR INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.**—This subtitle shall not apply with respect to—

(1) activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States; or

(2) activities necessary to carry out or assist law enforcement activity of the United States.

SA 3106. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Ms. WARREN) 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 subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1067. EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950.

Section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4564(a)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2025” and inserting “September 30, 2026”.

SA 3107. Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____. From among funds made available to the Medical and Prosthetic Research account, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be made available for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into an agreement with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct a study on the prevalence and mortality of cancers among individuals who served as active duty aircrew in the Armed Forces: *Provided*, That the panel or panels established by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to conduct the study shall identify exposures associated with military occupations of those individuals, including relating to chemicals, compounds, agents, and other phenomena: *Provided further*, That the study shall review existing studies to determine associations between exposures and the incidence of overall cancer morbidity, cancer mortality, and increased prevalence of brain cancer, colon and rectal cancers, kidney cancer, lung cancer, melanoma skin cancer, non-Hodgkin lymphoma, pancreatic cancer, prostate cancer, testicular cancer, thyroid cancer, urinary bladder cancer, and any other cancers determined appropriate by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the agreement shall require that, not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine shall submit to the Secretary and Congress a report on its systematic review and data analysis of the research topics covered under this section.

SA 3108. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available for—

(1) “National Science Foundation—Research and Related Activities” shall be \$3,276,150,000; and

(2) “National Science Foundation—Agency Operations and Award Management” shall be \$355,000,000.

SA 3109. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SCHATZ) 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 subtitle D of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1038. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PROCURE OR MODIFY FOREIGN AIRCRAFT FOR PRESIDENTIAL AIRLIFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of Defense may be made available for the procurement, modification, restoration, or maintenance of an aircraft previously owned by a foreign government, an entity controlled by a foreign government, or a representative of a foreign government for the purposes of providing presidential airlift options.

SA 3110. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ASSESSMENT OF FEASIBILITY OF EXPANDING AGRICULTURAL QUARANTINE AND INSPECTION PROGRAM TO PRODUCTS ENTERING HAWAII.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service shall conduct and submit to Congress an assessment regarding the feasibility of expanding the Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection program to products entering the State of Hawaii, which shall include a determination of the methods of transportation and the types of commerce that are the most likely contributors of invasive pests entering the State of Hawaii and recommendations on how to begin implementing the expansion and an estimate of the cost.

SA 3111. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) 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 appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION ____ —UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA DISCLOSURE

SEC. ____ 01. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the “Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena Disclosure Act of 2025” or the “UAP Disclosure Act of 2025”.

SEC. ____ 02. FINDINGS, DECLARATIONS, AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) All Federal Government records related to unidentified anomalous phenomena should be preserved and centralized for historical and Federal Government purposes.

(2) All Federal Government records concerning unidentified anomalous phenomena should carry a presumption of immediate disclosure and all records should be eventually disclosed to enable the public to become fully informed about the history of the Federal Government’s knowledge and involvement surrounding unidentified anomalous phenomena.

(3) Legislation is necessary to create an enforceable, independent, and accountable process for the public disclosure of such records.

(4) Legislation is necessary because credible evidence and testimony indicates that Federal Government unidentified anomalous phenomena records exist that have not been declassified or subject to mandatory declassification review as set forth in Executive Order 13526 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note; relating to classified national security information) due in part to exemptions under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), as well as an over-broad interpretation of “transclassified foreign nuclear information”, which is also exempt from mandatory declassification, thereby preventing public disclosure under existing provisions of law.

(5) Legislation is necessary because section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Freedom of Information Act”), as implemented by the Executive branch of the Federal Government, has proven inadequate in achieving the timely public disclosure of Government unidentified anomalous phenomena records that are subject to mandatory declassification review.

(6) Legislation is necessary to restore proper oversight over unidentified anomalous phenomena records by elected officials in both the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government that has otherwise been lacking as of the enactment of this Act.

(7) Legislation is necessary to afford complete and timely access to all knowledge gained by the Federal Government concerning unidentified anomalous phenomena in furtherance of comprehensive open scientific and technological research and development essential to avoiding or mitigating potential technological surprise in furtherance of urgent national security concerns and the public interest.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this division are—

(1) to provide for the creation of the unidentified anomalous phenomena Records Collection at the National Archives and Records Administration; and

(2) to require the expeditious public transmission to the Archivist and public disclosure of such records.

SEC. ____ 03. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) ARCHIVIST.—The term “Archivist” means the Archivist of the United States.

(2) CLOSE OBSERVER.—The term “close observer” means anyone who has come into close proximity to unidentified anomalous phenomena or non-human intelligence.

(3) COLLECTION.—The term “Collection” means the Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena

Records Collection established under section ____ 04.

(4) CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE CAMPAIGN PLAN.—The term “Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan” means the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan required by section ____ 09(c)(3).

(5) CONTROLLING AUTHORITY.—The term “controlling authority” means any Federal, State, or local government department, office, agency, committee, commission, commercial company, academic institution, or private sector entity in physical possession of technologies of unknown origin or biological evidence of non-human intelligence.

(6) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Government Ethics.

(7) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term “Executive agency” means an Executive agency, as defined in subsection 552(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(8) GOVERNMENT OFFICE.—The term “Government office” means any department, office, agency, committee, or commission of the Federal Government and any independent office or agency without exception that has possession or control, including via contract or other agreement, of unidentified anomalous phenomena records.

(9) IDENTIFICATION AID.—The term “identification aid” means the written description prepared for each record, as required in section ____ 04.

(10) LEADERSHIP OF CONGRESS.—The term “leadership of Congress” means—

(A) the majority leader of the Senate;

(B) the minority leader of the Senate;

(C) the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(11) LEGACY PROGRAM.—The term “legacy program” means all Federal, State, and local government, commercial industry, academic, and private sector endeavors to collect, exploit, or reverse engineer technologies of unknown origin or examine biological evidence of living or deceased non-human intelligence that pre-dates the date of the enactment of this Act.

(12) NATIONAL ARCHIVES.—The term “National Archives” means the National Archives and Records Administration and all components thereof, including presidential archival depositories established under section 2112 of title 44, United States Code.

(13) NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE.—The term “non-human intelligence” means any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform regardless of nature or ultimate origin that may be presumed responsible for unidentified anomalous phenomena or of which the Federal Government has become aware.

(14) ORIGINATING BODY.—The term “originating body” means the Executive agency, Federal Government commission, committee of Congress, or other Governmental entity that created a record or particular information within a record.

(15) PROSAIC ATTRIBUTION.—The term “prosaic attribution” means having a human (either foreign or domestic) origin and operating according to current, proven, and generally understood scientific and engineering principles and established laws-of-nature and not attributable to non-human intelligence.

(16) PUBLIC INTEREST.—The term “public interest” means the compelling interest in the prompt public disclosure of unidentified anomalous phenomena records for historical and Governmental purposes and for the purpose of fully informing the people of the United States about the history of the Federal Government’s knowledge and involvement surrounding unidentified anomalous phenomena.

(17) **RECORD.**—The term “record” includes a book, paper, report, memorandum, directive, email, text, or other form of communication, or map, photograph, sound or video recording, machine-readable material, computerized, digitized, or electronic information, including intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and target acquisition sensor data, regardless of the medium on which it is stored, or other documentary material, regardless of its physical form or characteristics.

(18) **REVIEW BOARD.**—The term “Review Board” means the Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena Records Review Board established by section ____07.

(19) **TECHNOLOGIES OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN.**—The term “technologies of unknown origin” means any materials or meta-materials, ejecta, crash debris, mechanisms, machinery, equipment, assemblies or sub-assemblies, engineering models or processes, damaged or intact aerospace vehicles, and damaged or intact ocean-surface and undersea craft associated with unidentified anomalous phenomena or incorporating science and technology that lacks prosaic attribution or known means of human manufacture.

(20) **TEMPORARILY NON-ATTRIBUTED OBJECTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “temporarily non-attributed objects” means the class of objects that temporarily resist prosaic attribution by the initial observer as a result of environmental or system limitations associated with the observation process that nevertheless ultimately have an accepted human origin or known physical cause. Although some unidentified anomalous phenomena may at first be interpreted as temporarily non-attributed objects, they are not temporarily non-attributed objects, and the two categories are mutually exclusive.

(B) **INCLUSION.**—The term “temporarily non-attributed objects” includes—

- (i) natural celestial, meteorological, and undersea weather phenomena;
- (ii) mundane human-made airborne objects, clutter, and marine debris;
- (iii) Federal, State, and local government, commercial industry, academic, and private sector aerospace platforms;
- (iv) Federal, State, and local government, commercial industry, academic, and private sector ocean-surface and undersea vehicles; and
- (v) known foreign systems.

(21) **THIRD AGENCY.**—The term “third agency” means a Government agency that originated a unidentified anomalous phenomena record that is in the possession of another Government agency.

(22) **UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “unidentified anomalous phenomena” means any object operating or judged capable of operating in outer-space, the atmosphere, ocean surfaces, or undersea lacking prosaic attribution due to performance characteristics and properties not previously known to be achievable based upon commonly accepted physical principles. Unidentified anomalous phenomena are differentiated from both attributed and temporarily non-attributed objects by one or more of the following observables:

- (i) Instantaneous acceleration absent apparent inertia.
- (ii) Hypersonic velocity absent a thermal signature and sonic shockwave.
- (iii) Transmedium (such as space-to-ground and air-to-undersea) travel.
- (iv) Positive lift contrary to known aerodynamic principles.
- (v) Multispectral signature control.
- (vi) Physical or invasive biological effects to close observers and the environment.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “unidentified anomalous phenomena” includes what were previously described as—

- (i) flying discs;
- (ii) flying saucers;
- (iii) unidentified aerial phenomena;
- (iv) unidentified flying objects (UFOs); and
- (v) unidentified submerged objects (USOs).

(23) **UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORD.**—The term “unidentified anomalous phenomena record” means a record that is related to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, or non-human intelligence (and all equivalent subjects by any other name with the specific and sole exclusion of temporarily non-attributed objects) that was created or made available for use by, obtained by, or otherwise came into the possession of—

- (A) the Executive Office of the President;
- (B) the Department of Defense and its progenitors, the Department of War and the Department of the Navy;
- (C) the Department of the Army;
- (D) the Department of the Navy;
- (E) the Department of the Air Force, specifically the Air Force Office of Special Investigations;
- (F) the Department of Energy and its progenitors, the Manhattan Project, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Energy Research and Development Administration;
- (G) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence;
- (H) the Central Intelligence Agency and its progenitor, the Office of Strategic Services;
- (I) the National Reconnaissance Office;
- (J) the Defense Intelligence Agency;
- (K) the National Security Agency;
- (L) the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency;
- (M) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;
- (N) the Federal Bureau of Investigation;
- (O) the Federal Aviation Administration;
- (P) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;
- (Q) the Library of Congress;
- (R) the National Archives and Records Administration;
- (S) any Presidential library;
- (T) any Executive agency;
- (U) any independent office or agency;
- (V) any other department, office, agency, committee, or commission of the Federal Government;
- (W) any State or local government department, office, agency, committee, or commission that provided support or assistance or performed work, in connection with a Federal inquiry into unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, or non-human intelligence; and
- (X) any private sector person or entity formerly or currently under contract or some other agreement with the Federal Government.

SEC. ____04. UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS COLLECTION AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—(A) Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist shall commence establishment of a collection of records in the National Archives to be known as the “Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena Records Collection”.

(B) In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Archivist shall ensure the physical integrity and original provenance (or if indeterminate, the earliest historical owner) of all records in the Collection.

(C) The Collection shall consist of record copies of all Government, Government-provided, or Government-funded records relating to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, and non-

human intelligence (or equivalent subjects by any other name with the specific and sole exclusion of temporarily non-attributed objects), which shall be transmitted to the National Archives in accordance with section 2107 of title 44, United States Code.

(D) The Archivist shall prepare and publish a subject guidebook and index to the Collection.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The Collection shall include the following:

(A) All unidentified anomalous phenomena records, regardless of age or date of creation—

(i) that have been transmitted to the National Archives or disclosed to the public in an unredacted form prior to the date of the enactment of this Act;

(ii) that are required to be transmitted to the National Archives; and

(iii) that the disclosure of which is postponed under this Act.

(B) A central directory comprised of identification aids created for each record transmitted to the Archivist under section ____05.

(C) All Review Board records as required by this Act.

(b) **DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS.**—All unidentified anomalous phenomena records transmitted to the National Archives for disclosure to the public shall—

(1) be included in the Collection; and

(2) be available to the public—

(A) for inspection and copying at the National Archives within 30 days after their transmission to the National Archives; and

(B) digitally via the National Archives online database within a reasonable amount of time not to exceed 180 days thereafter.

(c) **FEES FOR COPYING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Archivist shall—

(A) charge fees for copying unidentified anomalous phenomena records; and

(B) grant waivers of such fees pursuant to the standards established by section 552(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **AMOUNT OF FEES.**—The amount of a fee charged by the Archivist pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) for the copying of an unidentified anomalous phenomena record shall be such amount as the Archivist determines appropriate to cover the costs incurred by the National Archives in making and providing such copy, except that in no case may the amount of the fee charged exceed the actual expenses incurred by the National Archives in making and providing such copy.

(d) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **USE OF FUNDS.**—The Collection shall be preserved, protected, archived, digitized, and made available to the public at the National Archives and via the official National Archives online database using appropriations authorized, specified, and restricted for use under the terms of this Act.

(2) **SECURITY OF RECORDS.**—The National Security Program Office at the National Archives, in consultation with the National Archives Information Security Oversight Office, shall establish a program to ensure the security of the postponed unidentified anomalous phenomena records in the protected, and yet-to-be disclosed or classified portion of the Collection.

(e) **OVERSIGHT.**—

(1) **SENATE.**—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall have continuing legislative oversight jurisdiction in the Senate with respect to the Collection.

(2) **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—The Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives shall have continuing legislative oversight jurisdiction in the House of Representatives with respect to the Collection.

SEC. — 05. REVIEW, IDENTIFICATION, TRANSMISSION TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES, AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS BY GOVERNMENT OFFICES.

(a) IDENTIFICATION, ORGANIZATION, AND PREPARATION FOR TRANSMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, each head of a Government office shall—

(A) identify and organize records in the possession of the Government office or under the control of the Government office relating to unidentified anomalous phenomena; and

(B) prepare such records for transmission to the Archivist for inclusion in the Collection.

(2) PROHIBITIONS.—(A) No unidentified anomalous phenomena record shall be destroyed, altered, or mutilated in any way.

(B) No unidentified anomalous phenomena record made available or disclosed to the public prior to the date of the enactment of this Act may be withheld, redacted, postponed for public disclosure, or reclassified.

(C) No unidentified anomalous phenomena record created by a person or entity outside the Federal Government (excluding names or identities consistent with the requirements of section 552(a)(7)(C)) shall be withheld, redacted, postponed for public disclosure, or reclassified.

(b) CUSTODY OF UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS PENDING REVIEW.—During the review by the heads of Government offices under subsection (c) and pending review activity by the Review Board, each head of a Government office shall retain custody of the unidentified anomalous phenomena records of the office for purposes of preservation, security, and efficiency, unless—

(1) the Review Board requires the physical transfer of the records for purposes of conducting an independent and impartial review;

(2) transfer is necessary for an administrative hearing or other Review Board function; or

(3) it is a third agency record described in subsection (c)(2)(C).

(c) REVIEW BY HEADS OF GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 300 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each head of a Government office shall review, identify, and organize each unidentified anomalous phenomena record in the custody or possession of the office for—

(A) disclosure to the public;

(B) review by the Review Board; and

(C) transmission to the Archivist.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the head of a Government office shall—

(A) determine which of the records of the office are unidentified anomalous phenomena records;

(B) determine which of the unidentified anomalous phenomena records of the office have been officially disclosed or made publicly available in a complete and unredacted form;

(C)(i) determine which of the unidentified anomalous phenomena records of the office, or particular information contained in such a record, was created by a third agency or by another Government office; and

(ii) transmit to a third agency or other Government office those records, or particular information contained in those records, or complete and accurate copies thereof;

(D)(i) determine whether the unidentified anomalous phenomena records of the office or particular information in unidentified

anomalous phenomena records of the office are covered by the standards for postponement of public disclosure under this division; and

(ii) specify on the identification aid required by subsection (d) the applicable postponement provision contained in section 552(a)(7)(C);

(E) organize and make available to the Review Board all unidentified anomalous phenomena records identified under subparagraph (D) the public disclosure of, which in whole or in part, may be postponed under this division;

(F) organize and make available to the Review Board any record concerning which the office has any uncertainty as to whether the record is an unidentified anomalous phenomena record governed by this division;

(G) give precedence of work to—

(i) the identification, review, and transmission of unidentified anomalous phenomena records not already publicly available or disclosed as of the date of the enactment of this Act;

(ii) the identification, review, and transmission of all records that most unambiguously and definitively pertain to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, and non-human intelligence;

(iii) the identification, review, and transmission of unidentified anomalous phenomena records that on the date of the enactment of this Act are the subject of litigation under section 552 of title 5, United States Code; and

(iv) the identification, review, and transmission of unidentified anomalous phenomena records with earliest provenance when not inconsistent with clauses (i) through (iii) and otherwise feasible; and

(H) make available to the Review Board any additional information and records that the Review Board has reason to believe the Review Board requires for conducting a review under this division.

(3) PRIORITY OF EXPEDITED REVIEW FOR DIRECTORS OF CERTAIN ARCHIVAL DEPOSITORIES.—The Director of each archival depository established under section 2112 of title 44, United States Code, shall have as a priority the expedited review for public disclosure of unidentified anomalous phenomena records in the possession and custody of the depository, and shall make such records available to the Review Board as required by this division.

(d) IDENTIFICATION AIDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist, in consultation with the heads of such Government offices as the Archivist considers appropriate, shall prepare and make available to all Government offices a standard form of identification, or finding aid, for use with each unidentified anomalous phenomena record subject to review under this division whether in hardcopy (physical), softcopy (electronic), or digitized data format as may be appropriate.

(B) The Archivist shall ensure that the identification aid program is established in such a manner as to result in the creation of a uniform system for cataloging and finding every unidentified anomalous phenomena record subject to review under this division where ever and how ever stored in hardcopy (physical), softcopy (electronic), or digitized data format.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR GOVERNMENT OFFICES.—Upon completion of an identification aid using the standard form of identification prepared and made available under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) for the program established pursuant to subparagraph (B) of such paragraph, the head of a Government office shall—

(A) attach a printed copy to each physical unidentified anomalous phenomena record, and an electronic copy to each softcopy or digitized data unidentified anomalous phenomena record, the identification aid describes;

(B) transmit to the Review Board a printed copy for each physical unidentified anomalous phenomena record and an electronic copy for each softcopy or digitized data unidentified anomalous phenomena record the identification aid describes; and

(C) attach a printed copy to each physical unidentified anomalous phenomena record, and an electronic copy to each softcopy or digitized data unidentified anomalous phenomena record the identification aid describes, when transmitted to the Archivist.

(3) RECORDS OF THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES THAT ARE PUBLICLY AVAILABLE.—Unidentified anomalous phenomena records which are in the possession of the National Archives on the date of the enactment of this Act, and which have been publicly available in their entirety without redaction, shall be made available in the Collection without any additional review by the Review Board or another authorized office under this division, and shall not be required to have such an identification aid unless required by the Archivist.

(e) TRANSMISSION TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES.—Each head of a Government office shall—

(1) transmit to the Archivist, and make immediately available to the public, all unidentified anomalous phenomena records of the Government office that can be publicly disclosed, including those that are publicly available on the date of the enactment of this Act, without any redaction, adjustment, or withholding under the standards of this division; and

(2) transmit to the Archivist upon approval for postponement by the Review Board or upon completion of other action authorized by this division, all unidentified anomalous phenomena records of the Government office the public disclosure of which has been postponed, in whole or in part, under the standards of this division, to become part of the protected, yet-to-be disclosed, or classified portion of the Collection.

(f) CUSTODY OF POSTPONED UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS.—An unidentified anomalous phenomena record the public disclosure of which has been postponed shall, pending transmission to the Archivist, be held for reasons of security and preservation by the originating body until such time as the information security program has been established at the National Archives as required in section 552(a)(7)(D).

(g) PERIODIC REVIEW OF POSTPONED UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All postponed or redacted records shall be reviewed periodically by the originating agency and the Archivist consistent with the recommendations of the Review Board in the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan under section 552(a)(7)(D)(B).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—(A) A periodic review under paragraph (1) shall address the public disclosure of additional unidentified anomalous phenomena records in the Collection under the standards of this division.

(B) All postponed unidentified anomalous phenomena records determined to require continued postponement shall require an unclassified written description of the reason for such continued postponement relevant to these specific records. Such description shall be provided to the Archivist and published in the Federal Register upon determination.

(C) The time and release requirements specified in the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan shall be revised or amended only if the Review Board is still in session and

concurs with the rationale for postponement, subject to the limitations in section 09(d)(1).

(D) The periodic review of postponed unidentified anomalous phenomena records shall serve to downgrade and declassify security classified information.

(E) Each unidentified anomalous phenomena record shall be publicly disclosed in full, and available in the Collection, not later than the date that is 25 years after the date of the first creation of the record by the originating body, unless the President certifies, as required by this division, that—

(i) continued postponement is made necessary by an identifiable harm to the military defense, intelligence operations, law enforcement, or conduct of foreign relations; and

(ii) the identifiable harm is of such gravity that it outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

(h) REQUIREMENTS FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Executive agencies shall—

(A) transmit digital records electronically in accordance with section 2107 of title 44, United States Code;

(B) charge fees for copying unidentified anomalous phenomena records; and

(C) grant waivers of such fees pursuant to the standards established by section 552(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) AMOUNT OF FEES.—The amount of a fee charged by the head of an Executive agency pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) for the copying of an unidentified anomalous phenomena record shall be such amount as the head determines appropriate to cover the costs incurred by the Executive agency in making and providing such copy, except that in no case may the amount of the fee charged exceed the actual expenses incurred by the Executive agency in making and providing such copy.

SEC. 06. GROUNDS FOR POSTPONEMENT OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS.

Disclosure of unidentified anomalous phenomena records or particular information in unidentified anomalous phenomena records to the public may be postponed subject to the limitations of this division if there is clear and convincing evidence that—

(1) the threat to the military defense, intelligence operations, or conduct of foreign relations of the United States posed by the public disclosure of the unidentified anomalous phenomena record is of such gravity that it outweighs the public interest in disclosure, and such public disclosure would reveal—

(A) an intelligence agent whose identity currently requires protection;

(B) an intelligence source or method which is currently utilized, or reasonably expected to be utilized, by the Federal Government and which has not been officially disclosed, the disclosure of which would interfere with the conduct of intelligence activities; or

(C) any other matter currently relating to the military defense, intelligence operations, or conduct of foreign relations of the United States, the disclosure of which would demonstrably and substantially impair the national security of the United States;

(2) the public disclosure of the unidentified anomalous phenomena record would reveal the name or identity of a living person who provided confidential information to the Federal Government and would pose a substantial risk of harm to that person;

(3) the public disclosure of the unidentified anomalous phenomena record could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and that

invasion of privacy is so substantial that it outweighs the public interest; or

(4) the public disclosure of the unidentified anomalous phenomena record would compromise the existence of an understanding of confidentiality currently requiring protection between a Federal Government agent and a cooperating individual or a foreign government, and public disclosure would be so harmful that it outweighs the public interest.

SEC. 07. ESTABLISHMENT AND POWERS OF THE UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS REVIEW BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established as an independent agency a board to be known as the “Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena Records Review Board”.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint, without regard to political affiliation, 9 citizens of the United States to serve as members of the Review Board to ensure and facilitate the review, transmission to the Archivist, and public disclosure of government records relating to unidentified anomalous phenomena.

(2) PERIOD FOR NOMINATIONS.—(A) The President shall make nominations to the Review Board not later than 90 calendar days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) If the Senate votes not to confirm a nomination to the Review Board, the President shall make an additional nomination not later than 30 days thereafter.

(3) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—(A) The President shall make nominations to the Review Board after considering persons recommended by the following:

(i) The majority leader of the Senate.

(ii) The minority leader of the Senate.

(iii) The Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(iv) The minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(v) The Secretary of Defense.

(vi) The National Academy of Sciences.

(vii) Established nonprofit research organizations relating to unidentified anomalous phenomena.

(viii) The American Historical Association.

(ix) Such other persons and organizations as the President considers appropriate.

(B) If an individual or organization described in subparagraph (A) does not recommend at least 2 nominees meeting the qualifications stated in paragraph (5) by the date that is 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall consider for nomination the persons recommended by the other individuals and organizations described in such subparagraph.

(C) The President may request an individual or organization described in subparagraph (A) to submit additional nominations.

(4) QUALIFICATIONS.—Persons nominated to the Review Board—

(A) shall be impartial citizens, none of whom shall have had any previous or current involvement with any legacy program or controlling authority relating to the collection, exploitation, or reverse engineering of technologies of unknown origin or the examination of biological evidence of living or deceased non-human intelligence;

(B) shall be distinguished persons of high national professional reputation in their respective fields who are capable of exercising the independent and objective judgment necessary to the fulfillment of their role in ensuring and facilitating the review, transmission to the public, and public disclosure of records related to the government's understanding of, and activities associated with unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, and non-human

intelligence and who possess an appreciation of the value of such material to the public, scholars, and government; and

(C) shall include at least—

(i) 1 current or former national security official;

(ii) 1 current or former foreign service official;

(iii) 1 scientist or engineer;

(iv) 1 economist;

(v) 1 professional historian; and

(vi) 1 sociologist.

(5) MANDATORY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall conduct a review of each individual nominated and appointed to the position of member of the Review Board to ensure the member does not have any conflict of interest during the term of the service of the member.

(B) REPORTS.—During the course of the review under subparagraph (A), if the Director becomes aware that the member being reviewed possesses a conflict of interest to the mission of the Review Board, the Director shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the Director became aware of the conflict of interest, submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives a report on the conflict of interest.

(c) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All Review Board nominees shall be granted the necessary security clearances and accesses, including any and all relevant Presidential, departmental, and agency special access programs, in an accelerated manner subject to the standard procedures for granting such clearances.

(2) QUALIFICATION FOR NOMINEES.—All nominees for appointment to the Review Board under subsection (b) shall qualify for the necessary security clearances and accesses prior to being considered for confirmation by the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(d) CONSIDERATION BY THE SENATE.—Nominations for appointment under subsection (b) shall be referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate for consideration.

(e) VACANCY.—A vacancy on the Review Board shall be filled in the same manner as specified for original appointment within 30 days of the occurrence of the vacancy.

(f) REMOVAL OF REVIEW BOARD MEMBER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No member of the Review Board shall be removed from office, other than—

(A) by impeachment and conviction; or

(B) by the action of the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, physical disability, mental incapacity, or any other condition that substantially impairs the performance of the member's duties.

(2) NOTICE OF REMOVAL.—(A) If a member of the Review Board is removed from office, and that removal is by the President, not later than 10 days after the removal, the President shall submit to the leadership of Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives a report specifying the facts found and the grounds for the removal.

(B) The President shall publish in the Federal Register a report submitted under subparagraph (A), except that the President may, if necessary to protect the rights of a person named in the report or to prevent undue interference with any pending prosecution, postpone or refrain from publishing any or all of the report until the completion

of such pending cases or pursuant to privacy protection requirements in law.

(3) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—(A) A member of the Review Board removed from office may obtain judicial review of the removal in a civil action commenced in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(B) The member may be reinstated or granted other appropriate relief by order of the court.

(g) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Review Board, other than the Executive Director under section 08(c)(1), shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Review Board.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the Review Board shall be allowed reasonable travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the member's home or regular place of business in the performance of services for the Review Board.

(h) DUTIES OF THE REVIEW BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Review Board shall consider and render decisions on a determination by a Government office to seek to postpone the disclosure of unidentified anomalous phenomena records.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS AND RENDERING OF DECISIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Review Board shall consider and render decisions—

(A) whether a record constitutes a unidentified anomalous phenomena record; and

(B) whether a unidentified anomalous phenomena record or particular information in a record qualifies for postponement of disclosure under this division.

(i) POWERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Review Board shall have the authority to act in a manner prescribed under this division, including authority—

(A) to direct Government offices to complete identification aids and organize unidentified anomalous phenomena records;

(B) to direct Government offices to transmit to the Archivist unidentified anomalous phenomena records as required under this division, including segregable portions of unidentified anomalous phenomena records and substitutes and summaries of unidentified anomalous phenomena records that can be publicly disclosed to the fullest extent;

(C)(i) to obtain access to unidentified anomalous phenomena records that have been identified and organized by a Government office;

(ii) to direct a Government office to make available to the Review Board, and if necessary investigate the facts surrounding, additional information, records, or testimony from individuals which the Review Board has reason to believe are required to fulfill its functions and responsibilities under this division; and

(iii) request the Attorney General to subpoena private persons to compel testimony, records, and other information relevant to its responsibilities under this division;

(D) require any Government office to account in writing for the destruction of any records relating to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, or non-human intelligence;

(E) receive information from the public regarding the identification and public disclosure of unidentified anomalous phenomena records;

(F) hold hearings, administer oaths, and subpoena witnesses and documents;

(G) use the Federal Acquisition Service in the same manner and under the same conditions as other Executive agencies; and

(H) use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other Executive agencies.

(2) ENFORCEMENT OF SUBPOENA.—A subpoena issued under paragraph (1)(C)(iii) may be enforced by any appropriate Federal court acting pursuant to a lawful request of the Review Board.

(j) WITNESS IMMUNITY.—The Review Board shall be considered to be an agency of the United States for purposes of section 6001 of title 18, United States Code. Witnesses, close observers, and whistleblowers providing information directly to the Review Board shall also be afforded the protections provided to such persons specified under section 1673(b) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (50 U.S.C. 3373b(b)).

(k) OVERSIGHT.—

(1) SENATE.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall have continuing legislative oversight jurisdiction in the Senate with respect to the official conduct of the Review Board and the disposition of postponed records after termination of the Review Board, and shall have access to any records held or created by the Review Board.

(2) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—Unless otherwise determined appropriate by the House of Representatives, the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives shall have continuing legislative oversight jurisdiction in the House of Representatives with respect to the official conduct of the Review Board and the disposition of postponed records after termination of the Review Board, and shall have access to any records held or created by the Review Board.

(3) DUTY TO COOPERATE.—The Review Board shall have the duty to cooperate with the exercise of oversight jurisdiction described in this subsection.

(4) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—The Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives, and staff of such committees designated by such Chairmen and Ranking Members, shall be granted all security clearances and accesses held by the Review Board, including to relevant Presidential and department or agency special access and compartmented access programs.

(l) SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide administrative services for the Review Board on a reimbursable basis.

(m) INTERPRETIVE REGULATIONS.—The Review Board may issue interpretive regulations.

(n) TERMINATION AND WINDING DOWN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Review Board and the terms of its members shall terminate not later than September 30, 2030, unless extended by Congress.

(2) REPORTS.—Upon its termination, the Review Board shall submit to the President and Congress reports, including a complete and accurate accounting of expenditures during its existence and shall complete all other reporting requirements under this division.

(3) TRANSFER OF RECORDS.—Upon termination and winding down, the Review Board shall transfer all of its records to the Archivist for inclusion in the Collection, and no record of the Review Board shall be destroyed.

SEC. 08. UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS REVIEW BOARD PERSONNEL.

(a) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint 1 citizen of the United States, without regard to political affiliation, to the position of Executive Director of the Review Board. This position counts as 1 of the 9 Review Board members under section 07(b)(1).

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The person appointed as Executive Director shall be a private citizen of integrity and impartiality who—

(A) is a distinguished professional; and

(B) is not a present employee of the Federal Government; and

(C) has had no previous or current involvement with any legacy program or controlling authority relating to the collection, exploitation, or reverse engineering of technologies of unknown origin or the examination of biological evidence of living or deceased non-human intelligence.

(3) MANDATORY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall conduct a review of each individual appointed to the position of Executive Director to ensure the Executive Director does not have any conflict of interest during the term of the service of the Executive Director.

(B) REPORTS.—During the course of the review under subparagraph (A), if the Director becomes aware that the Executive Director possesses a conflict of interest to the mission of the Review Board, the Director shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the Director became aware of the conflict of interest, submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives a report on the conflict of interest.

(4) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—(A) A candidate for Executive Director shall be granted all the necessary security clearances and accesses, including to relevant Presidential and department or agency special access and compartmented access programs in an accelerated manner subject to the standard procedures for granting such clearances.

(B) A candidate shall qualify for the necessary security clearances and accesses prior to being appointed by the President.

(5) FUNCTIONS.—The Executive Director shall—

(A) serve as principal liaison to the Executive Office of the President and Congress;

(B) serve as Chairperson of the Review Board;

(C) be responsible for the administration and coordination of the Review Board's review of records;

(D) be responsible for the administration of all official activities conducted by the Review Board;

(E) exercise tie-breaking Review Board authority to decide or determine whether any record should be disclosed to the public or postponed for disclosure; and

(F) retain right-of-appeal directly to the President for decisions pertaining to executive branch unidentified anomalous phenomena records for which the Executive Director and Review Board members may disagree.

(6) REMOVAL.—The Executive Director shall not be removed for reasons other for cause on the grounds of inefficiency, neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, physical disability, mental incapacity, or any other condition that substantially impairs the performance of the responsibilities of the Executive Director or the staff of the Review Board.

(b) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Review Board, without regard to the civil service laws, may appoint and terminate additional personnel as are necessary to enable the Review Board and its Executive Director to perform the duties of the Review Board.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a person appointed to the staff of the Review Board shall be a citizen of integrity and impartiality who has had no previous or current involvement with any legacy program or controlling authority relating to the collection, exploitation, or reverse engineering of technologies of unknown origin or the examination of biological evidence of living or deceased non-human intelligence.

(B) CONSULTATION WITH DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS.—In their consideration of persons to be appointed as staff of the Review Board under paragraph (1), the Review Board shall consult with the Director—

(i) to determine criteria for possible conflicts of interest of staff of the Review Board, consistent with ethics laws, statutes, and regulations for employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

(ii) ensure that no person selected for such position of staff of the Review Board possesses a conflict of interests in accordance with the criteria determined pursuant to clause (i).

(3) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—(A) A candidate for staff shall be granted the necessary security clearances (including all necessary special access program clearances) in an accelerated manner subject to the standard procedures for granting such clearances.

(B)(i) The Review Board may offer conditional employment to a candidate for a staff position pending the completion of security clearance background investigations. During the pendency of such investigations, the Review Board shall ensure that any such employee does not have access to, or responsibility involving, classified or otherwise restricted unidentified anomalous phenomena record materials.

(ii) If a person hired on a conditional basis under clause (i) is denied or otherwise does not qualify for all security clearances necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the position for which conditional employment has been offered, the Review Board shall immediately terminate the person's employment.

(4) SUPPORT FROM NATIONAL DECLASSIFICATION CENTER.—The Archivist shall assign one representative in full-time equivalent status from the National Declassification Center to advise and support the Review Board disclosure postponement review process in a non-voting staff capacity.

(c) COMPENSATION.—Subject to such rules as may be adopted by the Review Board, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates—

(1) the Executive Director shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay for level II of the Executive Schedule and shall serve the entire tenure as one full-time equivalent; and

(2) the Executive Director shall appoint and fix compensation of such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out this division.

(d) ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Review Board may create advisory committees to assist in ful-

filling the responsibilities of the Review Board under this division.

(2) FACA.—Any advisory committee created by the Review Board shall be subject to chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) SECURITY CLEARANCE REQUIRED.—An individual employed in any position by the Review Board (including an individual appointed as Executive Director) shall be required to qualify for any necessary security clearance prior to taking office in that position, but may be employed conditionally in accordance with subsection (b)(3)(B) before qualifying for that clearance.

SEC. 09. REVIEW OF RECORDS BY THE UNIDENTIFIED ANOMALOUS PHENOMENA RECORDS REVIEW BOARD.

(a) CUSTODY OF RECORDS REVIEWED BY REVIEW BOARD.—Pending the outcome of a review of activity by the Review Board, a Government office shall retain custody of its unidentified anomalous phenomena records for purposes of preservation, security, and efficiency, unless—

(1) the Review Board requires the physical transfer of records for reasons of conducting an independent and impartial review; or

(2) such transfer is necessary for an administrative hearing or other official Review Board function.

(b) STARTUP REQUIREMENTS.—The Review Board shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of its appointment, publish a schedule in the Federal Register for review of all unidentified anomalous phenomena records;

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, begin its review of unidentified anomalous phenomena records under this division; and

(3) periodically thereafter as warranted, but not less frequently than semiannually, publish a revised schedule in the Federal Register addressing the review and inclusion of any unidentified anomalous phenomena records subsequently discovered.

(c) DETERMINATIONS OF THE REVIEW BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Review Board shall direct that all unidentified anomalous phenomena records be transmitted to the Archivist and disclosed to the public in the Collection in the absence of clear and convincing evidence that—

(A) a Government record is not an unidentified anomalous phenomena record; or

(B) a Government record, or particular information within an unidentified anomalous phenomena record, qualifies for postponement of public disclosure under this division.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In approving postponement of public disclosure of a unidentified anomalous phenomena record, the Review Board shall seek to—

(A) provide for the disclosure of segregable parts, substitutes, or summaries of such a record; and

(B) determine, in consultation with the originating body and consistent with the standards for postponement under this division, which of the following alternative forms of disclosure shall be made by the originating body:

(i) Any reasonably segregable particular information in a unidentified anomalous phenomena record.

(ii) A substitute record for that information which is postponed.

(iii) A summary of a unidentified anomalous phenomena record.

(3) CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE CAMPAIGN PLAN.—With respect to unidentified anomalous phenomena records, particular information in unidentified anomalous phenomena records, recovered technologies of unknown origin, and biological evidence for non-human intelligence the public disclosure of which is postponed pursuant to section

06, or for which only substitutions or summaries have been disclosed to the public, the Review Board shall create and transmit to the President, the Archivist, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives a Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan, with classified appendix, containing—

(A) a description of actions by the Review Board, the originating body, the President, or any Government office (including a justification of any such action to postpone disclosure of any record or part of any record) and of any official proceedings conducted by the Review Board with regard to specific unidentified anomalous phenomena records; and

(B) a benchmark-driven plan, based upon a review of the proceedings and in conformity with the decisions reflected therein, recommending precise requirements for periodic review, downgrading, and declassification as well as the exact time or specified occurrence following which each postponed item may be appropriately disclosed to the public under this division.

(4) NOTICE FOLLOWING REVIEW AND DETERMINATION.—(A) Following its review and a determination that a unidentified anomalous phenomena record shall be publicly disclosed in the Collection or postponed for disclosure and held in the protected Collection, the Review Board shall notify the head of the originating body of the determination of the Review Board and publish a copy of the determination in the Federal Register within 14 days after the determination is made.

(B) Contemporaneous notice shall be made to the President for Review Board determinations regarding unidentified anomalous phenomena records of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and to the oversight committees designated in this division in the case of records of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. Such notice shall contain a written unclassified justification for public disclosure or postponement of disclosure, including an explanation of the application of any standards contained in section 06.

(d) PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY OVER REVIEW BOARD DETERMINATION.—

(1) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OR POSTPONEMENT OF DISCLOSURE.—After the Review Board has made a formal determination concerning the public disclosure or postponement of disclosure of an unidentified anomalous phenomena record of the executive branch of the Federal Government or information within such a record, or of any information contained in a unidentified anomalous phenomena record, obtained or developed solely within the executive branch of the Federal Government, the President shall—

(A) have the sole and nondelegable authority to require the disclosure or postponement of such record or information under the standards set forth in section 06; and

(B) provide the Review Board with both an unclassified and classified written certification specifying the President's decision within 30 days after the Review Board's determination and notice to the executive branch agency as required under this division, stating the justification for the President's decision, including the applicable grounds for postponement under section 06, accompanied by a copy of the identification aid required under section 04.

(2) PERIODIC REVIEW.—(A) Any unidentified anomalous phenomena record postponed by the President shall henceforth be subject to the requirements of periodic review, downgrading, declassification, and public disclosure in accordance with the recommended

timeline and associated requirements specified in the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan unless these conflict with the standards set forth in section ____06.

(B) This paragraph supersedes all prior declassification review standards that may previously have been deemed applicable to unidentified anomalous phenomena records.

(3) **RECORD OF PRESIDENTIAL POSTPONEMENT.**—The Review Board shall, upon its receipt—

(A) publish in the Federal Register a copy of any unclassified written certification, statement, and other materials transmitted by or on behalf of the President with regard to postponement of unidentified anomalous phenomena records; and

(B) revise or amend recommendations in the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan accordingly.

(e) **NOTICE TO PUBLIC.**—Every 30 calendar days, beginning on the date that is 60 calendar days after the date on which the Review Board first approves the postponement of disclosure of a unidentified anomalous phenomena record, the Review Board shall publish in the Federal Register a notice that summarizes the postponements approved by the Review Board or initiated by the President, the Senate, or the House of Representatives, including a description of the subject, originating agency, length or other physical description, and each ground for postponement that is relied upon to the maximum extent classification restrictions permitting.

(f) **REPORTS BY THE REVIEW BOARD.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Review Board shall report its activities to the leadership of Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, the President, the Archivist, and the head of any Government office whose records have been the subject of Review Board activity.

(2) **FIRST REPORT.**—The first report shall be issued on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and subsequent reports every 1 year thereafter until termination of the Review Board.

(3) **CONTENTS.**—A report under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) A financial report of the expenses for all official activities and requirements of the Review Board and its personnel.

(B) The progress made on review, transmission to the Archivist, and public disclosure of unidentified anomalous phenomena records.

(C) The estimated time and volume of unidentified anomalous phenomena records involved in the completion of the Review Board's performance under this division.

(D) Any special problems, including requests and the level of cooperation of Government offices, with regard to the ability of the Review Board to operate as required by this division.

(E) A record of review activities, including a record of postponement decisions by the Review Board or other related actions authorized by this division, and a record of the volume of records reviewed and postponed.

(F) Suggestions and requests to Congress for additional legislative authority needs.

(4) **COPIES AND BRIEFS.**—Coincident with the reporting requirements in paragraph (2), or more frequently as warranted by new information, the Review Board shall provide copies to, and fully brief, at a minimum the President, the Archivist, leadership of Congress, the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives, and the Chairs and Chairmen, as the case may be, and Ranking Members and Vice Chairmen, as

the case may be, of such other committees as leadership of Congress determines appropriate on the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan, classified appendix, and postponed disclosures, specifically addressing—

(A) recommendations for periodic review, downgrading, and declassification as well as the exact time or specified occurrence following which specific unidentified anomalous phenomena records and material may be appropriately disclosed;

(B) the rationale behind each postponement determination and the recommended means to achieve disclosure of each postponed item;

(C) any other findings that the Review Board chooses to offer; and

(D) an addendum containing copies of reports of postponed records to the Archivist required under subsection (c)(3) made since the date of the preceding report under this subsection.

(5) **NOTICE.**—At least 90 calendar days before completing its work, the Review Board shall provide written notice to the President and Congress of its intention to terminate its operations at a specified date.

(6) **BRIEFING THE ALL-DOMAIN ANOMALY RESOLUTION OFFICE.**—Coincident with the provision in paragraph (5), if not accomplished earlier under paragraph (4), the Review Board shall brief the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office established pursuant to section 1683 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (50 U.S.C. 3373), or its successor, as subsequently designated by Act of Congress, on the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan, classified appendix, and postponed disclosures.

SEC. ____10. DISCLOSURE OF RECOVERED TECHNOLOGIES OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN AND BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE OF NON-HUMAN INTELLIGENCE.

(a) **EXERCISE OF EMINENT DOMAIN.**—The Federal Government shall exercise eminent domain over any and all recovered technologies of unknown origin and biological evidence of non-human intelligence that may be controlled by private persons or entities in the interests of the public good.

(b) **AVAILABILITY TO REVIEW BOARD.**—Any and all such material, should it exist, shall be made available to the Review Board for personal examination and subsequent disclosure determination at a location suitable to the controlling authority of said material and in a timely manner conducive to the objectives of the Review Board in accordance with the requirements of this division.

(c) **ACTIONS OF REVIEW BOARD.**—In carrying out subsection (b), the Review Board shall consider and render decisions—

(1) whether the material examined constitutes technologies of unknown origin or biological evidence of non-human intelligence beyond a reasonable doubt;

(2) whether recovered technologies of unknown origin, biological evidence of non-human intelligence, or a particular subset of material qualifies for postponement of disclosure under this division; and

(3) what changes, if any, to the current disposition of said material should the Federal Government make to facilitate full disclosure.

(d) **REVIEW BOARD ACCESS TO TESTIMONY AND WITNESSES.**—The Review Board shall have access to all testimony from unidentified anomalous phenomena witnesses, close observers and legacy program personnel and whistleblowers within the Federal Government's possession as of and after the date of the enactment of this Act in furtherance of Review Board disclosure determination responsibilities in section ____07(h) and subsection (c) of this section.

(e) **SOLICITATION OF ADDITIONAL WITNESSES.**—The Review Board shall solicit ad-

ditional unidentified anomalous phenomena witness and whistleblower testimony and afford protections under section 1673(b) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (50 U.S.C. 3373b(b)) if deemed beneficial in fulfilling Review Board responsibilities under this division.

SEC. ____11. DISCLOSURE OF OTHER MATERIALS AND ADDITIONAL STUDY.

(a) **MATERIALS UNDER SEAL OF COURT.**—

(1) **INFORMATION HELD UNDER SEAL OF A COURT.**—The Review Board may request the Attorney General to petition any court in the United States or abroad to release any information relevant to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, or non-human intelligence that is held under seal of the court.

(2) **INFORMATION HELD UNDER INJUNCTION OF SECRETARY OF GRAND JURY.**—(A) The Review Board may request the Attorney General to petition any court in the United States to release any information relevant to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, or non-human intelligence that is held under the injunction of secrecy of a grand jury.

(B) A request for disclosure of unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, and non-human intelligence materials under this division shall be deemed to constitute a showing of particularized need under rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Attorney General should assist the Review Board in good faith to unseal any records that the Review Board determines to be relevant and held under seal by a court or under the injunction of secrecy of a grand jury;

(2) the Secretary of State should contact any foreign government that may hold material relevant to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, or non-human intelligence and seek disclosure of such material; and

(3) all heads of Executive agencies should cooperate in full with the Review Board to seek the disclosure of all material relevant to unidentified anomalous phenomena, technologies of unknown origin, and non-human intelligence consistent with the public interest.

SEC. ____12. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **PRECEDENCE OVER OTHER LAW.**—When this division requires transmission of a record to the Archivist or public disclosure, it shall take precedence over any other provision of law (except section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 specifying confidentiality and disclosure of tax returns and tax return information), judicial decision construing such provision of law, or common law doctrine that would otherwise prohibit such transmission or disclosure, with the exception of deeds governing access to or transfer or release of gifts and donations of records to the United States Government.

(b) **FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.**—Nothing in this division shall be construed to eliminate or limit any right to file requests with any executive agency or seek judicial review of the decisions pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) **JUDICIAL REVIEW.**—Nothing in this division shall be construed to preclude judicial review, under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, of final actions taken or required to be taken under this division.

(d) **EXISTING AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this division revokes or limits the existing authority of the President, any executive agency, the Senate, or the House of Representatives, or any other entity of the Federal Government to publicly disclose records in its possession.

(e) RULES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—To the extent that any provision of this division establishes a procedure to be followed in the Senate or the House of Representatives, such provision is adopted—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 13. TERMINATION OF EFFECT OF DIVISION.

(a) PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO THE REVIEW BOARD.—The provisions of this division that pertain to the appointment and operation of the Review Board shall cease to be effective when the Review Board and the terms of its members have terminated pursuant to section 7(n).

(b) OTHER PROVISIONS.—(1) The remaining provisions of this division shall continue in effect until such time as the Archivist certifies to the President and Congress that all unidentified anomalous phenomena records have been made available to the public in accordance with this division.

(2) In facilitation of the provision in paragraph (1), the All-domain Anomaly Resolution Office established pursuant to section 1683 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (50 U.S.C. 3373), or its successor as subsequently designated by Act of Congress, shall develop standardized unidentified anomalous phenomena declassification guidance applicable to any and all unidentified anomalous phenomena records generated by originating bodies subsequent to termination of the Review Board consistent with the requirements and intent of the Controlled Disclosure Campaign Plan with respect to unidentified anomalous phenomena records originated prior to Review Board termination.

SEC. 14. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this division \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2025.

SEC. 15. CONFORMING REPEAL.

(a) REPEAL.—Subtitle C of title XVIII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31) is hereby repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2 of such Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title XVIII.

SEC. 16. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this division or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this division and the application of that provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected by the invalidation.

SA 3112. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) 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 title X, add the following:

Subtitle H—Robot Security

SEC. 1091. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED FOREIGN COUNTRY.—The term “covered foreign country” means any of the following:

- (A) The People’s Republic of China.
- (B) The Russian Federation.
- (C) The Islamic Republic of Iran.
- (D) The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.

(2) COVERED FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term “covered foreign entity” means an entity that is domiciled in a covered foreign country, or subject to influence or control by the government of a covered foreign country as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Defense, and any subsidiary or affiliate of such an entity.

(3) COVERED UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE SYSTEM.—The term “covered unmanned ground vehicle system”—

(A) means a mechanical device that—

(i) is capable of locomotion, navigation, or movement on the ground; and

(ii) operates at a distance from one or more operators or supervisors based on commands or in response to sensor data, or through any combination thereof; and

(B) includes—

(i) remote surveillance vehicles, autonomous patrol technologies, mobile robotics, and humanoid robots; and

(ii) the vehicle, its payload, and any external device used to control the vehicle.

SEC. 1092. PROHIBITION ON PROCUREMENT OF COVERED UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subsection (b), the head of an executive agency may not procure any covered unmanned ground vehicle system that is manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity.

(b) EXEMPTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General are exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement is required in the national interest of the United States and—

(1) is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of unmanned ground vehicle system or counter-unmanned ground vehicle system technology;

(2) is for the sole purposes of conducting counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities, protective missions, or Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations, or for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of an unmanned ground vehicle system or counter-unmanned ground vehicle technology; or

(3) is an unmanned ground vehicle system that, as procured or as modified after procurement but before operational use, can no longer transfer to, or download data from, a covered foreign entity and otherwise poses no national security cybersecurity risks as determined by the exempting official.

SEC. 1093. PROHIBITION ON OPERATION OF COVERED UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE SYSTEMS FROM COVERED FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, no Federal department or agency may operate a covered unmanned ground vehicle system manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity.

(2) APPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTED SERVICES.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) applies to any covered unmanned ground vehicle systems that are being used by any executive agency through the method of contracting for the services of covered unmanned ground vehicle systems.

(b) EXEMPTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General are exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the operation is required in the national interest of the United States and—

(1) is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of unmanned ground vehicle system or counter-unmanned ground vehicle system technology;

(2) is for the sole purposes of conducting counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities, protective missions, or Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations, or for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of an unmanned ground vehicle system or counter-unmanned ground vehicle system technology; or

(3) is an unmanned ground vehicle system that, as procured or as modified after procurement but before operational use, can no longer transfer to, or download data from, a covered foreign entity and otherwise poses no national security cybersecurity risks as determined by the exempting official.

SEC. 1094. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PROCUREMENT AND OPERATION OF COVERED UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE SYSTEMS MANUFACTURED BY CERTAIN FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), no Federal funds awarded through a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, or otherwise made available may be used—

(1) to procure a covered unmanned ground vehicle system that is manufactured or assembled by a covered foreign entity; or

(2) in connection with the operation of such a robot or unmanned ground vehicle system.

(b) EXEMPTION.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General are exempt from the restriction under subsection (a) if the procurement or operation is required in the national interest of the United States and—

(1) is for the sole purposes of research, evaluation, training, testing, or analysis for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of unmanned ground vehicle system or counter-unmanned ground vehicle system technology;

(2) is for the sole purposes of conducting counterterrorism or counterintelligence activities, protective missions, or Federal criminal or national security investigations, including forensic examinations, or for electronic warfare, information warfare operations, cybersecurity, or development of an unmanned ground vehicle system or counter-unmanned ground vehicle system technology; or

(3) is an unmanned ground vehicle system that, as procured or as modified after procurement but before operational use, can no longer transfer to, or download data from, a covered foreign entity and otherwise poses no national security cybersecurity risks as determined by the exempting official.

SA 3113. Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3038 submitted by Ms. COLLINS and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available for—

(1) “Agricultural Programs—National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities” shall be \$487,510,000;

(2) “Agricultural Programs—Economic Research Service” shall be \$80,000,000;

(3) “Agricultural Programs—National Agricultural Statistics Service” shall be \$185,000,000;

(4) “Agricultural Programs—Agricultural Research Service—Salaries and Expenses” shall be \$1,700,000,000;

(5) “Agricultural Programs—Agricultural Research Service—Buildings and Facilities” shall be \$42,500,000;

(6) “Farm Production and Conservation Programs—Natural Resources Conservation Service—Conservation Operations” shall be \$112,259,000;

(7) “Farm Production and Conservation Programs—Natural Resources Conservation Service—Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations” shall be \$36,360,000;

(8) “Farm Production and Conservation Programs—Farm Production and Conservation Business Center—Salaries and Expenses” shall be \$214,000,000;

(9) “Farm Production and Conservation Programs—Farm Service Agency—Salaries and Expenses” shall be \$950,000,000, of which no amounts shall be required to be used for the hiring of new employees to fill vacancies and anticipated vacancies at Farm Service Agency county offices and farm loan officers;

(10) “Rural Development Programs—Rural Development—Salaries and Expenses” shall be \$265,008,000;

(11) “Rural Development Programs—Rural Housing Service—Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account” for—

(A) gross obligations of the principal amount of section 523 self-help housing land development loans shall be \$0; and

(B) the cost of section 523 self-help housing land development loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be \$0;

(12) “Rural Development Programs—Rural Housing Service—Rural Housing Voucher Account” shall be \$0;

(13) “Rural Development Programs—Rural Housing Service—Mutual and Self-Help Housing Grants” shall be \$0;

(14) “Rural Development Programs—Rural Housing Service—Rural Housing Assistance Grants” shall be \$0;

(15) “Rural Development Programs—Rural Housing Service—Rural Community Facilities Program Account” for the cost of loans, loan guarantees, and grants, including the cost of modifying loans, shall be \$204,436,000, of which no amounts shall be available for community facilities grants, as authorized by section 306(a)(19) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, or grants to tribal colleges as authorized by section 306(a)(25) of such Act;

(16) “Rural Development Programs—Rural Utilities Service—Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account” for—

(A) cost-of-money rural telecommunications loans made pursuant to section 305(d)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 shall be \$0; and

(B) guaranteed rural telecommunications loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act shall be \$0;

(17) “Domestic Food Programs—Food and Nutrition Service—Commodity Assistance Program” shall be \$91,070,000, of which no amounts shall be available for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program; and

(18) “Foreign Assistance and Related Programs—Foreign Agricultural Service—McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program Grants” shall be \$0.

SA 3114. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the matter preceding division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESCISSION LIMITATION.

No amounts may be rescinded from amounts provided under any division of this Act or any other appropriation Act for fiscal year 2026, unless the rescission is made through an appropriation Act (as defined in section 3 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 622)).

SA 3115. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. LIMITATIONS ON REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement the Department of Agriculture memorandum issued on July 24, 2025 (relating to the Department of Agriculture reorganization plan) (referred to in this section as the “Memorandum”), or any similar plan relating to reorganization of the Department of Agriculture.

(b) BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) conduct a benefit-cost analysis on the Memorandum and any similar plan relating to reorganization of the Department of Agriculture; and

(2) submit to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture an unredacted report that contains—

(A) the findings of that benefit-cost analysis; and

(B) such other information as the Office of Inspector General determines necessary for that benefit-cost analysis.

(c) PUBLIC COMMENT; REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) carry out a public comment period on the Memorandum and any similar plan relating to reorganization of the Department of

Agriculture to solicit public comment from agricultural producers and other communities on the impact of that reorganization; and

(2) submit to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture a report that contains—

(A) a description of how that reorganization will retain sufficient staff expertise to carry out Department of Agriculture mission areas and result in greater efficiencies and customer service for agricultural producers and other communities; and

(B) such other information as the Office of Inspector General determines necessary for the report.

(d) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Office of Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available, the reports received under subsections (b)(2) and (c)(2).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 29, 2025, at 3 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 29, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a briefing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 29, 2025.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 29, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 29, 2025, at 3 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting immediately followed by a closed briefing.

COMMEMORATING THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER AND RECOGNIZING ITS CONTINUED LEADERSHIP IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SPACE LAUNCH SYSTEM AND HUMAN SPACE EXPLORATION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 309.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 309) commemorating the 65th anniversary of the Marshall Space Flight Center and recognizing its continued leadership in the development of the Space Launch System and human space exploration.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 309) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 26 (legislative day, June 24), 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following resolutions, which are at the desk: S. Res. 344 and S. Res. 345.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the

motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JULY 30, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 30; 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 proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 182, Thomas Gaiser; further, notwithstanding rule XXII, at 11:30 a.m. the cloture motions filed on Monday ripen and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Gaiser nomination; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday's session of the Senate, the motions 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.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. THUNE. Madam 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 9:21 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, July 30, 2025, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RE-

SERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. LYNN M. LEE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. SHAWN M. COCO
BRIG. GEN. SEAN F. CONROY
BRIG. GEN. BUEL J. DICKSON
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL M. FESLER
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT E. HARGENS
BRIG. GEN. TROY D. HAVENER
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK L. LANAGHAN
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM M. LEAHY
BRIG. GEN. ALLISON C. MILLER
BRIG. GEN. MARK R. MORRELL
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH F. MORRISSEY, JR.
BRIG. GEN. JAMES R. PARRY
BRIG. GEN. CARLA R. RINER
BRIG. GEN. STEPHANIE S. SAMENUS

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. GARY R. CHARLTON II
BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. CLEET
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER A. JARRATT
BRIG. GEN. JASON W. KNIGHT
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY A. KRANE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER M. BLOMQUIST
IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MONIE R. ULIS

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 29, 2025:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

SAMUEL BROWN, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR MEMORIAL AFFAIRS.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

WILLIAM KIMMITT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

EARL MATTHEWS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

SUSAN MONAREZ, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.

THE JUDICIARY

EMIL J. BOVE III, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT.