



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2025

No. 159

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 30, 2025, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2025

The Senate met at 3 p.m. on the expiration of the recess and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God of grace and glory, help us to look in the right place for wisdom and guidance. Remind our lawmakers that You have promised in James 1:5 to liberally give wisdom to all who request it.

May our Senators continue the quest of seeking Your wisdom so that when the days of opportunity are past, they will go out with joy and be filled with Your peace. Let Your wisdom lift them above all discord and infuse them with an unshakeable faith in Your prevailing providence. Give them a sense of Your purposes and a deep dependence on Your guidance and grace. As a government shutdown looms, help them to attempt something they couldn't do without Your power.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUDD). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2296, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Chaplain, in his opening prayer, mentioned something about the shutting down of the government. It would be a good opportunity for me to follow on that and say that it costs money to shut down the government and costs money to open up the government.

The government is supposed to protect and serve the American people. You can't do that if you are shut down. I hope we can avoid it.

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the agricultural economy.

There are many big issues facing our Nation's farmers this season. There is stress in the grain-producing areas of the United States. That is true of my State of Iowa.

Stress comes from the fact that farmers are losing \$1.10 a bushel on corn and soybeans about \$2 a bushel. Stress comes not only from low prices for their products but high input costs, uncertainty in the international market, particularly the issue of tariffs. Then, also, we have the issue of high interest rates, market consolidation, and I suppose you can go on.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S6805

Today, I would like to focus on high input costs that farmers will be paying this season.

The average production costs for farmers are down only 3 percent since their very high peak in 2022. Meanwhile, corn prices are down 50 percent in the same period. To put it plainly, many farmers will be lucky if they break even this fall. Those words “break even” is not possible just because of price. If they break even, it is only because of the expectant bumper crops that we will have at least throughout the Midwest that I know about.

In response to the farmers’ concerns about the market concentration and changes in anti-dumping and countervailing duty rates, I introduced the Fertilizer Research Act to shed light on the fertilizer industry.

The issue of ag inputs has become a large enough problem that last week, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice announced a memorandum of understanding to cooperate on agricultural antitrust issues. I am certain many farmers are glad to see these developments, but they need more immediate relief. This will become more of an issue as the harvest progresses.

My message is, as I see it from my State of Iowa, it is beginning to look like the 1980s’ agriculture depression all over. Congress was too slow to respond in the 1980s. Thousands of farmers went out of business in the 1980s. That should concern all of us because with only 2 percent of the people producing all the food for the 98 percent, we can’t let the destruction of the family farmer happen in 2025 like it did in the 1980s.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the government is on the verge of a Democrat-caused shutdown, a shutdown of the Government of the United States of America.

Senator SCHUMER has sent us a ransom note. It is not about a negotiation; it is about a shakedown. That is what we are facing here today in the U.S. Senate. SCHUMER’s ransom note, it is not about keeping the government open; it is about caving to the far left, the radical wing of his party. It is pure politics; it is political theater; and every Democrat in this body knows it.

This afternoon, my colleagues are going to be meeting at the White House with the President of the United States. The American people deserve to know what the Democrats are demanding. So let’s take a look at this trillion-dollar demand note.

They are demanding more than a trillion dollars in new spending to keep the government open for just 4 weeks. They want permanent new spending to continue the Biden COVID bonus payments.

If you could believe it, they want sanctuary cities to continue to give free healthcare to illegal immigrants. At the same time, they threaten to defund the Border Patrol.

They want to send billions of dollars to foreign countries, but they want to slash billions of dollars to help rural hospitals right here in America. That is what the Democrats are proposing in their ransom note.

They want to subsidize free healthcare for people who refuse to work, who are working-age individuals and are healthy and ought to have a job. Yet they threaten the paychecks of the people whose job it is to keep our country safe.

They demand this far-left wish list or else, they say, they are going to shut down the government at midnight tomorrow.

The biggest scam in this ransom note is the COVID-era Biden bonus payments. Democrats are demanding \$400 billion to continue these subsidies forever. Let’s remember that Democrats created these Biden bonus COVID subsidy payments during COVID in 2021. It was part of their reckless tax-and-spending bill. They passed it when they controlled the House, the Senate, and the White House.

At the time that Biden started these bonus payments, most people realized that COVID was already behind us, but that didn’t stop them. Democrats extended the payments again in 2022, and they set the expiration date for December of 2025. That is about 3 months from now.

Democrats promised at that time, when they put them into place, that the Biden COVID bonus payments would be temporary. They weren’t intended to last forever. Now the Democrats, in their ransom note to the Republicans and to President Trump, say they want these temporary payments to go on forever.

I have here the House report that came out on this 2021 reckless tax-and-spending bill. It is called “American Rescue Plan of 2021.” This is a report of the Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, H.R. 1319, dated February 24, 2021.

Instead of going through the whole thousand-page document and bringing it here and throwing it on the floor, which is where it belongs, I copied pages 215 and 216. What does it say about these bonus payments? They say right here, it applies “during the public health emergency is over. And it says in the payments, when you turn to the next page, they would go “temporarily”—“temporarily.” That is their word, not mine. Well, COVID is over. Joe Biden lost. Democrats are in the minority. These Biden COVID bonus payments, they need to go away as well.

They were just one more part of a big government giveaway, and now CHUCK SCHUMER is here demanding that we make these bonus payments permanent. To me, “temporary” means “temporary.” That is what the Democrats are demanding just to keep the government open for 4 short weeks. It is preposterous.

Twelve years ago, in 2013, America faced another shutdown. At that time, Senator CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut sent out a press release—2013, 12 years ago. In his press release, Senator MURPHY of the minority from Connecticut said this:

There is a time and a place to debate healthcare—

He went on to say—

but not when the funding of the federal government—and all the lives that are impacted by it—[are hanging] in the balance.

He is not here today to hear those words, but his party needs to recognize that is exactly what they said 12 years ago. And, today, Democrats like Senator MURPHY are doing the very thing that he condemned in his press release 12 years ago.

Stunningly, the Democrats want to eliminate, of all things, the \$50 billion Rural Health Transformation Fund. This is the fund that Republicans created to keep rural hospitals open.

I am a doctor. I practiced medicine in Wyoming for more than 20 years. I know what affordable, reliable, quality care means to our communities. They are lifelines to small communities.

Yet, yesterday, on “Meet the Press,” the minority leader, CHUCK SCHUMER, said rural hospitals are closing. So he wants to put the noose around their neck. This makes it worse. He is threatening, as part of his demand, to eliminate the \$50 billion set aside for rural hospitals in America.

Last week, I was at home in Wyoming. I attended a ribbon cutting in Pinedale for a new hospital. This is the first hospital ever in Sublette County, WY. The nearest hospital is 85 miles away. There is another one 100 miles away. Depending on, in the winter, which roads are open, people in that community had to either drive 85 or 100 miles seeking healthcare.

This is going to help the communities in Pinedale. It is going to save lives. It matters to those people.

Yet the ransom note from Senator SCHUMER and the Democrats would shut it down, prevent all of these rural hospitals that are struggling that we have provided for in our comprehensive economic plan that we passed in July. SCHUMER wants to pull the plug on all of it. It is part of their bill. It is part of the ransom note. It is what the Democrats are trying to do.

Let’s be honest. The Democrats have a political problem. The far left, their radical wing, is demanding a shutdown of the government. Their caucus is divided. The American people overwhelmingly want the government to remain open to provide vital services to the people. They know that it costs

money to shut down the government. It costs even more to reopen the government. Democrats don't seem to care.

What we have here is a clean, bipartisan, continuing resolution to fund the government for the next 7 weeks. The House of Representatives has already passed it with a bipartisan vote, and it keeps the government open for 7 weeks at the current funding levels. So it doesn't cut anything.

It says: Let's just continue to work on appropriations bills. It gives Republicans and Democrats an opportunity to work on the budgeting for next year, the appropriations process, to keep the government open for the next year. President Trump is ready to sign it. It is here before the Senate, and it is time to pass it.

Senator SCHUMER has repeatedly bragged that Democrats never shut down the government when they were in the majority. I would remind the minority leader today that 13 times under Joe Biden, the Senate passed a clean continuing resolution to keep the government open. We should do the same right now. Senator SCHUMER ought to remember those 13 times. Today should be no different. If this government shuts down—and it should not—it will clearly be a SCHUMER shutdown.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming is a friend of mine, really. And though we may disagree on some political issues, I greatly respect him and am glad to call him a colleague. But we do disagree on this point that he just made, and it is a very important disagreement because it affects every family in America.

The decision was made, in the big beautiful budget bill by Donald Trump, to cut \$1 trillion out of Medicaid. Medicaid is a program which helps people who have limited income have health insurance. It also takes care of your mother and grandmother when they are in the nursing home. It is a critical element of funding healthcare in America, and the Republicans cut \$1 trillion out of it.

If you go to the hospitals in Illinois, some of them are great hospitals, others do great things, but you will find that the hospitals that struggle to survive are ones that have more Medicaid patients than paying insurance patients. It is a tougher margin, and many of them worry about it. And the notion of cutting \$1 trillion out of this program worries me.

Don't take my word for it. Ask the Illinois Health and Hospital Association or even, if there is one—I am sure there is—the Wyoming Hospital Association what the impact of cutting \$1 trillion out of Medicaid reimbursement is going to be: not good, particularly in rural areas.

Senator BARRASSO made reference to his situation in Wyoming. In the State of Illinois, we have plenty of these

rural hospitals, and if one closes, it means your pregnant wife who goes into labor now has to drive 70 miles instead of 20 for that delivery. I would hate to have to go through that. Yet that is what is going to happen. So the position we are taking is that that kind of cut from Medicaid is going to hurt hospitals and hurt people across America.

Secondly, there is a tax credit available for people in middle-income categories to buy health insurance. It is part of the Affordable Care Act, which was the Barack Obama plan that extended more health insurance coverage to America than we had ever had in our history.

How important is health insurance to you?

I had a personal experience as a law student at Georgetown. I had decided I couldn't wait, and I asked a young lady to marry me, and she did. And my second year in law school, we learned that God was sending us a little baby, and we were so happy about it. And she arrived with her share of difficulties.

I had no health insurance—none. What do you do—as a student with a wife and a baby, and the baby is sick—when you have no health insurance? Well, Children's Hospital here in Washington, DC, brought us into the so-called charity ward, and we waited to see who would walk through the door with the name "Doctor So-and-so" to take care of my daughter.

I never felt more inadequate in my life, as a father and a husband, than not having health insurance. We got through it. She got through it too and lived a good life.

But the point was there were moments when I worried that I couldn't provide the basics for my baby because I didn't have health insurance, and 15 million Americans will lose their health insurance because of this Republican budget that I just referred to, the big beautiful budget. Fifteen million will lose health insurance. I wouldn't wish that on anybody.

So when the Democrats say there are healthcare issues that are part of this debate on funding the government, that is what we are talking about, keeping these hospitals open—critical hospitals in the inner city, as well as in rural areas—making sure that people have their health insurance.

And there is one third element I would add that I don't think will be able to be negotiated: medical research.

Did you ever hear of the National Institutes of Health? Why, sure you have. It is the best medical research Agency of any government in the world.

I went to the NIH about 12 years ago and met with Dr. Francis Collins, an amazing man, who was head of the NIH, and I said to him: I really believe in what you do. Your research in cancer and heart disease and so many other things makes a difference. What can I do to help?

Well, he said, thank you for asking. There have been some people who have done remarkable things.

I said: Oh, I remember. There was a bipartisan coalition, a few years back, that doubled the budget in medical research for NIH.

I said: I wish I could say I could do that again, but I don't think I can. What can I do?

He said: Give me and this Agency 5 percent real growth each year in medical research, and we will light up the scoreboard. We are so close—so close—to finding cures and new drugs in so many areas that if you can give us consistent research, it will make a difference.

I came back to the Senate. I sat down with my friends on both sides of the aisle. Roy Blunt, a Republican Senator from Missouri, was a leader in this effort. Lamar Alexander, a Republican Senator from Tennessee, was another leader. And PATTY MURRAY is still serving as head of the Appropriations Committee and is one of the best when it comes to medical research.

We put our heads together, and over the span of 10 years, the budget for NIH medical research went from \$30 billion to \$48 billion. We got the 5 percent coming every single year. It was quite an achievement: a 60 percent increase in that budget. Things were happening—good news, good developments when it came to cures and treatments. I was so proud of that effort and glad that it was bipartisan from the start.

So what did the Trump budget suggest we do with medical research? Cut it back from \$48 billion to \$30 billion, where we started 10 years ago. Do you know what happens when you cut back on research that basic? You know what happens, and I do too. When that terrible diagnosis happens at the doctor's office, it breaks your heart. And you finally stop crying, and you say to the doctor: Is there anything you can do? Is there a surgery, a medicine, anything you can do for someone I love very much?

And they say: Well, there is a clinical trial. There is medical research underway. It is a longshot, but you have a chance.

It is hope. Medical research is hope, and it is one of the areas where I think Donald Trump's cuts are the most heartless cuts of all. Democrats care about this. I do. I am willing to fight over it.

I am not willing to say: We will just go on with business as usual. Let's accept this. Let's cut back a trillion dollars out of Medicaid. Let's take 15 million Americans and take away their health insurance. Let's cut back \$18 billion of medical research each year. And we will say it is just a clean continuing resolution bill.

That is what we are fighting over. Is it important? For me, it is one of the most important things we can do in terms of helping families across America.

And let me tell you something that is going on, and you should know about it. You will soon, if you are covered by it. Health insurance has tax treatment

that helps you pay the premiums. It makes a dramatic difference. And now, in a matter of days—days—health insurance companies are going to announce what the new premiums are going to be because of the budget bill—the big beautiful budget bill—of President Trump. They are going to go up dramatically. And as these premiums go up, some people won't be able to pay for them, and they will be without health insurance. And others will see their family budget explode with an increased health insurance premium.

That is the reality of this debate. It is not about who gets bragging rights and gets to beat on their chest—Democrat or Republican. In my mind, it is a question of whether families across this country can count on us for the basics, and making sure that healthcare is there for America is one of the basics, as far as I am concerned.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. President, there is another issue I want to raise that relates to the administration, and you have to go back in history to appreciate it.

Richard Nixon—students of history, of course, know that name—was former Vice President of the United States, former Senator. He was a Senator and a Congressman, Vice President under President Eisenhower, and then President of the United States.

He went through a period we know as Watergate. It was controversial. Some people broke into the Democratic national headquarters. They were caught. They were prosecuted. When it was all over, we had the Watergate investigation, and, ultimately, President Nixon resigned. But before he resigned, he instructed his staff to give him background information on his enemies list, the people that he considered to be his political enemies. And the word was out that they were going to be treated harshly by his administration, whether it was the Department of Justice or the Internal Revenue Service.

Well, we went through that chapter. He resigned. And then Congress came together—Democrats and Republicans—and said: We can never let this happen again. We can't let a President put his finger on somebody and say: That is a political enemy. Go prosecute them. Try to find them guilty of a crime. Make sure they pay a fine. Give them bad publicity.

We agreed, on a bipartisan basis, for standards—between the White House, the Department of Justice, and Congress—when it came to these political decisions that could ultimately result in prosecution.

Well, under President Trump, we are back into the Nixon conversation about the “enemies list,” except President Trump's enemies list is longer than anything Richard Nixon ever dreamed of, and that is what we are looking at now.

On September 20, the acting U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, Erik Siebert, announced his resignation. The acting U.S. attorney, ap-

pointed by Trump, resigned. Mr. Siebert resisted President Trump's demands to bring charges without sufficient evidence against New York Attorney General Letitia James and former FBI Director James Comey.

Mr. Siebert, a Republican appointed by Donald Trump just a few weeks ago, stayed true to his oath to the Constitution and his commitment to following the facts and the law, and for that, he was forced to resign his office. In his place, President Trump installed his personal attorney—an attorney with no experience as a prosecutor; never did it before—to indict James Comey in a politically motivated case considered by career prosecutors in that office too weak to bring charges.

This indictment represents the latest step in President Trump's long crusade to weaponize the Federal Government against his perceived political enemies—a return to the days of Richard Nixon.

We remember when the President was initially impeached in the first of his historic two impeachments after he attempted to pressure a foreign ally to dig up dirt against Joe Biden and his family. We remember when President Trump turned a mob of insurrections loose on our Capitol, where they violently attempted to prevent the peaceful transfer of power, leading to his second impeachment.

I will never forget that day as long as I live—January 6. It has been my honor to serve in this Chamber 29 years. I have seen a lot. I am honored to represent a great State like Illinois. But I will never forget that moment when we were sitting here counting the electoral college votes as to what the American people had decided of the next President. Vice President Pence was presiding. We were seated in our chairs. I noticed something unusual: Those two doors opened, and four or five people walked in, up to the Vice President, and literally yanked him out of his chair and took him out the door. We knew there was a political demonstration outside, but all of a sudden, it turned bad and scary and dangerous.

Capitol Police came in and announced to us seated in this Chamber: Stay at your desks. We are going to make this a safe Chamber here in the Capitol. Don't worry about those people demonstrating outside. They are not going to get close to the Chamber. Just stay where you are.

We looked at one another and thought, what is next? Well, what was next was, 10 minutes later, the same policeman came in and said: Leave immediately. Don't take anything with you; just get out of the Chamber. It is too dangerous for you to stay here.

We all—Democrats and Republicans—filed out those doors.

You know what happened next: The insurrections took over this building. It was one of the most embarrassing moments in the history of the U.S. Capitol Building.

Imagine, if you will, for a moment if you heard the news that the House of Commons in Parliament had its door broken down and people raided the chamber. You would say to yourself: What is going on in England, for goodness' sake? The House of Commons taken over by people in the street?

That is exactly what happened here, and it happened on January 6.

So this President, embarrassed by that moment, maybe—who knows if he is ever embarrassed—decided he would go after the people who prosecuted the insurrections, the people who were prosecuted for crimes like beating up policemen.

You all came here today, and we welcome you to this Chamber. The reason you are safe in this building today is a lot of women and men in uniform who are guarding you and me and all of our staff so we can do the people's business.

Those people were under attack by the January 6 insurrections. These were not curious tourists who came here. They ended up beating on these police, and 140 of them were seriously injured.

If you believe it, in his second administration, the President has gone further than Richard Nixon and what he has done before. His political appointees have fired FBI agents and Federal prosecutors who were called on to prosecute the insurrections. He has installed loyalists whose chief qualification is their loyalty to him, not their loyalty to the law or the Constitution.

We recently learned that a top Federal prosecutor in Sacramento was fired after she advised the Border Patrol to comply with a court order. Yes, the Trump administration fired a career prosecutor for following a court order.

Never in the history of our country has a President so brazenly demanded the baseless prosecution of his rivals, and he doesn't even try to conceal it or hide it. He glories in this constitutional outrage.

In a social media post, President Trump issued a command to Attorney General Bondi:

They impeached me twice, and indicted me (5times!), OVER NOTHING. JUSTICE MUST BE SERVED, NOW!!!

We can't delay any longer.

He is referring to the prosecution of James Comey.

Imagine that. A sitting President commanding his Attorney General to prosecute State and Federal officials who simply tried to uphold the rule of law. That is exactly what this President is doing. What Richard Nixon was stopped from doing, he is doing.

Since Watergate, Republican and Democratic Presidents alike respected the independence of the Justice Department, recognizing that shielding it from the pull of politics is essential to safeguarding the rule of law. Under President Trump, those constitutional guardrails have been removed—destroyed.

I want to be clear. What you are seeing from the Trump White House is not normal. This isn't some inside-the-beltway drama. If the President can turn the Department of Justice and the FBI into his own personal police force to target political enemies, he can just as easily turn it against ordinary Americans, and the dam is already starting to break.

The President sent Active-Duty forces into Los Angeles earlier this year to put down protests of his administration's cruel immigration raids. He threatened to make war on the city of Chicago, which I am honored to represent, by sending forces into that city, as well as Memphis, TN, and has now ordered the military to Portland, with authorization to use "full force"—"full force"—in Portland, OR.

The Governor of Oregon and the mayor of Portland said that what the President said about being at war and "unlivable" is just plain wrong, and yet he does it.

It is a slippery slope into authoritarianism. Once DOJ and our military have been politicized, there are few guardrails left.

So while today it is Letitia James and James Comey who are the targets, tomorrow it could be our fellow citizens who dare to even criticize the policies of the Trump regime. That is the risk we face and the danger that lies ahead in this perilous moment. That is why I have opened an investigation calling for answers from Attorney General Bondi, including making available several Trump-installed loyalists for questioning. The American people deserve to know if the chief law enforcement Agency of the United States is following the Constitution or pursuing political revenge.

Let me end with this. During the Watergate scandal, President Nixon attempted to bend the Department of Justice to his will to go after his enemies and conceal his administration's involvement in this unlawful conduct.

When President Nixon did this, Democrats and Republicans on a bipartisan basis in Congress sounded the alarm together and defended the rule of law. On a bipartisan basis, we responded to Nixon. Those legislatures recognized the danger posed by a President attempting to wield power to benefit him personally. They knew it was unconstitutional, and they stood firm on a bipartisan basis in Congress.

Where is that same courage today? It is time for the Republicans to join Democrats and step up and say enough is enough. This is not about political parties; it is about protecting our democracy from a would-be dictator intent on setting it all ablaze to achieve his personal aims.

This is a code-red alarm for the rule of law, and unless we come together to stop the President's abuses, I fear this administration will continue to corrode our American democracy.

My question is this: Is there one Republican Senator in this Chamber who gives a damn?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BRITT). The Senator from Texas.

POLITICAL VIOLENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to begin my remarks this afternoon by reflecting on the tragic shooting at the Dallas ICE Facility that happened this last week. One detainee was killed and two others were injured by a 29-year-old shooter who was later found dead on the scene from a self-inflicted gunshot wound.

This is not the first attack of its kind against the immigration enforcement officials in Texas. In fact, this is the fourth in as many months—four attacks against law enforcement officials in the last 4 months.

On July 4 in Alvarado, TX, assailants opened fire outside an ICE detention facility, wounding an Alvarado Police Department officer in the neck. Ten people were subsequently arrested and charged with attempted murder while six other subjects have been charged with related offenses.

Three days later, July 7, a man shot at a Border Patrol employee in McAllen as he tried to park his car. He then fired at the Border Patrol annex, attempting to break in, before finally being killed in a firefight with Border Patrol agents.

In addition to these attacks on law enforcement, we know our country is still reeling from the horrific murder of Charlie Kirk, whose life was taken from him simply for expressing his views and engaging in political dialogue on college campuses.

We are beginning to see in our country a level of political violence that is not and should not ever be considered normal.

But this is a warning signal about the direction we are heading in as a nation, and it is one we cannot afford to ignore. Many of us are asking ourselves, how did we get here? Well, the answer, it seems—or at least part of the answer—is simple and straightforward. It begins with the demonization of free speech and the vilification of those who are doing nothing more and nothing less than their duty, which is to enforce the laws on the books. Frequently, these are laws passed by Congress on a bipartisan basis and signed into law by the President. These law enforcement officials are simply enforcing the laws that we have written. The radical base of the Democratic Party seems to be at war with the men and women who actually enforce our laws, and with the same breath, they seem to, from time to time, celebrate mob violence. We all remember the so-called peaceful protests of 2020 that resulted in massive economic losses and harms to businesses, not to mention that many law enforcement officers were injured or even died as a result of mob violence.

Embarrassingly, it was a Texas Member of the House of Representatives, Congresswoman JASMINE CROCKETT, who recently said on national television:

When I see ICE, I see slave patrols.

Not to be outdone, Congresswoman ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ described ICE as a "rogue agency that should not exist."

Then there is former Member of Congress Colin Allred, who called ICE "un-American" and "harmful to our public safety."

These attacks against the men and women who enforce our laws are simply unconscionable, and they have undeniably contributed to getting us in the dangerous place we find ourselves in today.

If these individuals and other Democrats truly cared about public safety, they would stand with Republicans. We would stand united as Americans in supporting our men and women in blue and green, and they would denounce the unprecedented rise in attacks against these law enforcement officers immediately. Instead, Democrats seem to endorse a complete inversion of how a just and ordered society functions.

Unfortunately, this is going to require some of our Democratic colleagues to swim against the tide of opinion among their radical base and show some leadership. But they have to decide as a party to move away from the dangerous and radical demands of their leftwing base.

Unfortunately, the Democratic leader in this Chamber, the Senator from New York, is showing anything but that kind of leadership right now. He has demonstrated a complete unwillingness to tone down the rhetoric of his party or to make actually even good-faith gestures toward good governance. In fact, this very week, he has demonstrated just how far he is willing to go to undermine basic governance in order to appease his radical base. He would rather shut down the government than work across the aisle for the benefit of the American people.

Senate Democrats have so far refused to even vote on a simple stopgap measure that will give us a little more time—about 9 weeks—to negotiate full-year government funding. If they do not relent in this partisan posturing, the result will be forever known as the Schumer shutdown.

You don't have to take it from me on what a government shutdown would mean for the American people; all we have to do is to read back to them the very words Senate Democrats have said in the past.

In September of last year, when the shoe was on the other foot, Senator SCHUMER said:

If the government shuts down, it will be average Americans who suffer most.

He also said:

A government shutdown means seniors who rely on Social Security could be thrown into chaos.

Is this even the same individual that is taking the position that is heading us toward a shutdown in the coming days?

Last September, he went so far as to even say:

Keeping the government open will mean no poison pills or reckless partisan posturing.

This is what he said just last year about a government shutdown. Where is that man today? Today, I will tell you, he is engaging in reckless, partisan posturing while Republicans are proposing a responsible alternative.

Again, this is not a vote on a permanent policy but, rather, a stopgap measure to get us to a place where we need to be when it comes to the appropriations process.

But he is willing to impose the very costs that he warned about on the American people and our seniors in order to score political points with his progressive, radical base. The hypocrisy is obvious, and it is staggering.

It is a time for reckoning for our friends in the Democratic Party. They seem to not really know what they stand for these days except opposition to each and every thing that the majority party or the President wants, even when it is in their self-interest to do so. They need to look at themselves in the mirror and decide what and who they stand for. Are they going to be the party of violence and lawlessness and a degradation in public safety? Are they going to continue to what has been called frighteningly an assassination culture? Will they continue down this mad path of taking the lives of those they disagree with and siding with the criminals over law enforcement personnel that are simply enforcing laws they themselves have helped write? Will they continue on prioritizing their ideology ahead of responsible governance?

I often wonder how our friends on the other side of the aisle would react if they had to live—if they had to live—in crime-ridden neighborhoods overtaken by gangs and drug dealers and they had to wait 20 or 30 minutes before any police officer responded to their calls for help after an assault or a robbery. How would they feel? Well, I am quite sure, I am confident that they would change their tune. Just like current residents in blue cities who had to suffer under the weight of failed Democratic soft-on-crime policing policies, they would gladly welcome additional police protection and efforts to clean up and stabilize their neighborhoods.

Sadly, most Democrats—at least so far here in Washington, DC—have appeared to be completely tone-deaf and rarely hear the true voices of the people whose lives they assume they represent, people living in these inner cities.

Well, regardless of what Democrats decide to stand for, Republicans will continue to be the party that respects free and open discussion of ideas. We will continue to support our law enforcement officers, men and women who risk their lives day in and day out so that Texans and all Americans can sleep soundly in their beds. We will continue to be the party that opposes reckless partisan tactics that put ideology ahead of the needs of the American people.

Republicans have made it clear under President Trump that we will enforce the rule of law. That is nonnegotiable. So it is no surprise that the American people overwhelmingly voted for Republican leadership last November.

If Democrats continue to head down this path of violence and division, they should not be surprised if they continue to experience the same outcome at the ballot box in the upcoming midterms as they did last November in the general election.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S. 2296

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, this spring, just a few days before Congress enacted the last continuing resolution, which is the spending plan—this resolution that would extend the Biden-era spending levels—President Trump said in a speech that he wanted to do something that hadn't been done in over 20 years: balance the budget. I fully commend him for that, and I am very supportive of trying to get there.

The difficulty is that the spending levels that we voted on in March and the spending levels we will vote on again this week don't balance the budget and don't come anywhere close. These are the spending levels that Biden put in place in December before he left office.

Most Republicans were critical and condemnatory. Many conservative Republicans, like myself, voted against these spending levels because they were such that they would lead to a \$2 trillion deficit. Well, that is still true. This year, the deficit will be right around \$2 trillion, and it is because we have continued the Biden spending levels.

To balance the budget, Congress needs a much stronger response than the legislation being presented. Critics of excessive Federal spending have rightly argued that Congress should return to prepandemic levels of spending. When the pandemic came in, spending went through the roof. The economy was shut down. They wrote free checks to all Americans. The problem is that all that was borrowed. There was no money. There was no rainy day fund.

Now, there is a way to tackle the budget and to try to balance the budget over time. I have a Penny Plan budget that I have been introducing for several years. We have not gotten any Democrat support, but we have gotten over half of the Republicans to support it. My Penny Plan would balance over about a 5-year period and would return spending almost immediately to what would be a prepandemic level.

Six months ago, though, when the current continuing resolution was

passed, Republicans were told that we were just clearing the decks, that this was going to be temporary, and that we would then be bold and present budgets that would cut spending. Once President Trump was in office, with a Republican majority in the Senate and the House, we would finally address spending levels. And wouldn't you know it—getting serious about a balanced budget is not on the agenda this week. There really isn't any serious change. What we are talking about is a continuing resolution that continues the Biden spending levels. These spending levels this year have led to almost \$2 trillion in deficit and are projected next year to lead to \$2.1 trillion in deficit.

In addition, we will also be voting on something called an automatic continuing resolution proposal. This is the idea that, rather than having the government shut down, it would just continue spending the same amount of money. In theory, I like the concept; I just don't really like continuing the Biden-era spending levels because they never balance—not over 5 years; not over 10 years; really, never. The lines never cross. So, sure, you would keep the government open, but you would keep the government open and spend the same amount we do currently, which is out of control and not defensible. So keeping the government open while continuing \$2 trillion deficits hardly seems desirable.

Rather than the relentless fury to tackle the debt, which is what we were promised with a Republican majority, the powers that be have once again waved the white flag of surrender by failing to present the American people with legislation that would make the cuts necessary to balance the budget.

Under the proposed continuing resolution or the automatic continuing resolution we will vote on tonight, the budget never balances. Even if you take it out as far as the eye can see, revenue will never meet expenditures. So it is just not something I can support, and I don't think it is a conservative proposal. Spending has gotten so out of control that this freeze, even over a decade, doesn't put a dent in the deficit.

Presidents of both parties pay lip-service to the idea that the national debt must be addressed. Yet it gets worse under both parties. People ask me: Whose fault is it—Republicans or Democrats? And I just say: Yes, it is both parties. The right wants unlimited spending for the military, and the left wants unlimited spending for welfare. So you have guns and butter. You scratch my back, and I will scratch yours, and it all goes up.

Now, the reverse compromise could happen. You could actually cut a little bit from the military side and a little bit from the welfare side, and really everybody would get a little bit of a haircut across the board. You could balance your budget that way. But you can't exclude or exempt huge swaths of

government spending. You have to look at all spending, and if you do, the budget can be balanced by a 6-percent cut across the board, excluding Social Security.

I am proud of the President for what he has tried to do, though. Unlike past Presidents, Donald Trump has created the Department of Government Efficiency to identify and eliminate waste. DOGE has found billions of dollars of waste. Americans were rightfully appalled when they were told that your government has been spending \$2 million on sex changes in Guatemala. I mean, it sounds like a bad punch line that, you know, you might hear from late night comics—\$2 million on sex changes in Guatemala. Your government was spending that money, and the DOGE people came in and said: We shouldn't do it.

I have been talking about these things for years, but finally we have an administration that is interested in it.

There is \$25,000 for an LGBT opera in Colombia and nearly \$1 million to study the microaggressions among obese Latinx, whatever that means.

But it is just crazy wasted money. I mean, it would be one thing if it was from even a surplus of crazy wasted money, but we are doing this, and we have to borrow the money from China to send to all these crazy projects around the world. This doesn't even count the \$200 billion we have sent to Ukraine. That is all borrowed as well.

This summer, President Trump sent Congress a special message identifying \$9.4 billion in rescissions, and Congress, for the first time in a long time, did the right thing: We voted for and passed this rescissions package to cut \$9 billion.

I supported, as I always do, cutting this foreign aid. With a deficit of \$2 trillion a year, though, \$9 billion is a drop in the bucket. We have to do more. Congress has to do more.

As much as I appreciate this, the power of the purse needs to be exerted more by Congress. We have let so many of these decisionmaking powers devolve to the President. The Founders, I think, would be appalled with Congress. They would be appalled with what Congress has become. Congress exerts no powers. It gives away its powers and does not seek a restoration of its powers.

Right now, we are living under emergency rule, where the President has declared emergencies on 160 countries and has declared that he has the right to declare whatever he wants through import taxes. Well, our Founding Fathers would be appalled. The Constitution is very clear: Taxes originate in Congress, and even more specifically, taxes originate in the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, Congress has been all too happy to wither in the shadow of the Presidency that grows larger with each successive administration. Whether it be Republican or Democrat, the Presidency grows larger and stronger;

to wit, the continuing resolution that we are considering—the spending plan that we are considering—maintains the Biden spending levels.

If you will remember, there was an election. Do you remember the Republicans all said: Bidenomics and Bidenflation and Biden spending—we are against all that.

That was kind of what the election was decided on, and now you have a Republican in the White House, Republicans in the Senate, and Republicans in the House, and we are living under the Biden spending levels that they complained about.

The great irony is, the Democrats have now switched. The Democrats supported the Biden spending levels under President Biden. Now there is a President Trump and the spending levels are exactly the same, and all the Democrats are voting no. It makes no sense at all.

It is really ironic that every Democrat Senator supported the spending levels just 9 months ago that we are voting on now. So when they say “continuing resolution,” we are continuing the same spending levels that we started with in December of last year, and every Democrat voted for them.

Likewise, in December of last year, conservative Republicans voted against the Biden spending levels, and now they are poised to vote for the Biden spending levels. Both parties have completely flip-flopped to the opposite side of the same issue that hasn't changed. Congress has truly entered the upside-down world.

To add insult to irony, the CR before us adds the foreign aid dollars we canceled 2 months ago back into the baseline spending. So we, finally, for the first time and as long as I can remember, had a vote to get rid of this crazy foreign aid, this foreign welfare. We did the right thing. We got rid of \$9 billion. There is still another 40-some-odd billion dollars in the budget. We got rid of \$9 billion. By voting on this continuing resolution today, they are sticking the foreign aid back in. The foreign aid will be back part of the baseline again. We have to go through the whole thing again. It is almost as if DOGE never existed, as if DOGE never found all this stuff, criticized it, shamed Congress into doing the right thing, and we cut the foreign aid. It is going back in. So we are going to do a CR that doesn't lessen the foreign aid spending. It is going to have the same level of foreign aid spending we had last year.

I am not going to fall for this trick, and conservatives shouldn't either. As Jefferson tells us, our job is to be eternally vigilant. What the country needs is a bipartisan effort in Congress to reclaim the power of the purse and to do what is necessary to eliminate duplicative spending, wasteful spending, and spend only what we can afford.

We have some programs here that were begun 40 years ago, authorized. People said: We are going to solve the problem of homelessness, 40 years ago.

The programs have been reauthorized, and we just continue living on and on. Then, every year or so, someone goes: Wow, we have a homeless problem. Why don't we get another government program to build homes?

They did this in California recently. They spent \$27 billion over a several-year period. Do you know what the average unit cost for the affordable housing was? A million dollars a unit. That is the history of government, the incompetence of government; that they are going to build houses for poor people, and it turned out costing them a million dollars a unit to build houses for poor people.

Just 2 weeks ago, a majority of the Republican caucus actually did vote for my Six Penny Plan. The Penny Plan, as I have said, is to cut spending across the board. It is how we would actually finally balance the budget. It is this compromise that everything needs a little bit of a haircut. Unfortunately, we have gotten no Democrat support for it. We got a little over half the caucus, but probably a little over a third—30, 40 percent of the caucus—is still believing that we should just keep spending levels as they are or continue to increase spending. So we are not quite there yet. There is not quite enough fear of where we are.

But \$37 trillion in debt is not something to be sneezed at. We are adding in \$2 trillion a year. The interest alone is about \$1 trillion. Some people have made the argument that a country can no longer remain strong when its interest payments on its debt exceed its actual spending to defend itself, the military spending. So I think we are really at a tipping point.

Everybody comes to us for money. Everybody has got their hand out. Everybody wants more out of us. From Israel to Israel's neighbors, everybody has got their hand out. Everybody wants more money from us. And I think it makes no sense for us to be borrowing it from China to give it to other countries, no matter how good the request is.

The plans that have been presented before us—we had two plans presented: a Republican plan and a Democrat plan. Which one adds debt? Yes, both of them. The Republican plan will add \$2 trillion in debt next year if we continue spending at the same level. The Democrat plan said we want another trillion on top of that, so it would be a \$3 trillion deficit next year. So neither party is serious about this.

But there is an alternative, when we get enough Republicans, and that is the Penny Plan that I have been offering for several years. It balances it by gradually reducing spending just a little bit each year.

But by supporting yet another continuing resolution at the current spending levels, Republicans are essentially signing off on the fiscal policies of the Biden administration—policies Republicans once rightly opposed.

Just a short time ago, virtually every Republican was saying the Biden

spending levels were too high. But given that this continuing resolution will add another \$2 trillion deficit next year, this plan, at the Biden level, should be a nonstarter. However the legislation before us today is being presented as a solution to dysfunction, but in reality, it is just papering over the cracks.

This measure is not a reversal of the status quo; it is the status quo. It does nothing to address our debt. It does nothing to divert our trajectory that is bankrupting this Nation. This is not some theoretical debate; this is math. This is what will happen. This is what happened last year and is going to happen again—\$2 trillion in additional debt.

We bring in about \$4.7 trillion. We spend \$6.7 trillion. We are spending \$2 trillion more than comes in. This isn't like an emergency. This isn't even the excuse of the pandemic. This is routine business, routine status quo, \$2 trillion in deficit every year.

If we stay on this path, we keep spending like we did during the pandemic or under the Biden administration, we are guaranteeing a future of higher inflation and crippling debt for our children and grandchildren.

We are running out of ways to fix this. We are running out of time.

The CBO projects that within the next 10 years, mandatory spending—this is all the welfare programs—and interest alone will exceed revenue. We are getting pretty close to that now.

Think about that. We vote on a budget that is not mandatory spending. Military spending is considered to be discretionary, and then there is a bunch of discretionary welfare. Military is a little bit more than the welfare. That is the budget we vote on. Then you have mandatory spending, which is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, food stamps, and then interest on the debt. That, essentially, is equal to what comes in. The taxes that are coming in equal the mandatory spending. So when we actually do produce a budget, which isn't very often, the stuff we are spending is almost entirely borrowed.

If you look at the discretionary spending budget, it is about \$1.8, \$1.9 trillion. That is the debt. That is what the debt is. The debt is, essentially, equivalent to the discretionary spending. The mandatory programs, the welfare programs, have gotten so big, and they grow with such abundance each year. We have added in young, healthy, able-bodied people to these programs that really shouldn't be on welfare. You have added these people in, and it is consuming all of your taxes. So, really, everything else is being borrowed.

Entitlement programs and interest will consume every single dollar within a year or two that comes in, in tax revenue.

Imagine if you were running your household that way: no money left for food, clothing, shelter, unless you take

out a loan every single year forever. That is what we are doing. You really can't live that way. You can borrow if you want to borrow to buy a house, but the bank holds the house. But you don't borrow money to pay rent for your apartment. You don't borrow money to pay for your groceries. You have to actually earn that money and have enough for your daily living expenses. We are to the point where we are borrowing for the daily living expenses of government.

My amendment that I have offered to this would take the automatic renewal that prevents us from shutting down—take the automatic renewal and put in the Penny Plan numbers so what you would actually have is not running the government at the same levels, at the Biden levels; you would actually reduce spending by 6 percent.

I am fine to make it automatic. I am fine to let it kick in and go on so we don't shut the government down, and we avoid the chaos and the discomfort of having the government shut down. But we shouldn't keep spending the same amount of money. That would be like abdicating our duty just to spend the same amount.

But if we were to use my Penny Plan budget, we would be returning to prepandemic spending levels, a significant cut that would put us on the path to balancing our budget within 5 years.

The government, though, has lost sight—lost sight—of its priorities. The American people are the ones paying the price. The big spenders don't tell you the truth. They don't tell you that it is all borrowed. They don't tell you that you are being ripped off by inflation. They don't tell you that well, gosh, we are going to give you all this stuff, but it has a cost.

Really, nothing really is free in life. There is really not any possibility of getting something for nothing. What you get from government through borrowed money you pay for through inflated prices.

The inflation of the Biden years didn't go away. Over the last 3 or 4 years in the grocery store, a lot of the meat and the different items in the grocery store went up 20 percent. When they say inflation is slowing down, that means we are just not adding more to it. But if you don't make 20 percent more than you made 4 years ago, you are being ripped off. You are being ripped off by inflation.

It wasn't that long ago that my colleagues, at least on this side of the aisle, stood united in opposition to this fiscal recklessness. It wasn't that long ago that we drew a line in the sand on debt and the debt ceiling; that we demanded spending caps; that we said we wouldn't mortgage our children's future to fund today's political convenience. Now, some seem content to roll over and lock in the very policies that we ran against.

I won't do that, and I won't urge my colleagues to do that either. We can't claim to be fiscal conservatives while

voting for more and more debt. We can't claim to be this great opposition to the Biden spending levels and then vote the Biden spending levels in. We can't claim to not like deficit spending and then vote for spending that will inevitably lead to another \$2 trillion in debt next year.

This country can't afford to write another blank check. We can't afford to lock in the fiscal mistakes of the past. We need real reform. We need it now. We need to return to the principles of limited, constitutional government. If we obeyed the Constitution—most of the nonsense, most of the spending that goes on up here really isn't authorized under the Constitution. If we return to the Constitution, the principles of limited government, responsible budgeting, and economic freedom, we would have a balanced budget again. We need to start today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

WAIVING QUORUM CALLS

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the Waltz nomination and Calendar No. 161, S. 2806.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

S. 2296

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I expect the distinguished minority leader, my friend from New York, will speak possibly after the first vote and report that we are still at an impasse on funding the government, which, of course, expires at midnight tomorrow night.

At that point, I want to implore my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and particularly the Democratic leader, to agree that while we are at an impasse, there is still very, very important business to attend to, and that is the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act, which, as the President knows, has been reported from the Senate Armed Services Committee, some months ago, by an overwhelming majority vote, with only one dissenting vote. I think it was a vote of 24 to 1. That bill was reported to the floor.

Our side of the cloakroom has run several hotlines, and we have been ready to go now for several days. Our disappointment has been that while the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee has been willing to proceed and a number of our friends on both sides of the dais, Republicans and Democrats, on the Armed Services Committee have been willing to proceed, we don't have engagement yet from the minority leadership.

So I simply want to express aloud what I hope I can engage the Senator from New York about when he does speak. While we are at an impasse and the Senate is still in session, it seems to me a reasonable thing to do to bring this bipartisan, noncontroversial, but highly significant bill to the floor.

We have agreed to a managers' package on our side. We actually have 985 Member-driven items already in the National Defense Authorization Act. We have agreed to a number of amendments and a second managers' package.

There is very little difference on what will be brought to the Senate for votes, and it just seems to me that we don't need to sit around idly while negotiations perhaps are going on with the White House, with the House, and the Senate. We need to proceed to this very essential legislation—the national defense bill.

If we could get that done this week, I think it would show to our constituents back home in both parties—Independent, Republican, and Democrat—that we are serious about the business of protecting the United States, enacting this very important legislation and the changes we need so that we are not doing last decade's type of national defense but doing our job under the Constitution to make sure the United States is strong.

So I would make that request to my Democratic friends and to my Republican friends, most of whom, on our side, are ready to proceed and have been ready to proceed on the National Defense Authorization Act.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 425, Michael G. Waltz, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

John Thune, John Boozman, Tim Sheehy, John Hoeven, James Lankford, Shelley Moore Capito, Pete Ricketts, Markwayne Mullin, Tommy Tuberville, Rick Scott of Florida, James E. Risch, Bernie Moreno, Tom Cotton, Ted Budd, David McCormick, John R. Curtis, Mike Rounds.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michael G. Waltz, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 531 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—1

Tuberville

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

The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael G. Waltz, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during his tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2850

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in the wake of the violent and senseless murders of multiple lawmakers and political advocates, I rise to seek passage of legislation that will provide a real measure of protection to all Americans for their privacy and security.

Before I do, I also want to point out that I am just back from the so-called "war-ravaged hellhole" of Portland, OR—my hometown—and somehow I made it out unscathed. I will have more to say, but I want to make clear that my hometown of Portland is safe; it is vibrant; and Portlanders do not

want Federal troops and do not need Federal troops.

Now, with respect to privacy, as it stands today, data brokers have amassed vast amounts of Americans' personal information, which they are willing to sell to anyone with a credit card. Would-be murderers can often find the home addresses and other personal information about their targets within a few search results on Google. Indeed, the assassin who murdered Minnesota State representative Melissa Hortman and shot State senator John Hoffman repeatedly used "people search" websites run by data brokers to learn the home addresses of the victims.

I also recognize that Members of Congress receive untold numbers of violent and harassing threats as a result of our jobs, and I want to credit the bipartisan effort in the Senate Commerce Committee to provide privacy protections for Members of Congress. I do not intend to stand in the way of their legislation.

The bill I offer today takes the privacy protections against data brokers in the Commerce Committee's bill and extends them to all Americans. Protecting everyone is the most effective way to protect U.S. military and intelligence personnel, including undercover officers. There have been numerous press reports over the past few years revealing how data brokers are selling sensitive location data collected from U.S. personnel who are working at military bases and other sensitive facilities and that they are willing to actually sell this data to foreign buyers. Members of Congress should not receive special treatment. Our constituents deserve protection from violence, stalking, and other criminal threats.

For that reason, Mr. President, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2850; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I thank my friend the Senator from Oregon for his passion for privacy. He has had a passion for protecting privacy his entire tenure in the Senate, as have I, and his passion is genuine. I believe we have an obligation, a bipartisan obligation, to do more to protect the privacy of Americans, especially kids, but to protect the privacy of Americans across the board.

We also are well aware we live in a time in which violence is on the rise. There is enormous division. There is

enormous anger and hatred. The entire world was shocked just a couple of weeks ago at the assassination of Charlie Kirk by a deranged gunman who inscribed his political agenda on the shell casings as he murdered a husband and a father of two. Just last week, I was in Dallas where another deranged gunman opened fire at an ICE facility, killing two. Again, that deranged gunman inscribed his political agenda on the shell casings. I wish we did not face this partisan anger. I wish we did not face these threats of violence.

A previous Congress passed legislation protecting the personal information of Federal judges because, sadly, too many Federal judges and their families have been targeted for violence. That legislation was bipartisan; it passed into law; and it has had some modicum of success in protecting Federal judges and their families.

In this instance, Senator KLOBUCHAR, a Democrat, and myself have teamed up together to extend the same protections of privacy that Federal judges have to Members of Congress and to their staffs. We are all blessed to represent our States, and yet we know that there are threats of violence that come with this job. Collectively, the 100 of us in this Chamber have faced thousands and thousands of death threats and threats of violence. Our staffs have been victims of violence over and over again, and so this legislation is bipartisan legislation to enhance the safety and security of Members of Congress and their staffs.

Senator WYDEN has now suggested broadening that to all Americans. I admire that sentiment and agree with that sentiment. There are challenges, however, with the language he has drafted. The language he has drafted, as presently written, could, among other things, prevent law enforcement and parents from knowing where convicted sexual predators are living. It could have the effect of gutting Megan's Laws that have been adopted all across this country.

So what I have offered to Senator WYDEN is to work with him in good faith. I chair the Commerce Committee. I have already offered to convene a hearing to examine how we can expand privacy protections more broadly but do so in a way that doesn't disrupt law enforcement; that doesn't disrupt legitimate interests, such as knowing where sexual predators are living and making sure they are not living near young children, near daycares, near schools.

Because the legislation submitted by the Senator from Oregon has not yet worked through those issues, I reiterate my offer to work in a bipartisan manner to find an expansion of the legislation that is under consideration that would work effectively, but in the meantime, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has offered to do a

hearing on my proposal, and I do appreciate that.

I simply believe it is unfortunate when the Senate will pass privacy protections for ourselves but not for all Americans and that only shady data brokers, would-be murderers and stalkers, as well as foreign adversaries buying data on U.S. Government officials, are actually going to benefit from blocking this bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2851

However, Mr. President, in understanding that my colleague has made his arguments in believing that my legislation goes too far, I also have a narrower piece of legislation tailored specifically to three groups of people who face elevated risks of violence, doxing, and stalking that is similar to Members of Congress and our staffs.

This bill is also modeled on the bipartisan Commerce Committee bill and protects Members of Congress and staff. Additionally, it protects State and local officials, including State judges who were left out of an earlier judicial privacy bill. The threat to State and local officials has not gone away. Earlier this month, a gunman fired a bullet directly into the home of a State senator in Illinois. This legislation also protects survivors of sexual assault and domestic violence who deserve the strongest possible safeguards against being stalked or harmed.

Even if a Member objects to protecting all Americans, surely, the people doing our jobs in State capitals across the country and those who have suffered assault and violence deserve the same protection as the Presiding Officer and I.

Therefore, as in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2851 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, for the same reasons I articulated a minute ago. I am quite sympathetic to the concerns raised by the Senator from Oregon. He is right. There are threats against State and local officials. Those threats are serious, and they deserve to be dealt with seriously.

In my view, violence is never acceptable, and that is whether I agree with you politically or I disagree with you politically. We should debate civilly, with respect, with decency, and violence should never be the answer.

So just as I did with his previous amendment, I extend my offer in the hearing we convene to consider the issue of State and local officials to consider how best to expand the protection. I am interested in expanding the

protection to as wide a universe as is feasible, as is practicable, but that answer is not yet worked out.

State and local officials is a universe that comprises tens of thousands, if not more people than that. We should have hearings and consider the effect before passing legislation that, if the bill got expanded, would engender an objection to this bill and kill the entire bill altogether.

Because I don't want this body to do nothing and to fail to take a reasonable, commonsense step to protect the security of Members of Congress and their staffs and because I very much want to pass Senator KLOBUCHAR's legislation—which I might note, Senator KLOBUCHAR is a Democrat; I am a Republican. This is bipartisan legislation. Because this amendment at that time, I believe, would imperil the Senate doing anything right now, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to tell my colleague from Texas I look forward to the hearings on legislation that would ensure that all Americans have these protections because, as you and I have talked about, I think it is critically important there not be a double standard in America. I thank my colleague for the offer of the hearings.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

GRAND BLANC SHOOTING

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. President, first, along with Senator GARY PETERS, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate observe a moment of silence in this Chamber to honor the four people and many more wounded yesterday in Grand Blanc Township.

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

(Moment of silence.)

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. President, today, I rise on behalf of the community of Grand Blanc, a community in unspeakable pain, grief, and anger. I stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate as Michigan's junior Senator, along with our senior Senator GARY PETERS, to represent and honor what has gone on in our community.

At 10:30 yesterday morning, a man drove a car into The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Grand Blanc Township. The gunman set fire to the building and started shooting. At this time, four are deceased, more are injured and at the hospital. In this small community just 15 minutes from my own community, we are shocked to the core.

In addition to mourning the dead, we pray for the injured. We pray for the community that will be living with the effects of this for months and years to come, and we thank the professionals who are taking care of those in shock today.

Everywhere you go in Michigan, whether I was picking up a cup of coffee or picking up my dry cleaning, Michiganders are very raw.

I think the most important thing, first, is to thank our first responders but also use them as an example. The first officer was on the scene 30 seconds after the 9-1-1 call, and it took law enforcement 8 minutes to neutralize the shooter—8 minutes. They did a masterful job addressing an incredibly complex act of violence, and their efforts are what are keeping people afloat.

I want to give special recognition to two officers: one from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, the other a Grand Blanc Township police officer who happened to be in the area close by and risked their lives to protect the innocent. They did not wait. They ran toward the danger without hesitation. They are heroes today.

I visited Grand Blanc Township this morning. We made a point to go with both Democratic- and Republican-elected leaders, local, State, and Federal. What I saw in the community is confusion and deep pain that something like this could happen in this small place. It is a community where fender benders are much more common than any kind of violent crime, and there is a feeling of pain that such a senseless and useless act of violence happened in our community.

I think it is important to learn that lesson from law enforcement. From everyone I talked to, whether it was local law enforcement, our State folks, our Federal folks, they all said: We just all joined in. We didn't think.

They put their heads down, and they started protecting people. That is the example I hope we can all learn as we try to understand this moment in our country's history.

We have a problem in this country. We have an epidemic in this country, and we have to acknowledge that. The only way we get better is by acknowledging we have a problem. We have a problem with mental health, and we have a problem where people think violence is a legitimate option in voicing disagreement in our system. Whether it was the death of Charlie Kirk, State legislators in Minnesota, people worshipping in Grand Blanc, those who attacked the President of the United States, it is normal to look for an ideology and a reason why they would perpetrate these kinds of attacks. But I think more than anything, what I ask Michiganders and ask Americans to do is look not for the specific reason why but understand that what is happening in our country, we are signaling that we are unwell. We are unwell. Whether it is in Nevada or Michigan, people are unwell, and we have to understand that it is our responsibility to address that.

In Michigan, we, unfortunately, have had five mass shootings in the past 4 years. Oxford High School, Michigan State University, the Splash Pad in Rochester Hills, another church in Wayne, MI, and now Grand Blanc Township is added to this sick fraternity of communities that have to endure this kind of violence.

I would dare say that myself, this is the fourth time I have personally dealt

with one of these mass shootings. I can see that it desensitizes you after all these times. You get used to it in a way that I just can't reconcile.

It was important for us to come together—Democrats and Republicans—to put out the message that, please, take a breath. Don't watch everything social media is putting forward. Learn from our law enforcement officials to be serious and judicious, and let us all be leaders in our own lives. Either you are working every day in your community to make things better or you are working to split people apart.

This targeted violence was meant to terrorize us. It is meant to make us scared in our houses of worship, where people were just trying to pray on a Sunday morning. It is meant to terrorize us in our high schools, in our colleges, in our places of political discourse, on our university campuses. But what it does by making us afraid is, it is infringing on our freedom. If people don't feel that they can go to their sanctuaries—the place where they and their children are supposed to be safe—that is infringing on our freedom.

I would say we must acknowledge as Americans that we have an illness, and the symptom is this extreme violence that is being perpetrated on our most innocent civilians.

I hope today, after a long month of violence across the country, that Democrats and Republicans, especially in this body, can rise above the petty political games and come together to get to work on this epidemic. It is our responsibility as leaders. It is our responsibility as the people look to us to lead.

I just encourage every American to rise above the anger and vitriol of this moment and instead focus on our communities and what we need to come together and heal.

With that, I yield to my senior Senator GARY PETERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I, along with my Senate colleague from Michigan ELISSA SLOTKIN, am heartbroken and appalled to stand here today as we grieve yet another tragedy in our home State of Michigan.

On Sunday, Grand Blanc Township experienced unimaginable violence when a gunman drove his car into The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, fired gunshots at the members of the congregation, and then started a massive fire using gasoline that destroyed most of the church building. This was shocking. It was horrific. It was a violent attack on a quiet and peaceful community.

There are now families whose loved ones will never return their call, never hug them back, and never sit by their side as they practice their faith.

I am devastated to share the ages of these individuals that ranged from just 6 years old to 78 years old. I simply can't imagine the agony that their families are now experiencing.

There are also eight other victims who remain in critical condition in the hospital with their families waiting anxiously by their side. My thoughts are with them as we hope and pray for their safe recovery.

This was the kind of horror that you don't want to believe is even possible in our world, let alone in our own community. But, unfortunately, this is not the first time that I have stood at this podium after senseless acts of violence devastated parents, siblings, children, friends, and neighbors in my State. That is why a part of me feels this terrible sadness today for the pain and loss that was inflicted upon Grand Blanc Township and the greater community.

But I also feel just immense outrage because there are no words to describe the pain, the devastation, and confusion you experience at these moments—pain for the senseless loss of life, devastation for the sense of fear that no matter how hard we work to heal, this despicable act has shattered this quiet community—and our utter confusion as to how someone could have the capacity to inflict this kind of evil.

We know that our Nation is plagued by an epidemic of gun violence. More than 100 Americans will die from gun violence each and every day in our country. We also know that there has been a rise in violent threats and deadly attacks targeting churches, synagogues, mosques, and other houses of worship in communities all across our country. We cannot allow these patterns of violence to continue. We cannot simply accept these attacks like it is another normal day. It is not.

And despite what people may tell us, there is far more that unites us than divides us. Now, more than ever, we need to come together and hold each other up. And once we have grieved, we must work together to find solutions that will prevent this kind of tragedy from devastating more communities.

It is certainly past time to enact sensible gun reform and ensure that every American can practice their faith without fear for their lives. It is certainly past time to take the temperature down on our politics, a growing sickness that has undoubtedly contributed to the rise of polarization and hate-fueled violent attacks against our country. The bottom line is that the time to act is now. There is simply no other option.

I want to, once again, share my deepest condolences for the families and loved ones of the victims of this absolutely horrific attack. My heart breaks for the entire community and everyone who has been impacted by this catastrophic event.

I also want to thank the law enforcement and emergency personnel who responded immediately to this harrowing scene. In fact, two law enforcement officers engaged the shooter in less than a minute, and as a result, there is no question that countless lives were

saved. Their profound bravery and heroism can never be forgotten, as well as the courageous community members who acted quickly to shield women, children, and the elderly from gunfire.

Finally, I want to thank the numerous local, State, and Federal Agencies that have stepped in to support the victims and their loved ones and ensure a thorough investigation is carried out.

Michiganders are tough. Michiganders are resilient. But most importantly, they are kind. On Sunday, that kindness showed through as we saw so many people race—race—to help in the aftermath of this appalling attack. As we remember the victims and as we remember their loved ones and the community members who are still grieving, I hope those actions not only provide some form of comfort but also show that heroism and kindness in the face of unspeakable tragedy is truly who we are as Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, first of all, I want to express my sadness at the loss of lives in Michigan, and I want to thank my colleagues Senator PETERS and Senator SLOTKIN.

You speak for every single one of us, and our hearts are broken. Regrettably, our hearts are broken too many times with this endless violence. But thank you so much. And you spoke for every single Member of the Senate, Republican and Democrat, and I think you spoke for America.

Thank you, my colleagues.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, we are on the verge of a shutdown, and the question is why. And there are a couple of reasons, because, in my view, we should never have a shutdown, and it is an indication of a breakdown in the constitutional process and the failure of the Executive and the legislative branch to do their job.

As with any kind of shutdown, the conversation focuses on who is to blame. I don't particularly want to talk about who is to blame because I know who will suffer. The people who will suffer are the people that the Presiding Officer represents in Nebraska; they are the people I represent in Vermont. But I do think it is important to give some history of how this happened and what is at stake, and I say that hoping that at the end of the day, which will be tomorrow, we do not have a shutdown, we do not turn the lights off on government.

We have had brinkmanship before, but before, we have had situations where, as we approach the midnight hour, the policy differences—that were vast—between Republicans and Democrats were being discussed by Democrats and Republicans, and that discussion was often at the behest and insistence of the Executive, playing a proper role to get us to talk and resolve those differences. This time, it is different. We have an Executive who said that his party should not even speak to Democrats—not even speak to Democrats.

So I will just ask the commonsense question a Vermonter would ask: Peter, if you disagree with somebody and you won't talk to them, how will you resolve the disagreement?

And that is what has happened.

The second thing is—and I want to say this to my Republican colleagues—we have an Executive who pays no respect to the role that the legislative branch of this government plays in the affairs of this country.

We passed a budget with Republican and Democratic support, and we have an Executive who said he didn't care what it is we passed; he was going to do what he wanted, under the aggressive, caustic leadership of Russell Vought, the head of the Office of Management and Budget. And what Republicans and Democrats in this body agreed to spend, the Executive refused to spend, froze the funding; whether it was foreign aid or healthcare, he could decide.

That is a total and complete violation of the constitutional separation of powers. To the extent that this body—Congress—puts its head in the sand and disregards the assault on our authority by the Executive, we have relinquished our authority. More importantly, we have relinquished our duty. We have relinquished our duty to the people we represent to stand up for the constitutional separation of powers and to bear the responsibility that we have to make decisions about taxing and spending.

There is another reason why we can't just kick the can down the road. There is, in this country, an affordability crisis. People can't afford homes, and they definitely cannot afford healthcare. Folks are terrified at the likelihood of a person they love in their family getting sick if they don't have insurance.

What is about to happen if we don't act before this shutdown is that folks who are getting their healthcare through the Affordable Care Act, who are paying a significant portion of their income for that healthcare but can only afford it because of the subsidies—not because they want to have subsidies but because the healthcare system is so expensive—ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act. Those folks in the Presiding Officer's State and mine are going to lose their healthcare, and that is a reason we cannot condone a resolution that does not include protecting people's healthcare across this country, all those folks who are dependent on the Affordable Care Act for them to be able to have security that if their partner or if their child needs healthcare, they will have access to healthcare. That is the urgency of this. That is what makes it different.

We have an Executive who has told the Congress and the Republicans in Congress: Don't talk to the Democrats. Disgraceful.

More than that, we have a situation where the people all of us represent will lose their healthcare if we don't resolve that now—right now—because

they are starting to hear about the premium increases that will make it completely unaffordable for them to have access to healthcare.

When we get into a political situation, my Republican colleagues ask me: PETER, why would you want to have a shutdown?—which I don't want, by the way. But you know what, it is a fair question.

But there is a fair question I can ask of my Republican colleagues: Why do you want to have a resolution where the people we all represent are going to lose their healthcare? That is a fair question for us to ask you.

My belief is that there is no answer for that question because it is within our power right now—today, tonight—to make certain that folks who are on the Affordable Care Act will continue to have access to healthcare. It is up to us to solve that problem.

Let me just talk specifically about that and what it means to folks. If we don't act, in Florida, a 30-percent increase; Kentucky, a 32-percent increase; Louisiana, a 32-percent increase; Alabama, a 34-percent increase; West Virginia, a 35-percent increase; Texas, 39 percent; Tennessee, 41; South Carolina, 50.

We have wicked-high healthcare premiums in Vermont, and we may have the worst situation. Let me give an example. I know the Presiding Officer, as a former Governor, is totally sensitive to this. I know the Presiding Officer is.

A family where you have two folks working and they are making a little over \$100,000—they can get the ObamaCare healthcare for about \$7,500. Their premium is going to increase by \$2,300. That is not their fault. They have no control over that. They can't shop around. But what they know is they have a child, maybe a child with disabilities, and what they know is they love that child. They know they love their family. They know, as responsible adults, they want to make sure that if those kids or if their partner needs healthcare, they will have it.

If we fail to act, we are saying: You are on your own. It is complicated. It is political.

That is so unacceptable, and that is what we are talking about.

The blame game is: Why are you in favor of a shutdown?

I am not in favor of a shutdown.

I think the more profound question for each of us—Republican, Democrat, Independent—is, Is it within your power to continue healthcare for the Americans whom we represent? And the answer to that, we all know, is yes, it is within our power.

Now, we may have to stand up to an Executive who doesn't particularly care about that. But we do. We do. And if we do, we must act. So that is what is at stake here.

When we step back from the politics and the blame game and the shutdown showdown activities that are becoming ever more prominent here and just ask ourselves, as U.S. Senators, all of us

who represent people who are working-class, some are wealthy, some are disabled, all kinds of people, and we care about them. But can we really say we care about them if we let them lose their healthcare? My answer to that is no.

So I am ready to do whatever it takes to continue access to healthcare. And the people who want healthcare—it is about the love they have for the people in their lives; it is not about getting some political advantage with the outcome of this debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, Donald Trump is powerful, but he is not all-powerful. It is true that he is trying to consolidate power in illegal and dangerous ways, but it is also true that he is often failing to do that because of public opinion, because of markets, because of institutions, and because of the law itself.

I want to give a couple of recent examples. Two weeks ago, shortly after Trump and FCC Commissioner Brendan Carr threatened to punish ABC if it didn't suspend Jimmy Kimmel's show, the network announced that it was taking the show off the air indefinitely. So at first, the public coercion seemed to work. Brendan Carr had said, point blank:

We can do this the easy way or [we can do this] the hard way.

And the network caved. But a swift and searing backlash quickly followed. Consumers revolted. People began canceling their subscriptions.

Disney's market cap fell by close to \$6.5 billion in a matter of days. Artists, advertisers, and employees spoke out. Even Republicans in the Senate denounced the move.

My Senate colleague TED CRUZ called it "dangerous as hell":

I think it is unbelievably dangerous for government to put itself in the position of saying we're going to decide what speech we like and what speech we don't, and we're going to threaten to take you off [the] air if we don't like what you're saying.

Criticizing your own party's administration is hard. I understand that. But this is not about whether you are left or right or whether you thought Jimmy Kimmel's comment was insensitive or not. It is about the basic question of "Are we allowed to speak freely in the country without fear that the government is going to come after us?" because, if not, that is not the America that any of us recognize.

Here is another example. Last week, Trump installed a loyalist with no experience as prosecutor as the interim U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, and within days, the office indicted former FBI Director James Comey on charges without much evidence at all.

And the case is so absurd that they couldn't even get a single career prosecutor to take it on. So, instead, the newly installed interim U.S. attorney

had to sign and present the indictment herself in a highly unusual move. One of the charges was rejected by the grand jury almost immediately.

Now, why does that matter? It is, without a doubt, a dark day for the country when the President of the United States uses the Justice Department to prosecute political opponents. But legal experts widely expect this case to fail before it even gets to trial. And that, too, will be a reminder that while this President is powerful, he is not all-powerful. This isn't a free-for-all. He doesn't get to just do whatever he wants.

That brings me to this debate about government funding. Democrats are out of power, but we are not powerless, and our price is not that high. We have been asking Republicans, for over a month, to sit down and negotiate. I have been here 13½ years. We have never passed an appropriations bill without negotiation.

But Trump literally told his party: "Don't even bother dealing with them." And so it took them until today, on the eve of a shutdown, for a meeting.

And the House is out of town. The House adjourned until after the funding deadline expires. They were going to come back on October 1, which is already 24 hours too late. Now they are thinking October 7.

If you are serious about a deal, if you are serious about keeping the government open, why are you not in the U.S. Capitol?

Russ Vought, in July, the OMB Director, said: You know, the appropriations process should be less bipartisan.

The person in charge of the Federal Government in the executive branch is pretty explicit. He says: The appropriations process should not involve Democrats at all.

The only way to keep the government open is for both parties to negotiate a bipartisan agreement. If the Republicans want to listen to Donald Trump and say, "Don't even bother dealing with the Democrats," then there is a very old adage and an iron law in politics, which is: If you don't ask for the vote, you do not get the vote.

We are ready to work together to keep this government open, and I want everybody to understand what we are fighting for—what we are fighting for. Tens of millions of Americans are getting letters in the mail, and they don't know they are on the Affordable Care Act exchange. What the hell is that anyway? They just sign up for healthcare on a website, right? You don't know if you are on Obamacare or some hybrid thing or employer or this or that. You just get a letter from your insurer, and they say: If you want to reenroll in your healthcare plan, here is how much it will be. It is usually like a small increase, year over year, to cover inflation.

So now they are going to get a letter that literally says: Your subsidies are

gone, and your new price is x. The average increase is going to be hundreds of dollars per person per month. Add to that that we are hearing in some States, and maybe as a result of some job owning with the administration, they are waiting to send those letters. They are waiting to send those letters. Why? Because they are hoping we are going to resolve this ACA tax credit thing, and they don't want to eat, politically speaking, the fact that a bunch of people, tens of millions of people—Democrats, Republicans, Independents, nonvoters, but zero noncitizens—zero noncitizens—you are not eligible to be on the exchange if you are a noncitizen—are going to get a letter saying: You know it is going to be \$3,000 or \$4,000 more per year.

Like, go talk to a regular person. Some of us know regular people who are on that exchange and know: I just can't do it—\$300 dollars more per month. And, by the way, if you get that letter in December and your first payment is due on January 1, you are extra screwed.

So I understand that the White House understands how big of a political liability this is because people are really going to get hurt. And now it is a question of sort of people wanting to not behave as though they are giving in.

But let's be adults here. There is a crisis that is about to happen to tens of millions of Americans, and we have an opportunity to fix it, and there is bipartisan desire to fix it. And Leader Thune and Speaker Johnson's view is: Nah, we will deal with that later. And Donald Trump was saying: Why don't we deal with that next year?

By next year, all of the rates are locked in, and people will be paying \$300 or \$400 or \$500 more per person per month.

We can fix this, and we should.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today because we have a choice here, and the Democratic leaders in both the Senate and the House just went to the White House. They had a long meeting. I am glad that meeting happened. I hope something will come out of it.

But the President has repeatedly said: Well, we don't need Democratic votes. Well, we can do this on our own.

The problem is the more he says that, the more the American people are saying: What about me?

"What about me?" says the farmer whose soybean market is dried up, whom I met with last week. "What about me?" says the mom coming out of the grocery store and looking at her bill or the student thinking "I can't afford this electricity bill" or everyone that is starting to look at these healthcare numbers, looking at the insurance premiums, looking at the fact that this administration has not stood up for them on healthcare?

So if they would open their eyes right now and see what is going on out

there or maybe go to those 13 rural counties that I just visited in Minnesota, maybe they would see that this is a moment where people are expecting the President and congressional Republicans to work with us on these unfolding crises.

The tariffs may be decided in the courts or the Congress can decide enough is enough, but this healthcare crisis—that is on this body to do something right now. The President has sadly made his position clear. He would rather shut down the government than work with congressional Democrats to address this skyrocketing healthcare cost crisis.

So our colleagues, many of whom I work with every day, they can decide: Are they going to rubberstamp what he does or are they going try to work with us?

So one of the things that one of the farmers said to me last week, at one of my meetings, is this: Between my entire market drying up—in Minnesota, 60 percent of our soybeans are exported to other countries; of course, China hasn't purchased a bushel since this President came in—and the cost of fertilizer going up because of the tariffs on potash out of Canada—and even then, though they were reduced, it is still a major driver—between the issues with visas and not having enough workers—he described it, as he looked at the healthcare policy and what is happening there, since about 28 percent of our farmers are on the Affordable Care Act because they are individual businessowners—he said it is the perfect storm of ugly.

I think that is a good way to describe it. So what do you do when there is a storm—a perfect storm of ugly—coming at you? Do you go out there with an umbrella and say, well, maybe we can look at this in a month or two?

You don't have that luxury. The American people don't have that luxury. This is not a December thing. This is not a January thing. This is a now thing.

So I hope our colleagues will see it as the opportunity that it is, and that is to finally do something to help the people that are facing this.

NBC recently reported on one family that currently pays \$278 a month for health insurance, thanks to the healthcare tax credit. If Republicans in Congress and the President let this expire, this family's premiums could soar to \$1,800 a month, an increase of \$1,500 a month.

The estimate is that nationally it will be a 75-percent increase in premiums. In rural, it will be double. I was actually surprised at our rural hospitals—of course, they are concerned about the Medicaid cuts—that the \$500 billion in Medicare cuts that is coming at them, because of the fact that the debt was increased so much in that bill with the tax cuts for the wealthy that it triggered an automatic \$500 billion of Medicare costs.

All of that is worrisome, but maybe I just hadn't thought it through. The Af-

fordable Care Act premium increases, without any tax credits, really concern them. Why? Because so many of their people that are going into their hospitals in rural areas are either on Medicaid or they are on what we call in Minnesota MNSure, their policy through the Affordable Care Act.

Those people won't be able to afford double—no way—because they are already in that perfect storm of ugly. So then they aren't going to have insurance, and they are going to show up in their emergency rooms, in these midsize towns, with no insurance. So they said this could make a major, major difference for them.

Our legislation would have kept the lights on. Our bill, it got more votes than the Republican bill. I would like to point that out. A whole bunch of people didn't even show up for the vote that we just had a week ago, and our proposal that did something about healthcare—to restore people's healthcare—actually got more votes than the Republican proposal.

So we want people to work with us and prevent millions of Americans from losing their healthcare. This is our opportunity to show why we came here to begin with, and that is to stand up for our constituents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, for the past 6 or so months, I have been crisscrossing the State of Wisconsin, listening to families, small business owners, parents, caregivers, doctors, nurses, and neighbors about what good, affordable healthcare means to them. And the overwhelming consensus, as you might expect, was that having healthcare you can rely on and afford means everything.

I know this exact feeling. When I was just 9 years old, I had a very serious childhood illness, similar to spinal meningitis. That wasn't the exact diagnosis. But I was in the hospital for 3 months, and even though I was able to make a full recovery, my family was then not able to find any health insurance to cover me, not at any price, because I had been labeled as a child with a preexisting health condition.

You see, back then, insurance companies were under no obligation to cover people who had been sick or were sick. So people with preexisting health conditions, like diabetes or a cancer diagnosis, so often went uninsured. That kind of experience, being hospitalized for months and then not being able to get health insurance, it is not an experience that one forgets.

So when we have these debates about healthcare policy, I know that it is not just a high-minded conceptual idea. It is real. The consequences are real, and the people behind the stories are real.

And over the past few months, I have been able to hear those real stories. I heard stories from families who were sometimes unable to put into words what it would mean if their Medicaid were stripped away.

I heard from Evan in Madison, WI. Evan is on Medicaid. We call it Badger Care in the State of Wisconsin. Evan has undergone two brain surgeries and subsequent radiation over the past 10 years to treat brain tumors. Thankfully, he has Medicaid to help cover this care, but his ability to stay healthy means that he needs medication. He wrote to me and said that without Medicaid, "I won't be able to afford my medication that literally gives me the ability to go out and be a part of my community."

I also heard from Ashley from De Pere, WI. She told me how Medicaid was essential for her 15-year-old daughter with disabilities. Medicaid has allowed her to modify her home so her daughter can safely get around and also allowed the family to get a wheelchair-accessible van so her daughter can get to school and get to the doctor and just be a kid and experience the world.

These are the Americans who are now living in fear that their Medicaid is on track to be terminated because my Republican colleagues jammed through a partisan bill that cuts Medicaid to the bone and will kick more than 10 million Americans off their healthcare. As always, I would be remiss if I did not say that was all in service to giving huge tax breaks to big, profitable corporations and the ultrawealthy.

This is the damage that I am hearing about from the people I work for, and, sadly, the stories from folks who are worried their healthcare is on the line don't end there. Twenty-four million Americans get their healthcare from the Affordable Care Act, and they are waiting right now for that dreaded letter in the mail letting them know that their premium costs are about to skyrocket. For the 22 million who receive enhanced premium tax credits, their costs will go up on average by 75 percent. Four million of these Americans are going to get that letter and realize that they cannot afford healthcare at all anymore.

This, of course, is because my Republican colleagues refuse to pass our bill to extend the enhanced premium tax credits and make them permanent, which allow millions of Americans to get affordable healthcare through the ACA.

I heard from some of those families and small business owners last week. They are just dreading what they are about to find out and what the future holds for them.

Take Kim, who owns a bakery in the Fox Valley. Last week, she laid out how if Republicans refuse to extend these tax breaks, she is not only worried about how she will be able to afford her healthcare but also that increased costs on the exchange will mean that employees may quit working for her to go work for a big company that offers insurance. And, of course, she is worried that her customers will inevitably be left with less

in their pockets to come by and patronize her store.

I also heard from Keith in Marathon County, who runs his own insurance business. He knows this issue inside out, and Keith laid out some staggering figures for me of what he is staring down. If Republicans don't join me in extending these premium tax credits and making them permanent, Keith's premiums will go from less than \$740 per month to more than \$2,300 per month just to get insurance for his family. That is a staggering increase.

It is no exaggeration to say that the American people are staring down a healthcare crisis. We have a healthcare system in crisis. And I want to be clear that it is 100 percent manufactured by my Republican colleagues.

But do you know what? This is still avoidable. It is still avoidable. I am hearing my constituents sounding the alarm, so I am here to do the same. I got the memo that they don't want to have Medicaid gutted, they don't want to have their Affordable Care Act tax credits taken away, and they don't want their costs to skyrocket.

The people I work for have been crystal clear about what they expect and demand of Congress: Work together to lower costs and give them the opportunity for their hard work to let them save and to let them get ahead.

So that is my position. We need to lower the costs of healthcare, not take it away from families. I simply refuse to just go along to get along because the people I represent are truly struggling, and the solution is right in front of us.

That brings us to today. The path to keep the government open and stop healthcare costs from rising for millions is on the table. The whole idea of a shutdown is totally avoidable. If Republicans refuse to see what is right in front of them, then a shutdown is on them. And Wisconsinites will know exactly who to thank when they get that dreaded letter and their healthcare costs skyrocket or they see it simply stripped away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the House of Representatives is not coming back into session, reportedly, until next week. The government is shutting down tomorrow night, and the Republican House of Representatives isn't here, and they aren't coming back until the government has been shut down—reportedly for days. That tells you all you need to know about who is responsible for a potential shutdown of the government. Republicans care so little about funding the government that they aren't even showing up.

President Trump doesn't care either. He boycotted even meeting with Democrats until 24 hours before the shutdown was to begin. He was watching golf or posting on social media—basically anything except trying to negotiate, to do the job of government.

I wish Republicans were trying to keep the government open instead of trying to shut it down, but what I really want is for Republicans to open their eyes and see what is happening at an increasing pace to our democracy.

What I want and what I think is necessary at this moment is for any budget that we write to put the health of our democracy first. In fact, as I have watched the events of the past few weeks play out, with political enemies being systematically hunted by this administration, I think that we all have a moral obligation to only support a budget that at the very least puts the brakes on the President's lawlessness.

Right now, our democracy is in grave peril, and there is no better example of this than the events that played out last week over the indictment of former FBI Director James Comey.

The President has made it clear that he wants to put his political enemies in jail as retribution for the charges brought against him. He does not care about whether there are grounds for these charges; he just wants charges. So he instructed Erik Siebert, the U.S. attorney in Virginia, a Republican, to bring charges against James Comey, but Siebert refused for a simple reason: There was no evidence that James Comey had done anything illegal. So Trump fired Siebert, and he appointed his personal lawyer, who has never set foot in a courtroom, as the new U.S. attorney simply because he knew she would follow orders.

Every career prosecutor in the office recommended she refuse to bring the charges—again, because there were no charges to be brought—but she did it anyway, as instructed. Not a single other lawyer in the office would sign the indictment—virtually unprecedented in a case like this.

Trump cheered the indictment, and then he warned that there would be more charges brought against others that had vocally opposed his policies.

That is not all that happened in the last 2 weeks. Trump ordered the FCC to issue threats to TV stations that did not remove one of his primary late night critics, Jimmy Kimmel, from the airwaves. He announced new military deployments to additional cities. He began a process to harass and arrest leaders of prominent political groups that oppose his Presidency, threatening at least one funder of groups that oppose his policies, George Soros, with arrest simply for supporting opposition to Trump.

Much of this, though not all of it, has happened in the wake of the brutal, horrific murder of conservative activist Charlie Kirk. His assassination was abhorrent, and it was and still is a moment for all of us to consider what we can do to stamp out political violence and violence of all kinds. But his murder does not justify the dizzying campaign of political repression that has been carried out—often in his name—since. To exploit his murder to crush

dissent or to censor speech is unacceptable.

This brings me back to the debate over the expiring budget. I join with my colleagues in wanting this new budget to at the very least postpone the healthcare insurance increases that are coming for millions of Americans and that are going to ruin people's lives in this country—75 percent increases for people, who are going to make this awful decision about whether they should continue to pay their premiums, whether they should put food on their table for their kids, or whether they should risk going without insurance.

I think that is a pretty reasonable ask. Just don't increase costs on families when it comes to healthcare at a time when the cost of everything else is going up because of President Trump's insane economic policies.

But let me ask you this as well: Why would we not also simply say that any budget we pass should stop the worst of the lawlessness? Stop the deployments to our cities. Stop the witch hunt of Comey and Soros and Senator SCHIFF. Stop using the FCC to censor speech. Stop unconstitutionally ignoring the budget and spending only money that the President wants to spend.

To me, this is simple: We should not willingly pay the bills for the most serious assault on political freedom since the Civil War—an assault that may collapse American democracy as we know it.

Now, I know my Republican friends think this is hyperbole, that our fear for our democracy is just fearmongering, just politics. I swear it is not.

Our Republican colleagues know why Comey and Senator SCHIFF and Soros are being targeted. They know that the President just picked the people that give him the hardest time and told his folks to come up with charges.

My Republican colleagues know the impact that this has on people who want to politically and peacefully oppose the President but now won't do that because they fear for their freedom. Republicans know this. They should not defend it.

Republicans know that it is wrong to sit down and agree to a budget and then cheer the President when he refuses to spend the money in blue States or on the priorities that got Democrats to sit down at the table to begin with. Republicans know that is not fair play. They shouldn't defend it.

Republicans know that using the FCC to crack down on speech that the President doesn't agree with is wrong. They know, as Senator CRUZ pointed out, that is a slippery slope we may never get off.

I want to find agreement with the Republicans on stopping these premiums from going up. I do. I think that is really important for people in this country. And I think it is OK to admit that this is an odd arrangement that we have in American Government

today, where the minority party in the Senate, so long as it has 40 Members, is kind of in a coalition government with the majority party because the budget can't pass without bipartisan agreement. But the majority party has an obligation to honor and fight for a basic set of protections for our democracy, and when it doesn't, it really stops being a good-faith negotiating partner.

How do Republicans expect us to vote for a budget that funds a government that is lawlessly pursuing Democrats, that is arresting and harassing our members and our allies, that is deploying the Army and masked officers to our cities?

We are at a moment of decision for this country. Right now, Republicans aren't even trying to keep the government open. They are not even here.

They are not even here. They are rooting for a shutdown.

But if we are going to keep the government open, why can't we all agree that it should only be a government that respects our democracy, that is not corrupt, that doesn't treat people and places that oppose President Trump as enemies deserving of indictment or military deployment. That also seems like a pretty minimalist ask.

So it is decision time: Is this Senate going to fund the destruction of our democracy or are we going to do what is necessary to stand up for basic American values?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my colleague from Connecticut and to build on some of the arguments that he has made so well. We are here because our democracy is in crisis. It is not some potential catastrophe on the horizon that is distant or hypothetical. It is real. It is now because of the lawlessness and recklessness of this administration.

And it is the result of a contempt for the law, for legal norms that, seemingly, is boundless. We have seen it in the Jimmy Kimmel episode where the FCC Chair said, in mobster-like language: They can do it the hard way or the easy way.

"You have a nice restaurant there. It would be a shame if anything happened to it." I prosecuted mob cases. That is the kind of language we see from organized crime.

And it was shown in the indictment of James Comey, a document signed only by the U.S. attorney, not by any career official, and after only 14 members of the 23 people on that Grand Jury voted to do it on two of the counts, rejecting a third.

All of this kind of procedure is so highly extraordinary. As a former prosecutor, it would be an embarrassment. But this administration is beyond shame when it comes to lawlessness.

And we have seen it in immigration, in healthcare, in education, in the VA,

where countless people have been illegally fired, some of them hired back.

And that is why we are insisting that there be a guarantee that the President will follow the law when we pass a budget. It is not a hypothetical danger that he will disobey it. In fact, he has ordered rescissions, impoundments, clawbacks. If we pass a law, we have to be sure the President will follow it. Otherwise, there really isn't any point to this branch of government.

And so I say to my Republican colleagues, as a matter of your self-respect, as a matter of protecting this institution, you should agree with us that there must be a guarantee that the rule of law will prevail.

And I say to my constituents in Connecticut: We are going to stand up for you to save your healthcare because you can't wait to get sick. You don't choose to get sick on November 22 or January 3 when it is convenient for Donald Trump and the Republican majority.

You need to know, when there is open enrollment on November 1, whether or not your insurance will be affordable for you. You need to know whether those subsidies will make it affordable for you because otherwise you won't be able to buy insurance through the ACA. In fact, 90 percent of all people in Connecticut who buy insurance through the ACA marketplace receive some kind of subsidy, and their insurance premiums will skyrocket by 75 percent if that subsidy is ended. They need to know now, when open enrollment starts, whether those subsidies will be there for them.

And it will affect insurance premiums for everyone if we fail to extend those subsidies as part of this continuing resolution now. Why? Because healthier people who see their insurance premiums rise by 20 percent—right now, they are projected to rise at least 18 percent for everyone because that is the cost of this failure to extend the subsidies. The healthier people are going to say: I am not bothering. I won't need it.

The sicker people may try to buy it, and the insurance companies will have to cover illnesses, more of them, with fewer premiums, and they will have to charge more to everyone to cover it.

So this failure to do the right thing has impacts for everyone who seeks healthcare and tries to buy insurance to pay for it.

The Republican proposal is an abject failure when it comes to ensuring that the American people don't pay more for healthcare. And I heard from constituents just over this past weekend as I went to the Durham Fair, as I went to the mum parade in Bristol, as I went to Norwalk and Stamford and Milford, all around the State, people asking me: What will happen to my health insurance? What will happen to my healthcare?

Nothing is more important than health, and we are saving healthcare for the American people by insisting

that this extension of government funding include a reversal of the cruel and stupid "Big Blatant Betrayal"—it is not a Big Beautiful Bill, the "Big Blatant Betrayal" that failed to extend those healthcare subsidies—and insist that whatever bill that is passed be obeyed by the President.

The ACA premium tax credits have protected millions of Americans from those higher healthcare costs, and they have reduced the numbers of Americans without health insurance coverage. They have provided robust choices for consumers and provided stability for healthcare providers, especially in rural areas.

And I have heard from those providers who are as worried as their patients about what will happen to this program.

What the Republicans are doing is cruel. It is unnecessary. There is a straightforward, simple solution. It should not be a partisan issue. Republicans know we have to extend those subsidies. Why not now? That is the mystery to the American people.

And there will be no credit for a shutdown. The American people know that we are not seeking it. We hope to avoid it. It will be on Republicans who have refused to come to the table. House Republicans have refused even to come to town, come back to go into session, and they are having discussions, reportedly, about whether they can have fundraisers during the shutdown if there is one.

So we need some wiser heads and stronger conscience to prevail, and I am hopeful there is still time to reach that kind of agreement.

I choose to stand with working families, and I urge my Republicans to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, millions of Americans better check their mailbox over the next week or two. There is some bad news. Letters are being sent by health insurance companies that are trying to give some kind of a warning to these families about what is going to happen to their health insurance premiums because of the big beautiful Trump budget bill.

One family in Illinois tells the story, Leighanne Safford and her husband Lorry. Right now, Leighanne and Lorry pay \$278 a month for health insurance under the Affordable Care Act. But starting January 1, their monthly premiums—now get this—jump from \$278 a month to \$1,800 a month, a 550-percent increase—\$1,500 more coming out of the paychecks of Lorry and Leighanne.

Why is this happening? Because we have a system, or had a system, that provided subsidies and tax credits to working families so that they could afford their health insurance. However, in the big beautiful budget bill of Donald Trump—passed with every Republican voting for it, every Democrat voting against it—these subsidies and credits started to disappear.

Thanks to President Biden and a Democratic Congress, those credits were there for families that they could count on. Because of the Republican decision with President Trump to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America, they cut back on the premium assistance that was available to the Safford family.

These credits had opened the door to millions of working and middle-class Americans like Leighanne and Lorry to be able to afford quality health insurance.

Now they have got to make a choice. This is a lot of money—\$1,500 a month. Millions of Americans will decide: Are we going to cut back on essentials like food and dental or switch to a higher deductible plan, more money out-of-pocket if anybody gets sick? Leighanne said:

Right now, we're making a decision based on . . . being relatively healthy. But, as we all know, with health, it can change any day.

That is the same bind that millions of Americans are going to face because of the Republican decision to give a tax break to the wealthiest people in America.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, more than 4 million American families are going to lose their health insurance if Congressional Republicans allow these subsidies to expire, and that is what is going to happen if we don't change, including more than 100,000 in my State of Illinois.

It doesn't have to be this way. We can extend these tax credits and still fund government.

I remember a time in this Chamber when Democrats and Republicans came together on a bipartisan basis when real family challenges existed and tried to solve the problem. We just don't have that spirit here anymore. They have decided on the Republican side, we are going to give tax breaks to these wealthy people, even at the expense of working families.

And we have a President hell-bent on abusing his power and a Republican Congress that refuses to disagree with him.

Earlier this year, President Trump and Republicans in Congress signed into law this Big Beautiful Bill. It cuts nearly a trillion dollars from programs like Medicaid. What is Medicaid important for? Limited-income families and retired individuals.

This big beautiful Republican budget bill cuts nearly a trillion dollars from Medicaid and \$300 billion from the Food Stamp Program, now known as SNAP.

As a result of their bill, the Republican bill, more than 10 million Americans will lose their health coverage.

Ever had a child who was sick and no health insurance? I have. You will never forget it as long as you live.

This is separate from 4 million others who stand to lose their health coverage if the Republicans continue to block our efforts with the ACA tax credits. It seems Republicans in Congress are fine

adding more than 3 trillion to the national debt over the next 10 years to pay for those tax cuts, but they draw the line at extending healthcare to millions of hard-working Americans.

The math is clear. Republicans don't have the votes to force this extreme agenda. Government requires input from both sides. We are taking a stand for this family and millions more just like them. When they get the jolt of the news of where their health insurance premium is going to go, where do they turn? I hope they can turn to Congress and Members of the Senate who actually care for working families. If we refuse to do the job, Leighanne and Lorry are going to pay the price.

Let's be clear, Democrats stand ready to negotiate on a fair bipartisan basis. The only reason we are staring at this shutdown is because Republicans have refused to come to the table.

There was a meeting at the White House today. Don't let it be the last one. Let's come together and fix this healthcare problem for working families.

The President on FOX News said last week: Don't even bother dealing with the Democrats.

Well, the President is wrong. We are in this together. We need to solve this problem together. If the government shuts down, it will be because of President Trump walking away from a major challenge facing working families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, one of the things I have had the most trouble understanding in the time that I have been in the Senate has been Republicans' bizarre fascination with attacking healthcare systems, with taking healthcare coverage away from Americans. It came to a boil in the "Beautiful for Billionaires" bill—which cut about a trillion dollars out of Medicaid—and, in a hidden fashion through sequester, cut about half a trillion dollars out of Medicare and then attacks the Affordable Care Act, which so many Americans rely on to be able to afford their health insurance.

I represent Rhode Island. Rhode Island is probably going to lose up to \$5 billion in Federal Medicaid funding. The Medicare cuts would be probably about half of that. And the Affordable Care Act is going to hit about 40,000 Rhode Islanders who will see their insurance premiums explode. And that is going to happen soon.

This is a healthcare crisis that Republicans have created, and we would like to try to protect the American public in all of this. These are not going to be small increases in people's bills. We are talking about an 85-percent increase in already expensive health insurance premiums, as much as \$1,200 a year for a middle-class family.

Let me give you just an example of what this looks like in real life. I have

a constituent named Carla. Carla is 60 years old. She is retired. She was a mental health counselor, which is noble work but doesn't make you rich. She gets \$60,000 in annual income, mostly from her 401(k). She doesn't yet qualify for Medicare, so she got insurance from the Rhode Island State health insurance marketplace.

She has a family history of heart disease. She has hypertension. When the tax credits under the Affordable Care Act expire at the end of the year, Carla's monthly premium will go from \$427 a month to \$904 a month. That is more than double. That is a \$477 per month increase to the expenses of a woman whose total income is only \$60,000 a year.

We ought to be able to solve this. All we are asking for is serious negotiations to address the Republican healthcare crisis or, I guess, if they refuse, the Republican government shutdown. It is very much up to Republicans where we go from here. All the reports are that the meeting between the President and congressional leaders went badly; no progress was made at all.

It is really up to the Republicans. Will they really choose to shut down the U.S. Government just to indulge their bizarre fascination with taking healthcare away from Americans? Aren't we better than that?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, we are just a day away from a government shutdown because President Trump and Republicans would rather shut down the government than work with us to keep healthcare premiums from spiking for American families. We are watching the same pattern repeat itself again in Washington: partisan politics and dysfunction hurting hard-working families.

This fight is about healthcare. It is about what happens to families in Arizona if tax credits that reduce their healthcare premiums expire. It is about costs going up for people who are already feeling squeezed by inflation and Trump's tariffs driving up the prices of everything from groceries to back-to-school supplies.

And it is not complicated. If these tax credits expire, working families in my State will see their monthly premiums spike when they go to sign up for a new plan in just a few weeks. I have heard from Arizonans who are now saving hundreds of dollars every month because of these credits. Ending them would be a gut punch. For some, it would mean losing their coverage altogether.

It is pretty simple. We should extend them, and that is what we are proposing. Let's not forget who holds the cards: Donald Trump and my Republican colleagues. They are the ones saying no—not just to Democrats, not just to us, but to families in Arizona and across the country.

But instead of working with us to lower costs and avoid a shutdown, Donald Trump has refused to even sit down and talk about it for weeks until just today, barely 24 hours before the deadline. He would rather watch the country inch closer to a shutdown than to try to figure out solutions.

It is going to be everyday Americans who pay the price, your constituents and mine. In Arizona, more than 379,000 people have reduced premiums through these tax credits. It lowers their premium by an average of about \$475 every single month. So if those tax credits are allowed to expire, that means their healthcare premiums for next year go up as much as 55 percent. That is hundreds of dollars every single month.

And that blows a huge hole in the family budget. It means canceled family trips. It means not being able to sign your kid up to a sports league. It means taking on more shifts just to cover this added cost. And for a lot of folks, what this means is they will not be able to afford health insurance at all.

The estimate is that more than 109,000 people in Arizona alone would be unable to afford coverage. In the richest country in the history of the world, there is no reason why somebody who is working full time shouldn't be able to afford basic health insurance. No one should be one accident or one unexpected illness away from financial ruin. No one should be unable to take their kid to a doctor when they get sick.

But here we are because of Donald Trump and Republicans. This would hurt even harder in rural Arizona and small towns—places like Cochise, Apache, Navajo, and Santa Cruz Counties where there are fewer large employers who offer health benefits. But these are counties with higher poverty rates. It will hurt families across Arizona who finally—finally—got access to care and now they are being told that it may disappear.

It doesn't have to be this way. There is still time to extend the premium tax credits and protect families from higher costs while keeping the Federal Government open and serving Americans.

Mr. President, we can do this. We just have to be willing to sit down and work to figure it out. I know I am.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. We are behind schedule, so I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 25 minutes before taking the vote.

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

ELIMINATE SHUTDOWNS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I will ask you, I ask anybody in the Chamber, anybody who will listen to me on C-SPAN: Aren't you getting sick and tired of these government shutdown showdowns—with the drama, the turmoil, partisan bickering, the holding American people and our economy hos-

tage for demands for billions and billions of dollars and more spending that we can't afford?

I know I am. This madness doesn't have to continue. We can begin ending this madness tonight by voting on a very simple piece of legislation: Eliminate Shutdowns Act.

Again, it is very simple. All it does is say, if we don't pass appropriations bills for all of government or any department, we don't shut those departments down. We don't shut all of government down. We do, literally, what the State of Wisconsin has done since the 1950s: We keep spending at last year's levels. I mean, how more common sense can you get?

We accomplish that by enacting 2-week rolling continuing appropriations to fund all of government or any part of it that doesn't have an appropriation passed for it on a rolling basis. I ask the Chamber: Who could be opposed to something so simple that, again, it prevents all this turmoil, all this drama, all this partisan bickering?

Well, my guess is Democrats will oppose it. My guess is also some of our appropriators will oppose it. I have heard some of the rationale. I don't think it really holds water. But what one point made is the problem with continuing resolutions is they fund programs that should be reduced or canceled and prevent important new programs from being started.

Well, again, that will create the incentive—I agree with that, by the way; I don't like CRs either—that will create the incentive, under these automatic rolling 14-day continuing appropriations, to pass appropriations bills. It doesn't in any way, shape, or form diminish or detract from the authority of appropriators or the Appropriations Committee.

I also heard the appropriators want the pressure of government shutdowns to allow them to pass appropriation bills. I guess I somewhat understand their point. But I would like to point out that pressure certainly hasn't worked.

I got here in the year 2011. I don't think anybody can dispute the fact that at least since that point in time—and probably before that—the appropriations process is broken. It is dysfunctional.

In 15 years, what we should have done in Congress is pass 180 appropriations bills during those 15 years: 12 a year times 15—180 bills. Do you know how many we actually have passed? Six—six bills—one for fiscal year 2017, five for fiscal year 2019—six bills. That is a 3.3-percent success rate or, stated a better way, that is a 96.7-percent failure rate of the appropriations process.

During that 15 years, we have had three shutdowns, and we have passed 55 continuing resolutions—55. And people are going to oppose an automatic rolling continuing appropriation? By the way, this year, the continuing resolution that we did pass took us 6 months. It took us 6 months of dysfunction be-

fore we finally passed the appropriations for this year, which, of course, is going to end in a day and a half.

What the shutdown pressure did produce is the pressure to mortgage our children's future for it. It produced the pressure to pass multiple, thousand-page omnibus spending bills. We have increased or suspended the debt ceiling 12 times in those 15 years, since I have been here. Our debt has gone from \$14 trillion to over \$37 trillion. Clearly, this is a broken process. Spending is completely out of control.

I don't think it is going to surprise anybody to find out that I brought a couple of charts to basically make my point. I would like to talk about a few facts, a few figures. This Chamber is generally not really interested in talking about, like, figures, but with my accounting background, I would like to. So let me give you a little history lesson. This dates back—these are 4-year average deficits going back to the year 2001.

You will see, in the two terms of President Bush's administrations, average deficits were \$200 billion and \$300 billion. So the average over his 8 years is \$250 billion worth of deficits. Again, those were unacceptably high back then. That is when \$100 billion or 2, actually, was real money. People were concerned about it.

President Obama came into office with the great recession. As his adviser Rahm Emanuel said, "Never let a good crisis go to waste." And he didn't. So, in his first term, President Obama's average deficit was \$1.27 trillion. That sparked the Tea Party movement. I am part of that. When the Tea Party came, we actually made a difference. We did dig our heels in on that out-of-control deficit spending. So for President Obama's second term, deficits averaged \$550 billion. Again, \$550 billion—that is a lot of money, except in Washington, DC.

President Trump came into office with a divided government, and he had to do deals to get spending bills passed. So his deficit increased to \$810 billion for the first 3 years. Then COVID hit. We went on a massive, bipartisan, "uniparty" spending spree: a \$3.1 trillion a year deficit—\$3.1 trillion. We went from \$4.4 trillion in spending to 6.5 and never looked back.

Now, responsible leaders would have recognized that that was an aberration. We can't keep spending once the pandemic has passed.

You know, back in World War II, we had responsibilities. We started World War II by spending 11.7 percent of GDP. During World War II, that increased to 41 percent for the war effort, but responsible leadership brought that spending back down to 11.4 percent of GDP, after the war, in 1948.

That is not what the Biden administration did. They kept spending at pandemic levels. We averaged, during the Biden administration, deficits of \$1.9 trillion, and we will have a deficit this year of about \$2 trillion.

And the very sad fact is, over the next 10 years, based on the CBO's most recent figures, the total 10-year deficit is going to equal about \$26.4 trillion. That is \$2.6 trillion per year. It starts out at about \$2 trillion and ramps up to over \$3 trillion by the year 2035.

Most of our party leadership says the problem here is we have a spending problem. We don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. Let me just prove that point.

This is one of my favorite charts. It literally shows that no matter how much we try and punish success with the top marginal tax rate—we had, back in 1959, a top marginal tax rate of 91 percent. How much would you work if the Federal Government took 91 cents of every dollar you made? I wouldn't work very hard, personally. It has been as low as 28 percent. I would say, for a brief period of time, we were 72 percent free under Ronald Reagan. Now we are at 37 percent for the top marginal tax rate. But, again, you can see the ups and downs.

What is noteworthy about this chart is that no matter how much you try and punish success, over time, it has been very consistent. We were able to extract 17.1 percent of the American economy in Federal revenue. We have had a high of 20 percent, but that was after the dot-com bubble, and that quickly came back down to a 17.1-percent average.

It is time we recognized that reality. If we ever balance our budget, what we need to do is get spending under control. We have a spending problem, which I think this chart clearly demonstrates.

Back in 2000, we spent \$1.8 trillion—\$1.8 trillion. That was 17.7 percent of GDP. That was the year that we had 20 percent of revenue. We had a surplus for 4 years. We had a surplus for 4 years, and we frittered that all away. We finally broke the \$2 trillion mark in the year 2002, after 9/11. All of a sudden, we were on a war footing. We had to spend more to defend this Nation. Again, we have never looked back.

The absolute high point—other than World War II, the high point in spending was with President Obama, after the great recession, at 24.4 percent of GDP. By the way, that year, because of the recession, revenue went down to 14.4 percent. That is what produced those massive deficits of \$1.2 trillion, \$1.3 trillion.

In 2014—again, as a result of the Tea Party—we pretty well held spending flat at about \$3.5 trillion for about 5 or 6 years. So spending, as a percent of GDP, which is a relevant figure, dropped down to 20.2. This year, we are going to be spending over \$7 trillion—greater than 23 percent of our economy—and we are going to collect about 17.1 percent. We have got in excess of a 6-percent structural deficit. It is clearly unsustainable.

I hear a lot of talk about, "Well, RON, it is all mandatory spending," which is a problem. All of these government

shutdowns are all about 25 percent of Federal spending—the discretionary accounts. We have 75 percent of our spending in mandatory, but you have to understand this is not all Social Security, Medicare, or even Medicaid.

Over the decades—I am researching to see exactly how this happened—we have transferred what I would consider and what probably formerly was discretionary spending into other mandatory. So, this year, we will spend about \$1 trillion in other mandatory spending. What this chart shows are the variants between 2019 spending, plussed up for population and inflation, leaving Social Security and Medicare and interest alone with spending at 2025 levels. If we were to do that, instead of spending \$7 trillion this year, we would be spending about 6.5. In other mandatory—again, not Social Security and Medicare or even Medicaid—we are spending \$239 billion more than inflation and population adjusted for 2019 spending. I don't think we were spending too little in 2019. Nondefense discretionary is up about \$145 billion over fully inflated 2019 levels. So that is not the problem.

There is just one other fact I want to dispute, particularly for defense hawks in my party, because I hear it a lot.

Well, the good news is we have got parity between defense spending and domestic spending. I don't know what figures they are looking at, but if you only consider nondefense discretionary—yes, it increased from Bill Clinton—it is pretty close to 1 to 1. But that was before 9/11, before we were on a war footing. Under Trump, it is 1.64 to 1. But, again, you can't ignore the other mandatory—that other trillion dollars—nowadays. If you factor in nondefense discretionary and other mandatory, we have increased spending on domestic programs 2½ times to 1. In defense, from Obama's spending, the increase is 3½ times to 1. Under Trump, it is 3.65. So we don't have parity.

I am sorry, defense hawks. You have had—you know, lights out. You have lost that battle. We are not even close to parity. Whatever you think you are getting in defense, they are getting 3½ times that in domestic spending. Again, we can't afford it.

So, again, those are just some basic facts, some basic figures that explain our current fiscal situation. Let me go back to where I started.

Here we are again in another shutdown showdown. The Democrats' opening bid, by the way, was: OK, well, we will give you a 4-week CR—4 weeks—and all we are asking is for another \$1.5 trillion in spending. So we are willing to end the turmoil, and we will quit playing games with people's lives for 4 weeks, as long as you agree to roll back everything you passed in the One Big Beautiful Bill and increase spending by \$1.5 trillion.

Is that a serious starting negotiation point? I don't think so.

What I am asking from all of my colleagues is, please, imagine a world in

which these ridiculous shutdowns are no more than a ridiculous relic of the past, where we are not wasting our time and effort and energy and angst over this partisan bickering.

Again, I have to remind you that the Eliminate Shutdowns Act does not diminish the authority of the Appropriations Committee. If we do these rolling continuing appropriations, now the appropriators can get together, and they can find areas of agreement, like we did in this Chamber on Veterans Affairs and Military Construction, in that minibus. Where there are areas of disagreement, we will take some time and find the compromises.

As I said, I agree with the point that the problem with CRs is that they fund programs that should be reduced or canceled, and they prevent important new programs from being started. There, again, is another incentive to do appropriations, and now you have the time to do it. We won't be wasting our time and effort and energy and angst on these charades. These are charades.

I can't predict exactly what will happen if we pass the Eliminate Shutdowns Act. Nobody can. I can predict we will never have another shutdown—ever—in the Federal Government. I am OK with that. Again, I don't like CRs. I don't like our current spending level. I am willing to concede much higher spending levels than I think we can afford to eliminate government shutdowns for all times. So I can predict that.

But here is something else I think could happen: If we are not wasting our time on this partisan bickering over shutdowns, there have been so many discussions about bipartisan appropriations and budget reform, things like 2-year appropriations cycles, where, instead of 12 bills, which, obviously, we can't pass, how about doing 6 and making it manageable? In the year you don't appropriate for an account, you are doing oversight, and just reverse the cycle. I mean, I would even consider 3-year appropriations bills—4 a year—but that could impinge on future Congresses.

Again, I understand there are complications to all of these things, but think positively about what ending shutdowns could do for this body, for this government, for people's lives.

Passing the Eliminate Shutdowns Act, eliminating shutdowns for all time, would be a signature achievement of this Congress. Think of that. We together, on a bipartisan basis, can say we are the group after the horrible assassination of Charlie Kirk. Recognize this is the moment to come together as a nation, as a Senate, as a Congress. Do the right thing for the American people. End government shutdowns. That would be a signature achievement in this Congress, and I am hoping and praying that we do that. But let me be honest. Voting no on this bill—voting no is basically voting yes for continuing the chaos and for continuing to play partisan games with

people's lives and our economy. That is what a "no" vote is. Voting yes would help cement this as a lasting legacy for this Congress.

So, again, I urge all of my colleagues, please put the partisanship aside. Recognize the value of eliminating shutdowns and vote yes on this very simple, very commonsense bill that I think quite honestly the American people want to see passed.

With just a couple more minutes, I sat in the Chamber, and I listened to all the arguments about the ObamaCare subsidies—the temporary, COVID, enhanced ObamaCare subsidies. Nobody is talking about doing away with the ObamaCare subsidies. But for sure it should be pointed out that the reason health insurance is so expensive on the individual market is because of the faulty design of ObamaCare.

We had high-risk pools to take care of people with preexisting conditions. It needed a couple of tweaks to cover everybody. But that wasn't good enough for Democrats because they want a single-payer system, so they threw out and outlawed high-risk pools, and in its place forced people on the individual insurance market to pick up the full cost of covering people with preexisting conditions. That caused insurance rates on the individual market to skyrocket. That is why insurance prices continue to skyrocket on the individual market in particular.

What Democrats did during COVID is they basically removed any participation in the ObamaCare exchanges from many millions of people who qualified. The result of that is massive fraud. You have unscrupulous agents and brokers who are signing people up, just using their name and their birth date, for health insurance that these people don't even know they are signed up for. So they don't make claims. Something like 12 million people on the ObamaCare exchanges out of 20½ million had no claims. It is typical that maybe 10 to 15 percent of people on insurance don't make claims because they are healthy but 12 million out of 20½? That means 6 million don't even know they have a policy.

So we are literally pouring tens of billions of dollars per year into insurance companies for policies for people that they don't even know they have and they don't use them, while we are paying commissions to those dishonest brokers. That is a massive level of fraud that apparently Democrats have no problem perpetuating. Republicans have a problem with that. We want to lower premiums by doing commonsense reforms and repairing the damage done by ObamaCare.

Again, I think what I heard on the floor needed some response. That is my response to that.

I will just end again by encouraging all of my colleagues—the American people don't like these shutdowns. They want them ended. We have a very simple bill—not partisan—that really

offers no advantage to anybody, which is perfect. It just keeps the government open. It gives appropriators time to do appropriating, appropriate those Departments, and end all the chaos and all the turmoil and all the playing games with people's lives.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON WALTZ NOMINATION

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

Mr. JOHNSON. 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 North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 532 Ex.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to this cloture vote.

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

ELIMINATE SHUTDOWNS ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, this bill has a very nice-sounding name, but that is about the only good thing you can say about it because what it really does is hand over Congress's power of the purse to Donald Trump and Russ Vought.

If this bill passes, it won't just be Democrats' voice in funding that gets squashed; Republicans will be cutting themselves out of funding decisions because the bill extends government funding indefinitely so Donald Trump and Russ Vought never have to worry about Congress again.

If this bill were to pass, Trump could quite literally refuse to sign every funding bill—even a bipartisan bill—unless it met all of his demands. And Congress would then have to override his veto with a two-thirds vote in both Chambers if we ever wanted to get off the "forever CR" this bill would put in place. No way.

There is a very simple way to avert a shutdown. It starts with Republicans working with Democrats to hammer out a solution. It is time to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I will ask you, I will ask everybody in the Chamber, everybody listening to me on C-SPAN: Aren't you getting sick and tired of the shutdown showdowns? I am. In 15 years, we should have passed 180 appropriations bills before the end of the fiscal year. We passed six—3.6 percent. That is a 96.7-percent failure rate.

I am sorry the appropriations process is broken. This bill does nothing to diminish the authority of the appropriators. What it does is it removes all the turmoil, all the disruption of people's lives. It takes away the partisan bickering, and it just—every 14-day rolling appropriations bill to keep any Department open, where we haven't passed an appropriations bill, gives appropriators time to find areas of agreement and work on compromise in disagreement.

Let me be clear, a vote against the Eliminate Shutdowns Act is a vote to continue the chaos and to continue the partisan game playing with people's lives.

And by the way, this won't be the only time we will vote on this. I will guarantee you that if we go into a shutdown. Please, do right by the American people. Vote for the Eliminate Shutdowns Act. We can do away with shutdowns for all time. A simple vote yes will do that.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 161, S. 2806, a bill to provide for automatic continuing appropriations.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Ashley B. Moody, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, Pete Ricketts, Ted Budd, Bill Hagerty, John R. Curtis, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, John Cornyn, Cynthia M. Lummis, 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 motion to proceed to S. 2806, a bill to provide for automatic continuing appropriations, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 37, nays 61, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 533 Ex.]

YEAS—37

Banks	Ernst	McCormick
Barrasso	Graham	Moody
Blackburn	Grassley	Moreno
Britt	Hagerty	Risch
Budd	Hawley	Schmitt
Capito	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Husted	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Sheehy
Cramer	Justice	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Tuberville
Cruz	Lankford	Young
Curtis	Lee	
Daines	Lummis	

NAYS—61

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Ricketts
Baldwin	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Rounds
Blumenthal	Kelly	Sanders
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schatz
Booker	King	Schiff
Boozman	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Luján	Shaheen
Cassidy	Markey	Slotkin
Collins	McConnell	Smith
Coons	Merkley	Thune
Cortez Masto	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Mullin	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Fetterman	Murphy	Warren
Fischer	Murray	Welch
Galleo	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wicker
Hassan	Paul	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Marshall Tillis

(Mr. BARRASSO assumed the Chair.) The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). On this vote, the yeas are 37, the nays are 61.

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

The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE OPINION LETTER

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the GAO opinion letter dated September 18, 2025.

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

DECISION

Matter of: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management—Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to Buffalo Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment

File: B-337503

Date: September 18, 2025

DIGEST

The U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Buffalo Field Office issued a *Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment* (Buffalo RMPA). The Buffalo RMPA makes areas of public land administered by the Buffalo Field Office unavailable for coal leasing consideration.

The Congressional Review Act (CRA) requires that before a rule can take effect, an agency must submit the rule to both the House of Representatives and the Senate, as well as the Comptroller General. CRA adopts the definition of “rule” under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) but excludes certain categories of rules from coverage. We conclude that the Buffalo RMPA meets APA’s definition of a rule, and that no CRA exception applies. Therefore, the Buffalo RMPA is a rule subject to CRA’s submission requirements.

DECISION

In November 2024, the U.S. Department of the Interior (Interior), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Buffalo Field Office issued a *Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment* (Buffalo RMPA). We received a request for a decision as to whether the Buffalo RMPA is a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act (CRA). As discussed below, we conclude that the Buffalo RMPA is a rule for purposes of CRA.

Our practice when issuing decisions is to obtain the legal views of the relevant agency on the subject of the request. Accordingly, we reached out to Interior to obtain the agency’s views. We received Interior’s response on August 8, 2025.

BACKGROUND

BLM Public Land Management

Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (FLPMA), BLM is responsible for developing, maintaining, and, when appropriate, revising “land use plans which provide by tracts or areas for the use of the public lands.” BLM land use plans, referred to as “resource management plans” (RMPs), establish goals and di-

rectives to guide future land and resource management actions implemented by BLM. Pursuant to FLPMA, BLM established procedures for the development, revision, and amendment of RMPs.

The objective of resource management planning is to maximize resource values for the public through a rational, consistently applied set of regulations and procedures which promote the concept of multiple use management. An RMP generally establishes land use designations; allowable resource uses; resource conditions, goals, and objectives; program constraints and general management practices; areas to be covered by more specific plans; and other related information.

BLM may amend an RMP to account for, among other things, new data, new or revised policy, or a change in circumstances. Amendments are to be made through an environmental assessment of the proposed change or an environmental impact statement, if needed, and must involve public involvement and interagency coordination.

Buffalo Field Office Resource Management Plan

In 2015 BLM issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for six approved resource management plan amendments (2015 ROD). According to BLM, the 2015 ROD reflected a broad and unprecedented effort to address declining ecosystems in the region and concerns about a potentially endangered species. The 2015 ROD included the Buffalo Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan (2015 Buffalo RMP).

Following its issuance, the 2015 Buffalo RMP was challenged in the United States District Court for the District of Montana on the basis that BLM improperly approved the plan in violation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The court found that BLM violated NEPA and ordered BLM to complete a new coal screening and remedial NEPA analysis.

In response to the court’s order, BLM issued an amended Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (2019 Buffalo RMPA) in November of 2019. The 2019 Buffalo RMPA was also challenged in court. Once again, the court found that BLM violated NEPA. In its order, the court directed BLM to consider no coal leasing and limited coal leasing alternatives and to disclose the public health impacts, both climate and non-climate, of burning fossil fuels from the planning area.

On November 20, 2024, in response to the court’s order, BLM issued the Buffalo RMPA, which is the subject of this decision. The Buffalo RMPA replaced the 2019 Buffalo RMPA’s decision regarding the availability of coal resources for leasing. The Buffalo RMPA designates 48.12 billion short tons of coal as unavailable for further consideration for leasing. It also precludes the acceptance of new coal lease applications for the duration of the planning period, which extends through 2038. However, it permits the development of existing coal leases in accordance with lease terms and conditions.

Congressional Review Act

CRA, enacted in 1996 to strengthen congressional oversight of agency rulemaking, requires federal agencies to submit a report on each new rule to both houses of Congress and to the Comptroller General for review before a rule can take effect. The report must contain a copy of the rule, “a concise general statement relating to the rule,” and the rule’s proposed effective date. CRA allows Congress to review and disapprove rules issued by federal agencies for a period of 60 days using special procedures. If a resolution of disapproval is enacted, then the new rule has no force or effect.

CRA adopts the definition of “rule” under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA),

which states that a rule is “the whole or a part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency.” However, CRA excludes three categories of rules from coverage: (1) rules of particular applicability; (2) rules relating to agency management or personnel; and (3) rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

Interior did not submit a CRA report to Congress or the Comptroller General on the Buffalo RMPA. In its response to us, Interior provided additional information about the Buffalo RMPA but did not state a position as to whether it is a rule under CRA.

DISCUSSION

At issue here is whether the Buffalo RMPA meets CRA’s definition of rule, which adopts APA’s definition of a rule, with three exceptions. As explained below, we conclude that it does and that no exceptions apply. Consequently, the Buffalo RMPA is subject to review under CRA.

The Buffalo RMPA is a Rule under APA

Applying APA’s definition of rule, the Buffalo RMPA meets all of the required elements. First, the Buffalo RMPA is an agency statement as it was issued by BLM, a federal agency.

Second, the Buffalo RMPA is of future effect as it is to be used prospectively to guide and direct the leasing and allocation of coal within the federal government’s mineral estate administered by BLM’s Buffalo Field Office. The management decisions made in the Buffalo RMPA became effective November 20, 2024, when the Record of Decision was signed. As of that date, the Buffalo RMPA replaced prior decisions on the availability of coal leasing by making certain areas unavailable for such leasing until 2038. Any subsequent program- or activity-level management actions must adhere to the directive established in the Buffalo RMPA. Therefore, the Buffalo RMPA has future effect.

Finally, the Buffalo RMPA implements, interprets, or prescribes law or policy, because it designates which areas of BLM-administered land are available for coal leasing consideration in accordance with BLM’s responsibilities for land use management under FLPMA. Specifically, the Buffalo RMPA designated approximately 48.12 billion short tons of coal as unavailable for further leasing consideration to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Our conclusion here is consistent with our previous decisions finding similar land use plans and RMPs implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy. *See, e.g.*, B-337163, June 25, 2025; B-337175, June 25, 2025; B-329065, Nov. 15, 2017; B-238859, Oct. 23, 2017; B-274505, Sept. 16, 1996. For example, in B-337163, June 25, 2025, we concluded that BLM’s Miles City Resource Management Plan Amendment (Miles City RMPA) implemented law and prescribed policy by foreclosing coal leasing on BLM-administered land pursuant to its duties under FLPMA and other applicable statutes to manage land use and the government’s mineral resources. Similarly in B-337200, June 25, 2025, we concluded that an RMP issued by BLM implemented law and prescribed policy by designating or foreclosing specific activities or land use on BLM-administered land within its Central Yukon planning area (Central Yukon RMP).

Like the Miles City RMPA and the Central Yukon RMP, the Buffalo RMPA carries out BLM’s legal mandates related to land use planning and resource allocation. It prescribes policy by modifying prior decisions for the allocation of BLM administered coal

and prohibiting all coal leasing within the Buffalo Field Office planning area. As such, the Buffalo RMPA meets the third element of the APA definition of rule. Having satisfied all the required elements, the Buffalo RMPA meets the APA definition of rule.

CRA Exceptions

We must next determine whether any of CRA’s three exceptions apply. CRA provides for three types of rules that are not subject to its requirements: (1) rules of particular applicability; (2) rules relating to agency management or personnel; and (3) rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice that do not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

(1) Rule of Particular Applicability

Consistent with our previous decisions, the Buffalo RMPA is a rule of general applicability, rather than particular applicability. For example, in B-337163, June 25, 2025, BLM issued the Miles City RMPA that established land use designations to govern all coal activities by any person or entity within the planning area of its Miles City Field Office. Because the Miles City RMPA governed all coal activities by any person within its purview, we concluded that the Miles City RMPA was a rule of general applicability. Similarly, the Buffalo RMPA establishes land use designations that prohibit coal leasing by any person or entity within the Buffalo planning area, making it a rule of general applicability.

(2) Rule of Agency Management or Personnel

The Buffalo RMPA is not a rule of agency management or personnel. We have previously held that rules that fall into this category relate to purely internal agency matters. Because the Buffalo RMPA is concerned with public use of the areas it governs rather than management of BLM itself or its personnel, it does not meet CRA’s second exception.

(3) Rule of Agency Organization, Procedure, or Practice that Does Not, Substantially Affect Non-Agency Parties

Lastly, the Buffalo RMPA is not a rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

We have previously explained that this exception was modeled on the APA exception to notice-and-comment rulemaking requirements for “rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice.” The purpose of the APA exception is to ensure “that agencies retain latitude in organizing their internal operations,” so long as such rules do not have a substantial impact on non-agency parties.

Following this interpretation in the CRA context, we have only applied CRA’s third exception to rules that primarily focus on the internal operations of an agency. For instance, in B-329926, Sept. 10, 2018, we found that updates to a Social Security Administration (SSA) hearing manual governing SSA adjudicators’ use of information from the Internet qualified as a rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice. There, the manual outlined procedures for SSA employees to follow in processing and adjudicating benefits claims. Because the manual was directed to and binding only on SSA officials without imposing new burdens on claimants, we concluded that the manual met CRA’s third exception.

In contrast, rules that are directed at and primarily concerned with the behavior of non-agency parties do not fall within this category. Thus, in B-337163, June 25, 2025, we declined to apply CRA’s third exception to BLM’s Miles City RMPA, because it was not limited to changes in BLM’s internal operations. Instead, the Miles City RMPA foreclosed non-agency parties from leasing coal

within designated areas of the government’s mineral estate. Similarly, in B-337200, June 25, 2025, we declined to apply CRA’s third exception to the Central Yukon RMP because it foreclosed certain actions by non-agency entities, through the establishment of land use designations and delineation of the activities that may be undertaken in the planning area.

Here, the Buffalo RMPA does entail some changes to agency procedure in that BLM will no longer consider coal leasing applications within the designated planning area. However, like the Miles City RMPA and the Central Yukon RMP, the Buffalo RMPA is not limited to changes to internal agency operations. Instead, the Buffalo RMPA is directed at, and concerns itself primarily with, regulating the allocation of coal and coal leasing by non-agency parties. Therefore, the Buffalo RMPA does not qualify as a rule of agency organization, procedure or practice.

We must also consider whether the Buffalo RMPA substantially affects the rights or obligations of non-agency parties. When analyzing this aspect of CRA’s third exception, “the critical question is whether the agency action alters the rights or interests of the regulated entities.” Along similar lines, courts have determined that “[a]n agency rule that modifies substantive rights and interests can only be nominally procedural, and the exemption for such rules of agency procedure cannot apply.”

In previous decisions, we have concluded that where an RMP designates use by non-agency parties in the areas it governs, it has a substantial effect. *See, e.g.*, B-337163, June 25, 2025; B-337175, June 25, 2025; B-329065, Nov. 15, 2017; B-238859, Oct. 23, 2017; B-274505, Sept. 16, 1996. For instance, in B-337163, June 25, 2025, we explained that the Miles City RMPA altered substantive rights and obligations of non-agency parties by excluding 1,745,040 acres of BLM-administered land from coal leasing, effectively precluding these parties from pursuing coal leases within the Miles City planning area. Similarly, in B-337200, June 25, 2025, we concluded that the Central Yukon RMP substantially affected non-agency parties by imposing, among other things, land use restrictions, such as designating areas of critical environmental concern and closing certain tracts for land for mineral extraction and recreational use.

Consistent with our prior decisions concerning other RMPs, the Buffalo RMPA has a substantial effect on non-agency parties. The Buffalo RMPA designates approximately 481,000 acres of subsurface federal coal mineral estate as closed to coal leasing by any person or entity. This action removes an estimated 48.12 billion short tons of federal coal from future leasing. As a result, BLM has precluded nonagency parties from pursuing new federal coal leases in the planning area, thereby altering their substantive rights and obligations. Accordingly, the Buffalo RMPA fails to meet CRA’s third exception.

CONCLUSION

The Buffalo RMPA is a rule for purposes of CRA because it meets the definition of a rule under APA and no CRA exception applies. Therefore, the Buffalo RMPA is subject to CRA’s requirement that it be submitted to Congress and the Comptroller General before it can take effect.

EDDA EMMANUELLI PEREZ,
General Counsel.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. 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. 25-1G. 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 22-35 of July 15, 2022.

Sincerely,

MARY BETH MORGAN,
(For Michael F. Miller, Director).

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-1G

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

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Estonia.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 22-35.

Date: July 15, 2022.

Implementing Agency: Army.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On July 15, 2022, Congress was notified by congressional certification transmittal number 22-35, of the possible sale under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of six (6) M142 High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS) Launchers; thirty-six (36) M30A2 Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) Alternative Warhead (AW) Missile Pods with Insensitive Munitions Propulsion System (IMPS) and Frequency Modulated Continuous Wave—Directional Doppler Ranging (FMCW—DDR) Proximity Height-of-Burst (HOB) Sensor Capability; thirty-six (36) M31A2 GMLRS Unitary High Explosive (HE) Missile Pods with IMPS and FMCW—DDR Proximity HOB Sensor Capability; thirty-six (36) XM403 Extended Range GMLRS (ER GMLRS) Alternative Warhead (AW) Missile Pods with IMPS and Side Mounted Proximity Sensor (SMPS) HOB Capability; thirty-six (36) XM404 ER GMLRS Unitary Pods with IMPS and SMPS HOB Capability; and eighteen (18) M57 Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS) Missile Pods. Also included were M28A2 Low Cost Reduced Range Practice Rocket (LCRRPR) pods; ruggedized laptops; training equipment; publications for HIMARS and munitions/missiles; and other related elements of program and logistics support. The total estimated cost was \$500 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted \$455 million of this total.

This transmittal notifies the inclusion of the following additional MDE items: six (6) M142 High Mobility Artillery Rocket Systems (HIMARS); two hundred fifty (250) M31A2 Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) Unitary Alternative Warhead (AW), unitary High Explosive missile pods with Insensitive Munition Propulsion System (IMPS) capability; two hundred fifty (250) M30A2 GMLRS AW missile pods with IMPS; two hundred fifty (250) XM403 Extended Range (ER) GMLRS AW missile pods with IMPS and Side Mounted Proximity Sensor (SMPS) Height-of-Burst (HOB) capability; two hundred fifty (250) XM404 ER GMLRS Unitary pods with IMPS and SMPS HOB capability; and two hundred (200) M57 Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS). The following non-MDE items are also included: M282 Low Cost Reduced Range Practice Rocket (LCRRPR) pods; communications equipment; publications for HIMARS and munitions/missiles; and other related elements of program and logistics support. The estimated total value of the new items is \$4.23 billion. The estimated non-MDE value will increase by \$125 million to a revised \$170 million. The estimated total case value will increase by \$4.23 billion to a revised \$4.73 billion. MDE constitutes \$4.56 billion of this total.

(iv) Significance: This notification is being provided as the additional MDE items were not enumerated in the original notification. The inclusion of this MDE represents an increase in capability over what was previously notified. The proposed sale will improve Estonia's capability to meet current and future threats and enhance its interoperability with U.S. and other allied forces. It will also allow for continued modernization of Estonia's armed forces while expanding capability to strengthen homeland defense and deter regional threats.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that continues to be 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: September 26, 2025.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. 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,
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 25-81, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Germany for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$1.23 billion. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-81

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Germany.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$1.10 billion.
Other \$0.13 billion.
Total \$1.23 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):
Up to four hundred (400) AIM-120D-3 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

Up to 12 twelve (12) AIM-120D-3 AMRAAM guidance sections, including precise positioning provided by either Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module or M-Code.

One (1) AIM-120 AMRAAM Integrated Test Vehicle.

Non-Major Defense Equipment: The following non-MDE items will also be included: AMRAAM telemetry kits, control sections, containers, and support equipment; ADU-891 Adaptor Group Test Sets; KGV-135 A encryption devices; spare parts, consumables and accessories, and repair and return support; weapons system support and software; classified and unclassified software delivery and support; classified and unclassified publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (GY-D-YAM).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: September 25, 2025.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Germany—AIM-120D-3 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles

The Government of Germany has requested to buy up to four hundred (400) AIM-120D-3 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM); up to twelve (12) AIM-120D-3 AMRAAM guidance sections, including precise positioning provided by either Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module or M-

Code; and one (1) AIM-120 AMRAAM Integrated Test Vehicle. The following non-Major Defense Equipment items will also be included: AMRAAM telemetry kits, control sections, containers, and support equipment; ADU-891 Adaptor Group Test sets; KGV-135 A encryption devices; spare parts, consumables and accessories, and repair and return support; weapons system support and software; classified and unclassified software delivery and support; classified and unclassified publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$1.23 billion.

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 a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve Germany's capability to meet current and future threats by providing increased air-to-air capability for the German F-35 program and supporting German and shared NATO planning, training, and operational requirements. Germany will have no difficulty absorbing these articles into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be RTX Corporation, located in Arlington, VA. At this time, the U.S. Government is not aware of any offset agreement proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined by in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Germany.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-81

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM-120D-series Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) is a supersonic, air-launched, aerial intercept guided missile featuring digital technology and microminiature, solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high- and low-flying and maneuvering targets. The AIM-120D features a quadrangle target detection device and an electronics unit within the guidance section that performs all radar signal processing, mid-course and terminal guidance, flight control, target detection, and warhead detonation. Precise positioning will be provided by either Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module or M-Code. This potential sale will include an AMRAAM Integrated Test Vehicle and guidance and control sections.

2. The ADU-891 Adapter Group Test Set provides the physical and electrical interface between the Common Munitions Built-in-Test Reprogramming Equipment (CMBRE) and the missile.

3. The KGV-135 A is a high-speed, general purpose encryptor/decryptor module used for wideband data encryption.

4. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

5. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

6. A determination has been made that Germany can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

7. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Germany.

WELCOMING ECUMENICAL
PATRIARCH BARTHOLOMEW

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, New Jersey is home to one of our Nation's most vibrant Greek Orthodox communities. For generations, it has nurtured a community rooted in faith and service—values that continue to strengthen the fabric of not just our shared home but of American society.

This month, our Nation's Capital welcomed His All-Holiness Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew, the spiritual leader of over 300 million Orthodox Christians worldwide. His visit to the United States—where he has met with congressional leaders and the President of the United States—is a reminder of our shared efforts and responsibility to pursue peace and justice, religious tolerance and coexistence, and environmental stewardship in all we do.

His historic visit serves as a profound moment of unity, reflection, and joy for Greek Orthodox New Jerseyans and Americans of all faiths across the country. We deeply respect and appreciate his decades of moral leadership and unwavering commitment to the dignity of all humanity.

HONORING SERGEANT DANIEL D.
EDENFIELD

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and career of a true hero, Sergeant Daniel D. Edenfield.

Sergeant Edenfield lived to serve his country, his city, and Hoosiers throughout Allen County. He began his service with the U.S. Army in Vietnam from 1969 until 1971. Upon his return home to Fort Wayne, Sergeant Edenfield joined the Allen County Sheriff's Department on January 10, 1972.

During his 26 years serving Allen County, Sergeant Edenfield was known as a "cops' cop," always ready and eager to respond to calls for backup with a relentless commitment to keeping his community safe. He was not only a model officer, but also a father of two children and committed husband. In these and so many other ways, Sergeant Edenfield was a testament to the value of servant leadership.

On May 15, 1998, Sergeant Edenfield was providing security for a special event at the Allen County War Memorial Coliseum. While on watch, he witnessed an assault, and, in true fashion, Sergeant Edenfield chased down the perpetrator on foot. He apprehended the offender and called for a patrol car to transport him to the county jail. Sadly, Sergeant Edenfield collapsed before the car arrived, and he was taken to a local hospital, where he passed away while undergoing emergency surgery for a heart attack.

Later this week, Allen County and the city of Fort Wayne will recognize October 3, 2025, as "Sergeant Dan D. Edenfield Day" in honor of Sergeant Edenfield's life and service. The county will also be dedicating a stretch of Parnell Avenue near the Allen County War Memorial Coliseum as the "Sergeant Dan D. Edenfield Memorial Parkway," cementing a community recognition of his heroism.

It is my honor to recognize Sergeant Dan Edenfield for his service and the lasting impact he had on the greater Fort Wayne area. We pay tribute to the commitment and sacrifice he demonstrated throughout his life.

TRIBUTE TO PAM LEWIS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished public servant Pam Lewis, one of my office's long-standing congressional liaisons at the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration.

Throughout her career at the State Department, Ms. Lewis has exemplified the highest ideals of Federal service. From her early work addressing complex casework to her later role as a leading expert on refugee admissions and immigration law, Ms. Lewis's contributions have been both exceptional and enduring. Her efforts have strengthened U.S. foreign policy and humanitarian assistance programs in profound and indelible ways.

Ms. Lewis' reputation for excellence is known throughout the halls of Congress and in congressional offices nationwide. She has been a trusted resource and guiding voice for countless offices and individuals across the country who have turned to her for clarity, guidance, and solutions. That kind of impact cannot be measured by titles or tenure alone; it speaks to a legacy built on knowledge, professionalism, and a steadfast commitment to doing what is right.

It is clear from those who have worked closely with Ms. Lewis, including during the creation of the Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance and later at PRM, that her dedication and institutional insight helped shape and elevate the work of our colleagues. Ms. Lewis' expertise in immigration regulations, particularly related to family reunification, has opened doors for thousands of individuals seeking safety and a new start.

I commend Ms. Lewis for her extraordinary service to our Nation. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Ms. Lewis and wishing her a well-earned, fulfilling, and enjoyable retirement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO FLOYD BRANTLEY

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor 100 years of one Arkansan's life and service as a living testament of the sacrifice and character embodied by our "Greatest Generation." Floyd Brantley is a beloved resident of Conway, AR, and I am honored to extend a birthday greeting that celebrates this milestone.

Mr. Brantley's military career spans decades and three wars. He first answered the call to serve in the Navy as a high schooler. His brother, while serving on the U.S.S. *Atlanta*, made the ultimate sacrifice at the Battle of Guadalcanal, the first major Allied attack against Japan in World War II. Leaving high school to enlist, Brantley first served as a medic at a fleet hospital in the Pacific Theater. My office was honored to interview him for the Library of Congress Veterans History Project in 2016. During that visit, he recounted the horrors of war he saw every day in that hospital, but also his lifelong devotion to our Nation and the cause of freedom.

When WWII ended, Brantley returned to the United States determined to finish his education. He re-enrolled in high school at the age of 20 and went on to study at Baylor University. Still driven by an unwavering patriotism, he found himself called back to the service during his time at Baylor and worked with Air Force officials on campus until he enlisted with the Air Force after graduation. As an airman, he fought in the Korean war and eventually earned the rank of captain.

Even after two Active-Duty wartime experiences, Brantley never lost his devotion to our Nation and passion to serve. At the age of 50, he joined the Air National Guard as a cook. When the Vietnam war started, he attempted to serve overseas again but the service would not allow him due to his age.

Over the years, I have been fortunate to visit with Mr. Brantley, most recently on his visit to Washington for Memorial Day. It is an honor to watch him continue to thrive and inspire others, including bright young students at the University of Central Arkansas where he regularly visits campus to encourage our next generation of leaders to understand and appreciate the Pledge of Allegiance. He was also appointed to a 3-year term on the Arkansas Veterans' Commission by Governor Sarah Huckabee Sanders. That term expires October 2026, when he will be 101 years old.

Floyd Brantley is a true American hero. His life is a powerful example of service, resilience, and love of country.

As the city of Conway and the State of Arkansas celebrate his 100th birthday, I want to share my sincere congratulations and gratitude for his tremendous spirit, resilience, and patriotism.●

TRIBUTE TO LISA STOCKDALE

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary Arkansan whose steadfast commitment to children and families has made a profound impact across The Natural State, my 2025 Angels in Adoption Honoree Lisa Stockdale of Bentonville. I am proud to celebrate her selfless service, enduring compassion, and tireless advocacy.

Lisa was recently named the 2024 Arkansas Foster Parent of the Year, a well-deserved recognition following 9 years of dedication as a wonderful foster parent. Since beginning her journey with The CALL, a faith-based organization that recruits and supports foster families, Lisa has welcomed 37 children into her home. Her care has spanned the broadest range of needs, from medically fragile infants to teenagers navigating difficult transitions, with each child benefiting from the safe, loving, and stable environment she cultivated.

Lisa combines her professional expertise as a nurse with extraordinary empathy to safeguard kids in need. She has served as a nursing instructor and worked in a juvenile detention facility, experiences that have shaped her unique, holistic approach to caregiving. Her ability and willingness to foster children with significant medical needs is especially appreciated by those who know her work. At home, she is a single mother to sons Ethan and Isaac who share in her mission of opening their hearts and home to others. She and her family approach foster care with humility and purpose, saying, "Without my kiddos and without foster care, I would still be wandering around aimlessly looking for God's purpose for me." Her faith and resilience are evident in every aspect of her life.

Lisa's record of service to others is extensive. She is a veteran of the U.S. Army Reserve and deployed to Afghanistan in 2004-2005 with the 325th Field Hospital out of Independence, MO. It was through the Army that she earned her nursing license, a credential she has used to heal, teach, and uplift others ever since.

Lisa Stockdale embodies the spirit of Arkansas through faithful, generous, and deep investment in her community. Her conviction reminds us that one person can transform lives, strengthen families, and inspire hope. I am honored to recognize her as an Angel in Adoption and thank her for the light she brings to our State and to the foster care system.●

RECOGNIZING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF TRINITY CATHOLIC SCHOOL IN FORT SMITH

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate 40 years of edu-

cational excellence at Trinity Catholic School in Fort Smith. For four decades, Trinity has provided an exceptional education to students while fostering a community that upholds high standards of learning and nurtures the hearts and minds of every student.

Founded in 1986 by Father Jack Harris, the Sisters of Mercy, and the Benedictine Sisters in Fort Smith, the school began as an extension of Immaculate Conception Church and quickly grew into a vibrant center for youth education and spiritual enrichment. In 1996, the school transitioned to the grounds of St. Scholastica Monastery where it has maintained its emphasis on community and character development. With the support of the Trinity Trust, a modern activities center was added in 2005 to accommodate its expanding athletic and extracurricular programs.

Trinity's success is rooted in the dedication of its teachers, clergy, administrators, and staff, all working tirelessly to cultivate an environment where each student is known, supported, and challenged. That unwavering commitment to meeting students where they are—in their studies, personal growth, and faith—has made a lasting impact on countless lives.

Its powerful motto, "Be something. Do something. Leave Something. All for the Glory of God," is a lived mission. The passionate pursuit of academic excellence, faith-centered guidance, and a robust activities program at Trinity undeniably prepares students for lives of purpose and service.

On this 40th anniversary, I extend my heartfelt congratulations to the entire Trinity community and thank them for decades of faithful devotion to Fort Smith and the River Valley as we anticipate many more years blessed with continued growth and success in the classroom and beyond.●

RECOGNIZING IDAHO MOUNTAIN SEARCH AND RESCUE K-9 STELLA BLUE

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I pay tribute to the Idaho Mountain Search and Rescue Unit, IMSARU, in Boise, as they mourn the unexpected loss of one of the unit's treasured K-9s, Stella Blue.

Stella Blue was an instrumental part of this team. She faithfully served her community with honor and dedication in her role as a live find search and rescue K-9 team member. She committed thousands of hours and countless miles in search of lost and missing people, bringing comfort, light, and hope to her team and to the people of Idaho.

Stella's life and the loss felt by her teammates is a reminder of the extraordinary dedication of the Idaho Mountain Search and Rescue Unit. These committed individuals voluntarily give incredible amounts of their time to not only helping their fellow Idahoans and others in distress, but also ensuring they and the K-9s entrusted to aid with their searches are

effectively trained. Stella Blue's handler, Brian Marinelli, a Boise teacher and U.S. Air Force veteran, devoted innumerable hours to Stella Blue's training, while forging a bond cemented in trust. I also recognize the loss felt by the Marinelli family—Brian's wife Midori and their children Sara and Dante—as Stella Blue was a cherished member of their family in addition to her service to the people of Idaho.

As I extend my condolences to Brian Marinelli and the entire Idaho Mountain Search and Rescue Unit, I also thank the team for its outstanding service. Stella Blue's days were too few but exceedingly well spent. And your remembrance of her as a trusted partner, teammate, and friend is a moving example of your devotion to those you search for and alongside. Thank you for your loyal and dedicated service.●

RECOGNIZING BANNOR TOYS

● Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to honor Bannor Toys of Madrid, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 2011, Stacey and Jesse Bannor founded Bannor Toys after becoming frustrated with low-quality, easily broken, and overly complicated children's toys. Instead, they yearned for nostalgic, traditional, wooden toys for their own children like the ones they remembered playing with at their grandparents' houses. With this in mind, Jesse got to work in their basement and began crafting toys for their kids. But word quickly spread as the parents and children at Stacey's home daycare loved the toys, sparking the start of their business. What started as a personal mission and hobby transitioned to selling at craft fairs and farmers markets and, today, has grown into a successful toy company offering high-quality, modern, and eco-friendly toys through their Bannor Toys website, Etsy shop, and wholesale partners. The products range from rattles and teething toys to matching games, bath toys, and more. Today, Stacey manages every aspect of production, running the business primarily on her own. While Bannor Toys partners with a small company in Illinois to cut the wood, Stacey finishes each toy personally in their Madrid workshop. The business continues to thrive 14 years later.

In 2019, Bannor Toys was recognized at the White House Made in America Showcase and received the Renew Rural Iowa Entrepreneur Award from the Iowa Farm Bureau. The company has also been featured multiple times on Fox and Friends and Fox Business and is an active member of the Madrid Chamber of Commerce. These honors are a testament to the high-quality, fun, and safe toys Stacey and Jesse cre-

ate, as well as the success of their business.

Stacey and Jesse are also dedicated to giving back to the community. They donate to children's shelters, participate in Toys for Tots, and provide new books for local school students. More than 6 years ago, Bannor Toys launched Supplies for Success with Madrid Elementary School to provide school supplies, basic hygiene items, winter hats and mittens, and classroom snacks for students in need. Every fall, they stock this room with supplies for students to "shop" and pick out their own items to ensure each student has something special for back-to-school season. Stacey and Jesse have used the success of their business to give generously and leave their community better than they found it.

Over the past 14 years, Bannor Toys has become a model of innovation in children's toys and a proud example of local manufacturing. Bannor Toys serves as a reminder that innovation and tradition can go hand in hand, creating products that inspire families while preserving timeless values. It is my honor to recognize Stacey and Jesse Bannor for their outstanding work and dedication to their community. I look forward to their continued success and wish them the very best in the years ahead.●

RECOGNIZING GREAT WESTERN SUPPLY CO.

● Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to honor Great Western Supply Co. of Davenport, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 1986, Collin Carney used seed money from his father to purchase the failing Great Western Supply Co. in Burlington, IA. Mr. Carney set out to become more than a purveyor of shovels and rakes and expanded the company's offerings to include janitorial and food service items. To further align with the commercial janitorial space, Mr. Carney engaged a chemist to develop cleaning supplies unique to Great Western Supply Co., such as "Hammerhead Degreaser" and "No Rinse Floor Cleaner," which are manufactured locally and sold at their three storefronts in Davenport, Marion, and Burlington and are also available online. Mr. Carney employs nearly 30 staff who are certified in 27 custodial training programs, one aspect of Great Western Supply's second-to-none commitment to quality care and customer service. A friendly and knowledgeable voice answering each phone call and fulfilling orders with a 99-percent accuracy rate continues that priority and highlights the core values of the company which are love, respect, honesty, and hard work.

Great Western Supply Co. is deeply involved in the sanitation supply industry. They are proud members of the Quad City, Marion, and Burlington Chambers of Commerce, as well as C12, an organization for Christian business leaders. Mr. Carney is a very active member of the Pro-Link network of janitorial and sanitation distributors and the International Sanitation Supply Association. Great Western Supply Co. was recognized for their year-over-year growth and continuous collaboration with Pro-Link by being named Business of the Year in 2023. Collin Carney's involvement in the community includes a seat on the board of directors at One Eighty, a faith-based non-profit organization which serves the community by providing a 14-month residential recovery program for people in the throes of crisis, poverty, and addiction. His commitment to the program goes above and beyond leadership, as he employs several One Eighty residents, who not only receive meaningful work and a paycheck, but also the benefits of the positive culture and family atmosphere Carney has created for his team.

Over the years, Great Western Supply Co. has built a reputation for excellence and collaboration. What began as a rake and shovel supply company in Burlington has grown into something truly special in Iowa. It is my honor to recognize Collin Carney and the entire Great Western Supply Co. team for their outstanding work and dedication to supporting their community. I look forward to their continued success and wish them the very best in the years ahead.●

RECOGNIZING THE HINCKLEY INSTITUTE

● Mr. LEE, Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Hinckley Institute of Politics at the University of Utah on the occasion of its 60th anniversary. For six decades, this esteemed institution has exemplified a commitment to public service, civic engagement, and the betterment of our State and Nation by inspiring generations of students to become involved American citizens.

Founded in 1965 by visionary philanthropist Robert H. Hinckley through a generous bequest from the Noble Foundation, the institute was established with the honorable mission to teach students respect for practical politics and true personal engagement in government. That goal has expanded over the last six decades to encourage students of all majors and disciplines to gain hands-on experience and dedicate their skills to public service. Over the years, the institute has placed more than 10,000 interns in positions that foster growth, leadership, and a deep appreciation for the American political process.

In Washington, DC, the institute stands as one of the oldest continuous internship programs in the country. Thousands of interns have tackled

prestigious roles with Utah's congressional delegation, the U.S. Supreme Court, and multiple Presidential administrations. In Utah, interns provide vital staffing to the State's legislature, work with State and local government, and bring crucial support to our non-profit community. Hinckley students also work across the globe. Over the years, students have traveled to over 50 countries, participating in internships ranging from humanitarian causes, parliamentary staffing, and international policy initiatives. Many Hinckley alumni have held elected office and led distinguished careers in public service. These dedicated Utahns continue to better our country by upholding the principles of our Constitution and bringing Utah's work ethic to Washington.

In 2023, the Hinckley Institute expanded its reach with the opening of the Orrin G. Hatch Center in Washington, DC. The Hatch Center serves as a premier living and learning hub for students and provides unparalleled access to the heart of national policy-making. The founding of the Dan Jones Center for Public Service has also positioned the institute as a leader for public opinion polling, impactful research, and thought leadership in Utah and beyond.

As we celebrate this milestone, let us recognize the Hinckley Institute's unwavering dedication to fostering generations of engaged Utahns. By empowering students to contribute meaningfully to our country, the institute continues to advance the tenets of public service essential to our great Nation's strength. I commend the Hinckley Institute on 60 years of excellence and look forward to its achievements in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING MCINTYRE FARMS

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, as a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. Today, I am proud to honor McIntyre Farms in Caldwell as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for September 2025.

The McIntyre family started farming row crops and raising animals, including a small dairy, watermelons, and later alfalfa, in the Treasure Valley in 1910. Nearly a century later, in 2006, Ben and Brad McIntyre returned from college, becoming the fourth generation of McIntyres to farm the land.

Upon taking over the farm, Ben and Brad quickly took notice of the soil's biology. They began studying soil health, learning as much as possible about the importance of carbon and mineral content, and water retention. The McIntyre brothers decided to rebuild the land using a no-till, regenerative approach. They now bring in a rotation of cows, pastured hogs, chick-

ens, and turkeys to rebuild the soil without using artificial fertilizers and pesticides. This practice leaves the land healthier and improves the quality of its products.

Today, McIntyre Farms sells a variety of meats, dairy, eggs, and seasonal produce at their store and offers pickup or home delivery. The operation is primarily run by three generations of McIntyres, including Loren, Ben and Brad's father, along with their wives and children.

Congratulations to the McIntyre family and the employees at McIntyre Farms on being recognized as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for September 2025. Your dedication to excellence makes Idaho proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

REMEMBERING LARRY NEAL BARRON

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Larry Neal Barron, a distinguished citizen of Maryland, who passed away on August 10, 2025, at the age of 83.

Born on September 3, 1941, in Friedens, PA, Mr. Barron embodied the values of service, commitment, and leadership throughout his remarkable life. Following his graduation from Somerset Joint High School, he proudly answered the call to serve his country as a member of the U.S. Marine Corps, assigned to the elite HMX-1 unit. His service exemplified patriotism and devotion to duty.

After completing his military service, Mr. Barron embarked on a 37-year career with Mack Truck, where he was not only a respected employee but also a leader within the United Auto Workers. His advocacy through the Community Action Program and recognition with two Bobby Fouche Awards—from both the Central Maryland Labor Council and the Western Maryland Democratic Summit—reflect his steadfast dedication to the dignity of working men and women.

Mr. Barron's commitment to community extended far beyond his professional life. He gave his time generously as a scoutmaster at Long Meadow Church of the Brethren, guiding young people for 8 years. For more than half a century, he was a devoted member of Covenant Presbyterian Church, where he held numerous leadership roles and exemplified faith in action.

In addition, Mr. Barron was a proud Freemason, joining Medairy Lodge in Williamsport in 1976 and rising to serve as worshipful master for two terms. He attained the 32nd Degree, served as grand inspector of Masons for the State of Maryland, and was past president of the Maryland Masonic Research Society. His leadership also extended to youth organizations, including service as past associate guardian of Bethel No. 26, International Order of Job's Daughters.

Larry Barron was also an active figure in civic life, especially within the

Democratic Party. He served on the Washington County Democratic State Central Committee and was a primary organizer of the Western Maryland Democratic Summit, where his tireless work strengthened civic engagement and democratic participation across our region.

Above all, Mr. Barron will be remembered as a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. He is survived by his beloved wife Judy Mae Barron; his daughter Catherine Middlekauff; and his grandchildren Caitlin and Camden Middlekauff. His life was one of service to God, country, family, and community.

The people of Maryland have lost a dedicated citizen and leader, but his legacy of service will continue to inspire. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing appreciation for and paying respects to Mr. Larry Barron's remarkable impact and memory.●

REMEMBERING SAMUEL JORDAN

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memory of the late Samuel Jordan of Maryland, who left an indelible mark on our State and Nation. Mr. Jordan worked tirelessly to make a positive difference in his community and across the globe, and he will be remembered for his remarkable advocacy as a transit champion in Baltimore.

Mr. Jordan's dedication to justice and civil rights started at a young age. After graduating from Franklin and Marshall College with honors, he founded Black Arise, a community-based liberation group. As an avid learner and pursuer of justice, he returned to school and earned a law degree. He inspired the next generation at the University of the District of Columbia, teaching constitutional and criminal law.

Throughout his life, he pursued justice across multiple fields. He was a strong supporter of workers' rights, fought for a better healthcare system, and advocated for racial justice. He championed civil rights on the global stage, serving as a United Nations delegate at a world conference against racism in post-apartheid South Africa.

Back home, Mr. Jordan's leadership at the Baltimore Transit Equity Coalition and the Innovative Housing Institute has made a difference in the lives of many. His dedication to building equitable transportation, enhancing affordable housing, and eliminating structural racism is an inspiration to us all and a testament to his lifelong pursuit of creating positive change.

I offer my heartfelt gratitude to Mr. Jordan's family for his commitment to strengthening communities and dedication to social justice. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our condolences to his family and in honoring Mr. JORDAN's incredible legacy.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Holstead, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2025, the Secretary of the Senate, on September 23, 2025, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2483. An act to reauthorize certain programs that provide for opioid use disorder prevention, treatment, and recovery, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 318. A bill to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-64).

By Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 428. A bill to promote space situational awareness and space traffic coordination and to modify the functions and leadership of the Office of Space Commerce, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-65).

By Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 503. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to evaluate and consider the impact of the telecommunications network equipment supply chain on the deployment of universal service, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-66).

By Mr. CRUZ, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1433. A bill to reauthorize the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act to promote the protection of the resources of the Northwest Straits, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-67).

S. 1437. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish a program to identify, evaluate, acquire, and disseminate commercial Earth remote sensing data and imagery in order to satisfy the scientific, operational, and educational requirements of the Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-68).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 620. A bill to provide public health veterinary services to Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations for rabies prevention, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-69).

S. 642. A bill to provide compensation to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community for the taking without just compensation of land by the United States inside the exterior boundaries of the L'Anse Indian Reservation that were guaranteed to the Community under a treaty signed in 1854, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119-70).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. BRITT (for herself and Mr. KIM):

S. 2924. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study and rulemaking on the definition of the term "small entity" under the securities laws for purposes of chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2925. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study on the governance of neural data and other related data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KIM, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2926. A bill to establish the New York-New Jersey Watershed Restoration Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 2927. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements for supporting new mobile cancer screening units to expand patient access to essential screening services in rural and underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2928. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform and reduce fraud and abuse in certain visa programs for aliens working temporarily in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FETTERMAN (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 2929. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded egg alternatives; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2930. A bill to reduce spending on nuclear weapons and related defense spending and to prohibit the procurement and deployment of low-yield nuclear warheads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2931. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2932. A bill to protect the name, image, and likeness rights of, and provide protections for, student athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JUSTICE (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2933. A bill to redesignate a playground in the New River Gorge National Park and Preserve in the State of West Virginia as the "Hearts of Gold Playground: In Honor of West Virginia Children and Families Impacted by Childhood Cancer"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 2934. A bill to limit the availability of civil actions affected by United States sanctions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2935. A bill to prohibit State and local law enforcement officers from arresting foreign nationals within the United States solely on the basis of an indictment, warrant, or request issued by the International Criminal Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2936. A bill to designate Antifa as a domestic terrorist organization, to counter domestic terrorism and organized political violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 2937. A bill to establish legal standards for advanced artificial intelligence products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2938. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish the Advanced Artificial Intelligence Evaluation Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND
SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 419. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2025 as "Hawaiian History Month" to recognize the history, culture and contributions of Native Hawaiians and reaffirm the United States Federal trust responsibility to the Native Hawaiian Community to support their well-being; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MULLIN):

S. Res. 420. A resolution supporting the designation of September 19, 2025, as "National Concussion Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 421. A resolution urging the executive branch and leaders of the G7 and the European Union to seize sovereign assets of the Russian Federation under the jurisdiction of members of the G7 and disburse such assets to Ukraine in tranches of not less than \$10,000,000,000 United States dollars per month until expended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 142

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 142, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to wildland firefighters in recognition of their strength, resiliency, sacrifice, and service to protect the forests, grasslands, and communities of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 410

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 410, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 545

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 545, a bill to prohibit certain uses of xylazine, and for other purposes.

S. 611

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 611, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and to expand eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation paid to certain survivors of certain veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 807

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 807, a bill to provide for the crediting of funds received by the National Guard Bureau as reimbursement from States.

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 807, *supra*.

S. 844

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to accelerate workplace time-to-contract under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 921

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 921, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue guidance on whether hospital emergency departments should implement fentanyl testing as a routine procedure for patients experiencing an overdose, and for other purposes.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to include requirements relating to graduates of career and tech-

nical education programs or programs of study for small business development centers and women's business centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate a waiver under that Act, to eliminate an authorization for States to use new motor vehicle emission and new motor vehicle engine emissions standards identical to standards adopted in California, and for other purposes.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for memorial headstones and markers furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certain individuals who died before November 11, 1998.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1175, a bill to amend section 6903 of title 31, United States Code, to provide for additional population tiers, and for other purposes.

S. 1234

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1234, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update the resource limit for supplemental security income eligibility.

S. 1245

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1245, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand health care and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 1320

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1320, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take certain steps regarding research related to menopause, perimenopause, or mid-life women's health, and for other purposes.

S. 1521

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1521, a bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for a prohibition on contributions to the United Nations related to discrimination against Israel.

S. 1594

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Mary-

land (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1594, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit certain activities involving prohibited primate species, and for other purposes.

S. 1677

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1677, a bill to provide health insurance benefits for outpatient and inpatient items and services related to the diagnosis and treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 1806

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1806, a bill to terminate unused authorities of the Securities and Exchange Commission that were established pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 1808

At the request of Mr. MCCORMICK, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1808, a bill to permit a registered investment company to omit certain fees from the calculation of acquired fund fees and expenses, and for other purposes.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1829, a bill to combat the sexual exploitation of children by supporting victims and promoting accountability and transparency by the tech industry.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1829, *supra*.

S. 2715

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2715, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals with approved medical residency training programs to submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services certain information regarding osteopathic and allopathic candidates for such programs.

S. 2742

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2742, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the reallocation of applicable volumes for small refineries under the Renewable Fuel Standard, and for other purposes.

S. 2787

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2787, a bill to amend the

Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to ensure that ranchers who have grazing agreements on national grasslands are treated the same as permittees on other Federal land.

S. 2794

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2794, a bill to require the heads of agencies to establish a policy with respect to the deactivation of charge cards of employees separating from the agency, and for other purposes.

S. 2806

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2806, a bill to provide for automatic continuing appropriations.

S. 2848

At the request of Ms. ALSOBROOKS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2848, a bill to require amounts used to pay the costs of the renaming the Department of Defense to be derived from the travel budget of the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 2854

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2854, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to terminate the District of Columbia Judicial Nomination Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 2858

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2858, a bill to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes.

S. 2859

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2859, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 2881

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2881, a bill to provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal land in the State of California, and for other purposes.

S. 2907

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2907, a bill to prohibit health care professionals, hospitals, or clinics from participating in the chemical or surgical mutilation of a child and to provide a private right of action for children and the parents of children whose healthy body parts have been

damaged by medical professionals practicing chemical and surgical mutilation.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution expressing support for the continued value of arms control agreements and negotiated constraints on Russian and Chinese strategic nuclear forces.

S. RES. 86

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

S. RES. 409

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 409, a resolution recognizing the 74th anniversary of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Philippines and the strong bilateral security alliance between our two nations in the wake of escalating aggression and political lawfare by the People's Republic of China in the South China Sea.

AMENDMENT NO. 3060

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3060 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2925. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a study on the governance of neural data and other related data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 2925

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 "Management of Individuals' Neural Data Act of 2025" or the "MIND Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) an individual's neural data and other related data can be monetized and used to shape individual behavior, emotional states, and decision making in ways existing laws do not adequately address;

(2) vertical corporate integration of neurotechnology, artificial intelligence systems, wearable devices, digital platforms, and global data infrastructure may create interconnected systems with insufficient transparency, accountability, or user control regarding the use of such data;

(3) such concentration increases the risk of behavioral influence, cognitive manipulation, erosion of personal autonomy, and the exacerbation of existing social and economic disparities, particularly in the absence of enforceable privacy protections, including protections of neural data and other related data;

(4) the absence of a comprehensive Federal standard for the collection, processing, and international transfer of such data presents risks to civil liberties and to national security, given the dual-use potential of and foreign interest in the data assets of the United States;

(5) strong protections for such data are essential to safeguard privacy, prevent discrimination and exploitation, and ensure that innovation in neurotechnology applications proceeds with accountability and public trust; and

(6) while this Act focuses primarily on neural data, related biometric and behavioral data that can reveal mental states may pose similar risks and warrant comparative analysis to identify broader privacy gaps.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE.**—The term "artificial intelligence" has the meaning given such term in section 5002 of the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Act of 2020 (15 U.S.C. 9401).

(2) **COMMISSION.**—The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(3) **FEDERAL AGENCY.**—The term "Federal agency" has the meaning given the term "agency" in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) **NEURAL DATA.**—The term "neural data" means information obtained by measuring the activity of an individual's central or peripheral nervous system through the use of neurotechnology.

(5) **NEUROTECHNOLOGY.**—The term "neurotechnology" means a device, system, or procedure that accesses, monitors, records, analyzes, predicts, stimulates or alters the nervous system of an individual to understand, influence, restore, or anticipate the structure, activity, or function of the nervous system.

(6) **OTHER RELATED DATA.**—The term "other related data"—

(A) means biometric, physiological, or behavioral information that does not directly measure the neural activity or central or peripheral nervous system of an individual, but can be processed, analyzed, or combined with other data to infer, predict, or reveal cognitive, emotional, or psychological states or neurological conditions; and

(B) may include heart rate variability, eye-tracking patterns, voice analysis, facial expression recognition, sleep patterns, or other signals derived from consumer devices, wearables, or biosensors.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION STUDY AND REPORT ON NEURAL DATA GOVERNANCE.

(a) **STUDY AND REPORT.**—

(1) **STUDY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall conduct a study on—

(i) what additional authorities, if any, the Federal Government needs to regulate neural data and other related data that can reveal an individual's mental state or activity, and to establish appropriate privacy protections for individuals in the United States;

(ii) best practices for privacy and data security for the private sector to protect such data; and

(iii) the extent to which existing laws, regulations, and governing frameworks, including the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191), govern the use, storage, processing, portability, and privacy of such data, any gaps in law that should be addressed, and potential additional protections for such data that fall outside the scope of such Act.

(B) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study described in subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consult with—

(i) the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy;

(ii) the Commissioner of Food and Drugs;

(iii) other relevant Federal agencies determined appropriate by the Commission; and

(iv) representatives of the private sector, academia, civil society, consumer advocacy organizations, labor organizations, patient advocacy organizations, and clinical research stakeholders including medical and health care professionals.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall—

(A) submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) that—

(i) includes the information described in subsection (b); and

(ii) describes a regulatory framework that maximizes opportunities for responsible innovation in neurotechnology while minimizing the risks of harm that arise from such innovation, such as discrimination, profiling, surveillance, manipulation, and the misuse of neural data and other related data in employment, healthcare, financial services, education, commerce, and public life; and

(B) publish the report on the website of the Commission.

(b) REPORT CONTENTS.—The report described in subsection (a)(2) shall include—

(1) an analysis on—

(A) the collection, processing, storage, sale, and transfer of neural data and other related data; and

(B) all relevant uses of neurotechnology, neural data, and other related data for understanding, analyzing, and influencing human mental states and behavior;

(2) a summary of the ethical, legal, and regulatory landscape surrounding neural data and other related data that can reveal an individual's mental state or activity, including any existing guidelines related to—

(A) the collection of such data;

(B) consent for the collection, use, and transfer of such data;

(C) individual rights relating to such data;

(D) predictive modeling; and

(E) using such data to infer or influence behavior;

(3) an assessment of—

(A) how neural and other related data is collected, processed, and transferred in interstate commerce, and the benefits and risks associated with the collection and use of such data, including how such data may serve the public interest, improve the quality of life of the people of the United States, or advance innovation in neurotechnology and neuroscience; and

(B) how the use of such data may pose risks to individuals, including vulnerable populations, across different contexts or use cases;

(4) recommendations for the categorization and oversight of neural data and other related data uses, including—

(A) a framework that—

(i) distinguishes categories of such data, classifying such data based on both the potential for beneficial use cases (including medical, scientific, or assistive applications), and the potential for individual, societal, or group-level harm arising from misuse;

(ii) describes the properties of such data based on its capacity to directly or indirectly identify an individual or to reveal or infer sensitive personal information about an individual; and

(iii) suggests corresponding governance requirements such as heightened oversight, stricter consent standards, prohibited use cases regardless of individual consent, enhanced access restrictions, and cybersecurity protections;

(B) standards for computational models of the brain and guidance on assessing harms in contexts where such data is integrated with artificial intelligence or used as part of a system designed to influence behavior or decision making;

(C) an analysis of whether, and if so how, individuals may be exposed to unfair, deceptive, or coercive trade practices through the misuse of neural data and other related data across different environments, and recommendations for safeguards to prevent such harms; and

(D) recommendations for categorizing certain applications of neural data and other related data, or certain practices regarding such data, as impermissible, such as those designed to manipulate behavior or erode privacy with respect to an individual's mental state or activity;

(5) an examination of how the application of artificial intelligence to neural and other related data that can reveal an individual's mental state or activity may reshape the risks, oversight demands, and ethical considerations associated with such data;

(6) recommendations for consumer transparency, consent frameworks, and neural data and other related data use restrictions, such as—

(A) limiting such data use to only clearly disclosed purposes;

(B) restricting the resale of such data to third parties or the use of such data for individual profiling or targeted advertising;

(C) the use of separate, conspicuous consent mechanisms for the use of such data in developing or deploying computational models of the brain; and

(D) the public disclosure of—

(i) intended uses for such data, sharing practices, and artificial intelligence applications; and

(ii) policies related to the retention and deletion of such data; and

(E) prohibited use cases, regardless of individual consent;

(7) recommendations regarding applications of neural data and other related data in specific areas, including—

(A) sectors or practices that raise concerns about privacy, manipulation, discrimination, inequality, or long-term harm, such as—

(i) employment practices, such as in hiring, surveillance, or performance evaluation;

(ii) educational settings and other settings involving children under the age of 13 and teens;

(iii) insurance, financial, and housing services;

(iv) neuromarketing and behavioral shaping, including the targeting of consumers;

(v) commercial surveillance;

(vi) monetization models, such as data brokers, that aggregate or sell neural data and other related data;

(vii) the transfer of neural data and other related data through acquisitions, mergers, or bankruptcy proceedings;

(viii) law enforcement and the criminal justice system; and

(ix) sectors where algorithmic recommendation or design patterns intentionally amplify addictive use or behavioral manipulation;

(B) how existing Federal statutes enforced by the Commission, including the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) and other consumer protection laws, apply to neural data and other related data; and

(C) whether there are regulatory gaps in protecting the privacy of children and teens, including the applicability of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.) and related laws to neural data and other related data;

(8) an analysis of the potential security risks associated with the collection, use, and transfer of neural data and other related data, including—

(A) an assessment of current cybersecurity and data protection requirements applicable to entities that collect, process, or store neural data or other related data, including any gaps in such requirements where such entities fall outside existing Federal standards, such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-191);

(B) an assessment of interagency review models to determine whether certain exports, public releases, or commercial uses of neurotechnologies, including their component parts and integration with artificial intelligence systems, should be subject to restrictions or enhanced controls;

(C) an examination of foreign investment risks in neurotechnology firms;

(D) recommendations on actions the Government and nongovernment actors can take to ensure transparency and due diligence in international partnerships involving such data;

(E) supply chain risks involving components used in neurotechnology that are acquired from foreign countries; and

(F) the implications of storing and processing such data locally versus in cloud environments;

(9) recommendations for incentive structures that promote ethical innovation in neurotechnology that prioritize consumer protection and descriptions of how such structures can be aligned with existing regulatory and certification pathways or requirements, such as the development of—

(A) voluntary standards tied to business incentives, such as research and development tax credits and expedited regulatory pathways;

(B) financial support for responsible scientific inquiry and innovation in neurotechnology, conducted in ethically governed and controlled environments, with safeguards to prevent misuse or harmful applications;

(C) regulatory sandbox mechanisms to enable early-stage neural data applications to be tested with agency oversight, informed consent, and structured risk review;

(D) policies that promote long-term support for users of brain-computer interfaces, such as interoperability standards and post-trial maintenance practices;

(E) competitive incentives, such as procurement preferences for companies that meet specified standards relating to the use of neurotechnology;

(F) public-private partnerships to develop open standards and ethical practices regarding the treatment of neural data and other related data;

(G) ways the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the Food and Drug Administration can coordinate on the use and approval of neurotechnology to reduce reimbursement and coverage barriers;

(10) a proposed framework for enforcement mechanisms, remedies, and penalties for the misuse of, gross negligence regarding the use of, and unauthorized collection, use, transfer, or disclosure of neural data and other related data; and

(11) other analysis and recommendations determined appropriate by the Commission.

(c) ANNUAL UPDATES.—Not later than 1 year after the date the Commission submits the report to Congress under subsection (a), and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Commission shall publicly update the findings in such report to—

(1) reflect evolving advancements in neurotechnology, neural data and other related data use cases, and the associated risks involved with such advancements and use cases; and

(2) assess whether additional reports or updates to any guidance are necessary to ensure that privacy, particularly as it relates to neural data and other related data, continues to be protected.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for purposes of carrying out this section.

SEC. 5. CONDITIONAL LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL AGENCY USE OF NEURAL DATA.

(a) GUIDANCE TO FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the Commission submits the report described in section 4(a)(2), the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Commission and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall develop guidance, using such report to inform such guidance, regarding the procurement and operational use by Federal agencies of neurotechnology that collects, uses, procures, or otherwise processes neural data or other related data. Such guidance shall identify—

(A) prohibited, permissible, and conditionally permitted use cases of such neurotechnology that are consistent with such report;

(B) technical, procedural, and ethical safeguards regarding each use case of such neurotechnology; and

(C) requirements for transparency, limitations regarding the purposes for which such neurotechnology can be used, individual opt-in consent mechanisms regarding the use of such neurotechnology, and protections for the privacy of the people of the United States.

(2) BINDING GUIDANCE.—Not later than 60 days after the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy develops the guidance under paragraph (1), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue binding implementation guidance to each Federal agency pursuant to the guidance developed under paragraph (1).

(b) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of a Federal agency may not procure or operate any neurotechnology that collects, uses, procures, or otherwise processes neural data in a manner inconsistent with the guidance issued under subsection (a)(2).

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 1 year after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget issues guidance in accordance with subsection (a)(2).

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 2937. A bill to establish legal standards for advanced artificial intel-

ligence products; 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. 2937

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Aligning Incentives for Leadership, Excellence, and Advancement in Development Act” or the “AI LEAD Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—ALIGNING INCENTIVES FOR SAFETY, INNOVATION AND UNITED STATES COMPETITIVENESS

Sec. 101. Developer liability for harm to business or consumer.

Sec. 102. Deployer liability for harm to business or consumer.

TITLE II—UNCONSCIONABLE LIABILITY LIMITATIONS

Sec. 201. Unconscionable liability limitations.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Federal cause of action.

Sec. 302. Special rule for deployers.

Sec. 303. Period of limitations.

Sec. 304. Preemption.

Sec. 305. Severability.

TITLE IV—REGISTRATION OF FOREIGN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM PROVIDERS

Sec. 401. Foreign agent registration requirement.

Sec. 402. Enforcement.

Sec. 403. Public registry.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 501. Effective date.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Artificial intelligence systems are products that shift decision-making power and responsibility away from humans to software-based systems, often without direct human oversight.

(2) These products, while holding great promise, have caused and will cause harm to businesses and individuals. For example, multiple teenagers have tragically died after being exploited by an artificial intelligence chatbot.

(3) Unpredictable allocations of liability jeopardize public safety and the financial well-being of both individuals and entire industries, particularly the small businesses of the United States, and adversely affect the Federal Government and taxpayers.

(4) Product liability law can help to address harms caused by artificial intelligence systems that affect interstate commerce by incentivizing safety, providing certainty to artificial intelligence developers and deployers to continue to innovate, and ensuring the competitiveness of the United States.

(5) A Federal products liability framework for artificial intelligence systems will remove barriers to interstate commerce and protect individuals' due process rights.

(6) This Act establishes Federal legislative guidelines for products liability without implicating expressive speech to ensure more predictable legal outcomes for individuals

and industries and promotes business innovation.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “artificial intelligence system” means any software, data system, application, tool, or utility—

(i) that is capable of making or facilitating predictions, recommendations, actions, or decisions for a given set of human- or machine-defined objectives; and

(ii) that uses machine learning algorithms, statistical or symbolic models, or other algorithmic or computational methods (whether dynamic or static) that affect or facilitate actions or decision-making in real or virtual environments.

(B) INCLUSION.—An artificial intelligence system may be integrated into, or operate in conjunction with, other hardware or software.

(2) CLAIMANT.—The term “claimant” means any person, including a class of persons, who brings a liability action.

(3) COVERED PRODUCT.—The term “covered product” means an artificial intelligence system.

(4) DEPLOYER.—The term “deployer” means a person, including a developer, who uses or operates a covered product for—

(A) the person's own personal or commercial use; or

(B) use by a third party.

(5) DESIGN.—The term “design”, with respect to a covered product—

(A) means the intended or known material characteristics of the covered product; and

(B) includes—

(i) any intended or known formulation of the covered product and the usual result of the intended development or other processes used to produce the covered product, including unexpected skills or behaviors that appear in the covered product;

(ii) the selection of any data used for training a covered product through fitting its learnable parameters; and

(iii) training, testing, auditing, and fine-tuning the covered product.

(6) DEVELOPER.—The term “developer” means a person who designs, codes, produces, owns, or substantially modifies a covered product for—

(A) the person's own personal or commercial use; or

(B) use by a third party.

(7) EXPRESS WARRANTY.—The term “express warranty” means any material, positive statement, affirmation of fact, promise, or description relating to a covered product, including any sample or model of a covered product.

(8) HARM.—The term “harm” means, with respect to the effect of the use of a covered product—

(A) damage to property other than the covered product itself;

(B) personal physical injury, illness, or death;

(C) financial or reputational injury;

(D) mental or psychological anguish, emotional distress, or distortion of a person's behavior that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person; or

(E) any loss of consortium or services or other loss deriving from any type of harm described in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D).

(9) LIABILITY ACTION.—The term “liability action” means a civil action brought under section 301 based on any theory for harm caused by a covered product or covered product use.

(10) PERSON.—The “person” means any individual, corporation, company, association,

firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, or other entity, including any government entity or unincorporated association of persons.

(1) **SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION.**—The term “substantial modification”, with respect to a covered product—

(A) means any deliberate change made to the covered product by a deployer that—

(i) was not authorized or reasonably anticipated by the developer when the covered product left the control of the developer; and

(ii) changes the purpose, use, function, design, or intended use or manner of use of the covered product from that for which the covered product was originally designed, tested, or intended; and

(B) does not include a modification that solely reduces or mitigates a new or additional risk.

(12) **UNDER A LEGAL DISABILITY.**—The term “under a legal disability”, with respect to a person, means the person lacks the capacity to understand, make, or communicate decisions regarding the person’s legal rights—

(A) because of a mental illness or intellectual disability; or

(B) because the person is under the age of 18.

TITLE I—ALIGNING INCENTIVES FOR SAFETY, INNOVATION AND UNITED STATES COMPETITIVENESS

SEC. 101. DEVELOPER LIABILITY FOR HARM TO BUSINESS OR CONSUMER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In any liability action, the developer shall be liable to a claimant if the claimant establishes by a preponderance of the evidence—

(1) that—

(A) the developer failed to exercise reasonable care with respect to the design of the covered product; and

(B) the failure to exercise reasonable care was a proximate cause of harm to the claimant;

(2) that—

(A) the developer failed to exercise reasonable care with respect to providing adequate instructions or warnings applicable to the covered product that allegedly caused the harm that is the subject of the complaint; and

(B) the failure to exercise reasonable care with respect to providing adequate instructions or warnings was a proximate cause of harm to the claimant;

(3) that—

(A) the developer made an express warranty applicable to the covered product that allegedly caused the harm that is the subject of the complaint;

(B) the covered product failed to conform to the warranty; and

(C) the failure of the covered product to conform to the warranty was a proximate cause of harm to the claimant; or

(4) that—

(A) the covered product was, at the time of sale or distribution, in a defective condition unreasonably dangerous when used or misused in a reasonably foreseeable manner; and

(B) the defective condition was a proximate cause of the harm to the claimant.

(b) **DEFECTIVE DESIGN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In any liability action against a developer alleging that a covered product is unreasonably dangerous because of a defective design, as described in subsection (a)(1), the claimant shall be required to prove that, at the time of sale or distribution of the covered product by the developer, the foreseeable risks of harm posed by the covered product could have been reduced or avoided by the adoption of a reasonable alternative design by the developer, and the omission of the alternative design renders the covered product not reasonably safe.

(2) **MANIFESTLY UNREASONABLE DESIGN.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in a liability action described in that paragraph, if the design of a covered product is found to be manifestly unreasonable, a claimant shall not be required to prove the existence of a reasonable alternative design.

(3) **CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE SUPPORTING INFERENCE OF COVERED PRODUCT DEFECT.**—In a liability action described in subsection (a)(1), it may be inferred that the harm sustained by the claimant was caused by a covered product defect existing at the time of sale or distribution, without proof of a specific defect, when the incident that harmed the claimant—

(A) was of a kind that ordinarily occurs as a result of covered product defect; and

(B) was not, in the particular case, solely the result of causes other than covered product defect existing at the time of sale or distribution.

(4) **NONCOMPLIANCE AND COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIRED COVERED PRODUCT SAFETY STATUTES OR REGULATIONS.**—

(A) **NONCOMPLIANCE.**—For purposes of a liability action described in subsection (a)(1), if a covered product does not comply with an applicable covered product safety statute or administrative regulation, the covered product shall be deemed defective with respect to the risks sought to be reduced by the statute or regulation.

(B) **COMPLIANCE.**—For purposes of a liability action described in subsection (a)(1), the court may consider a covered product’s compliance with an applicable covered product safety statute or administrative regulation in determining whether the covered product is defective with respect to the risks sought to be reduced by the statute or regulation, but such compliance does not preclude as a matter of law a finding of covered product defect.

(c) **FAILURE TO WARN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of a liability action described in subsection (a)(2), a covered product shall be considered defective because of inadequate instructions or warnings if—

(A) the foreseeable risks of harm posed by the covered product could have been reduced or avoided by the provision of reasonable instructions or warnings by the developer; and

(B) the omission of the instructions or warnings renders the covered product not reasonably safe.

(2) **ADEQUATE INSTRUCTION OR WARNING.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), an adequate instruction or warning is one that a reasonably prudent person in the same or similar circumstances would have provided with respect to a reasonably foreseeable risk and that communicates sufficient information on the reasonably foreseeable risks and safe use of the covered product, taking into account the characteristics of, and the ordinary knowledge common to, an ordinary user of the covered product.

(3) **KNOWLEDGE.**—In a liability action described in subsection (a)(2), the claimant shall be required to prove that, at the time the covered product left the developer’s control, the developer knew of or, in light of then-existing scientific and technical knowledge, reasonably should have foreseen, the risk that caused the claimant’s harm.

(4) **OPEN AND OBVIOUS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In a liability action described in subsection (a)(2), a developer shall not be liable for failure to instruct or warn about a foreseeable risk that is open and obvious to the user of the covered product, taking into account the characteristics of, and the ordinary knowledge common to, an ordinary user of the covered product.

(B) **MINORS.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a risk shall be presumed to not be open

and obvious to a user of a covered product who is under 18 years old.

(5) **NONCOMPLIANCE AND COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIRED COVERED PRODUCT SAFETY STATUTES OR REGULATIONS.**—

(A) **NONCOMPLIANCE.**—In a liability action described in subsection (a)(2), if a covered product does not comply with an applicable covered product safety statute or administrative regulation, the covered product shall be deemed defective due to inadequate instructions or warnings with respect to the risks sought to be reduced by the statute or regulation.

(B) **COMPLIANCE.**—In a liability action described in subsection (a)(2), the court may consider a covered product’s compliance with an applicable covered product safety statute or administrative regulation in determining whether the covered product is defective due to inadequate instructions or warnings with respect to the risks sought to be reduced by the statute or regulation, but such compliance does not preclude as a matter of law a finding of covered product defect.

(d) **STRICT LIABILITY OF DEVELOPER FOR UNREASONABLY DANGEROUS OR DEFECTIVE COVERED PRODUCTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In a liability action described in subsection (a)(4), the developer of a covered product shall be strictly liable for harm caused by the defective condition of the covered product, notwithstanding—

(A) that the developer exercised all possible care in the design or distribution of the covered product; or

(B) that the claimant did not purchase the covered product directly from the developer or otherwise enter into a contractual relationship with the developer.

(2) **SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION.**—A developer shall not be liable under subsection (a)(4) for harm solely caused by a substantial modification.

SEC. 102. DEPLOYER LIABILITY FOR HARM TO BUSINESS OR CONSUMER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—A deployer shall be deemed to be liable as a developer under section 101 for harm caused by a covered product if—

(1) the deployer makes a substantial modification to the covered product; or

(2) the deployer intentionally misuses the covered product contrary to its intended use and that misuse is the proximate cause of harm to the claimant.

(b) **USE INTENDED BY DEVELOPER IS NOT MODIFICATION OR MISUSE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of subsection (a), a use of a covered product that is intended by the developer of the covered product does not constitute a substantial modification to or misuse of the covered product.

(2) **INFERENCE OF INTENDED USE.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), if a developer does not specify an intended use for a covered product, intended use shall be inferred by the targeted market and manner of distribution.

(c) **LICENSING.**—Subject to section 302, any deployer licensing a covered product shall not be liable to a claimant for a violation of section 101 solely by reason of ownership or use of the covered product.

TITLE II—UNCONSCIONABLE LIABILITY LIMITATIONS

SEC. 201. UNCONSCIONABLE LIABILITY LIMITATIONS.

(a) **CONTRACT WITH DEPLOYER.**—

(1) **PROHIBITION.**—A developer may not include language in a contract with a deployer that waives any right, proscribes any forum or procedure, or unreasonably limits liability under this Act or applicable State law related to harm caused by the covered product under section 101.

(2) UNENFORCEABLE.—Language in a contract that violates paragraph (1) shall be unenforceable.

(b) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—A developer or a deployer may not include language in terms and conditions relevant to a covered product that waives any right, proscribes any forum or procedure, or unreasonably limits liability under this Act or applicable State law related to harm caused by the covered product under section 101 or 102.

(2) UNENFORCEABLE.—Language in terms and conditions that violates paragraph (1) shall be unenforceable.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. FEDERAL CAUSE OF ACTION.

The Attorney General, any attorney general of a State, an individual or the legal representative of such an individual, or a class of individuals may bring a civil action in a district court of the United States against a developer or deployer for a violation of section 101, 102, or 201 to obtain—

- (1) injunctive relief;
- (2) in a case brought by the Attorney General, civil penalties;
- (3) damages, restitution, or other compensation on behalf of individuals;
- (4) reasonable attorney fees and other litigation costs reasonably incurred; or
- (5) in a case brought by the Attorney General or a State attorney general, such other relief as the Attorney General or State attorney general may consider to be appropriate.

SEC. 302. SPECIAL RULE FOR DEPLOYERS.

(a) STANDING IN FOR THE DEVELOPER.—If the developer is not a party to a liability action because the developer is not subject to the court's jurisdiction, is insolvent, or cannot otherwise be made to answer for the harm, the deployer may be held liable to the same extent that the developer would have been liable under section 101.

(b) DISMISSAL OF DEPLOYER.—A court shall dismiss the deployer from a liability action, upon motion, if—

- (1) the developer—
 - (A) is a party to the action; and
 - (B) is subject to the court's jurisdiction;
- (2) the developer is not insolvent or otherwise unable to satisfy any likely judgment; and
- (3) the deployer is not otherwise liable under section 102.

(c) JOINT FAULT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If both the developer and the deployer contributed to the harm under sections 101 and 102, each person may be held jointly and severally liable for the portion of harm caused by that person's conduct.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the right of a claimant to maintain a liability action against the developer, the deployer, or both, if the claimant can establish that each person contributed to the harm under sections 101 and 102.

(d) INDEMNIFICATION AND ATTORNEY FEES.—

(1) RIGHT TO SEEK INDEMNIFICATION.—A deployer that is held liable for harm caused by the developer under subsection (a) may pursue indemnification, including the recovery of attorney fees and litigation costs, from the developer.

(2) LIMITATION.—If the deployer is determined to be at fault for a portion of the harm under subsection (c), indemnification under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be limited to the portion of damages, fees, or costs attributable to the conduct of the developer.

(e) PRESERVATION OF CLAIMANT'S RIGHTS.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the right of the claimant to maintain a liability action against the developer, the deployer, or both persons, if the claimant can establish

that each person contributed to the harm under sections 101 and 102.

SEC. 303. PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a liability action may be filed not later than 4 years after the date on which the claimant discovered or, in the exercise of reasonable care, should have discovered—

(1) the harm that is the subject of the action; and

(2) the cause of the harm.

(b) LEGAL DISABILITY.—In the case of a person who is under a legal disability, the period of limitations under subsection (a) for a liability action brought by that person shall be tolled until the person ceases to be under a legal disability.

(c) TOLLING.—The period of limitations under subsection (a) shall be tolled from the date of the filing of a complaint against a developer or deployer to the date that a court enters a final judgment in the case.

SEC. 304. PREEMPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act supersedes State law only where State law conflicts with the provisions of this Act.

(b) MINIMUM PROTECTIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall prevent a State from enacting or enforcing protections that align with the principles of harm prevention, accountability, and transparency for a covered product that are stronger than such protections under this Act.

SEC. 305. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or an amendment made by this Act, is determined to be unenforceable or invalid, the remaining provisions of this Act and amendments made by this Act shall not be affected.

TITLE IV—REGISTRATION OF FOREIGN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM DEVELOPERS

SEC. 401. FOREIGN AGENT REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) DESIGNATION REQUIRED.—Before making a covered product available in the United States, a foreign developer shall designate an agent for service of process.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The designation of an agent under subsection (a) shall—

- (1) be in writing and submitted to the Attorney General;
- (2) include a written acceptance by the agent; and
- (3) specify the full legal name and address of both the foreign developer and the agent.

(c) AGENT QUALIFICATIONS.—A designated agent under subsection (a) shall be a permanent resident of the United States.

(d) UPDATES.—A foreign developer of a covered product shall notify the Attorney General of any change to the designated agent under subsection (a) or the contact information thereof not later than 15 days after the change.

SEC. 402. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—A foreign developer of a covered product that fails to designate an agent in accordance with section 401 may not deploy any covered product in the United States.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General may seek injunctive relief to prevent a violation of subsection (a).

SEC. 403. PUBLIC REGISTRY.

The Attorney General shall maintain a publicly accessible registry of designated agents of foreign developers of covered products.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 501. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall apply with respect to any liability action commenced on or after the date of enactment of this Act without regard

to whether the harm that is the subject of the liability action or the conduct that caused the harm occurred before that date of enactment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 419—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2025 AS ‘HAWAIIAN HISTORY MONTH’ TO RECOGNIZE THE HISTORY, CULTURE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF NATIVE HAWAIIANS AND REAFFIRM THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL TRUST RESPONSIBILITY TO THE NATIVE HAWAIIAN COMMUNITY TO SUPPORT THEIR WELL-BEING

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. RES. 419

Whereas Native Hawaiians are the indigenous people of Hawaii with a rich cultural legacy rooted in centuries of self-sufficiency, land stewardship, innovation, and community-building across the Hawaiian archipelago;

Whereas, in the late 19th century, Native Hawaiians were among the most literate people in the world, estimated to have a literacy rate of more than 90 percent, and established the first high school west of the Mississippi River;

Whereas pivotal 19th century Native Hawaiian historians and scholars, including Samuel Kamakau, Davida Malo, Kepelino Keauokalani, and John Papa Ii, documented Hawaiian history and produced important literature on Native Hawaiian genealogies, practices, and stories that remains relevant today;

Whereas the Kingdom of Hawai'i was an internationally recognized sovereign nation until its unlawful overthrow by United States forces in 1893;

Whereas, in 1993, Congress enacted Public Law 103-150 to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the illegal overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, and expressed regret for the role of the United States in the overthrow and affirmed the inherent sovereignty of the Native Hawaiian people;

Whereas, by 1919, the Native Hawaiian population had significantly declined since Western contact due to disease and loss of culture, language, land, and political leadership;

Whereas individual Native Hawaiians have led efforts to revitalize their culture, language, and traditions across generations, including—

(1) David Kalakaua, the first elected king of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, who commissioned the construction of Iolani Palace as a symbol of Hawaiian innovation and sovereignty and championed Hawaiian traditional arts and culture;

(2) Queen Liliuokalani, the last sovereign monarch of the Kingdom of Hawai'i, who promoted Hawaiian sovereignty through constitutional reform and preserved Native Hawaiian culture through her prolific musical compositions, writings, and philanthropic efforts;

(3) Bernice Pauahi Bishop, a princess of the Kingdom of Hawai'i whose will instructed the establishment of an institution to support the education and cultural stewardship of Native Hawaiian students;

(4) George Helm, Jr., a musician and activist who, as a founding member of the Protect Kaho'olawe Ohana organization, protested the U.S. military bombing of Kaho'olawe Island and advocated for aloha aina, love for the land;

(5) Duke Kahanamoku, a swimming champion who won 3 gold medals and 2 silver medals over 3 Olympic games and whose passion for surfing led him to be globally recognized as the "father of modern surfing" and also remembered for his achievements as a life-guard, sheriff, and ambassador of aloha;

(6) Edith Kanaka'ole, a revered kumu hula (hula teacher), composer, and educator who preserved Hawaiian traditions through chant, dance, and academic instruction, and whose legacy was honored with a United States mint quarter in 2023;

(7) Mary Kawena Pukui, co-author of the Hawaiian Dictionary and a leading scholar of Hawaiian language, customs, and oral traditions; and

(8) Isabella Kauaeka Yau Yung Aiona Abbott, the first woman on the biological sciences faculty at Stanford University, who in 1997 was awarded the Gilbert Morgan Smith medal, the highest award in marine botany from the National Academy of Sciences;

Whereas Native Hawaiians have made profound contributions to the United States at all levels of the Federal Government and in the Armed Forces including—

(1) Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, elected as a delegate to the United States House of Representatives from the Territory of Hawai'i and the only royal-born member of Congress;

(2) Senator Daniel K. Akaka, elected to the United States House of Representatives for 7 consecutive terms until he was appointed to the United States Senate, becoming the first Native Hawaiian to serve as a United States Senator; and

(3) Private First Class Herbert Kailieha Pililaa and Private First Class Anthony T. Kahooohanohano, Native Hawaiians who received the Medal of Honor;

Whereas Congress, over many decades, enacted hundreds of statutes to promote health, education, housing, and cultural preservation, recognizing and implementing the special political and trust relationship with the Native Hawaiian Community;

Whereas the State of Hawaii has enacted legislation formally recognizing September as Hawaiian History Month to honor the legacy of Queen Liliuokalani and promote public awareness for Native Hawaiian history and culture;

Whereas today, there are over 650,000 Native Hawaiians living across the globe, with the highest concentration living in Hawai'i, followed closely by California, Washington State, Nevada, Texas, and Oregon;

Whereas federal law recognizes the continued importance of ancestral homelands for Native Hawaiians and sets aside such lands for them, should they choose to return; and

Whereas Hawaiian History Month provides an opportunity to educate all people of the United States about Native Hawaiian history, celebrate their enduring contributions to the United States, and promote reconciliation: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate expresses support for the designation of "Hawaiian History Month"—

(1) to honor the history, culture, and contributions of Native Hawaiians to the State of Hawaii, the United States, and the global community;

(2) to recognize the importance of Public Law 103-150 and the ongoing efforts to achieve reconciliation, including through consultation;

(3) to commend the revitalization of Native Hawaiian language, culture, and traditions

as essential to the well-being and identity of Native Hawaiian communities; and

(4) to encourage Federal agencies, educational institutions, and civil society to observe Hawaiian History Month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and educational activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 420—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2025, AS "NATIONAL CONCUSSION AWARENESS DAY"

Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. MULLIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

Whereas mild traumatic brain injury, otherwise known as a concussion, is an important health concern for children, teens, and adults;

Whereas, according to information from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) there are as many as 1,600,000 to 3,800,000 sports-related concussions annually;

(2) as many as 5,300,000 individuals live with the long-term effects of a traumatic brain injury;

(3) between 2010 and 2016, an estimated 2,000,000 children under age 18 visited an emergency department because of a traumatic brain injury sustained during sports- or recreation-related activities;

(4) in 2023, there were an estimated 69,000 fatalities related to traumatic brain injuries;

(5) each year an estimated 283,000 children seek care in emergency departments in the United States for a sports- or recreation-related traumatic brain injury, with traumatic brain injuries sustained in contact sports accounting for approximately 45 percent of those visits;

(6) 7 in 10 emergency department visits for sports- or recreation-related traumatic brain injury are for children ages 17 and younger;

(7) research suggests that many children with a traumatic brain injury do not seek care in emergency departments or do not seek care at all, resulting in a significant underestimate of prevalence; and

(8) approximately 15 percent of all high school students in the United States self-reported 1 or more sports- or recreation-related concussions within the preceding 12 months;

Whereas the seriousness of concussions should not be minimized in athletics, and return-to-play and return-to-learn protocols can help ensure recovery;

Whereas concussions can affect physical, mental, and social health, and a greater awareness and understanding of proper diagnosis and management of concussions is critical to improved outcomes; and

Whereas the Senate can raise awareness about concussions among the medical community and the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of September 19, 2025, as "National Concussion Awareness Day";

(2) recognizes that mild traumatic brain injury, otherwise known as a concussion, is an important health concern;

(3) commends the organizations and individuals that raise awareness about mild traumatic brain injury;

(4) encourages Federal, State, and local policymakers to work together—

(A) to raise awareness about the effects of concussions; and

(B) to improve the understanding of proper diagnosis and management of concussions; and

(5) encourages further research and prevention efforts to ensure that fewer individuals experience the most adverse effects of mild traumatic brain injury.

SENATE RESOLUTION 421—URGING THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND LEADERS OF THE G7 AND THE EUROPEAN UNION TO SEIZE SOVEREIGN ASSETS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF MEMBERS OF THE G7 AND DISBURSE SUCH ASSETS TO UKRAINE IN TRanches OF NOT LESS THAN \$10,000,000,000 UNITED STATES DOLLARS PER MONTH UNTIL EXPENDED

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 421

Whereas, since the illegal invasion of Ukraine by the Russian Federation, the Russian Federation has committed widespread attacks on civilians amounting to crimes against humanity, including—

(1) widespread, systemic, and deliberate targeting of civilians by drones where civilians have been targeted for attack while going about their daily lives outside, and ambulances were struck while attempting to provide medical assistance;

(2) documented war crimes, including extrajudicial killings and torture of civilians and prisoners of war that are systemic and widespread throughout areas controlled by the Russian Federation;

(3) rape and sexual violence committed by Russian soldiers against male and female civilians and prisoners of war; and

(4) the illegal transfer of Ukrainian children to at least 210 different facilities inside the Russian Federation or areas controlled by the Russian Federation where the children are subjected to re-education and militarization;

Whereas the humanitarian costs of the invasion of Ukraine have been enormous, including—

(1) approximately 14,000 documented deaths of civilians, and more than 35,458 documented civilian casualties, including 700 children killed and 2,200 children injured since the start of the war;

(2) an estimated 120,000 Ukrainian soldiers killed or missing in action;

(3) displacement of more than 10,000,000 people, with 3,600,000 displaced within Ukraine and 6,900,000 seeking refuge abroad; and

(4) indiscriminate shelling and bombing in population centers leading to the destruction of critical civilian infrastructure that will cost an estimated \$524,000,000,000 to rebuild;

Whereas the conduct of the Russian Federation has not only harmed Ukraine but violates Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter requiring states to refrain from the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state;

Whereas the principle of state responsibility under international law holds that a state committing an internationally wrongful act is obligated to make full reparation for the injury caused;

Whereas the legal doctrine of countermeasures under customary international law permits targeted and proportionate responses to serious breaches of international obligations, including the use of seized sovereign assets to repair harm caused by such breaches;

Whereas, in response to the illegal aggression by the Russian Federation, members of the G7 imposed sanctions and froze Russian sovereign assets but have fallen short of confiscating such assets;

Whereas the continued passive freezing of Russian sovereign assets without a clear mechanism for permanent seizure and repurposing fails to uphold the principle of accountability and undermines the deterrent value of economic sanctions;

Whereas, in 2024, Congress passed the Rebuilding Economic Prosperity and Opportunity for Ukrainians Act (22 U.S.C. 9521 note; Public Law 118–50) (commonly known as the “REPO for Ukrainians Act”) to establish a domestic legal framework for the seizure and transfer of Russian sovereign assets;

Whereas the United States, every member of the European Union, and all but one member of the G7 are participating states of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas, on July 3, 2025, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe adopted unanimously in plenary session the Porto Declaration, which “[c]alls on OSCE participating States to unlock the full value of an estimated [\$300,000,000,000 United States dollars] in Russian sovereign assets frozen across the region by repurposing the underlying principal, in sizeable increments and on a regular and timely schedule, for Ukraine until the Russian Federation ends its aggression and agrees to compensate Ukraine for damages directly resulting from the war”;

Whereas the implementation of such seizure requires robust coordination with international partners to mitigate legal, diplomatic, and financial risks and to maximize legitimacy and effectiveness;

Whereas allied hesitation and lack of harmonized frameworks have impeded progress toward the actual transfer of such assets; and

Whereas it is in the strategic and moral interest of the United States to lead an international coalition in converting immobilized Russian sovereign assets into a funding mechanism for the recovery and global security of Ukraine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) determines that the Russian Federation bears full financial responsibility for the harm caused by its unlawful war of aggression against Ukraine, and the assets of the Russian Federation should be used to satisfy that responsibility;

(2) remains steadfast in its support for the sovereignty, independence, and right to self-defense of Ukraine, and believes all available diplomatic, legal, and economic tools should be leveraged to hold the Russian Federation accountable;

(3) recommends that the executive branch advocate internationally that—

(A) the violation of international law by the Russian Federation removes its entitlement to sovereign immunity protections over assets located abroad, under the doctrine of countermeasures;

(B) international law and precedent provide a legal basis for permanent confiscation of state-owned assets in response to grave violations of the international order; and

(C) the seizure of assets is a legitimate means of supporting the reconstruction of Ukraine and deterring future acts of aggression by other states;

(4) strongly urges all countries with sovereign assets of the Russian Federation under their jurisdiction—

(A) to pursue harmonization of domestic legal authorities to provide their governments with seizure powers equivalent to the powers granted by the Rebuilding Economic

Prosperity and Opportunity for Ukrainians Act (22 U.S.C. 9521 note; Public Law 118–50);

(B) to partner with the United States to develop and implement a multilateral sovereign asset repurposing fund that facilitates the lawful seizure and repurposing of Russian sovereign assets for the benefit of Ukraine; and

(C) to confiscate such assets and allocate them to Ukraine in tranches of not less than \$10,000,000,000 United States dollars per month until the funds are expended to support the defense of Ukraine against the Russian Federation; and

(5) calls on the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense to pressure any country with sovereign assets of the Russian Federation within their jurisdiction to confiscate such assets by—

(A) prioritizing the sale of United States weapons to countries that are found to have sovereign assets of the Russian Federation within their jurisdiction, and which have seized and distributed the assets to a fund for Ukraine; and

(B) deprioritizing the sale of United States weapons to countries that are found to have sovereign assets of the Russian Federation within their jurisdiction and have not seized and distributed the assets to a fund for Ukraine.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3913. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2806, to provide for automatic continuing appropriations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3914. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. WELCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3915. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3916. Mr. THUNE (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2144, to improve the safety and security of Members of Congress, immediate family members of Members of Congress, and congressional staff.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3913. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2806, to provide for automatic continuing appropriations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 1311(b)(1) of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, is amended by inserting “75 percent of” before “the rate”.

SA 3914. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. WELCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military

activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ROLE OF MULTINATIONAL PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS IN SUPPORTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) in the Sinai Peninsula has effectively maintained peace and stability between Egypt and Israel by monitoring compliance with the 1979 Israeli-Egyptian Peace and preventing the resurgence of hostilities for over four decades.

(2) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization-led peacekeepers in Kosovo effectively stabilized that region by preventing renewed ethnic conflict, safeguarding civilians, and supporting the return of displaced persons following the 1999 conflict.

(3) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) peacekeeping forces in Bosnia effectively enforced the Dayton Peace Agreement, ended large-scale hostilities, and contributed to long-term regional stability and reconstruction.

(4) The African Union-led Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID), jointly deployed with the United Nations, has protected vulnerable populations, ensured delivery of humanitarian aid, and helped rebuild infrastructure in the aftermath of a protracted conflict.

(5) Multinational peacekeeping missions, led by alliances such as NATO, the African Union (AU), the European Union (EU), and ad hoc coalitions, have successfully supported humanitarian operations in complex emergencies in locations such as Iraq, the Sahel Region, Somalia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Ukraine.

(6) Such missions have provided immediate and sustained humanitarian relief, including the protection of civilians, the delivery of food and medical supplies, and the support of internally displaced persons and refugees.

(7) The United States Government has constructively engaged in negotiations and promoted peace settlements among parties in post-conflict environments that had suffered mass atrocities and acts of terrorism, including in Bosnia, Kosovo, Liberia, El Salvador, Sudan, Colombia, and Guatemala.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should support an immediate cease-fire in Gaza;

(2) the President, the Secretary of State, and the heads of other relevant United States Government agencies should urgently use all available diplomatic tools to bring out the release of hostages held by Hamas; and

(3) the policy of the United States should be—

(A) to help organize a multinational force that includes international peacekeepers from NATO, major non-NATO allies, and members of the League of Arab States in coordination with local Palestinian civilian leaders, for the purpose of facilitating and protecting the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the civilian population of Gaza; and

(B) to support—

(i) the delivery of food, water, and medical supplies to Gaza;

(ii) capacity-building activities for Gaza in water, sanitation, electricity, medical care, and food systems; and

(iii) final implementation of a diplomatic solution for working toward a long-term peace in the Middle East in line with a two-state solution.

SA 3915. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 840. REPEAL OF CERTAIN SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTING RESTRICTIONS.

Section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84; 41 U.S.C. 3304 note) is hereby repealed.

SA 3916. Mr. THUNE (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2144, to improve the safety and security of Members of Congress, immediate family members of Members of Congress, and congressional staff; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. PROTECTING COVERED INFORMATION IN PUBLIC RECORDS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPLICABLE LEGISLATIVE OFFICERS.—The term “applicable legislative officers” means—

(A) with respect to a Member of the Senate or a designated Senate employee, the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate and the Secretary of the Senate, acting jointly; and

(B) with respect to a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives or a designated House employee, the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, acting jointly.

(2) AT-RISK INDIVIDUAL.—The term “at-risk individual” means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) any individual who is the spouse, parent, sibling, or child of an individual described in subparagraph (A);

(C) any individual to whom an individual described in subparagraph (A) stands in loco parentis;

(D) any other individual living in the household of an individual described in subparagraph (A);

(E) any designated Senate employee;

(F) any designated House employee; or

(G) a former Member of Congress.

(3) CANDIDATE.—The term “candidate” has the meaning given the term in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101).

(4) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term “covered employee” has the same meaning given such term in section 101 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301).

(5) COVERED INFORMATION.—The term “covered information”—

(A) means—

(i) a home address, including a primary residence or secondary residences;

(ii) a home or personal mobile telephone number;

(iii) a personal email address;

(iv) a social security number or driver’s license number;

(v) a bank account or credit or debit card number;

(vi) a license plate number or other unique identifier of a vehicle owned, leased, or regularly used by an at-risk individual;

(vii) the identification of a child, who is under 18 years of age, of an at-risk individual;

(viii) information regarding current or future school or day care attendance, including the name or addresses of the school or day care;

(ix) information regarding schedules of school or day care attendance or routes taken to or from the school or day care by an at-risk individual;

(x) information regarding routes taken to or from an employment location by an at-risk individual; or

(xi) precise geolocation data that is not anonymized and can identify the location of a device of an at-risk individual; and

(B) does not include information described in subparagraph (A) that is contained in—

(i) any report or other record required to be filed with the Federal Election Commission; or

(ii) any report or other record otherwise required under Federal or State law to be filed—

(I) by an individual to qualify as a candidate for the office of Member of Congress; or

(II) by any candidate for the office of Member of Congress.

(6) DATA BROKER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “data broker” means a commercial entity engaged in collecting, assembling, or maintaining personal information concerning an individual who is not a customer, client, or an employee of that entity in order to sell the information or otherwise profit from providing third-party access to the information.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “data broker” does not include a commercial entity engaged in the following activities:

(i) Engaging in reporting, news-gathering, speaking, or other activities intended to inform the public on matters of public interest or public concern.

(ii) Providing 411 directory assistance or directory information services, including name, address, and telephone number, on behalf of or as a function of a telecommunications carrier.

(iii) Using personal information internally, providing access to businesses under common ownership or affiliated by corporate control, or selling or providing data for a transaction or service requested by or concerning the individual whose personal information is being transferred.

(iv) Providing publicly available information via real-time or near-real-time alert services for health or safety purposes.

(v) A consumer reporting agency, only while engaging in activity subject to the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.).

(vi) A financial institution subject to the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (Public Law 106-102) and regulations implementing that Act.

(vii) A covered entity for purposes of the privacy regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2 note).

(viii) The collection and sale or licensing of covered information incidental to conducting the activities described in clauses (i) through (vii).

(7) DESIGNATED HOUSE EMPLOYEE.—The term “designated House employee” means—

(A) a covered employee designated in writing by—

(i) a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives; or

(ii) an officer of the House of Representatives; or

(B) an officer of the House of Representatives.

(8) DESIGNATED SENATE EMPLOYEE.—The term “designated Senate employee” means—

(A) a covered employee designated in writing by—

(i) a Member of the Senate; or

(ii) an officer of the Senate; or

(B) an officer of the Senate.

(9) GOVERNMENT AGENCY.—The term “Government agency” includes—

(A) an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) any agency in the judicial branch or legislative branch.

(10) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—The term “immediate family member” means an at-risk individual—

(A) who is the spouse, parent, sibling, or child of another at-risk individual;

(B) to whom another at-risk individual stands in loco parentis; or

(C) living in the household of another at-risk individual.

(11) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term “Member of Congress” means—

(A) a Member of the Senate; or

(B) a Member of, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives.

(12) TRANSFER.—The term “transfer” means to sell, license, trade, or exchange for consideration the covered information of an at-risk individual.

(b) GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each at-risk individual may—

(A) file written notice of the status of the individual as an at-risk individual, for themselves and their immediate family members, with each Government agency that includes information necessary to ensure compliance with this section, as determined by the applicable legislative officers; and

(B) request that each Government agency described in subparagraph (A) mark as private their covered information and that of their immediate family members.

(2) NO PUBLIC POSTING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Government agencies shall not publicly post or display publicly available content that includes covered information of an at-risk individual.

(B) DEADLINE.—Upon receipt of a request by an at-risk individual under paragraph (1)(B), a Government agency shall remove the covered information of the at-risk individual, and any immediate family member on whose behalf the at-risk individual submitted the request, from publicly available content not later than 72 hours after such receipt.

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit a Government agency from providing access to records containing the covered information of an at-risk individual to a third party if the third party—

(A) possesses a signed release from the at-risk individual or a court order;

(B) is subject to the requirements of title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.); or

(C) executes a confidentiality agreement with the Government agency.

(c) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An at-risk individual may directly, or through an agent designated by the at-risk individual, make any notice or request required or authorized by this section on behalf of the at-risk individual. The notice or request shall include information necessary to ensure compliance with this section.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF LEGISLATIVE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES TO MAKE REQUESTS.—

(A) LEGISLATIVE OFFICERS.—Upon written request of a Member of Congress, designated Senate employee, or designated House employee, the applicable legislative officers are authorized to make any notice or request required or authorized by this section on behalf of the Member of Congress, designated Senate employee, or designated House employee, respectively. The notice or request shall include information necessary to ensure compliance with this section, as determined by the applicable legislative officers. Any notice or request made under this subparagraph shall be deemed to have been made by the Member of Congress, designated Senate employee, or designated House employee, as applicable, and comply with the notice and request requirements of this section.

(B) LIST.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In lieu of individual notices or requests, the applicable legislative officers may provide Government agencies, data brokers, persons, businesses, or associations with a list of—

(I) Members of Congress, designated Senate employees, and designated House employees making a written request described in subparagraph (A); and

(II) immediate family members of the Members of Congress, designated Senate employees, and designated House employees on whose behalf the written request was made.

(ii) CONTENTS.—A list provided under clause (i) shall include information necessary to ensure compliance with this section, as determined by the applicable legislative officers for the purpose of maintaining compliance with this section.

(iii) COMPLIANCE WITH NOTICE AND REQUEST REQUIREMENT.—A list provided under clause (i) shall be deemed to comply with individual notice and request requirements of this section.

(d) DATA BROKERS AND OTHER BUSINESSES.—

(1) PROHIBITIONS.—

(A) DATA BROKERS.—It shall be unlawful for a data broker to knowingly sell, license, trade for consideration, or purchase covered information of an at-risk individual.

(B) OTHER BUSINESSES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), no person, business, or association shall publicly post or publicly display on the internet covered information of an at-risk individual if the at-risk individual, or an immediate family member on behalf of the at-risk individual, has made a written request to that person, business, or association to not disclose the covered information of the at-risk individual.

(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to—

(I) the display on the internet of the covered information of an at-risk individual if the information is relevant to and displayed as part of a news story, commentary, editorial, or other speech on a matter of public concern;

(II) covered information that the at-risk individual voluntarily publishes on the internet after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(III) covered information lawfully received from a Federal Government source (or from an employee or agent of the Federal Government).

(2) REQUIRED CONDUCT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After receiving a written request under paragraph (1)(B)(i), the person, business, or association shall—

(i) remove within 72 hours the covered information from the internet and ensure that the information is not made available on any

website or subsidiary website controlled by that person, business, or association; and

(ii) ensure that the covered information of the at-risk individual is not made available on any website or subsidiary website controlled by that person, business, or association.

(B) TRANSFER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), after receiving a written request under paragraph (1)(B)(i), the person, business, or association shall not transfer the covered information of the at-risk individual to any other person, business, or association through any medium.

(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to—

(I) the transfer of the covered information of the at-risk individual if the information is relevant to and displayed as part of a news story, commentary, editorial, or other speech on a matter of public concern;

(II) covered information that the at-risk individual voluntarily publishes on the internet after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(III) a transfer made at the request of the at-risk individual or that is necessary to effectuate a request to the person, business, or association from the at-risk individual.

(e) REDRESS.—An at-risk individual whose covered information is made public as a result of a violation of this section may bring an action seeking injunctive or declaratory relief in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(f) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(A) to prohibit, restrain, or limit—

(i) the lawful investigation or reporting by the press of any unlawful activity or misconduct alleged to have been committed by an at-risk individual;

(ii) the reporting on an at-risk individual regarding matters of public concern; or

(iii) the disclosure of information otherwise required under Federal law;

(B) to impair access to the actions or statements of a Member of Congress in the course of carrying out the public functions of the Member of Congress;

(C) to limit the publication or transfer of covered information with the written consent of the at-risk individual; or

(D) to prohibit information sharing by a data broker to a Federal, State, Tribal, or local government, or any unit thereof.

(2) PROTECTION OF COVERED INFORMATION.—This section shall be broadly construed to favor the protection of the covered information of at-risk individuals.

(g) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remaining provisions of this section, and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS AND OTHER MATTERS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882, a bill making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Jack Reed, Alex Padilla, Mazie Hirono, Jeanne Shaheen, Tammy Baldwin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Ben Ray Lujan, Brian Schatz, Sheldon Whitehouse, Michael F. Bennet, Christopher Murphy.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHUMER. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371, a bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Ashley B. Moody, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, Pete Ricketts, Ted Budd, Bill Hagerty, John R. Curtis, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Eric Schmitt.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 275.

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 Hung Cao, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 275, Hung Cao, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Bill Cassidy, Jon A. Husted, John Cornyn, John R. Curtis, Marsha Blackburn, Deb Fischer, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Joni Ernst, Shelley Moore Capito, Ashley B. Moody, Rick Scott of Florida, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, Tim Sheehy, James Lankford.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EN BLOC NOMINATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 2, S. Res. 412.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows: An executive resolution (S. Res. 412) authorizing the en bloc consideration in executive session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 2, S. Res. 412, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Ashley B. Moody, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Ted Budd, Bill Hagerty, John R. Curtis, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Eric Schmitt, Jon Husted.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

STRENGTHENING CHILD EXPLOITATION ENFORCEMENT ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1333 and 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. 1333) to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify provisions relating to kidnapping, sexual abuse, and illicit sexual conduct with respect to minors.

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

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

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

The bill (S. 1333) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1333

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 "Strengthening Child Exploitation Enforcement Act".

SEC. 2. KIDNAPPING; SEXUAL ABUSE; ILLICIT SEXUAL CONDUCT WITH RESPECT TO MINORS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1201—
(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting "obtains by defrauding or deceiving any person," after "abducts,";

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting "obtained by defrauding or deceiving any person," after "abducted,"; and

(C) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

"(2) DEFENSE.—For an offense described in this subsection involving a victim who has not attained the age of 16 years, it is not a defense that the victim consented to the conduct of the offender, unless the offender can establish by a preponderance of the evidence

that the offender reasonably believed that the victim had attained the age of 16 years.";

(2) in chapter 109A—

(A) in section 2241(c), by striking "crosses a State line" and inserting "travels in interstate or foreign commerce";

(B) in section 2242(3), by striking ", to include doing so" and inserting "or";

(C) in section 2243, by adding at the end the following:

"(f) INTENTIONAL TOUCHING INVOLVING INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE AGE OF 16.—

"(1) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, to knowingly cause the intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of any person by a person who has not attained the age of 16 years, with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person, or attempt to do so, if to do so would violate subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section, section 2241, or section 2242 had such intentional touching been a sexual act.

"(2) PENALTY.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned as provided in the applicable provision of law described in that paragraph, or both."; and

(D) in section 2244—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) as subparagraphs (A) through (F), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(II) by striking "Whoever" and inserting the following:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever";

(III) in paragraph (1), as so designated—

(aa) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking "if so to do" and inserting "if to do so";

(bb) in subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking "ten" and inserting "10";

(cc) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated, by striking "three" and inserting "3";

(dd) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated, by striking "two" and inserting "2";

(ee) in subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, by striking "two" and inserting "2"; and

(ff) in subparagraph (F), as so redesignated, by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) ATTEMPT.—Whoever attempts to commit an offense under paragraph (1) shall be subject to the same penalty as for a completed offense.";

(ii) in subsection (b)—

(I) by inserting "or causes" after "engages in";

(II) by inserting "or by" after "sexual contact with";

(III) by inserting ", or attempts to do so," after "other person's permission"; and

(IV) by striking "two" and inserting "2"; and

(iii) in subsection (c), by striking "If the sexual contact that violates this section (other than subsection (a)(5)) is with an individual" and inserting "If the sexual contact or attempted sexual contact that a person engages in or causes in violation of this section (other than subsection (a)(1)(E)) is with or by an individual"; and

(3) in section 2423(g)(1)—

(A) by striking "a sexual act (as defined in section 2246) with" and inserting "any conduct involving"; and

(B) by striking "sexual act occurred" and inserting "conduct occurred".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment to section 2241(c) of title 18, United States Code, made by subsection (a) shall apply to conduct that occurred before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO ABUSIVE SEXUAL CONTACT.

(a) PENALTIES FOR CIVIL RIGHTS OFFENSES INVOLVING SEXUAL MISCONDUCT.—Section 250(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 2244(a)(5),” and inserting “section 2244(a)(1)(E), or an attempt to engage in or cause such contact as prohibited by section 2244(a)(2),”;

(2) in paragraph (4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (a)(1) or (b) of section 2244, but excluding abusive sexual contact through the clothing,” and inserting “section 2244(a)(1)(A), an attempt to engage in or cause such contact as prohibited by section 2244(a)(2), or abusive sexual contact of the type prohibited by section 2244(b), but excluding abusive sexual contact through the clothing or an attempt to engage in or cause such contact”;

(3) in paragraph (5), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section 2244(a)(2)” and inserting “section 2244(a)(1)(B) or an attempt to engage in or cause such contact as prohibited by section 2244(a)(2)”;

(4) in paragraph (6), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (a)(3), (a)(4), or (b) of section 2244” and inserting “subparagraph (C) or (D) of section 2244(a)(1), an attempt to engage in or cause such contact as prohibited by section 2244(a)(2), or abusive sexual contact of the type prohibited by section 2244(b)”.

(b) SENTENCING CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES.—Section 3559 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2)(F)(i), by striking “sections 2244(a)(1) and (a)(2)” and inserting “subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 2244(a)(1)”;

(2) in subsection (e)(2)(A), by striking “2244(a)(1)” and inserting “2244(a)(1)(A)”.

Passed the Senate September 29, 2025.

IMPROVING THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2144 and 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. 2144) to improve the safety and security of Members of Congress, immediate family members of Members of Congress, and congressional staff.

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

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the Klobuchar substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third

time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 3916), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill (S. 2144), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 20 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 27, 2025, AS “NATIONAL ESTUARIES WEEK”

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 418.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 418) expressing support for the designation of the week of September 20 through September 27, 2025, as “National Estuaries Week”.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. 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. 418) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 19 (legislative day, September 16), 2025, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2025, AS “NATIONAL CONCUSSION AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 420, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 420) supporting the designation of September 19, 2025, as “National Concussion Awareness Day”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THUNE. 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 with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 420) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 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 resume consideration of Calendar No. 115, S. 2296; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:38 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 30, 2025, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 903:

To be general

GEN. KENNETH S. WILSBACH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JASON T. HINDS
MAJ. GEN. JASON R. ARMAGOST
MAJ. GEN. CLARK J. QUINN
MAJ. GEN. DAVID B. LYONS
MAJ. GEN. DANIEL H. TULLEY
MAJ. GEN. JENNIFER HAMMERSTEDT

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DENNIS O. BYTHEWOOD

IN THE AIR FORCE

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 brigadier general

COL. JAMIE A. PIEPER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

- LT. GEN. CHRISTOPHER O. MOHAN
- MAJ. GEN. MICHELLE A. SCHMIDT
- MAJ. GEN. JOHN L. RAFFERTY, JR.
- MAJ. GEN. PETER N. BENCHOFF
- MAJ. GEN. MICHELLE K. DONAHUE
- MAJ. GEN. JAMES P. ISENHOWER III
- MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM D. TAYLOR
- MAJ. GEN. RICHARD L. ZELLMANN
- MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL C. MCCURRY II
- MAJ. GEN. CHRISTOPHER L. EUBANK
- MAJ. GEN. FRANCISCO J. LOZANO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

- REAR ADM. PATRICK J. HANNIFIN
- REAR ADM. MICHAEL W. BAZE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be admiral

- VICE ADM. KARL O. THOMAS

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 29, 2025:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL G. WALTZ, OF FLORIDA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SES-

SIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on September 29, 2025 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

CHRIS PRATT, OF UTAH, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL-MILITARY AFFAIRS), VICE JESSICA LEWIS, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON FEBRUARY 11, 2025.

ERIK SIEBERT, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JESSICA D. ABER, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MAY 6, 2025.