



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2025

No. 163

Senate

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God of might and mercy, thank You for providing our lawmakers with opportunities for courageous and noble service.

On this third day of the government shutdown, inspire them to work for Your glory in all they think, say, and do. Lord, take their minds and illuminate them with the light of Your divine presence. Equip our Senators for their tasks, that they may be physically fit, mentally alert, and spiritually strong. Create in them the life of purity, honesty, and altruism that contributes to the solution of the problems they face. May they work with perseverance and magnanimity for the new and better day toward which Your divine intentions guide them.

We pray in Your omnipotent 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. CURTIS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

EN BLOC NOMINATIONS—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of S. Res. 412, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for the third day, we heard an opening prayer of the Chaplain praying that the government will open up and we in Congress would find a solution to keep the government open. That will help the 750,000 executive branch employees who are on furlough without pay; that will help the congressional staff who are working without pay, help the economy—something we should be doing.

You have heard me say several times how ridiculous it is to shut the government down because it costs money to shut the government down. It costs money to open the government up. The government is supposed to be a service to the American people, and you can't serve the American people if the government is not functioning properly.

AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. President, again, for the third time this week, I want to talk about the agricultural situation.

This week, I have been talking much about the dire situation in real America, where corn farmers are facing the worst corn-to-fertilizer ratios in American history.

You may not have heard about those ratios. Probably that is something that has been developed within the last two decades. But it puts the input costs of

farmers to grow a crop against the price that they receive for that crop, and it is the worst ever.

I mentioned the real America because we who are serving here in Washington, DC, work in an island surrounded by reality, and I want to make sure that the entire country knows what is going on in flyover country.

The last Congress—that would be in December of last year—passed \$10 billion in ad hoc appropriations for crop farmers to weather the economic storm. While this helped some farmers get through one more year, the economic situation on the family farm has only gotten worse.

Any farmer will tell you that they want to sell into the market and not harvest government checks; although, those checks may be necessary again this year.

We need to address the root cause of this issue by giving farmers more markets, so one very important decision that Congress can make is to have permanent year-round, nationwide E15. That would do just that, giving farmers more markets, particularly for corn.

People would say: Well, you better wake up because you have had nationwide year-round markets for 6 years through a Presidential waiver. But we need to have this by legislation because we need more certainty than what an individual President might think about this issue. And you need that certainty because it is going to take a lot of investment of infrastructure and retailers selling gasoline to invest in the equipment that it takes to have E15 nationwide. Some retailers are already doing that but not enough to have all the sales from E15 that we could have.

According to research, E15 would add \$25.8 billion to the U.S. economy, and \$13.8 billion would be from corn demand. Of course, ethanol production helps keep good jobs in rural communities—43,000 jobs in Iowa alone.

Not only would it create markets for farmers, but Congress could pass year-

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



Printed on recycled paper.

round E15 and save—actually save—\$3 billion to \$4 billion for the American taxpayer. This is a win-win for the real America, and it would be a real win for where we work here in Washington, DC, that island surrounded by reality.

Any legislation with ad hoc payments to farmers should include allowing year-round, nationwide E15; bring certainty to the market; get that investment in infrastructure that is so very, very important to get the most massive benefits out of E15 year-round.

These ad hoc payments are nothing but a bandaid. We better stop what is causing the bleeding.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has been 2 weeks since our first vote on a clean continuing resolution to keep the government open. This shutdown could have been avoided well before it began. But because Democrats have not budged from their partisan demands, the shutdown is now entering its third day.

There is a lot that we could be doing right now. We could be considering bipartisan appropriations bills through regular order, going to conference on the three appropriations bills we passed in August, or passing the bipartisan annual Defense bill. But instead, we are stuck in a shutdown mess of Democrats' making, and the American people are suffering as a result.

Republicans remain united around a clean, nonpartisan funding extension. It has passed the House of Representatives, and it is currently sitting right here in the Senate, ready to be voted on. It has no new Republican policies, no partisan policy riders. It is straightforward, simple, and clean.

All it does is reopen the government through November 21 to give us more time to pass appropriations bills here on the floor. We have a number of bipartisan bills waiting for floor consideration right now. The only thing standing in the way of reopening the government and getting back to doing the important work is Democrats' \$1.5 trillion in partisan spending demands. That is right, \$1.5 trillion.

Their partisan proposal demands more money—think about this—more money than our entire defense budget just to keep the government open for 4 weeks. That is not a credible proposal. It is a far-left wish list, and it is not how we are going to do things around here.

We can end this shutdown in just a few hours. We need to take one rollcall

vote—just one rollcall vote—on the House-passed clean continuing resolution. The President of the United States says that he is ready to sign it. We just need a handful of Democrats to agree.

Now, once we get the government back open, then we can talk about the issues that Democrats are raising, but we can't do that while they are holding the Federal Government hostage to their partisan demands.

Whatever Democrats are saying publicly, I think, privately, they are all well aware of the problems with their current position.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts has said:

Hostage tactics are the last resort for those who can't otherwise win their fights through elections, can't win their fights in Congress, can't win their fights for the Presidency, and can't win their fights in the Courts.

The Democrat leader called shutdowns “a politics of idiocy, of confrontation, of paralysis.”

Mr. President, this shutdown needs to end sooner rather than later, and there is only one way out of it: Democrats need to vote for the clean, nonpartisan continuing resolution sitting right there. All it takes is one rollcall vote—the government is back open. We need to get this government back open, which we can do very, very quickly, and then we can talk about whatever we need to talk about.

Just a few years ago, the Democrat leader had this to say:

We're allowed to come here and disagree over policy. In fact, our system of government was designed to allow for progress despite our large and sometimes raucous differences. But when one side . . . throws a temper tantrum and uses the basic functioning of our government as leverage in a policy argument, our system of government breaks down.

Let's hope the Democrat leader decides to heed his own words and that Democrats' temper tantrum ends sooner rather than later.

Later today, in a couple of hours, Democrats will have another opportunity to vote for the clean continuing resolution, and we will see if they are still committed to their shutdown politics. Republicans remain ready to reopen the government and to get back to doing the American people's business.

How much longer this shutdown lasts depends entirely on Democrats. The choice is theirs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, well, it is day 3 of the Trump shutdown, and the government remains closed because Donald Trump and Republicans insist on raising Americans' healthcare premiums and kicking millions off their insurance.

Sending premiums skyrocketing, as Republicans insist, is fundamentally unsustainable. The American people overwhelmingly support affordable healthcare. Seventy percent of Americans support extending the ACA premium tax credits according to a poll released yesterday by the Washington Post, and another poll by KFF yesterday found that nearly 80 percent support an extension. Guess what. Even a majority of Trump supporters support an extension. Even a majority of Trump supporters—nearly 60 percent—support an extension.

You don't need the polls. Just go into a barbershop. Just go into a diner. Just go into a supermarket and ask people. People are learning about this issue, and they are aghast that their premiums could go up so much. They are aghast that our Republican colleagues don't even want to fix it when it affects so many tens of millions of people and the amount that it goes up is so high—so high. It is not difficult. We know Americans want this, and we know many of my Republican colleagues want this as well.

Failure to act would be devastating, and Republicans know it. Even Donald Trump knows it. He talked about it a little bit with us in the White House when we went a few days back.

If we don't act now, then at least 22 million people will see their healthcare premiums double—double—on average. But for many people, it is even worse than that. If these ACA premium tax credits aren't extended, the average 55-year-old couple making \$85,000 a year would see their premiums not just double but triple—\$25,000 a year. How does a senior citizen—even one who has a little bit of savings and a little bit of a cushion—afford \$25,000 a year?

So that is all Democrats want to fix. We are on the side of the people. People know it and want it and need it. It is not complicated. Americans want it. Republican voters want it.

Democrats remain ready and willing to work with the other side. We are ready to work on a path forward to lower healthcare costs for the American people and fund the Federal Government.

I yield to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

FREEZING GRANTS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am sure that you can agree, having been involved in public service for a large part of your life, that sometimes it takes a long time to make an idea a reality. That has happened many times to me in my public career and, certainly, in my home State.

In 1969, 56 years ago, former Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley proposed extending the Red Line of the Chicago

Transit Authority, and yet, still, to this day, residents of the Far South Side of Chicago don't have that transit option, at least not as they should.

Transportation can make or break not only employment but attending school, even making it to a doctor's appointment. For decades, residents of the Far South Side viewed this extension as just politicians talking.

That changed this past January, when the Federal Transit Administration officially obligated \$1.9 billion in Federal funding for this crucial extension. After waiting over 50 years, it was finally going to be a reality. This project will expand transit access to 100,000 people. It will be an economic boost for the city and create tens of thousands of jobs for working families.

However, guess what: today, a news flash from the Trump administration. We received news that the OMB Director, Russell Vought, and the U.S. Department of Transportation have decided to illegally freeze \$2 billion in grants for Chicago, including the obligated grant for the expansion, and risk decades worth of effort.

This is in addition to the \$7.5 billion in Department of Energy grants Director Vought canceled yesterday, including 33 projects totaling almost \$700 million in Illinois.

So why would this administration decide to target thousands of working families when it comes to their electric bills and when it comes to transportation? Because President Donald Trump wants to punish States like Illinois and the people who live there because they didn't vote for him in the last election.

This is petty. It is unfair. It is wrong.

These vindictive actions will cost Illinoisans jobs. Many of them will lose their employment. And it is going to raise the cost of electricity across the country.

Freezing funds for these projects is a blatant abuse of power by a President and an administration that would rather settle petty personal scores than actually help people.

OMB should immediately release any freeze on these funds, and I will do anything I can, with Senator DUCKWORTH, to hold this administration accountable for its decisions, which continue to hurt working families.

NOMINATION OF STANLEY WOODWARD, JR.

Mr. President, on a separate subject, the upcoming vote on more than 100 nominees is exactly what I feared would happen when Senate Republicans violated Senate rules to fast-track nominees. This has opened the door to rushing through more extreme nominees who have one qualification for office: They are blindly loyal to President Trump.

That extends to a man named Stanley Woodward, the nominee to be the No. 3 official at the Department of Justice.

Let me make this clear: Mr. Woodward is not even close to qualified. He has never—never—worked at the Jus-

tice Department before this administration. What he has done is show his loyalty to Donald Trump by representing Trump associates for their roles in thwarting investigations into the President.

As Associate Attorney General, Mr. Woodward would oversee some of DOJ's most critical programs, including the Office of Justice Programs and the Civil Rights Division. As senior adviser to Attorney General Bondi, Mr. Woodward has already been involved in gutting these offices.

The Trump administration has terminated hundreds of millions of dollars in grants administered by the Office of Justice Programs that support State and local law enforcement. The Trump administration also has gutted the Civil Rights Division, which has been known for years as the "crown jewel" of the Justice Department.

About 70 percent of the Division's attorneys have been forced out—70 percent—and many, many staff have been diverted away from crucial efforts to protect the civil rights of all Americans, so long as they sign up for the mass deportations of the President.

Mr. Woodward also overruled Antitrust Division officials to personally negotiate a settlement with lobbyists in DOJ's challenge to Hewlett Packard's \$14 billion acquisition of Juniper Networks. The acquisition resulted in two firms controlling more than 70 percent of the wireless network market, a market duopoly.

To Trump administration political appointees in the Antitrust Division who objected to this settlement, what happened to them? They were forced out of office. One of them said of the settlement:

[C]orrupt lobbyists with no relevant expertise are perverting actual law enforcement through money, power, relationships, and influence. . . . Stanley Woodward perverted justice and acted inconsistent with the rule of law [in this deal].

I asked Attorney General Bondi about Mr. Woodward's involvement in the scandal. Crickets. No response. Nothing to say.

It is wrong to fast-track unqualified, unfit nominees whose only goal is to advance a political agenda at the expense of the American people. Previous Associate Attorney General nominees have received a rollcall vote on the floor of the Senate and committee, of course.

Take President Biden's nominee for this position, Vanita Gupta. In 2021, Republicans tried to filibuster her nomination in committee and then tried to shut down committee business before we voted.

On the floor, Republicans forced extra procedural votes to slow down our confirmation. Despite my frustration at the time with Republican colleagues for obstructing a highly qualified and experienced nominee to serve as Associate Attorney General, I never sought to short-circuit the constitutional responsibility of Members in the Senate of advice and consent.

Now when the shoe is on the other foot, Republicans are intent on taking away yet another core duty of the Senate in deference to President Trump. I hope they remember this moment when they resume their minority positions in the future.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on these nominations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, we are now in the third day of this government shutdown, and once again, our Democratic colleagues are going to have the opportunity to vote for a clean, nonpartisan continuing resolution that would open the government and allow us to continue working on the appropriations process.

Just to kind of give a little perspective on that, here are the statistics showing all of the Biden-era clean CRs that were passed. There were 13 of them—13 of them during the Biden administration, and 96 percent of the Democrats voted for it. Now they can't vote for a clean resolution. How do you explain that?

Unfortunately, Democratic leadership is demanding more than \$1 trillion in new spending just to keep the government open. So instead of voting for this clean CR, they want more than \$1 trillion in new spending in a CR that—the CR has no Republican priorities in it; it is just a clean CR.

So how is it we are supposed to put trillions of dollars of Democrat priorities in a CR that goes until November 21? That is what Leader SCHUMER has said, and that is exactly why this is the SCHUMER shutdown.

They have taken our government hostage with a list of demands that is really quite astonishing. They want funding for healthcare for illegal immigrants, and they want more subsidies for pandemic-era health insurance, all while actually repealing a \$50 billion healthcare fund for rural hospitals that was put in the One Big Beautiful Bill. How does that make sense? In the meantime, vital programs that support hard-working American families have either been shuttered or are very nearly out of money.

Let's end this Schumer shutdown and pass a clean, short-term CR—the same kind of clean CR, mind you, that, as I said, 96 percent of Democrats voted to support 13 times during the Biden administration. That is what this shows.

Let's pass this clean CR, get back to work, and move our appropriations bills through regular order. That is how we are supposed to do it—through regular order. Already, we have made progress in this Congress by doing just that. The Appropriations Committee has passed 8 of the 12 approps bills on a bipartisan basis. As a matter of fact, we just approved, not too long ago, three of them—one of them was my Ag appropriations bill—by big bipartisan majorities here on the floor in the Senate. Compare that to last Congress,

when Leader SCHUMER refused to allow us to bring any of the appropriations bills to the floor.

In fact, nearly a month ago now, the House requested a formal conference on the three bills that I just referenced that we passed across the floor with large bipartisan majorities, and we are ready to go to conference with them and finish our work on those appropriations bills through regular order, as I just said.

Our majority leader has said very clearly that he is ready to bring Defense appropriations and the Labor-Health bill, which would actually get us up north of 75, maybe even 80 percent of the appropriations process finished. He is ready to bring those two bills to the floor as soon as we are open and operating.

We need to reopen the government to return to our bipartisan appropriations work and get back to conducting the business of the American people.

Another good example is the work we are doing for our ag producers, and I know the Presiding Officer knows about that very well. Every American depends every single day on the high-quality, low-cost food supply that our farmers and ranchers provide.

At the same time, our farmers and ranchers depend on access to markets to ensure they get good prices for the high-quality crops they produce. This is particularly true, for example, for soybean farmers in my State of North Dakota, where we export 90 percent of what we grow—a lot of that going to markets like China.

With harvest season underway, the Trump administration continues to fight for better markets for our farmers and ranchers, but in the meantime, our producers need a bridge to stronger markets and the updated farm safety net which we included as part of the One Big Beautiful Bill.

Due to China's efforts to reduce commodity prices and push up the cost of production, our farmers are having a hard time right now, as you well know.

As the administration works to secure better trade deals for our Nation, it is critical that we don't allow China to use our farmers as a pressure point in those negotiations. That is why I have been working—along with others—with this administration on emergency assistance to bridge that gap while we seek better trade agreements and more export sales for our farmers.

Along with Senate Ag Committee chairman Senator BOOZMAN, we have done a lot of work, and we are ready to go when the President and the Secretary decide it is time to move forward with a plan that will help bridge that gap and keep our producers afloat. Doing so will give the administration's trade team needed leverage in these negotiations with China.

U.S. producers deserve to be treated fairly in the global marketplace, not to be used as a tool by China in their negotiations on fair trade, which we demand.

The administration's efforts are all about securing better trade terms that not only reduce foreign tariffs but eliminate the nontariff trade barriers that other countries use to lock out American farmers and ranchers.

By acting now and providing assistance to our producers during these negotiations, we will send a very strong signal to China that their tactics will not work.

That is how we secure better market access for our producers for the long term. That is exactly what President Trump did in his first term in the negotiations with China. We worked with him on the Market Facilitation Program to keep our farmers in the game. The result was that President Trump secured a \$50 billion agreement from China to purchase our ag commodities.

That is what we are working to do again. So let's get this government back open so we can continue that hard work. You know, that is just one example of the work that needs to get done for the American people.

So, again, we are going to have a vote here in a little bit, and once again, I ask that our Democrat colleagues join with us and vote to get this government open. It is a clean, short-term resolution so that we can do the work of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are 3 days into a government shutdown, and we are in the middle of a healthcare crisis entirely of Republicans' making. A new poll shows that nearly 80 percent of Americans—that is 4 in 5—want Republicans to work with us to stop their premiums from doubling.

So what is the holdup? After all, as we speak, health plans are in the middle of locking in massive rate increases, and those notices will be in the mail any day now.

These are two serious issues facing our country. Yet Trump and Republican leaders are refusing to take any of them seriously. On healthcare, they have decided to shut down the government rather than work with us, and they have decided they would rather make up lies about illegal immigrants than to talk about the actual issue at stake: the reality that Republicans are letting premiums more than double.

News flash: Republican areas are actually going to face some of the biggest price jumps if they refuse to save healthcare.

Small businesses are going to take a hit, not to mention farmers. One-quarter of our farmers are covered on the ACA exchanges, so this healthcare crisis is a big concern for them.

Millions of families across the country are about to see their monthly healthcare costs jump by hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars, and the Republicans' plan here seems to be, I hope no one notices.

That is out of touch. Maybe a couple thousand dollars here and there seems

like no big deal when you take your marching orders from billionaires like Donald Trump, but if Republicans talked to everyday families and fewer rich billionaires, they would understand that the healthcare crisis Republicans are ignoring is going to devastate folks back home.

Millions of people are going to be priced out of their insurance. They will skip their basic healthcare. They will skimp on their medication. They will miss out on lifesaving treatments. It is no exaggeration to say people will die. There is no avoiding that reality, although Republicans seem determined to try.

On the shutdown, Trump and Republican leadership are not taking this seriously. President Trump has made clear that he doesn't see this shutdown as a problem to solve; he sees a shutdown as an opportunity to hurt people. He sees a shutdown as an opening to make good on even more of the awful promises of Project 2025. Trump sees a shutdown as an excuse to harm whoever he wants and do whatever he wants, even and maybe especially if it hurts folks back home.

The Trump administration actually isn't even trying to hide that fact. They are targeting their cuts at blue States, they are talking about canceling Democratic priorities, and they are threatening our constituents if we do not bend the knee.

No one can believe President Trump is serious about ending this shutdown when he is more focused on tweeting out fake sombrero pictures and showing Russ Vought as the Grim Reaper than he is on working on a deal.

No one can believe President Trump seriously cares whether he is hurting everyday Americans when the only thing he is focused on is taking the opportunity to punish the American people with cruel cuts and cruel firings, which don't just hurt Democrats, they hurt his own voters as well.

I should mention that no one can believe Republican leadership is serious about ending the shutdown, either, when Senate Republicans are holding the same vote over and over while refusing to start serious negotiations.

By the way, House Republicans are not even here in town. Instead of talking about addressing healthcare, they are just saying "wait" or "later." Democrats have been waiting. We have been trying to save the healthcare tax credits for months. We cannot wait any longer. "Later" is too late.

The irony of Republicans telling us to wait on healthcare is as rich as the people they shoveled tax breaks on earlier this year, just like the ACA tax credits we are talking about now. Earlier this year, Republicans chose to spend a lot of time here and a lot of effort extending the tax cuts for wealthy CEOs.

Those tax cuts were set to expire at the end of this year, just like the ACA tax credits we are talking about now. What did Republicans do? Did they tell the billionaires to wait? No. Republicans moved Heaven and Earth to save

the tax cuts for those billionaires, but now they won't move a muscle to save families from skyrocketing healthcare costs.

Republican leaders can't be bothered. When billionaires have a tax cut expiring at the end of the year, it is all hands on deck for Republican leadership, even if it means throwing working families overboard with a trillion dollars in healthcare cuts families will need to cover out of their own pocket or go without coverage.

But when healthcare is on the brink, when healthcare premiums are being locked in right now—right now—and when they are going to double for our families, Republicans are nowhere to be found. I mean that literally. House Republicans have not been here all week. They are missing in action. They should be rushing back to work on a solution. But Republican leaders seem to be moving in the opposite direction, forcing a vote on the same failed partisan bill for the fourth time.

Mr. President, we are at the table. We want to be here. We want to find a solution. We want to reopen the government. We want to prevent families' costs from skyrocketing. I hope Republicans decide they are ready to join us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1337

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, earlier this week, I stood here and issued a very clear warning: Vital cyber security protections that have safeguarded our economy, our infrastructure, and our government for over a decade have now expired. For the past 10 years, these safeguards defended against increasingly aggressive and sophisticated cyber security attacks. Without them, there is no question our Nation is at greater risk of a major cyber security breach than ever before.

We didn't have to reach this point. Back in April, Senator ROUNDS and I introduced a clean, bipartisan 10-year extension of these critical—absolutely critical—security authorities. The Trump administration fully supports this effort. They fully support a 10-year extension. Businesses and stakeholders across industries who count on this law want to see a clean 10-year extension.

Over the past few months, we have heard from more than 100 of them urging us to pass legislation that will give them the long-term certainty of these protections. That is a key point, long-term certainty for these protections, so that they defend their systems and protect their customers.

Every single day we delay reauthorizing this law, we leave our hospitals, our power grids, our financial systems, and more increasingly vulnerable to cyber attacks. We must pass this legislation without delay to restore these vital defenses and protect our Nation. I urge my colleagues to immediately address this serious national security risk and pass this clean, long-term extension today.

Mr. President, as if 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. 1337 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and 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 Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, it is good to see that fake outrage is alive and well in the Senate. We have Democrats coming to the floor worried about the government being shut down, although they are the ones that have shut the government down.

Ironically, every Democrat in this body voted for the exact same spending levels that are in this continuing resolution. Last December, these Biden spending levels were put forward by Democrats. Now, you have every Democrat who voted for the spending levels now voting against them without any rhyme or reason or explanation. So, really, to come to the floor and complain about the government shutting down a program when the Senator has every ability to vote in a few minutes to open the government back up is quite fake outrage.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Let's be really clear, this has absolutely nothing to do with annual appropriations whatsoever. It doesn't have to do with the shutdown. This is a law that expired at the end of the fiscal year to protect our cyber security across the country. It is about restoring a law that has been in place for 10 years. It is not about the appropriations process.

This is simply about national security. So to use that as an excuse and to put our country at risk is simply unconscionable, given the broad bipartisan, bicameral support you have in the Senate and in the House and including the strong support from the Trump administration. This is simply irresponsible, and I think you will find it is basically one person standing in the way of providing critical protection for cyber security for the entire country. That is not the way this process is supposed to work.

I would hope folks would come to their senses, and we can provide this essential protection before it is too late.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, Donald Trump is sending \$20 billion not to America but to Argentina. Donald Trump is sending \$20 billion to Argentina to bail out their economy, and he wants to spend \$50 billion to clean up

the mess that he made by starting a trade war that crushed American soybean producers.

Let's be clear about what happened. It is not that the market is temporarily suspended. That market, in some cases, is gone. And during this period of time with—\$20 billion for the country of Argentina and \$50 billion for a tariff bailout—Americans are paying more for absolutely everything. Healthcare premiums for tens of millions of people are going to go up by a lot—not 10 percent, not 20 percent, not 50 percent—114 percent; 24 million Americans, 114 percent.

The bailout for Argentina is particularly absurd. Argentina is not a key security or economic partner. It is an economy that is in such dire shape that there is no guarantee that we will ever get our money back. It is a terrible investment any way you look at it under any circumstances but certainly in the context of Americans seeing their healthcare premiums increase by 114 percent right now.

You then have a separate bailout for American soybean producers totaling close to \$50 billion. And why? Because of the tariffs; because in one fell swoop, they wiped out half of the export market for American soybeans in China, and there is no way you can plug that gap. You can't come up with—I don't know what it would be—112 individual deals to kind of add up to the market-buying power of the PRC.

When you lose a buyer that also happens to be the biggest country in the world, you don't have a lot of options. At best, it is going to take you months or years to cut dozens of smaller deals, and it is not going to add up.

Just to recap, Trump is at the exact same time incinerating \$70 billion of taxpayer money. But what is the one thing that there is not enough money for? You. There is not enough money for you. There is enough money for a \$50 billion tariff bailout; there is enough money for Argentina; but there is not enough money for you.

They don't have enough money to help a family of four that is going to have to pay \$300 more per month to keep their healthcare plan. They have the money to cover for Trump's economic incompetence, but, apparently, they don't have the money to prevent a small business owner or a taxi driver or an early retiree from losing their healthcare.

This is not complicated at all. Donald Trump's economy is already hard as it is because of his choices to create shortages of electricity, of lumber, of food, of healthcare. Electricity prices are going up at twice the rate of inflation. Vegetables are up nearly 40 percent. Grocery prices are at their highest in 3 years now. People are supposed to find hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars to spare every single month or give up their healthcare coverage and hope they don't get sick.

We could end this shutdown right now if Republicans sat down and

worked with us to protect people's healthcare. By the way, the people who are being particularly hurt by these healthcare premium increases live in Republican States. Now, that shouldn't matter, but we are in politics. Just understand, we are standing here fighting for your constituents. If we were a little more cynical, we would let you stew in the most unpopular major legislation that has been passed in generations. But we want to solve this problem, not just for the 24 million people on the so-called exchange but for everybody who is about to see their premiums spike. Let's sit down and fix this.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

MR. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, my position on government shutdowns is pretty well-known. There is absolutely nothing to gain in taking basic government functions hostage for eleventh-hour partisan demands.

I hope our Democratic colleagues will relearn that lesson in short order because the American people have plenty to lose from freezing important functions of the Federal Government. Here in the Senate, the Democrat shutdown is taking time we ought to be spending on important outstanding business, beginning with our obligation to provide for the common defense. In particular, our work to deliver full-year Defense appropriations is not finished.

So I would like to talk briefly about what must come next after interim government funding is extended and what is at stake for our national security. The U.S. military is not immune from the disruptive short-term consequences of a government shutdown. But the long-term consequences of going without robust full-year Defense appropriations are far, far graver.

I offered this warning in the spring when, for the first time, Washington told America's men and women in uniform to conduct today's operations and prepare for tomorrow's threats using yesterday's dollars. We put the national defense on a full-year continuing resolution and forced the military services to function for another year—another year—on the anemic defense budget signed into law by President Biden.

A full-year CR is the enemy of readiness, modernization, and efficiency. The armed services want to make their budgets simpler, more efficient, and more flexible by consolidating budget lines. But they can't do that under a full-year CR.

Punting new appropriations directly contradicts—directly contradicts—the Pentagon's stated goal of building a resilient, surge-ready munitions enterprise. The prohibitions on new program starts under a CR effectively put high-priority service modernization efforts literally on ice.

The administration says it wants “flexible and efficient” investments.

Well, there is nothing flexible, efficient, resilient, or lethal about running the national defense enterprise on a full-year CR, nor will a CR send the consistent signal industry and investors need to pour private capital into the long-overdue expansion of our defense industrial base. If you want to increase our Nation's capacity to produce munitions more quickly and in larger volumes, full-year CRs just might be the worst way to go about it.

I don't mean to sound overly alarmed. God willing, the House-passed, short-term funding extension will give Congress enough time to deliver full-year appropriations and release our military from the constraints of the Biden fiscal year 2024 budget. But I want our colleagues to understand what is at stake this fall.

The President has set some ambitious, important, and overdue priorities for America's national security, and none of them—none of them—come cheap: the Golden Dome for America, an American shipbuilding renaissance, sixth-generation stealth fighter aircraft, the long-overdue modernization of our nuclear force. Reconciliation isn't enough to support these major efforts, and neither is a perpetual freeze at the Biden fiscal year 2024 level.

Reviving the warrior ethos, rebuilding the military, reestablishing deterrence—these are priorities we hear about all the time from the President's advisers. I certainly have no problem with rowing in that direction. I am all for high standards of physical fitness, but pushups alone—pushups alone—aren't going to stop Chinese hypersonic missiles. The next major conflict will likely be a test of lethality at very long distances.

That is why I have spent years urging successive administrations to rebuild—rebuild—our global power projection and long-range fires. It is why I criticized the Biden administration for talking about China as the “pacing threat” but turning in defense budget requests that didn't even keep pace with inflation.

The administration cannot afford to make this same mistake. So, this week, I was encouraged to hear Secretary Hegseth proclaim a “Trump buildup” in the mold of the Reagan buildup that helped end the Cold War. For the record, my fellow defense appropriators and I have been ready to deliver such a buildup since day one, and our bipartisan bill speaks for itself in putting money where our mouth is.

Ah, but here is the rub: We can only make it happen if the administration moves from words to action, and an important step in that process is the national defense strategy.

Historically, the national defense strategy is what administrations use to define threats, identify objectives, and propose coherent plans for aligning resources to actually meet them. But this time around, the stakes are a lot higher. A shortsighted NDS that doesn't align with the President's vi-

sion of American greatness and peace through strength could wind up as the pretext to extend Biden-era constraints on our military indefinitely.

Unfortunately, early reports suggest that this risk may be real and that the NDS may turn out eerily similar to the rhetoric of Obama-era officials' who viewed their remit as managing America's decline amid a transition to a multipolar world.

If the NDS ignores the importance of maintaining American primacy, fails to account for the global nature of competition with China, or discounts the value of supporting and integrating allies and partners, it would risk further sabotaging the President's efforts to restore peace through strength.

So I will be interested to read how the Department is applying the lessons and dividends of security cooperation with allies and partners to looming challenges, how it plans to address critical munitions shortages even as its fiscal year 2026 request and reconciliation investment fails to maximize existing production capacity, and how it accounts for the increased likelihood of simultaneous conflict in multiple theaters.

If the administration means what it says about restoring deterrence, it would recognize how plans to reduce security cooperation with frontline NATO allies invite more brazen Russian incursions into the alliance's territory and airspace; it would recognize how China is watching closely for signs of weakening American commitments to European allies, to Ukraine, or to AUKUS partners.

Of course, responsible senior officials who understood the dividends of security cooperation would not have tried an end run around the President to freeze assistance to Ukraine. They certainly would have appreciated that cutting off intelligence sharing to the world's foremost experts in drone warfare might make it harder for the U.S. military to achieve drone dominance.

On that count, I was encouraged earlier this week that the President himself green-lit an expansion of the intelligence cooperation that members of his administration had actually wanted to end.

As our colleagues will recall, the President observed last month that Ukraine can win—the President said Ukraine can win—and unlike some of his advisers, the American people are indicating in clear majorities that they think we ought to help.

By one recent poll, more than 6 in 10 Americans support—support—sending more arms and military supplies to help Ukraine win. That includes—listen to this: A clear majority of Republicans support helping Ukraine. And the recent voting history of the House of Representatives indicates that poll isn't a fluke. Last month, House Republicans voted overwhelmingly—House Republicans voted overwhelmingly—to reject an amendment to the NDAA that would have barred further

assistance to Ukraine. Listen to this: 72 percent of House Republicans—72 percent of House Republicans—including House leadership, said that continuing to arm Ukraine's defense was a good idea.

So the public is behind it. Republicans in Congress are behind it. We know it is the right thing to do.

Ultimately, the President knows that money talks. He understands that valuable things are expensive. What is true in property development is also true in military procurement. There is no way around it. Take the Golden Dome for example. Building anything close to a continental missile defense shield will, by reasonable estimates, cost several times more than was allocated this year in one-off reconciliation spending, every year, for decades to come.

If the Pentagon isn't even planning to max out its budget request for procuring critical munitions in the short term, why on Earth should our adversaries take any talk of long-term missile defense seriously? Likewise, why should they take American airpower seriously if we are only willing to develop sixth-generation stealth fighters for the Air Force but not for the Navy?

What good are multibillion-dollar aircraft carriers if we are not prepared to equip them with aircraft that can survive modern warfare?

At home and abroad, I am concerned that too many of the President's advisers are unwilling to acknowledge the gap between his stated priorities and what they are prepared to invest to achieve them. If you ask me, the name on the front door at the Pentagon matters a great deal less than whether the services inside are equipped and prepared to deter and win wars, and we are facing real, glaring gaps in critical capabilities.

The ink was barely dry on the One Big Beautiful Bill when senior Pentagon officials began to report to my colleagues and I on the Appropriations Committee that they still faced significant funding shortfalls. Given the high pace of operations in the Middle East and in the Western Hemisphere, it is safe to assume these costs are only going to continue to rise.

So there is a lot going on around this building, but, soon, I hope our colleagues will have an opportunity to go on record in favor of investing in peace through strength. We will have a chance to put our money where our mouth is on reestablishing deterrence and rebuilding the force required to back it up. Our investments in the common defense are a signal of our national resolve.

When the American people spoke last November, I don't think they meant for their leaders to mail in a third year of anemic—anemic—Biden-era top lines. I don't think the President assembled his policy and budget advisers with a mind to punt in the face of looming threats. When he hired civilian Pentagon leaders to restore deter-

rence, I think he meant more than just threatening adversaries with a catchy line on camera; I think he meant building the force that threatens them with its very existence.

So if the administration wants a Trump buildup, then let's build one, and once the Democrats' shutdown is over, let's start with serious, increased, full-year investments in our national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MOODY). The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, America is now in the middle of the Schumer shutdown. Two in three Americans oppose it. Democrats are holding the American people hostage. They are demanding \$1.5 trillion in new spending, and that is just to keep the government open for 4 short weeks. That amounts to \$48 billion a day.

Here is what the Democrats are demanding. They are demanding more taxpayer-funded healthcare for illegal immigrants. At the same time, they are taking away money from vulnerable hospitals in rural communities in my State and in yours.

Under Joe Biden, Democrats opened our borders. Ten million illegal immigrants flooded across. Under CHUCK SCHUMER, Democrats have now closed the government. They did it to give free healthcare to illegal immigrants.

Meanwhile, Democrats are demanding the repeal of \$50 billion of the rural hospital fund. This has been set aside as a lifesaver for our small community hospitals. That is who this fund has been set up to help, like the one I was at last week, in Pinedale, WY.

It is our first hospital in the county, ever. The closest hospital is 85 miles away. This is a needed, vital resource in rural Wyoming.

In addition, Democrats are demanding \$350 billion in permanent new spending for Biden's bonus COVID payments. They created these payments in 2021. They promised they would be temporary. They said they are there for the COVID emergency only. They extended them once so they would end at the end of this year. Clearly, COVID is over, and now they want these Biden bonus COVID payments to become permanent, to go on forever.

These payments are riddled with waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption. We have seen it. We have documented evidence.

Unlike most insurance, there are no premiums, there are no deductibles. Democrats also removed the income limit. The money goes straight from the government to the insurance companies. The bill goes directly to the hard-working American taxpayers.

The Democrats' price to reopen the government is all of those things I have mentioned, plus more.

What we are doing as Republicans is proposing to reopen the government for 7 weeks at the current funding levels. The House has already passed it. Republicans and Democrats have voted for it in the House and in the Senate. President Trump is ready to sign it.

It takes 60 votes in the Senate to reopen the government. We have voted repeatedly over the past several days. Each time, a few level-headed Democrats have joined Republicans in the vote. It is time for more Democrats to join us today.

There is only one person standing in the way, and that is the minority leader. He is holding the American people hostage. He fears retribution from the radical, socialist left. It is easy to see why. The radical socialist left—including Senator SANDERS, Senator WARREN, and AOC—they have become the Democrat leaders in this shutdown. They are the ones running the party.

While the government is stuck in this Schumer shutdown, the people paying the price are the American families. Veterans will face longer wait times for appointments. Members of the military and Border Patrol agents will continue to protect our Nation, but they will do it without pay. Some wildfire prevention, which is critical this time of the year, will stop. Wildland firefighters will remain on the job unpaid. Mothers will lose access to vital programs that help feed their children. Sick patients on Medicare and Medicaid may lose home healthcare services. Small business owners will not receive new Federal loans because the Small Business Administration is unable, during a shutdown, to process them.

The American people, all across this country, are feeling the pain of the Schumer shutdown. Their request is simple. They are asking Senate Democrats to do what they have done 13 times under Joe Biden—to vote for a clean continuing resolution that will reopen the government. All it takes is a few more Democrats—people who are willing to put the country first.

We are about to vote today on another clean continuing resolution, like the Democrats did 13 times when Joe Biden was in the White House, and that is the one to reopen the government. Republicans are going to vote for it.

Democrats have the opportunity today, in just a few short minutes, to do the right thing for the American people. Let's see if they do.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, here we go again. Three days ago, Democrats voted against a stopgap spending bill that would keep the government open for the benefit of 320 million American citizens. But because they voted against it, we are now in a government shutdown—something that should be a profound embarrassment to them, as it is to the rest of us who believe we were sent here to govern, not

to shut down the government and deny our own constituents access to the services that government necessarily provides in some cases.

If you listen to the media—not all of the media, but some of the media, particularly the sympathetic, leftwing media—you might think otherwise. But make no mistake about it. The blame for this government shutdown lies squarely on the Senate Democrats' shoulders.

Three Democrats voted to reopen the government the last time we voted, and other Democrats—we need five more—will have a chance to vote here in just a few minutes to reopen the government and to stop this charade.

But the facts of the matter are pretty straightforward. The reason we are in a government shutdown is because Senate Democrats refuse to vote for what is known around here as a clean continuing resolution, a clean CR.

As I mentioned, this is a stopgap procedure so we can then finish the work of the appropriations bills by November and, hopefully, pass bipartisan funding bills that will last for the remainder of the fiscal year, while we are doing other important work as well—hopefully, a National Defense Authorization bill; hopefully, other important legislation.

So why hold 320 million Americans hostage by denying them the benefits that their government is providing by shutting down the government? Why in the world would you do that?

I think, primarily, that this is because our friends on the other side of the aisle are afraid of their base supporters. We know that last time, the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, the Senator from New York, agreed to a short-term CR, which we did 13 previous times because it is a stopgap spending bill. The last time he agreed to a continuing resolution, he was pummeled by his Democratic base, and he is worried that if he does that again, without shutting down the government, without showing some fight, he will be ousted out of his position as a Democratic leader and maybe even defeated in his next primary election by ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, AOC.

But let's consider the consequences of this shutdown for some of the most vulnerable Americans, our seniors who rely on the Medicare hospital-at-home program and telehealth. Because of the government shutdown, CMS no longer has the authority to reimburse certain telehealth services.

Most of us were not particularly acquainted with telehealth before COVID, but Congress decided to reimburse healthcare providers for providing virtual visits with your doctors. In some cases, that is all people needed access to. So it is an important adjunct or supplement to our healthcare system. But that is no longer available because of the shutdown.

This will have a particularly severe impact on patients without access to reliable transportation, who will not be

able to see their doctor unless they can get access to telehealth.

Additionally, providers who participated in the Medicare hospital-at-home program no longer have the authority to deliver inpatient-level care in patients' homes. I know we are all concerned about the costs of healthcare, but if you can treat people in their homes, that is obviously a better place for the patient, and it is less costly healthcare. But that authority expired with the shutdown of the Federal Government. This means some of our most vulnerable Americans, sick and bedridden seniors, have been left without care or were unexpectedly forced to be transported to overcrowded hospitals when it may not be in their best interest to actually engage in that transport.

These are just examples of the real-life consequences of the unnecessary shutdown imposed on the American people by Senate Democrats, holding the American people hostage for their partisan political demands, which I will get to in a moment.

Democrats want Americans to believe that this is just about healthcare. They know that the particular healthcare benefit that they are most concerned about is a COVID-era plus-up of the Affordable Care Act's subsidies that were started back during the Biden administration. So even if these plussed-up benefits were to expire, people would not be denied the access to the Affordable Care Act if they happened to have a policy using that particular program.

So there is no imminent threat to these people or anyone else if we don't address it in the context of this shutdown. So it is a made-up crisis. We know that these provisions expire at the end of this calendar year, and there will be time—and we will take the time—to deal with those, as we should. But based on many of the stories of waste, fraud, and abuse associated with these plussed-up, COVID-era Biden subsidies for the Affordable Care Act, there is an important reason why we should take our time and look at these and reform them where necessary, and that is what we intend to do.

If Senate Democrats really cared about ensuring that the most vulnerable patients in America got access to healthcare, they would never have shut down the government. This shutdown is obviously not about healthcare if they are actually making healthcare worse by shutting down the government. It is simply a way for the Democratic leader to posture at length for his far-left progressive base.

It is unconscionable, if you think about it, that Democrats are holding the American people hostage and some of the very people they claim to be helping get access to healthcare. Yet they are framing it as though, somehow, Republicans are forcing partisan demands.

But the House has already passed a continuing resolution. The only thing

stopping this from making its way to President Trump's desk is a vote in the Senate. And we need 60 votes in the Senate, under Senate rules, and, right now, three Democrats have joined with virtually all Republicans to vote for this continuing resolution, which only will take us to November 20, to give us time to do the other appropriations bills that I mentioned a moment ago.

But the reason why I call the Democrats' demand a partisan wish list is because they are asking for the Sun and the Moon.

First of all, starting with their proposal, anybody listening is reminded of the fact that we just recently passed the One Big Beautiful Bill—since rebranded to the “Working Families Tax Cut Act.” But the proposal made by the Democrats in their alternative continuing resolution says they want to repeal it. They want to repeal the One Big Beautiful Bill, which cut taxes for every American, doubled the child tax credit, and provided innumerable benefits to the American people primarily by avoiding about a \$3,000 tax increase per family. They want to repeal it.

One of the provisions we made in that bill was to limit illegal aliens' access to Medicaid because some States were gaming the Medicaid Program. Not to get bogged down in the details too much, but this is a State-Federal program, and under the Affordable Care Act, the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the Medicaid.

Now, Democrats say: Well, it is illegal to provide free healthcare to illegal aliens under existing law, and it is. But what Democrats were doing in places like California, they were using that 10 percent State share to fund healthcare services for illegal aliens. And the One Big Beautiful Bill, the Working Families Tax Cut Act, put an end to that. So Democrats want to repeal that bill.

They also want to repeal the \$50 billion rural healthcare stabilization fund. Texas is a big State. We have urban areas; we have suburbs; and we have rural areas. We need to make sure that people living in rural areas—or, certainly, outside of urban and suburban areas—get access to healthcare. One of the things we did in the One Big Beautiful Bill is provide a \$50 billion stabilization fund to make sure they could get access to healthcare. But Democrats want to give that away. They want to repeal that bill in its entirety.

I have heard Democrats on TV and on social media say: We don't want to provide free healthcare to illegal aliens. But again, this is the provision that they want to change. They want to repeal this provision, “Alien Medicaid Eligibility,” which limited the ability to game the Medicaid Program, the State contribution to a State-Federal shared program to fund healthcare for illegal aliens.

Now, we know that there are a lot of reasons why people come to the country—our country—illegally. Many are drawn because they want to work. We

understand they want a better life. We understand that. But the right way to do that is through legal channels, not through illegal channels. But one of the magnets that draws people to come to the country is access to taxpayer-provided free benefits, like free healthcare.

But the States like California that game the Medicaid system are the worst offenders when it comes to providing free access to healthcare using this Medicaid Program. But this is the provision that Democrats now want to repeal, the prohibition we passed in the One Big Beautiful Bill, the Working Families Tax Cut Act.

What is more, Democrats are asking us to spend billions of dollars in new spending because they won't vote for a stopgap spending measure. So we know that the Affordable Care Act subsidies—in other words, ObamaCare—are enormously expensive.

I won't spend much time here talking about the false promises upon which ObamaCare was sold: If you like your policy, you can keep it; if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor; and actually the claim that it lowered healthcare expenditures. None of that was true. And Democrats want to put those subsidies on steroids through the Biden-era, COVID, supercharged subsidy program. And they want to do it not just temporarily; they want to do it for the next 10 years, which will result in hundreds of billions—even a trillion-dollar-plus—of new spending.

Now, one of the things that we did in the One Big Beautiful Bill was we passed \$400 billion in deficit reduction. Why is that important? Because our country now owes roughly \$37 trillion. We are \$37 trillion in debt. And if we don't do something about that, we are going to be in deep trouble in the not-too-distant future. Right now, we pay more money on interest on the national debt than we do on defense, in a very dangerous world. That is unsustainable, and that is dangerous.

But the Democrats want to forget all that and spend hundreds of billions of dollars in new spending on a short-term, 9-week stopgap spending measure. And they say: If you won't agree with us, we are going to shut down the government.

The kind of spending Democrats have asked for would effectively erase all the savings we achieved through the commonsense spending reforms in the One Big Beautiful Bill. It is unconscionable that Senate Democrats are hurting the American people because they want more spending for their pet programs. Yet they are framing it as though Republicans are the ones forcing partisan demands.

That is false. All we are asking them to do is to keep the government open and pass the short-term continuing resolution that has already been passed by the House of Representatives.

The Democratic leader said, 2 days ago, on the floor:

Republicans have tried to stick us with a partisan CR that fails to protect Americans' healthcare.

Three days ago, the vice chair of the Appropriations Committee said:

Instead of talking with us about addressing healthcare . . . Republicans decided to pass a partisan continuing resolution.

Again, that is false. They said they don't want to fund illegal aliens. They say it is a partisan continuing resolution we insist on. Both of those are false. The continuing resolution proposed by Republicans has already passed the House of Representatives. It does not include partisan demands.

If Democrats do not want to pass a clean continuing resolution, what are they proposing? Well, a partisan continuing resolution. And I have talked about some of the provisions. The alternative continuing resolution that Democrats are proposing would not only repeal the One Big Beautiful Bill, effectively, but they make other partisan demands on top of that. The Democrat CR would eliminate provisions of the One Big Beautiful Bill that are critical to putting our fiscal condition back on track, as I mentioned a moment ago.

In the Medicaid Program, we tightened eligibility. We added work requirements for able-bodied adults. We required stricter eligibility reporting and ensured that illegal immigrants do not get free healthcare benefits. The One Big Beautiful Bill was a critical step toward ensuring that Medicaid is there for the people who truly need it: the elderly, children, the disabled, not able-bodied adults.

Democrats have claimed over and over again they are not attempting to fund healthcare for illegal aliens, but as I have demonstrated, that is not true. Their proposed continuing resolution repeals the exact provisions of the One Big Beautiful Bill that prevented illegal aliens from receiving those benefits.

Just for those who want to read it for themselves, this is section 2141 of the Democrats' proposed continuing resolution. It strikes section 71109 of the One Big Beautiful Bill. This is a provision that limits eligibility requirements and Federal payments to States that allow medical assistance for illegal aliens.

Medicaid has always been intended to be a lifeline to the most vulnerable Americans when it comes to their health insurance, but over the last decades it has become bloated with waste, fraud, and abuse. We cannot continue to serve the most vulnerable Americans for whom Medicaid was originally designed if we are going to be subsidizing other people, like able-bodied adults, who should be capable of contributing themselves. Further, extending these subsidies without reform would continue contributing to the ballooning costs of healthcare, now roughly 18 percent of our entire economy.

This is the same problem we have had with ballooning costs in higher education. The more the government subsidizes, the more bloated that industry becomes; and, consequently, the

providers raise prices, and those services become less affordable to ordinary middle-class Americans who would not otherwise rely on government benefits.

The Republican reforms to Medicaid in the One Big Beautiful Bill put the most vulnerable Americans first, but Democrats have refused to vote for a clean continuing resolution and, instead, demanded that Republicans repeal these monumental reforms before allowing the lights to stay on.

Democrats are also demanding to extend the enhanced Affordable Care Act subsidies, which are really Obamacare on steroids, which don't even expire until the end of this year. We will get to that, believe me, before the end of the year, but to hold this short-term stopgap spending bill hostage is really unconscionable.

To anyone who says that Republicans are proposing a partisan continuing resolution while Democrats are doing everything they can to keep the government open, I hope I have made it clear that the reality is just the opposite. Republicans do not want a shutdown.

Shutdowns don't benefit anybody, and the same problem that caused the government to shut down is there staring you in the face when government is reopened. I think we have learned that from hard experience.

A poison pill-packed continuing resolution is simply not the solution. So I hope we can get five more Democrats to join three other Democrats who have already voted to keep the government open to vote this afternoon in just a few minutes and reopen the government for the benefit of all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak up to 10 minutes prior to the scheduled roll-call vote.

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

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF CHOOSE RESPECT DAY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I am here on the floor today to ask unanimous consent to pass a very important resolution that I try to move forward every year. It is my Choose Respect Day resolution.

I want to thank Senator SCHIFF, my lead cosponsor on the other side of the aisle. And it is to kick off also Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

As a former AG like myself, this is really important to me and my State. I come down on the floor a lot to brag about the great State of Alaska in so many different areas, but this is one area where I don't like to brag about Alaska because there is not much to brag about. We have some of the highest rates of domestic violence and sexual assault than anyplace in the country—really bad.

So when I was attorney general a number of years ago, the Governor and I launched this big initiative called the Choose Respect Initiative. We changed the laws. We made perpetrators really pay if they were going to commit these heinous crimes in Alaska.

We got funding for lawyers and resources. We got different services, and we had ads all over TV in Alaska about choosing respect—real Alaska men choose respect; they don't commit these heinous acts; they don't hit their girlfriend; they don't do any of that kind of horrible stuff.

And it started to work in my State, to change the culture, which wasn't a good culture in Alaska. We are still doing that. So when I came to the Senate, I really wanted to continue this work. It is really important work—it has been bipartisan—to try to change the culture in our country.

We have very, very high rates—too high rates—of domestic violence and sexual assault in many places in America. We should all be focused on making sure the next generation of young men don't do that.

So one of the ways in which we have done that is my POWER Act, which has been to get pro bono legal services for domestic violence survivors and victims. This is an innovative idea that we started in Alaska and brought here to the Senate.

The POWER Act now has had over 61,000 attorneys across America provide pro bono legal assistance to survivors—61,000. That was from a bill here we had on the Senate floor. These are the kind of things we can do in the Senate, in the Congress, to address this very significant challenge in my State and across the country.

So this resolution builds on what we are doing across the board on many of the different Choose Respect initiatives that I have brought to the Congress in a bipartisan way over the years. It calls upon all of us to mark Choose Respect Day by teaching our youth about healthy relationships, supporting survivors, honoring those we have lost, and recommitting ourselves to the fundamental truth that every person deserves to live in freedom from violence and fear.

The call to choose respect is simple but powerful: If we live by it not just on October 1, as the resolution calls for, we can break the cycle of abuse, strengthen families, and build a safer, more respectful country.

I think, at this point right now in our Nation's history, we could all use that. I urge my colleagues to join me in passing this resolution. Together, let's honor survivors, remember victims, and choose respect in all we do.

Madam President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 431, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 431) supporting the goals and objectives of Choose Respect Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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 table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 431) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EN BLOC NOMINATIONS

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I am very hopeful that my colleagues here will move forward on this bipartisan, clean continuing resolution so we can get our government open again.

I do want to just explain to the American people and maybe some of our friends in the media a little dirty secret that is going on down here on the Senate floor. A lot of my Democratic colleagues are getting frustrated, not with us—not with us. We have had three already cross over and vote with us. There are a lot more who want to do it.

They are frustrated because they know we have got to reopen the government. They know this is the way to do it, a simple, bipartisan, clean continuing resolution. We have been doing this all the time here in the Senate. We have done it over 10 times during the Biden administration on the Republican side, but there is frustration.

I will give you my sense of why there is frustration on the Democrat side. Usually, in this place, when you run for leader—Democrat leader, Republican leader—and you are in leadership, there is kind of an unwritten rule that the leader will protect the broader membership and broader Members—on votes and different things. That is kind of what leadership is about.

This is the first time I have seen in my entire time here in the U.S. Senate where, on the Democrat side, the broader membership seems to be protecting just the leader. We all know why. He is worried about his left flank; worried about getting primaried.

So my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are getting frustrated, not with us. They know this is the right way to do it.

They are getting frustrated because they think they are having to protect their leader. This isn't the way it works—is supposed to work here. The minority leader previously called blocking a clean, bipartisan CR to get bigger demands from their side "political idiocy."

What we are viewing right now is a lot of political idiocy coming from the other side, and my colleagues on the

Democratic side are really starting to get frustrated, not with us but with their own leader.

I am hoping on this vote, in the next hour or so, for the American people, for the institution of the U.S. Senate, we have a couple more Democrat Senators who have the courage to break with the political idiocy we see right now on their side.

Vote with us. Reopen the government. They know it is the right thing to do. I hope that happens.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S. RES. 412

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question occurs on adoption of the resolution.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 541 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|-------|------|-------|
| Coons | Cruz | Moran |
|-------|------|-------|

The resolution (S. Res. 412) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in the RECORD of September 18 (legislative day, September 16), 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS AND OTHER MATTERS ACT, 2026

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

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

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

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

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The 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 K. Hirono, Jeanne Shaheen, Tammy Baldwin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Ben Ray Luján, Brian Schatz, Sheldon Whitehouse, Michael F. Bennet, Christopher Murphy.

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

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

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 542 Ex.]

YEAS—46

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

NAYS—52

| | | |
|-----------|---------|---------|
| Banks | Boozman | Capito |
| Barrasso | Britt | Cassidy |
| Blackburn | Budd | Collins |

| | | |
|--------|------------|------------|
| Cornyn | Hyde-Smith | Ricketts |
| Cotton | Johnson | Risch |
| Cramer | Justice | Rounds |
| Cruz | Kennedy | Schmitt |
| Curtis | Lankford | Scott (FL) |
| Daines | Lee | Scott (SC) |
| Hawley | Lummis | Sheehy |
| Hoeven | Marshall | Sullivan |
| Husted | Fischer | Thune |
| | McConnell | Tillis |
| | Grassley | Tuberville |
| | Hagerty | Moreno |
| | Hawley | Wicker |
| | Mullin | Young |
| | Murkowski | |
| | Paul | |

NOT VOTING—2

Coons Moran

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, and the nays are 52.

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 5371.

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

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 5371.

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

The motion was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371, a bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, 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.

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

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 543 Exec.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—2

Coons Moran

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCORMICK). On this vote, the yeas are 54, and the nays are 44.

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING JANE GOODALL

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Jane Goodall, whose pioneering scientific research on the behavior of chimpanzees and decades of tirelessly circling the globe to build support for the protection of endangered wildlife and the global environment are unmatched in human history. Jane died on October 1, at the age of 91. I am one of the innumerable people

who had enormous admiration for her and who hoped that somehow she might live forever.

Jane Goodall recognized early in her life that protecting nature is first and foremost about educating and motivating human beings, on whom the survival of all other species depends. That became her life's mission, and she also never stopped advocating for the ethical treatment of animals, as embodied in the Captive Primate Safety Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

Her passing touches the hearts of countless millions of people of every generation on every continent. She was an extraordinary role model for young people of all nationalities and inspired many to seek careers in scientific discovery. Despite the increasing destruction of the Earth's environment caused by humans' ever-increasing demand for natural resources, she never lost hope in our collective ability to save the planet. We owe her immense gratitude for devoting her life to ensuring that we don't lose hope either.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN TAMERA BREWER

• Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, serving others takes on many different forms. For many of Alabama's veterans, their hometowns inspired them to pursue military service. And those strong upbringings and deep hometown roots often lead them to continue serving, even after their time in the military ends.

That is true for CPT Tamara Brewer of Marion. Growing up in Mobile, she saw firsthand the hardships our coastal communities endure when natural disasters strike. Tamara enlisted in the Alabama Army National Guard with a desire to help her fellow Americans. She had no idea that 9/11 would happen shortly after she entered basic training. Seeing terrorists attack our country made her desire to protect and serve even stronger.

Tamara was deployed to serve on the forefront of the war against terror, in Iraq, in 2008. For a year, she valiantly served as the headquarters company commander, where she received a Bronze Star for her brave leadership. After finishing her time in the Middle East, Tamara came back home to Marion where she continued finding ways to serve, particularly Alabamians living in the Blackbelt.

Sadly, Tamara was also faced with another challenge to overcome. She developed lung failure from her injuries in Iraq, causing her to retire in 2013. She uses her medical retirement as a new way to serve her neighbors, advocating for Alabama's veterans and inspiring Alabama's youth. Her husband of 25 years Scott and her son Grayson have encouraged and empowered her to use her talents in every way possible.

Tamara has been a part of countless efforts to solidify the Marion Military

Institute as a premiere military college in the country. Whether through working with the VFW Post 5104 to tell Alabama's World War II veterans' stories, serving on the Alabama Military Hall of Honor Board, or working with the Marion Military Institute's junior golf program to engage youth in the region, Tamara is undoubtedly impacting countless lives.

Tamara is a huge advocate for art therapy—finding solace in her photography, graphic design, and any outlet she can find to use her creativity for the betterment of those around her. She has designed various logos for Alabama businesses and helped capture Alabamians' important milestones such as weddings and graduations.

It is my honor to recognize her as the October Veteran of the Month.●

REMEMBERING SUE HECHT

• Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Sue Hecht, a distinguished public servant, trailblazer, and protector, from Frederick, MD, who passed away on September 23, 2025.

Born in Takoma Park on December 7, 1947, Sue devoted her life to public service and community betterment. She was a proud graduate of Hood College and later earned her M.B.A. from Frostburg State University. Before entering elected office, she worked as a freelance writer, a program specialist with the Frederick Job Training Agency, and most notably as the executive director of Heartly House, Inc., a non-profit dedicated to supporting victims of domestic violence. These early roles shaped her lifelong commitment to giving voice to the vulnerable and building systems of care.

Sue was first elected to the Maryland House of Delegates in 1994 where we served together briefly. She was re-elected to her position in 1998. During her time in the statehouse, she served on numerous committees, including appropriations. In her second term, she was appointed as deputy majority whip—a testament to her skill and her initiative. Sue was well known in Annapolis and back home in Frederick for her leadership, compassion, and steadfast support of her colleagues.

Sue also served as a leader among women legislators, rising to become president of the Women Legislators of Maryland. She was deeply committed to ensuring that women's voices were represented in every policy discussion and that issues affecting families, from childcare to healthcare to workplace fairness, received the attention they deserved.

In her leadership roles with Heartly House and the house of delegates, Sue fiercely fought for better resources for her constituents and did so with grace and humility. She held numerous positions with a variety of organizations including the Maryland Commission for Women, the Frederick County Affordable Housing Commission, the

Family Violence Council, the Frederick County Consortium of Human Service Providers, and the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence. Her contributions were widely recognized, earning her honors such as the Dorothy Beatty Memorial Award from the Women's Law Center of Maryland, recognition as one of Maryland's Top 100 Women, and the Consumer Legislator of the Year Award from the Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition.

Above all, Sue will be remembered as a mother, a wife, a friend, and an inspiration. She is survived by her daughter Shannon Aleshire, who followed in her footsteps of public service as the CEO of the Mental Health Association of Frederick County.

Maryland has lost a fierce advocate for the most vulnerable among us. Sue was a legislator of impact, a leader of courage, and a neighbor whose legacy will endure in Frederick, across Maryland, and beyond. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending condolences to Sue's family and in honoring the indelible impact she made in Frederick County and across Maryland.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1934. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pistachios Grown in California, Arizona, and New Mexico; Decreased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-SC-24-0021) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1935. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Increased Assessment Rate for Fresh Pears" (Docket No. AMS-SC-24-0045) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1936. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation" (RIN0790-AL30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1937. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Limitation on Certain Institutes of Higher Education (DFARS Case 2024-D023)" (RIN0750-AM20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1938. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “TRICARE Coverage of Clinical Trials and Termination of Expanded Access Treatments” (RIN0720-AB83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1939. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Assessing Contractor Implementation of Cybersecurity Requirements (DFARS Case 2019-D041)” (RIN0750-AK81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1940. A communication from the Army Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Environmental Analysis of Army Actions (AR 200-2)” (RIN0702-AB02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1941. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Thresholds (DFARS Case 2024-D002)” (RIN0750-AL99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1942. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Preventing Conflicts of Interest for Certain Consulting Services (DFARS Case 2024-D007)” (RIN0750-AM04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1943. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Technical Amendments” (Docket DARS-2025-0001) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1944. A communication from the Congressional and Public Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Relaxing Export Controls for Syria” (RIN0694-AK28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1945. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Acceleration of Effectiveness of Registration Statements of Issuers with Certain Mandatory Arbitration Provisions” (RIN3235-AN55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1946. A communication from the Congressional and Public Affairs Specialist, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of

Validated End-User Authorizations in the People’s Republic of China” (RIN0694-AK32) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1947. A communication from the Acting President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a nomination for a position covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 for the position of First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1948. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Housing Programs, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to action on a nomination for a position covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 for the position of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1949. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of a Proclamation with respect to action to adjust imports of timber and lumber and their derivative products (collectively, wood products) so that such imports will not threaten to impair the national security of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 2968. A bill to ensure access to certain public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 2969. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide that State law shall apply to the use of motor vehicles on roads within a System unit; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 2970. A bill to authorize the use of off-highway vehicles in certain areas of the Capitol Reef National Park, Utah; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHEEHY:

S. 2971. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to exclude from the definition of “transporting gas” certain movement of gas within, or in the vicinity of, a plant, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mrs. MOODY):

S. 2972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced excise tax rate for portable, electronically-aerated bait containers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORENO:

S. 2973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a daily tax on members of Congress during a lapse in appropriations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH:

S. 2974. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require taxpayers claiming the child and earned income tax credits, and their qualifying children, to have a valid social security number for employment purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JUSTICE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HUSTED):

S. Res. 430. A resolution designating October 4, 2025, as “National Energy Appreciation Day” to celebrate the people who work to power the United States and the economy of the United States and to build awareness of the important role that the energy producers of the United States play in reducing poverty, strengthening national security, and improving the quality of life for people around the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. Res. 431. A resolution supporting the goals and objectives of Choose Respect Day; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 88

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 88, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 556

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 556, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in logistical transactions and sanctions evasion relating to oil, gas, liquefied natural gas, and related petrochemical products from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 701

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSBOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Veteran Family Resource Program, and for other purposes.

S. 736

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 736, a bill to increase the penalty for prohibited provision of a phone in a correctional facility, and for other purposes.

S. 978

At the request of Mrs. MOODY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to amend the National Housing Act to establish a mortgage insurance program for first responders, and for other purposes.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) 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. 1406

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the payment method for oxygen and oxygen related equipment, supplies, and services, to increase beneficiary access to oxygen and oxygen related equipment, supplies, and services, and for other purposes.

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to nonprofit entities to assist such entities in carrying out programs to provide service dogs to eligible veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2309

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2309, a bill to direct a physician or nurse practitioner employed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certify the death of a veteran not later than 48 hours after such physician or nurse practitioner learns of such death, and for other purposes.

S. 2429

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2429, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to ensure the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection retains adequate resources to ensure fair, transparent, and competitive markets for financial products and services for consumers and to provide for whistleblower incentives and protection.

S. 2621

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for State-based maternal mortality review committees, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human

Services to disseminate best practices on maternal mortality prevention to hospitals, State-based professional societies, and perinatal quality collaboratives, and for other purposes.

S. 2731

At the request of Mr. SCHIFF, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGUO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2731, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to provide that an individual engaged in a labor dispute may receive unemployment benefits.

S. 2755

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2755, a bill to provide that no Federal funds may be obligated or expended to award a grant or contract to an institution of higher education for the specific purposes of conducting fundamental research in collaboration with a covered entity.

S. 2759

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2759, a bill to enhance our Nation's nurse and physician workforce by recapturing unused immigrant visas.

S. 2813

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2813, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit capacity-based restrictions on firearm magazines, and for other purposes.

S. 2818

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2818, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a corporate tax rate increase on companies whose ratio of compensation of the CEO or other highest paid employee to median worker compensation is more than 50 to 1, and for other purposes.

S. 2838

At the request of Mr. SCHIFF, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2838, a bill to protect our democracy by preventing abuses of Presidential power, restoring checks and balances and accountability and transparency in government, and defending elections against foreign interference, and for other purposes.

S. 2963

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2963, a bill to provide back pay to Federal contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 2965

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 2965, a bill to prohibit the use of the Exchange Stabilization Fund of the Department of the Treasury to bail out Argentina's financial markets.

S.J. RES. 82

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 82, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services relating to "Policy on Adhering to the Text of the Administrative Procedure Act".

S.J. RES. 83

At the request of Mr. SCHIFF, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 83, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 236

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 236, a resolution calling for the return of abducted Ukrainian children before finalizing any peace agreement to end the war against Ukraine.

S. RES. 424

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 424, a resolution affirming the unwavering commitment of the Senate to the First Amendment and to freedom of speech and of the press as foundations of the democratic republic of the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 430—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 4, 2025, AS "NATIONAL ENERGY APPRECIATION DAY" TO CELEBRATE THE PEOPLE WHO WORK TO POWER THE UNITED STATES AND THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES AND TO BUILD AWARENESS OF THE IMPORTANT ROLE THAT THE ENERGY PRODUCERS OF THE UNITED STATES PLAY IN REDUCING POVERTY, STRENGTHENING NATIONAL SECURITY, AND IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD

Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. JUSTICE, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HUSTED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 430

Whereas energy is a vital part of daily life and has greatly improved the standard of living in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the energy mix in the United States reflects an all-of-the-above energy approach, which is important for keeping energy affordable, reliable, and efficient;

Whereas the efficient use of the natural resources of the United States is a key part of strengthening the national security of the United States;

Whereas access to affordable, reliable energy supports economic growth and creates upward mobility;

Whereas the use of advanced energy technology has greatly reduced emissions associated with energy development and use while supporting sustained economic growth alongside continued environmental improvement;

Whereas the men and women who play a part in building, maintaining, and delivering access to energy should be commended for their hard work and vital role in modern life;

Whereas access to energy throughout the United States has more than doubled life expectancy in the United States;

Whereas access to energy has reduced the percentage of the global population living in poverty from more than 40 percent to less than 10 percent;

Whereas the energy industry accounts for 8,350,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas each direct job in the oil and natural gas industry of the United States generates 3.7 jobs elsewhere in the economy of the United States, ultimately supporting 10,800,000 jobs that account for 5.4 percent of employment in the United States;

Whereas Federal oil and natural gas leases for onshore and offshore development brought in more than \$22,000,000,000 in revenue for the Federal Government in 2022;

Whereas the United States oil and natural gas industry alone generates nearly \$1,800,000,000,000 in gross domestic product per year;

Whereas coal continues to serve as a reliable and affordable source of baseload power for consumers across the United States and provided 19.5 percent of the utility-scale electricity in the United States in 2022;

Whereas hydroelectric power infrastructure contributes significant clean and reliable baseload power to the energy grid of the United States and vital grid flexibility with the ability to scale up or down to match fluctuations in consumer demand;

Whereas innovation in the nuclear energy industry of the United States has led to the annual generation capacity of about 100,000 megawatts of safe, clean, and reliable nuclear power; and

Whereas renewable energy employment continues to expand, with solar jobs accounting for the largest area of growth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 4, 2025, as “National Energy Appreciation Day”; and

(2) encourages the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe National Energy Appreciation Day with appropriate events to promote education on, and celebrate the role of, modern energy systems in everyday life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 431—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF CHOOSE RESPECT DAY

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 431

Whereas, according to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey—

(1) up to 12,000,000 individuals in the United States report experiencing intimate partner violence annually, including physical violence, rape, or stalking; and

(2) approximately 1 in 5 women and up to 1 in 7 men in the United States have experienced severe physical violence by an intimate partner at some point in their lifetimes;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 3 women in the United States on average are killed each day by a current or former intimate partner;

Whereas domestic violence can affect anyone, but women who are 18 to 34 years of age typically experience the highest rates of domestic violence;

Whereas survivors of domestic violence are strong, courageous, and resilient;

Whereas most female survivors of intimate partner violence have been previously victimized by the same offender;

Whereas domestic violence is cited as a significant factor in homelessness among families;

Whereas millions of children are exposed to domestic violence each year;

Whereas a study found that children who were exposed to domestic violence in their households were 15 times more likely to be physically or sexually assaulted in their lifetime than other children who were not exposed to domestic violence in their households;

Whereas survivors of domestic violence experience immediate and long-term negative outcomes, including detrimental effects on mental and physical health;

Whereas research consistently shows that being abused by an intimate partner increases the likelihood of substance use by that individual, as well as associated harmful consequences;

Whereas nearly 85 percent of American Indian and Alaska Native women have experienced some form of intimate partner violence in their lifetimes;

Whereas law enforcement officers in the United States put their lives at risk each day by responding to incidents of domestic violence, which can be among the most volatile and deadly calls;

Whereas Congress passed the Choose Respect Act (Public Law 117-103; 136 Stat. 931) to encourage safety and respect in relationships, especially among adolescents and young adults;

Whereas Congress designated October 1 of each year as Choose Respect Day to increase awareness of domestic violence and to encourage those in relationships to choose respect; and

Whereas October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and objectives of Choose Respect Day; and

(2) encourages all private citizens, organizations, and Federal, State, and local governmental and legislative entities to recognize Choose Respect Day through proclamations, activities, and educational efforts in furtherance of changing the culture around the tolerance of domestic violence.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3923. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) 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 ac-

tivities 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.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3923. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1067. IDENTIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ENGAGED IN CROWD CONTROL.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “Federal law enforcement officer” means—

(A) an employee or officer in a position in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Federal Government who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise a law enforcement function; or

(B) an employee or officer of a contractor or subcontractor (at any tier) of an agency in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Federal Government who is authorized by law or under the contract with the agency to engage in or supervise a law enforcement function;

(2) the term “law enforcement function” means the prevention, detection, or investigation of, or the prosecution or incarceration of any person for, any violation of law; and

(3) the term “member of an armed force” means a member of any of the armed forces, as defined in section 101(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, or a member of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(3) of title 32, United States Code.

(b) **REQUIRED IDENTIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each Federal law enforcement officer or member of an armed force who is engaged in any form of crowd control, riot control, or arrest or detention of individuals engaged in an act of civil disobedience, demonstration, protest, or riot in the United States shall at all times display identifying information in a clearly visible fashion, which shall include—

(A) for a Federal law enforcement officer, the Federal agency and the last name or unique identifier of the officer; and

(B) for a member of an armed force, the service branch and the last name or unique identifier of the member.

(2) **PROHIBITION ON COVERING OF IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.**—A Federal law enforcement officer or member of an armed force may not tape over or otherwise obscure or conceal the identifying information required under paragraph (1) while the officer or member is engaged in any form of law enforcement activity described in paragraph (1).

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide any new authority for members of an armed force to engage in law enforcement activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS AND OTHER MATTERS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant 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.

CLOUTURE 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:

CLOUTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882, a bill making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

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

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHUMER. I withdraw my motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior legislative clerk read as follows:

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

CLOUTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. 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:

CLOUTURE 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 mo-

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EN BLOC NOMINATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider the en bloc nominations listed in 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 nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the en bloc nominations as follows:

Calendar Number 62: Paul Atkins, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2031 (Reappointment)

Calendar Number 86: James Baehr, of Louisiana, to be General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs

Calendar Number 92: Patrick David Davis, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General

Calendar Number 126: Leah Campos, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic

Calendar Number 127: Brandon Judd, of Idaho, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile

Calendar Number 128: Joseph Popolo, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands

Calendar Number 143: Catherine Jerez, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity)

Calendar Number 155: Ned Mamula, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey

Calendar Number 158: David Fink, of New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration

Calendar Number 159: Pierre Gentin, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce

Calendar Number 160: David Fogel, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service

Calendar Number 163: Devon Westhill, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture

Calendar Number 164: Kirsten Baesler, of North Dakota, to be Assistant

Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education

Calendar Number 168: Wayne Palmer, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Mine Safety and Health

Calendar Number 169: Julie Hocker, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor

Calendar Number 170: Marco Rajkovich, Jr., of Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2030 (Reappointment)

Calendar Number 178: John Busterud, of California, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency

Calendar Number 181: Stanley Woodward, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Associate Attorney General

Calendar Number 196: Janet Dhillon, of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for a term of five years

Calendar Number 252: David Keeling, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor

Calendar Number 253: Kimberly Richey, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, Department of Education

Calendar Number 255: Jonathan Berry, of Maryland, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor

Calendar Number 256: Andrew Rogers, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor

Calendar Number 265: Marc Andersen, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army

Calendar Number 268: James Woodruff II, of Florida, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2032

Calendar Number 270: Kevin Rhodes, of Florida, to be Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy

Calendar Number 272: Usha-Maria Turner, of Oklahoma, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency

Calendar Number 284: John Dever, of Illinois, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Calendar Number 299: Joseph Barloon, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Geneva Office), with the rank of Ambassador

Calendar Number 300: Brian Morrissey, Jr., of Virginia, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury

Calendar Number 304: Craig Trainor, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Calendar Number 306: Francis Brooke, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury

Calendar Number 307: David Peters, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce

Calendar Number 310: Mary Riley, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education

Calendar Number 311: Brian Christine, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services

Calendar Number 312: Jonathan Snare, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2029

Calendar Number 313: David Brian Castillo, of Washington, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Labor

Calendar Number 314: David Barker, of Iowa, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education

Calendar Number 315: Brittany Panuccio, of Florida, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2029

Calendar Number 323: Michael Boren, of Idaho, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment

Calendar Number 341: Audrey Robertson, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy)

Calendar Number 342: Lanny Erdos, of Ohio, to be Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

Calendar Number 345: Taylor Jordan, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce

Calendar Number 347: Derek Barrs, of Florida, to be Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

Calendar Number 348: Michael Rutherford, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation (New Position)

Calendar Number 349: Gregory Zerzan, of Texas, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation

Calendar Number 355: Christopher Fox, of Virginia, to be Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Calendar Number 357: Alex Adams, of Idaho, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services

Calendar Number 358: Jonathan McKernan, of Tennessee, to be an Under Secretary of the Treasury

Calendar Number 359: Macon Hughes, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense

Calendar Number 360: Philip Weinberg, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force

Calendar Number 361: Timothy John Walsh, of Colorado, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management)

Calendar Number 363: Gustav Chiarello III, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services

Calendar Number 364: Michael Stu-
art, of West Virginia, to be General
Counsel of the Department of Health
and Human Services

Calendar Number 367: William Kirkland, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior

Calendar Number 368: Laura Swett,
of Virginia, to be a Member of the Fed-
eral Energy Regulatory Commission
for a term expiring June 30, 2030

Calendar Number 369: David LaCerte,
of Louisiana, to be a Member of the
Federal Energy Regulatory Commis-
sion for the remainder of the term ex-
piring June 30, 2026

Calendar Number 374: Arch Capito, of
West Virginia, to be United States At-
torney for the Southern District of
West Virginia for the term of four
years

Calendar Number 375: David Dunavant, of Tennessee, to be United
States Attorney for the Western Dis-
trict of Tennessee for the term of four
years

Calendar Number 376: Matthew Har-
vey, of West Virginia, to be United
States Attorney for the Northern Dis-
trict of West Virginia for the term of
four years

Calendar Number 377: John Heekin,
of Florida, to be United States Atto-
ney for the Northern District of Flor-
ida for the term of four years

Calendar Number 378: Leif Olson, of
Iowa, to be United States Attorney for
the Northern District of Iowa for the
term of four years

Calendar Number 379: Adam Sleeper,
of the Virgin Islands, to be United
States Attorney for the District of the
Virgin Islands for the term of four
years

Calendar Number 380: David Toepfer,
of Ohio, to be United States Attorney
for the Northern District of Ohio for
the term of four years

Calendar Number 381: Kurt Alme, of
Montana, to be United States Attorney
for the District of Montana, for the
term of four years

Calendar Number 382: Nicholas Chase,
of North Dakota, to be United
States Attorney for the District of
North Dakota for the term of four
years

Calendar Number 383: Bart McKay
Davis, of Idaho, to be United States At-
torney for the District of Idaho for the
term of four years

Calendar Number 384: David Metcalf,
of Pennsylvania, to be United States
Attorney for the Eastern District of
Pennsylvania for the term of four years

Calendar Number 385: Lesley Murphy,
of Nebraska, to be United States Atto-
ney for the District of Nebraska for the
term of four years

Calendar Number 386: Ronald A. Par-
sons, Jr., of South Dakota, to be
United States Attorney for the District
of South Dakota for the term of four
years

Calendar Number 387: Kurt Wall, of
Louisiana, to be United States Atto-
rney for the Middle District of Lou-
isiana for the term of four years

Calendar Number 388: David Charles
Waterman, of Iowa, to be United States
Attorney for the Southern District of
Iowa for the term of four years

Calendar Number 389: Daniel Rosen,
of Florida, to be United States Atto-
nay for the District of Minnesota for
the term of four years

Calendar Number 391: Somers Farkas,
of New York, to be Ambas-
sador Extraordinary and Pleni-
potentiary of the United States of
America to the Republic of Malta

Calendar Number 392: Nicole
McGraw, of Florida, to be Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of
the United States of America to the
Republic of Croatia

Calendar Number 393: Leandro
Rizzuto, of Florida, to be Permanent
Representative of the United States of
America to the Organization of Amer-
ican States, with the rank of Ambas-
sador

Calendar Number 394: Herschel Walk-
er, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extra-
ordinary and Plenipotentiary of the
United States of America to the Com-
monwealth of The Bahamas

Calendar Number 395: Stacey
Feinberg, of California, to be Ambas-
sador Extraordinary and Pleni-
potentiary of the United States of
America to the Grand Duchy of Luxem-
bourg

Calendar Number 396: Kenneth
Howery, of Texas, to be Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of
the United States of America to the
Kingdom of Denmark

Calendar Number 397: Richard
Buchan III, of Florida, to be Ambas-
sador Extraordinary and Pleni-
potentiary of the United States of
America to the Kingdom of Morocco

Calendar Number 398: Bill Bazzi, of
Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordi-
nary and Plenipotentiary of the
United States of America to the Repub-
lic of Tunisia

Calendar Number 399: Lynda Blan-
chard, of Alabama, to be U.S. Rep-
resentative to the United Nations
Agencies for Food and Agriculture,
with the rank of Ambassador

Calendar Number 400: Howard Brodie,
of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordi-
nary and Plenipotentiary of the
United States of America to the Repub-
lic of Finland

Calendar Number 401: Arthur Fisher,
of North Carolina, to be Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of
the United States of America to the
Republic of Austria

Calendar Number 402: Melinda
Hildebrand, of Texas, to be Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of
the United States of America to the
Republic of Costa Rica

Calendar Number 403: Michel Issa, of
Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordi-
nary and Plenipotentiary of the
United States of America to the Leba-
nese Republic

Calendar Number 404: Nicholas
Merrick, of Texas, to be Ambassador
Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of

the United States of America to the Czech Republic

Calendar Number 405: Roman Pipko, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Estonia

Calendar Number 406: Thomas Rose, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Poland

Calendar Number 407: William White, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Belgium

Calendar Number 408: John Giordano, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Namibia

Calendar Number 409: Anjani Sinha, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Singapore

Calendar Number 411: Sean O'Neill, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand

Calendar Number 412: Julie Stuft, of Ohio, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kazakhstan

Calendar Number 413: Dan Negrea, of Connecticut, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations

Calendar Number 414: Sergio Gor, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of India

Calendar Number 415: Stephanie Hallett, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Bahrain

Calendar Number 416: James Holtsnider, of Iowa, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan

Calendar Number 417: Jacob Helberg, of Florida, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment)

Calendar Number 418: Benjamin Black, of New York, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation

Calendar Number 419: Thomas DiNanno, of Florida, to be Under Sec-

retary of State for Arms Control and International Security

Calendar Number 420: Paul Kapur, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs

Calendar Number 423: Sarah Rogers, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy

Calendar Number 424: Michael DeSombre, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (East Asian and Pacific Affairs)

Calendar Number 426: Riley Barnes, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor

Calendar Number 427: Todd Wilcox, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Diplomatic Security)

Calendar Number 428: Neil Jacobs, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere

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, and the provisions of S. Res. 412 (119th Cong.), do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar numbers: 62, 86, 92, 126, 127, 128, 143, 155, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 168, 169, 170, 178, 181, 196, 252, 253, 255, 256, 265, 268, 270, 272, 284, 299, 300, 304, 306, 307, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 323, 341, 342, 345, 347, 348, 349, 355, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 363, 364, 367, 368, 369, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 423, 424, 426, 427, 428, en bloc.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislation session.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 77, S. 180; Calendar No. 79, S. 419; Calendar No. 80, S. 539; Calendar No. 82, S. 1316; Calendar No. 83, S. 1563; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 1563 be agreed to, the committee-reported amendment to S. 1316 be agreed to, the

committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 539 be withdrawn, and the Cornyn substitute amendment at the desk to S. 539 be agreed to; finally, that the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

I rise to request unanimous consent here on the bills that were just mentioned, to call up and pass this year's Police Week bills. These are bipartisan bills. These are common sense. Most importantly, particularly in light of recent events—and you can turn on the television right now and see what I am talking about—they would give this Chamber the chance to demonstrate its commitment to the men and women who wear the badge and to the laws they serve to protect.

This is not a time to mince words or blur lines; this is a time to speak clearly with full moral force.

In cities across the country, our law enforcement officers are beset from below and above. From below, on our streets, they face an emboldened criminal element and a resurgence of organized political violence. From above, in the halls of power, they face a political class which seems hell-bent on undermining and attacking them at every turn.

We have watched this unfold for years now. The press has smeared and defamed our police officers, seeking to incite hatred and violence against them. Fringe academic ideas about defunding police and shutting prisons have moved from the classroom, to the courtroom, to the legislature, and then to codified laws. Riots. Lawsuits. Slashed budgets. Malicious lies blared through the largest megaphones in our country.

Time and time again, the system has sided with the criminal over the cop, the looter over the law. The result of this system could be seen in unprecedented waves of violence that ravaged our cities in the wake of the George Floyd riots in 2020. It can still be seen today on the streets of cities overtaken by antifa. These are not rhetorical or theoretical concerns; we watched it happen in real time.

It is not the product of social conditions or inequity or systematic this or that; it is the inevitable result of a civilization that has lost its moral nerve, a civilization that is too wracked by guilt to punish its criminals, to enforce its laws, or to confront its enemies—even when those enemies are beating police officers and firebombing Federal buildings right before our eyes.

When a government loses the ability or the will to defend its own cities, its own institutions, its own people, then it ceases to be a government worthy of its name.

The path back to justice is simple. It requires laws like the ones we are going to consider here today.

It requires protecting the people who protect us, like the bill to equip first

responders with protective gear against fentanyl exposure, keeping them safe from the very poisons they are trying to fight.

It requires ensuring that our police officers are healthy in body and in spirit, like the bill to reauthorize critical mental health services for cops and their families. Every single year, more police officers die by suicide than die in the line of duty. This is profoundly a policy failure and one that is on us to fix.

It requires hunting down the predators who seek to prey upon our kids from the darkest recesses of the internet, like the bill to reauthorize and modernize the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force. This bill funds and enhances our ability to catch and convict the very worst kinds of criminals—those who target and abuse children.

It requires building strong police departments with officers who know the neighborhoods and the people they protect, like our bill to send local recruits to police academies if they agree to serve in the precincts in their own communities.

It requires wisdom and experience, like the bill to give State and local agencies the ability to rehire retired officers in civilian law enforcement roles.

If you stand on the side of justice and our first responders, these votes should be simple and easy.

With that, I would ask to move forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request?

Mr. BOOKER. To the esteemed Presiding Officer, I am going to reserve the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I am really grateful that this is one of the areas where we have a lot of bipartisan support because this body I would say unanimously believes that we have to do more to help local law enforcement.

I see it in my State. We have real challenges—challenges with recruitment, challenges with officers who are in incredibly stressful situations for their mental health, and even empowering officers to be able to do their job, which is a job that everyone wants our officers to do.

I say this all the time: If you polled my city, which is a majority minority city, a majority African-American city, and asked them “Hey, do you want more police, less police, or the same amount of police?” undeniably, they would want more law enforcement.

When I talk to the law enforcement officers in not just my city but up and down the State, they want more resources. That is why I have multiple bills to actually fund our police departments around our country and specifically in New Jersey to empower them on everything from closing out murder

investigations all the way to mental health.

In fact, the legislation that is being brought forward—it is right, it is bipartisan legislation. I am the cosponsor of some of the bills we have right now on the floor. We should be united in this body, all 100 of us, to stand up for public safety and to fund our police, get them the resources and the equipment they need to do their job.

Unfortunately, that is not what is happening. President Trump, through an arbitrary Executive order, has told this body: Your intentions will not be followed.

The legislation that is being proposed today—the President has already said that those DOJ grants will not go to certain States—Illinois, California, New York, New Jersey—that they are not eligible for these grant programs. That is not a bipartisan way of going about it. That is singling out certain States over other States. That is actually defunding the police departments in certain States for other States when you say that these States that have gotten many of these grants in years past can no longer get them. None of us in this body should support that. All of us in this body should join together and say: When Congress passes a grant program, the President of the United States cannot arbitrarily decide which States receive those grants and which States don’t.

I feel a driving sense of urgency that we must support our police officers. They are facing greater and newer challenges in this country. I feel a deep urgency to support mental health issues in particular because I lost one of my dear childhood friends, who died by suicide in uniform.

I want to make a simple adjustment to this legislation—very simple. What it would do is basically say that when this body has approved these grant programs, the President can’t undermine the Founders’ intention that we hold the purse strings, that the President can’t undermine that and these grants have to go out as Congress intended them.

That is all I am asking from my colleague across the aisle, and it is all I am asking from this body, is that we, together, say: We need to get resources for police officers in all of our country. We shouldn’t be picking out some departments and not others.

This is just simply making sure that this is a bipartisan effort to fund local police officers.

So I ask my colleagues to pass these bills as I amend them so that we can refocus on the urgent work of reopening the government and then providing all law enforcement agencies with the resources they need, ensuring every law enforcement agency has a fair opportunity to secure funding to support their work, to support the men and women, to support their sacred and noble duties. We should work in a bipartisan way.

So I ask that the consent be modified such that my amendments to S. 180, S.

419, S. 539, S. 1316, and S. 1563, which are at the desk, also be agreed to, with all the other provisions that my colleague is asking for remaining intact, so that we can fund all of police and stop our President’s attempt to defund police departments in blue States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Reserving the right to object, let’s be clear about what this provision does from my friend from New Jersey. It is attempting to throw a lifeline to these sanctuary cities that are openly defying the law. In order to receive Federal grant dollars, you can’t withhold information from Federal law enforcement. That is what they are doing. That is what it means to be a sanctuary city.

What you are saying is, we are not going to work with ICE or any other Federal Agencies because we want to protect illegal immigrants in our cities.

That is what is happening. That is deeply unpopular with the American people. And that is why the President is taking this action to try to get these cities to come along and be part of the program with the rest of the country to say: We are all going to work together to keep our communities safe.

This provision is a direct attempt to undermine the Trump administration’s attempt to do that and their renewed enforcement of our immigration laws.

I know some people got used to the last 4 years, where 20 million people came here illegally and Federal law enforcement was handcuffed by the Biden administration to actually enforce our immigration laws—so much so that the rhetoric that had been exhibited at that time now has carried over, and you see fire bombings, and you see attacks on ICE officials, attempts to dox them, to destroy their families and their reputations and their finances, because they have been led to believe by many with the loudest microphones that somehow everyone is entitled to be here for as long as they want, that Federal laws don’t matter, that borders are arbitrary lines on a map and we are all global citizens.

The white papers from the sixties and the seventies found their way into the highest offices in government in the Biden administration. These Ivy League grads who wrote these white papers or read these white papers or were indoctrinated by these white papers were suddenly in charge. Well, there is a new sheriff in town who actually believes in law and order.

So I would hope that city leaders who defy our Federal laws shouldn’t be entitled to Federal tax dollars. Federal grant dollars are not entitlements. They are not unconditional welfare for far-left activists. If you want Federal funds, you have to comply with Federal law.

Sanctuary cities are in open defiance of Federal law. They actively prohibit their officials from cooperating with

Federal immigration officers. They release violent offenders, suppress gang databases, and do everything in their power to prevent the men and women in law enforcement from enforcing our laws. That is what they are doing in sanctuary cities right now.

Every one of the Police Week bills that I have offered for unanimous consent—and my friend from New Jersey is indeed a cosponsor—are very, very bipartisan. I can't actually believe we are in a place where we are going to be holding up that kind of bipartisan legislation when you see the violence against law enforcement officers in our country every single day. This is a lifeline to them, the help they need not just to do their jobs but to be able to seek the services so they can be healthy, physically and mentally.

So let's be clear about what is happening. My friend has, you know, a few moments here to reconsider this. These are common sense. If there is anything from last November we can take away, it is that the American people voted for a return to common sense.

With that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Yeah, I just—again, I have so much respect for my colleague that I want to respond to some of the things he said, because, again, I just want to affirm that he is right on the urgency to help our police officers. He is right that States should abide by Federal law that passes from this body. But what we have now is a President who, in his first term, didn't ever try something like this, which is undermining the will of Congress. This is really unprecedented. It has never happened—Republican President, Democratic President—including Donald Trump's first term, where he suddenly said: I am going to turn off the spigot of support to local law enforcement agencies because I don't agree with your policies.

I think that is a threat to the independence of our branch of government. I think that is in so many ways violative of our shared values on both sides of the aisle. But let me go further than that. What the President is doing is saying: Not only am I going to stop funding from going to the State of New Jersey, I am going to go to red counties in New Jersey, red counties in California.

I actually went out and talked to people. Republican legislators in States, Republican police officers, a Republican union leader told me this as well: This is ridiculous. This is insane that we would hold grants back from the entire State. He said: I don't agree with Democrats' policies, but we are out here putting our lives on the line, and Republicans in Congress want to stop resources coming to our police departments.

One of the union leaders said to me: My guys are out there sacrificing their

lives, and we can't get help that both sides of the aisle agree on?

So, yes, my colleague and I disagree on domestic immigration policies. One thing he and I don't agree on—because I was the mayor of a city that basically said: In order to keep my city safe, we are going to cooperate with the police department. It was an overbroad generalization that was made on the Senate floor that we are not supporting ICE and immigration activities. I know this up and down the State of New Jersey. Not only do we support them, but we detailed officers with Federal immigration enforcement. I did it when I was mayor.

You want to talk about cooperation. Anybody who knows local government from the FBI to the ATF to ICE, all over New Jersey, we are cooperating with Federal authorities. What we have simply said is we are responsible for local law enforcement. We are not going to do things that create such fear in our communities that immigrant communities are afraid to come to local police to report crimes. And that somehow—not in Trump's first term—but somehow in this term of office, that is a bridge too far.

Let me tell you right now, the way immigration is being pursued in our neighborhoods, where masked agents are coming out of unmarked cars or going to court appearances and schools and hospitals—my local police officers are telling me how much more dangerous this administration is making communities because people who are the victims of crime now are afraid to go to local police officers and report those crimes.

Again, this is not coming from politicians in New Jersey. This is coming from law enforcement officers that have said that we have created such a climate of fear in our country that just solving crimes is getting harder and harder because people are afraid to come to the police.

So, yes, we have policies that say there are certain things we won't do to maintain a community of trust within our communities.

I understand there is a lot of rhetoric. I could turn on shock news and all of that, but when you talk to the law enforcement officers in many of the most Republican parts of my community, they are outraged about what is happening right now.

Again, we can debate policy on immigration, but, to me, for a Senator to allow a President to undermine the power of the purse relegated by the Constitution to this body is outrageous. It has never been done before, not in Trump's first term, not by Bush, not by Reagan, not by Clinton, not by Obama. We are in new territory here in our country where we see a President encroaching upon our powers. I can't be complicit in that.

Everybody in this body—I would never question any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle. We all want our local police departments to not only be

able to do their job, we all want to have more equipment and resources. That is why these bills are bipartisan. How can we allow bipartisan bills passed out of the Senate to then be stopped, in a partisan way, by a President who is then going to choose red States and hurt blue States, even though my State has millions of Republicans who deserve to have their communities safe as well?

I am standing today just to say, let's use common sense and help our police officers together; get the resources desperately needed out to our communities now and not let this fall victim to something that wasn't even an issue in Donald Trump's first term.

So I object. I object. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, well, the shutdown melodrama continues. I love the smell of melodrama in the morning. It smells like the U.S. Senate. I said the other day that this shutdown is just further proof that human evolution is a slow, slow process. With this shutdown, what you are witnessing now is just further proof about why it took human beings thousands of years to learn how to stand upright. This shutdown is bone-deep, down-to-the-marrow stupid.

Some shutdowns are based on policy. Some shutdowns are based on politics. Some shutdowns are based on a combination of both. This one is pure. It is as pure as Ivory Snow.

This shutdown is based on politics. Let me tell you what is going on. I believe in the two-party system. Why? Because two parties create competition, and competition makes all of us better. It does. The Democratic Party—the opposite of my party, the Republican Party—the Democratic Party is competing within itself right now, and there is a distinct wing of the Democratic Party that is winning that competition. If I wanted to use a pejorative suppression, I would call it the loon wing of the party, the loon wing of the Democratic Party or you might call it the Bolshevik wing of the Democratic Party.

I think a more accurate description is to call it the socialist wing of the Democratic Party. I think that is fair. I am not saying that all of my Democratic friends are socialists, but there is clearly a wing of the Democratic Party that can only be described accurately as the socialist wing of the party. And that party is in ascendance. That party is in control.

My friend Senator SCHUMER is the leader of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate. And he, of course, has instructed his colleagues to vote to shut down the government. And Senator SCHUMER has been criticized for that, and I understand. I don't agree with him. I think he made a mistake.

But I don't think Senator SCHUMER is the leader of this effort. I don't. I think Senator SCHUMER, like many of his colleagues, would like to be loved by everybody in the party, and he would like to be loved by the socialist wing of his party. And I do think that is part of what is motivating this shutdown. And that is why I say it is all about politics.

But I don't think Senator SCHUMER is the person in charge because Senator SCHUMER is not the leader of the socialist wing of his party. Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ is. She is running the show. It was no accident the other day when the Congresswoman let it slip. She said: If you really want to negotiate the end of this shutdown, come see me. Come see me.

And I think any fairminded person has to look right now and say that the two leading Members—the quarterback—the two leading Members of the socialist wing of the Democratic Party—the quarterback is Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ, and her substitute is Senator BERNIE SANDERS. But I think it is the Congresswoman who is calling the shots.

I don't hate anybody. I have said that repeatedly, and I mean it. I like all of my colleagues. I look for grace wherever I can find it. When I say my prayers, I do, every single time—I ask God: Don't let me hate because it is hard sometimes. It is hard. But I do. I say: God, don't let me hate.

I certainly don't hate Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ. I want to make that very clear. She has the right to her opinion. She has the right to try to have the socialists take over the Democratic Party. That is the American way. Ironically, I think what she is doing is anti-American, but she has the right as an American to do it, so I don't hate her.

But I judge her by her policy. She has her opinion, and I have mine. I have to judge her, candidly, by her policy. Here is what the socialist wing of the Democratic Party, led by Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ, has said to the American people and to the U.S. Congress and to the Republicans in Congress: If you, Republicans, don't agree to make the Federal Government \$1.5 trillion—not million dollars, not billion dollars, \$1.5 trillion—bigger, we are going to shut the government down.

Of course we said no. I am not going to vote for that. My mother didn't raise a fool. As I said before, if she did, it was one of my brothers. I am never going to vote for that.

Where do I come up with this figure of \$1.5 trillion? Well, the first thing the socialists and Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ is asking us to do is to repeal the healthcare reforms in the One Big Beautiful Bill. We just passed them. We just passed them. Here it is, subtitle B, Health, in the One Big Beautiful Bill.

We didn't cut Medicaid in the One Big Beautiful Bill. In fact, under our bill, Medicaid is going to increase 2 percent a year over the next 10 years.

What we did by reforming Medicaid, which Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ wants us to reverse, we cut out the waste and the fraud.

For example, we found out that there are—no kidding, I am not just making this up—we found out that there are 2.8 million people on Medicaid who are double-dipping in America. They are either signing up for Medicaid in Louisiana and Mississippi double-dipping or signing up for Medicaid in Louisiana and they are signing up for the Affordable Care Act subsidies. That is called cheating.

Our bill would put an end to that, and it would save about \$140 billion on ten years. The socialist wing of the Democratic Party and Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ wants us to reverse that.

The second thing we did in our healthcare reforms in the One Big Beautiful Bill is to say you have to stop lying when you apply for Medicaid. Under President Obama, we had virtually no eligibility checks. People could walk in, and the Medicaid folks would say: How much do you make a year? They could say \$30,000 a year, and they would say, OK, you qualify.

Now, I trust people. I have said it before on this floor. I play cards with my friends all the time. They are friends. I cut the cards anyway. We have found—for example, just in Louisiana, we did a statistical sample of the people on Medicaid in Louisiana. Our auditors found 1,600 people on Medicaid who were making \$100,000 a year or more. That is cheating. So our bill put an end to that. Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ and the socialist wing of the Democratic Party want us to put it back. They want us to let people cheat.

What else are the socialists asking for in this \$1.5 trillion? Well, they are saying: We don't want people who can work to work.

We put a provision in our bill that the Congresswoman and the socialist wing of her party want us to take out that says: Look, if you are between the ages of 19 and 64 and you are able-bodied—we are not talking about a mother with a sick child in her arms—if you are able-bodied, if you are perfectly healthy, and if you don't have any dependent kids at home, then, if you qualify based on income, we will give you Medicaid. But you have to work. You have to work 20 hours a week or go to school 20 hours a week or do community service 20 hours a week because the free enterprise system—jobs—has done more to lift people out of poverty than all the social programs put together.

That is what is called a work requirement. What is wrong with that? Those who can work should work. Our welfare programs were meant to be bridges, not parking lots. Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ and the socialist wing of her party want us to reverse all of that.

What else do they want us to do? Well, they are upset at us over the Affordable Care Act. Let me tell you

what all this is about with the Affordable Care Act.

Under ObamaCare, if you are a low-income American, you are entitled to Medicaid. If you are a middle-income American, if you have a job, then chances are, you get insurance through your employer. Most people do. But if you are in the middle and if you make a little more money than the poverty level but you can't get insurance through your employer, we provide what is called the ObamaCare exchanges.

So when we talk about the ObamaCare subsidies, that is what we are talking about. It is about 24 million people, and it was meant for lower income people.

Up until 2019, it was all for low-income people. Then, in 2019, without any Republican votes, President Biden said: Look, we are in a pandemic. We are going to raise the limit. We are going to say that there are no income limits on ObamaCare—paid for by the taxpayer.

We have 24 million people on ObamaCare.

When they raised the limits, you could make any amount of money and still get a subsidy. That added about 1.6 million people on ObamaCare. ObamaCare was meant for people who make from roughly \$30,000 a year to \$130,000 a year for families of four. Now, because President Biden raised the cap, we have people making \$600,000 a year, \$150,000 a year, and families making \$200,000 a year who are getting subsidies from the American taxpayer. Why? Because they said we needed it in the pandemic.

The pandemic is over, and that is why the Democrats, when they passed the bill, put in a provision that says that at the end of this year, those extra subsidies are going to end.

Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ says: No. Until you agree to let them continue, to let anybody at any income level get subsidies, we are going to shut the government down.

That is their third demand, and that is part of the \$1.5 trillion.

Finally, of course, the Congresswoman is saying: We want you to give half a trillion dollars—not \$500,000, not half a billion dollars but half a trillion dollars—we want you to give half a trillion dollars to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting because we like what they say.

Well, we just eliminated money for all forms of media.

Now, those are the demands. Those are the demands. I will just mention one more.

Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ got very, very upset, as did the socialist wing of her party, when the President sent over what is called a rescission package.

Basically, President Trump said: We want you to take some stuff out of the budget that we think is a waste.

We did, and that upset the Congresswoman. She is entitled to be upset if

she wants to. But that really upset the socialist wing of the party.

So we took it out, and here is what they want us to put back in. We found that under President Biden, they were spending \$3 million for circumcisions and vasectomies in Zambia. We took that out.

The Congresswoman says: We are going to shut down the government until you put that back in.

We found \$500,000 of American taxpayer money for electric buses in Rwanda.

We found \$3.6 million for pastry cooking classes and dance focus groups for male prostitutes in Haiti. I kid you not. I am not making this up. It was in the budget under President Biden. We took it out.

Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ and the socialist wing—the loon wing of the Democratic Party—says: We are going to shut down the government until you put it back in.

I will just read you a few more that we took out that they are demanding we put back in.

There was \$6 million for media organizations for the Palestinians; \$833,000 for transgender people in Nepal; \$300,000 for a pride parade in Lesotho; \$882,000 for social media mentorship in Serbia; \$4.2 million—we took it out, and the Congresswoman and the socialist wing of their party says we have to put that back in before they will open the government—\$4.2 million for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex people in the Western Balkans and Uganda.

I could spend the rest of the afternoon on this. We took all of that out. It upset Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ, and it upset the socialist wing of her party. Now that wing of her party and the Congresswoman are threatening all other Democrats and saying: You have to shut the government down until we get what we want.

Part of what they want is to add this kind of stuff back into the bill. That is what this fight is all about.

We were in the process of negotiating a budget with our Democratic friends. We ran out of time. The cutoff was midnight Tuesday night. That is when—the clock struck midnight, and the budget ran out.

What we had asked for and what we are still asking for is, let's continue to negotiate—"we" meaning the Republicans and the Democrats—for 6 more weeks and to try to agree on a budget. That is all we are asking. We are not asking for any additional appropriations, any conditions, any stipulations. All we are asking for is what we call a clean CR. All we are asking for is just to further negotiate.

Congresswoman OCASIO-CORTEZ has done a stellar job in rising to the leadership of her party as a member of the socialist wing, and they are about to elect a socialist mayor of New York. I think Mr. Mamdani is going to win. They have said to our request—let's just continue the status quo for 6 more weeks—they said: We will give you 6 more weeks if you will give us \$1.5 trillion.

That is what they are demanding, and that is why we are shut down.

Let me say it again. I don't hate anybody. This is America. I sure don't hate the Congresswoman. She is entitled to her opinion, but I am entitled to mine. She can criticize my policy positions, but I am entitled to criticize hers.

I am here to tell you, Mr. President, in front of God and country, based on her policy positions that she is demanding—based on her policy positions that she is demanding that I just outlined of \$1.5 trillion of pure, unadulterated spending porn—based on that demand and based on her policy positions, the American people are looking at her and saying: This person has singlehandedly put an end to dumb blond jokes because that is the craziest thing I have ever heard.

Based on her policy positions—\$1.5 trillion of this kind of spending porn—the American people are looking at the

Congresswoman and saying: With respect, she must be bilingual—she must speak English and stupid.

And that is why we are not agreeing to it.

Now, I know every one of my Democratic colleagues, and I know more than half of them know better. They know what we are asking for is reasonable. I am just asking them to meet us halfway. We are not asking for any additional provisions, and they shouldn't ask for any additional provisions. Let's just open back up and continue to negotiate for 6 weeks. Don't be scared of the Congresswoman. Don't be scared of the socialist wing of your party.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, October 6; 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 cloture motions filed during Friday's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2025, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. 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 3:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, October 6, 2025, at 3 p.m.