United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2025 No. 167

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, October 10, 2025, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2025

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty and eternal God, You shine in the darkness. The whole Earth is bathed in Your light, and for that, we are grateful.

Today, be near to our lawmakers. Penetrate the springs of their being, bringing cleansing, healing, and unity. Drive them away from the shadows of a stalemate with our government shutdown, enabling them to find common ground. In times of challenges and trials, may they remember they are serving You.

Lord, as we all trust in Your mercies, surround our Nation and world with the shield of Your favor and protection.

And Lord, we thank You for the progress we are seeing in the Middle East.

We pray in Your great 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. MORENO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026—Resumed

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

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, once again, in the Chaplain's prayer, he brought up the issue before the U.S. Senate and presented it to the Lord about the problems created by the shutdown of the government. Not only are the employees of the U.S. Senate not being paid and 750,000 civil servants are furloughed without pay, but we are also beginning to read in business pages of the newspapers about the impact on the economy. For the State of Iowa, the White House Office of Economic Policy said that, weekly, it was doing damage to the economy of my State of Iowa of $137 million.

So we have to get the government back to work because it costs money to shut the government down, and it costs money to open the government up. The government is supposed to be a service to the American people, besides protecting the American people, and quite frankly, none of that can be done when it is shut down.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about some information that I got from whistleblowers the first time on September 23 of last year. At that time, I spoke to my fellow Senators, making public very concerning whistleblower allegations.

The whistleblower alleged to my office that the Postal Service, which is an independent government Agency, had hired registered sex offenders as

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

mail carriers. So I investigated to find out how bad this problem was at that Agency.

To date, the Postal Service has refused to provide a list of names of registered sex offenders. The Postal Service has provided some information about the number of sex offenders working at the Postal Service.

On July 7, 2025, the Postal Service confirmed that in 2024, the Agency employed 150 registered sex offenders. The letter said that of the 150, 102 had ''access to the public.'' Of the 102, 77 were mail carriers.

News even more alarming in that letter: The Postal Service doesn't track the routes used by employees who are registered sex offenders. We don't even know the locations where these carriers deliver their mail. The Postal Service also doesn't track the crimes that led to an employee's registration on the sex offender register.

On August 7, 2025, I wrote the Postal Service requesting additional information. So this is what I want to know about how the Postal Service ensures our communities are safe and what the crimes were, and that is just among other questions I have. To date, I have received no response.

When it comes to this matter, our communities deserve much better than what they are getting from the Postal Service, and we have to make sure that the Postal Service is as protective of people's safety as any other Agency of government.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ISRAEL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, before I begin, I want to mention the very welcome news that the first phase of the historic Israel-Gaza peace plan brokered by President Trump and his administration, working with allies and partners in the region, has been agreed to. This will finally mean the release of all remaining hostages, living and dead, who have been held by Hamas since its October 7, 2023, attack.

It is vital that Israel and especially Hamas implement the terms of this agreement as quickly as possible so that this can truly mark the beginning of an end to the bloodshed. I hope a lasting peace for this most war-torn of regions.

In addition to both sides adhering to all agreed-upon terms, true peace will also require that there is never again a threat to Israel emanating from Gaza.

This means that Hamas must disarm and relinquish any role in governance in the Gaza Strip, and I know the President and Secretary Rubio continue to work relentlessly to pursue peace and make this a reality.

I am grateful for this news, and my prayers today are for the successful release of all hostages, the success of this agreement, and the protection of all innocents in harm's way.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, we are now 9 days into the Democrats' government shutdown—9 days in which Democrats have had multiple opportunities to support a clean, nonpartisan CR—sitting right here at the Senate desk—to reopen the government; something that has been passed by our colleagues in the House of Representatives, that has achieved 55 Senators, a Senate majority. Out of 100 Senators, 55 Senators support this 24-page resolution sitting at the desk, which could open up the government today because as soon as the Senate passes it, the President will sign it into law.

This is the same nonpartisan measure that, as I said, passed the House 3 weeks ago, no partisan riders, no gimmicks, no partisan policies, Republican policies, anything like that—a simple resolution, 24 pages long, to open up our government and make sure that the Federal employees and the American people who depend upon them get paid.

The President is ready to sign it. All it takes is a handful of Democrats. There are three Democrats who have already supported this clean continuing resolution. Just a handful more, and we can end this shutdown in a matter of hours.

Fifty-five Senators, a Senate majority—a majority of the 100 U.S. Senators, a majority of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States is prepared to sign it. That is how straightforward this proposition is.

We have already seen plenty of negative impacts from the Democrat shutdown. A whole new wave of pain begins tomorrow if Democrats don't act because if we fail to fund the government by the end of day today, American servicemembers begin going without their paychecks starting tomorrow.

That is right. If Democrats can't bring themselves to reopen the government by the end of the day, our troops—the people who protect and defend this country—will start missing their paychecks. To say that that is unacceptable is an understatement.

Many of our servicemembers are serving in harm's way at this moment. All of them stand ready to rush into danger at a moment's notice to protect the rest of us. They and their families make numerous sacrifices to serve our country. The idea—the very idea—that they won't get a paycheck because Democrats can't bring themselves to accept a clean, nonpartisan CR is beyond the pale.

If the government remains shut down after today, instead of getting our troops paid, they are going to have to continue stretching what money they have saved. Unfortunately, sometimes that is not very much.

As one advocate for military families put it, ''This isn't just a financial hardship—it's destabilizing for households and military readiness alike.''

''Military readiness.''

Many families have already begun to visit food banks near bases, and it is even harder on families with a loved one who is deployed. Amy Palmer, who runs an organization that helps military families in Colorado, said families of the deployed ''are having to navigate this alone. They're used to getting the paycheck . . . and paying bills on behalf of their entire family, and with that servicemember deployed and not really having that support system from them . . . it is really hard.''

It is not just our troops who are going to be missing a paycheck. Civilian workers will also be missing part of their pay starting this Friday, including law enforcement officers like the members of our very own Capitol Police. Food banks and other nonprofits around the country are bracing for increased demand from Federal employees, especially here in the national Capitol region.

I remember when the Democrat leader was a passionate opponent of government shutdowns because of their impact on Federal workers. I am pretty sure that was just 6 months ago.

Other Democrats used to be concerned about the impact on Federal workers as well. A few years ago, our Democrat colleague from New Jersey—himself, a former career Federal worker—had this to say:

I worked through multiple shutdowns, including, you know, having to work and show up every day without getting paid. . . . I mean, it's just so scary to think of the fact that this is going to hurt people.

Yet Democrats aren't showing the slightest interest in reopening the government to ensure troops and Federal employees get paid.

Later today, we are going to have another vote on the clean continuing resolution to open up the government. As I said, we are a handful of Democrats away from passing this continuing resolution and reopening the government, a handful of votes away from paying our troops, and we are going to see if that matters to Democrats.

We will see if Democrats choose to pay America's troops or if they, once again, bow to the demands of their far-left base, which is telling them to hold out, or their strategists who are telling them that they are ''winning'' the shutdown.

Well, based on the reporting this morning, Democrats couldn't care less whether military families miss a paycheck tomorrow.

In an interview posted this morning, the Democrat leader said:

Every day gets better for us.

''Every day gets better for us.''

This isn't a political game. Democrats might feel that way, but I don't know of anybody else that does. The longer this goes on, the more the American people realize the Democrats own this shutdown.

A Morning Consult poll finds that ''voters increasingly blame Democrats for the government shutdown.''

In the latest Harvard-Harris poll, 65 percent of voters think Democrats

should reopen the government instead of holding out for their partisan demands.

But Democrats are apparently being told to hold the line by their far-left base, and so this shutdown drags on.

We can solve the issue of troop pay and every other problem we are seeing today—today—by passing this clean, nonpartisan CR and sending it to the President. He is ready to sign it. If Democrats would only agree, we could reopen the government in just a few hours, literally, pay our troops, pay our Federal workers, and stop this madness.

And this notion that somehow in this political game, the Democrats believe, according to their leader, that ''every day gets better for us,'' that is not the experience of the American people. It is time to end this shutdown and reopen this government. Let's pass this CR today.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ISRAEL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night, nearly 2 years to the day of Hamas's vicious attack on October 7, after nearly 2 long years of devastating war in Gaza, it appears that a ceasefire and hostage agreement has been reached. If this agreement is implemented, then, finally, after 2 years of immense suffering, the hostages could soon be free, there could be a ceasefire, and the victims of this painful conflict can start to rebuild their lives. This brings a huge sigh of relief to the hostage families, to all of Israel, and to Palestinians who have suffered for so long in this horrific humanitarian catastrophe.

Now, we await details and final acceptance and implementation from all parties of the first phase, and we must begin the even harder work of closing negotiations to end the war, to start building the day after in Gaza without Hamas, to surge humanitarian assistance to Palestinians in Gaza, and to build a lasting peace—a lasting peace—that ensures security and dignity for Israelis and Palestinians alike.

This morning, I hope and pray that all of the hostages are released, including the deceased hostages. I will never give up until all of the hostages are home, including the remains of my constituents Omer Neutra and Itay Chen. I have gotten to know their families well over the last 2 years, and I share their desperation to bring them home for proper burial and closure.

The work is not over, but any step to end this nightmare is one that should be celebrated and carefully implemented.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, now, on the shutdown and the Trump administration, the Federal Government has now been shut down for more than a week, but Donald Trump, Speaker JOHNSON, and Republicans in Congress are nowhere to be found. Instead of playing with people's lives, Donald Trump and Republican leaders in Congress need to sit down with Democrats and have a serious negotiation to fix healthcare and reopen the government at once.

Workers are starting to miss out on paychecks. Seniors are worried about delays at the Social Security Administration. Small businesses with government contracts are in the dark.

We need to end this shutdown as soon as possible. Every day that Republicans refuse to negotiate to end this shutdown, the worse it gets for Americans, and the clearer it becomes who is fighting for them.

Each day, our case to fix healthcare and end the shutdown gets better and better, stronger and stronger, because families are opening their letters showing how high their premiums will climb if Republicans get their way. They are seeing why this fight matters. It is about protecting their healthcare, their bank accounts, their futures.

But Republicans are absent. The House is literally on vacation. And Donald Trump, meanwhile, continues to play with people's lives and threaten mass layoffs for Federal workers.

Yesterday, the Wall Street Journal reported that Republican leaders in Congress have been urging the administration not to follow through with their threats of mass layoffs and no back pay for furloughed Federal workers. The Journal wrote that ''far-reaching government cuts and firings could backfire with the public.'' And aides have been ''warning that such moves could cause voters to blame Republicans for the shutdown.'' That is the Wall Street Journal.

Well, this is spot-on. If Donald Trump thinks that punishing Federal workers and treating the American public as pawns is going to help him politically, he is making a terrible mistake, because the American people are smart. They see what Trump and the Republicans are doing. They know Republicans are the ones in charge. They have the Presidency, the House, and the Senate—not Democrats.

We Democrats want to end this shutdown as quickly as we can, but Donald Trump and Republicans need to negotiate with us in a serious way to fix the healthcare premiums crisis. We can and should do both. It is not either-or, like Republicans think.

President Trump, meanwhile, is simply not taking this shutdown seriously, because, as we speak, the Trump administration continues to negotiate a $20 billion bailout for Argentina to prop up a MAGA ally. Apparently, Donald Trump thinks that $20 billion for a MAGA-friendly government in Argentina is fine, but fixing healthcare premiums here at home is not.

Meanwhile, thanks to Trump's bungled trade war with China, American soybean farmers have been shut out of foreign markets and are facing mass bankruptcies. With American farmers cut out, farmers in countries like Argentina are taking advantage, selling a record number of soybeans to China. But instead of helping American farms now in the middle of a shutdown, Donald Trump wants to send $20 billion to Argentina to help them compete against American farmers, all while hungry Americans face higher grocery prices and the largest cuts ever to nutrition aid, thanks to Donald Trump and the Republicans' ''Big Ugly Bill.''

It is utter lunacy. Whose side is Donald Trump on?

And the situation is no better here in Congress. In the middle of a shutdown crisis, Speaker JOHNSON has shut the lights off to the Halls of Congress. We Democrats have made clear that Republicans need to engage with us in serious negotiation to end this destructive shutdown and fix healthcare premiums as soon as we can, but Speaker JOHNSON has sent the House on vacation. He has sent Members home now for 3 weeks, and it sounds like he will keep them away for at least another week more. The House of Representatives has not held a vote—a single vote—since September 19, 20 days ago.

In fact, would you care to guess how many days the House has been in town since the end of July? Twelve days. That is it. Since the summer, the House of Representatives has held votes for only 12 days.

If you are someone who works two jobs or works weekends or overtime to make ends meet, what on Earth are you supposed to think when House Republicans can't even be bothered to show up to reopen the government?

House Republicans are getting paid and not working, and they are asking Federal workers to work and not get paid. If your electricity prices are skyrocketing, if your premiums are going up by thousands of dollars, if you are getting charged more for a cup of coffee or your groceries, and you see Republicans on vacation for 3 weeks straight, that is basically a middle finger to hard-working Americans.

And let's be clear. The Speaker's dig-in-at-all-costs approach is not sitting well with some Members of his own party.

Yesterday, MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE said the following:

> The House has so much work to do, why aren't we coming back in session? We could be doing appropriations, passing important bills, and more.

Representative MASSIE of Kentucky tweeted something similar:

> The government is shut down, but the House refuses to go back in session. Why are we in recess?

Said Republican MASSIE.

> Because the day we go back into session, I have 218 votes for the discharge petition to force a vote on releasing the Epstein files.

Representative KEVIN KILEY of California, Republican, meanwhile, posted this:

> The Speaker shouldn't even think about cancelling session for a third straight week.

So the cracks are showing on the Republican side because they know

Speaker JOHNSON's position of not budging on healthcare fixes is untenable.

And in Louisiana, in fact, I would have thought that of all people interested in fixing ACA premiums, it would have been a Representative from the State of Louisiana. Yesterday, I read a sobering report from the Times-Picayune saying that ''Louisiana stands to lose the most'' if the ACA premium tax credits expire.

According to that report, 85,000 Louisiana residents will lose health insurance. Many will see their premiums skyrocket. The average 60-year-old Louisiana couple making $85,000 a year would see insurance costs rise from $600 a month to $2,000 a month.

Hear that, Mr. Speaker? That is your constituents. Good Americans in your own State will suffer the most if the ACA premiums expire.

People will go bankrupt, people will get sick, people will die—all because the Speaker chose to keep the House on vacation, rather than come to work, negotiate with Democrats to fix this healthcare crisis, and end their Trump shutdown. Shameful.

We urge the Republicans to back away from their corner and have serious negotiations that the American people deserve and expect before people get sick and go bankrupt.

REMEMBERING KEVIN MCDONALD

Mr. President, now, finally, on a different, more somber but grateful note, last month, the Senate lost a beloved member of our family: Kevin McDonald.

Kevin served as the scheduler for our former colleague Senator Patrick Leahy for over 30 years, and I know Patrick would be the first to admit that he wouldn't have had the great career he did without Kevin by his side.

I am sure there were many days when I called Patrick 10 or 20 times—I still remember his phone number—or asked him to rush to my office in the middle of something else, and made Kevin's life hell trying to keep his schedule. But Kevin, the consummate professional he was, always found a way to make it work.

He made the hardest days feel easier. He made the busiest days feel smoother. And everyone who knew him, whether you were a Senator, a staffer, a parking attendant, or a police officer—everyone—just loved to be around him. He was the life of every party. He lit up every room he walked into and had an innate ability to turn friends into family.

We will all miss Kevin. We thank him for his service to the Senate, the State of Vermont, and the country. Our prayers are with his family, his friends, and his loved ones.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor having just listened to the minority leader talk, and I read in Punchbowl News, this morning, the minority leader making a statement to Punchbowl.

He thinks the Democrats have momentum. His statement is:

Every day gets better for us.

That is what he said in an interview from his office, yesterday, when he was interviewed by the news. He said:

Every day gets better for us.

Who is us? Not better for the American people. Who does he mean by us? Not the military who is not getting paid, not the Border Patrol that is not getting paid, not the air traffic controllers who aren't getting paid. Who is us?

He is playing a game. The Washington Post talked about it, just yesterday, in that headline in their editorial page: Democrat ''leaders play a dangerous game.''

That is what we have here. And what does the minority leader say? ''Every day gets better for us.'' Who in the world is ''us''? Is it this group that has organized the shutdown? They have talked about having an orchestrated group of the far-left wing, the terrorist wing of the Democratic Party organizing and orchestrating the shutdown, planning for weeks in the minority leader's office, closely coordinated. It is hurting the American people, but the minority leader has said it is getting better for them.

Look, how can they brag about the damage that they are doing to the American people, whether it is women on the Women, Infants, and Children Program needing food; whether it is small businesses applying for loans through the Small Business Administration; our troops; our Border Patrol. But, boy, from what I see from the minority leader and where he is trying to lead this country, it is a perfect quote for the shutdown: It gets better for them every day. I will tell you, it is rubbish, and it is hurting our country.

Thirteen times we have voted to open the government, keep it open with a continuing resolution, in Joe Biden's term, and now they are not going to do it because Donald Trump is in the White House. That is what we have in this country today—a political game being played by the Democrats because they think that every day gets better for them.

This isn't right versus left; this is right versus wrong. That is what we are facing in this country today. There are 1.3 million soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, coastguardsmen—guardians on Active Duty to protect our Nation, protect our freedoms. They are going to miss their paychecks, but CHUCK SCHUMER says it is getting better for them.

For the brave men and women in uniform, one date looms large. It is October 15. Normally, October 15 is payday. This year, under the Schumer shutdown, where it is getting better for SCHUMER every day, it is going to be a day that paychecks don't arrive for every one of them.

Nine days ago, October 1, servicemembers of the ranks got their last paycheck, and it is going to be their last paycheck until the dangerous game, the political game that SCHUMER and the others are playing ends and government reopens. We could do it today with a vote. We are going to have an opportunity to do it.

And it is wrong. It is just wrong to do this as a game because it is getting better for them every day—or so they think.

This Friday, October 10, tomorrow, Border Patrol agents and other Federal workers will receive only half a paycheck. The Democrat leader says it is getting better for them.

Seventy-two percent of military families say their most pressing concern is missing a paycheck.

Half a million military families relocate to new duty stations each year. For them, costs can be crushing. Moving costs the families an average of $8,000 out of pocket. Normally, this is reimbursed—may not be for a while.

CHUCK SCHUMER says it is getting better for them every day.

Under the Schumer shutdown, military families are going to be forced to stretch out the budgets, dip into savings, and take out loans. This adds to financial stress and strain.

At Fort Hood in Texas, the local food bank is seeing a 34-percent spike in demand just since the shutdown began. Military families are lining up for food, diapers, and baby formula. One employee there said the situation in Fort Hood had never happened, ever.

Maybe they are just stocking up because they know that, for the Democrats, they think it is getting better every day. That is what they are aiming for.

What in the heck are they thinking? Well, those people that have planned and organized all of this are thinking: Hey, we have a big rally coming to Washington, a ''No Kings'' rally coming up on the 18th. Getting better for them every day. Let's just hurt the military more; the Border Patrol more; the women, infants, and children more—hurt them because it is getting better for them every day.

Who is the ''us''? It is the leftwing of the Democratic Party; it is not the American people.

That is what we are focused on here. I want to focus on opening the government up for the American people. We have offered a clean continuing resolution at current funding levels, at Biden's funding levels, current levels. It reopens the government, pays our servicemembers.

Republicans want to reopen the government. We have voted to not shut down the government. We want to make sure our troops don't miss the paycheck on October 15. Not the Democrats because they think it is getting better for them.

The date on their calendar is not the 15th, which is the date on the calendar of every military member; their date is

October 18. That is the date when the most radical, leftwing activists are going to descend upon Washington. They are coming to protest President Trump. And the Democrat leader and his leadership team are hoping they will actually receive cheers from that group because it is getting better for them every day. That is what they say.

This shutdown is all about politics. That is what it is all about. It has been planned and orchestrated and organized for months.

The Washington Post editorial said it best: The Democrats are playing ''a dangerous game.'' They are choosing politics over the paychecks of the American working men and women who protect our Nation. And this weakness defines today's Democratic Party. They are radical. They are extreme. They are dangerous. They are scary. They are out of touch. But they think it is getting better for those people every day.

They are holding our military hostage. Why? Because they want to impress the leftwing activists. It is indefensible.

Servicemembers now have to worry about putting food on the table so that the Democrats and Senator SCHUMER can try to satisfy the far-left, liberal wing of the party, who will never be satisfied until this country is destroyed. That is what they want.

It is no surprise that 55 percent of Americans say Democrats are shutting down the government just to please their radical base.

The Senate can reopen the government today, but we need a handful of Democrats to join us. Democrats voted 13 times for a clean continuing resolution under Joe Biden. They know that the Schumer shutdown—it is reckless, it is radical, and it is wrong.

Democrats don't seem to care because, according to CHUCK SCHUMER, ''Every day gets better for us.'' As a result, the Democrats are threatening America's safety, our security, and our prosperity.

The American people don't want the government closed. CHUCK SCHUMER does because every day gets better for him.

Two in three Americans demand Democrats accept the continuing resolution at current funding levels. It is the right thing to do. It is fair. It is reasonable. It is time Democrats listen to them. It is time to open the government so the troops can get paid.

That is what this is all about—a political game being played by the radical left. And they believe it is getting better for them each day, and CHUCK SCHUMER—this wasn't some offhanded comment; this is exactly what he said yesterday in a sit-down interview with the press in his office. These were planned words and orchestrated to appeal to the people that he is trying to appeal to, who are not the average American who just wants to go to work, just wants to get paid a fair wage for a fair, full day's work, and defend the country.

So I know who the ''us'' is when he says ''us,'' and it is not the American people; it is not the hard-working people of your State or my State who want to get up, go to work, get the kids to school, put food on the table, and live in this greatest country of all times.

That is what we are dealing with, and that is why I came to the floor this morning, because when I heard this comment by the minority leader, I could not let it stand, and the American people deserve better.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUBSIDIES

Mr. President, on a separate matter, I want to talk about something else.

In July, President Trump signed into law the working-families tax cut. That legislation stopped a $4 trillion tax increase, it secured our border, it unleashed American energy, and it slashed wasteful Washington spending.

I thought one of the most egregious subsidies we eliminated was the electric vehicle tax credits. Under Joe Biden, Washington provided lucrative, luxury tax credits to prop up EV sales. The Biden car bribes forced working families to subsidize vehicles that people didn't want, couldn't afford, and weren't very practical in my State.

I have fought against these costly EV handouts for years. I introduced bills to repeal them, and I was joined by my Republican colleagues. I especially want to recognize the senior Senator from Ohio, Senator BERNIE MORENO.

Hard-working families should not be forced to bankroll luxury vehicles for wealthy elites. Republicans in Congress acted decisively. We terminated the EV tax credits. We deliberately chose September 30 as the end date for the subsidies. This quick termination meant significant savings for taxpayers—$200 billion in savings over the next 10 years.

But, as the saying goes, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. In Washington, we have to follow up and fight to protect taxpayers and taxpayer dollars even when the intent of Congress is clear. That is where I really want to point out the hard work of Senator MORENO, because that is what the Republicans are doing.

In recent weeks, Senator MORENO and I read troubling news. There was a last-ditch effort to game the system in the final days before the cutoff date. We immediately wrote to Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent to alert him about the issue and to address the problem. Senator TED CRUZ of Texas, who is chairman of the Commerce Committee, also raised his concern with the Treasury Department about the subsidies.

Major car companies responded to the letter, and they changed their policies, and I encourage all companies to follow their lead.

Republicans are going to continue to protect taxpayers and ensure these subsidies are gone for good. Here is the reality: The subsidies were never needed in the first place. Look at what has happened since Congress ended them. Tesla has actually lowered its prices. They have done it by stripping out luxury features, like vegan leather seats and ambient lighting. Hyundai slashed nearly $10,000 off of their Georgia-built model. This is precisely how fair market competition works.

Americans elected Republicans to end Washington wasteful spending. We are keeping our word.

So I am going to continue to work with my Senate colleagues and the Trump administration to keep this loophole closed, to enforce the law, and to protect hard-working taxpayers.

I yield the floor.

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

S. 2296

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, we are in an unfortunate period of hyperpartisanship that doesn't look good from this angle, and I know it doesn't look good to the general public. But I have some good, bipartisan news that might make us feel better about our national security. As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I come to the floor this morning and say that we are finally in a position to take up on the floor and vote on and pass the National Defense Authorization Act.

This is a very important act that we have managed, in times of majority and minority in Democratic and Republican administrations, to pass each year for over six decades.

My partner and colleague, the former chairman of the committee, JACK REED, and now ranking Democrat member, has worked with me, along with our Armed Services Committee members and our capable staffs, and we have built a strong, bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act.

It started this summer, when, earlier than usual, the committee approved our bill by an overwhelming majority of 26 to 1. Let me say that again. In this time when we can't seem to muster a 60-vote majority to keep us in business as a Federal Government, we were able to pass the National Defense Authorization Act by a vote of 26 to 1. It is member-driven, and it is full of national security priorities from Senators across this body on both sides of the aisle. It is designed to make important changes to make our country stronger, to make our defenses better and more able to defend ourselves and, therefore, to prevent armed conflict.

Senator REED and I have worked with majority and minority Members to build a bipartisan package of 49 amendments to be offered on the floor, and we are within moments of a decision point. We can decide to bring this matter to the floor and get unanimous consent to lock in consideration or we can begin voting, which will take us into the afternoon. I have to say that based on experience, if we don't get this locked in at this moment, then we will miss an opportunity to consider these amendments on the floor because we simply are going to run out of time if

we don't proceed before the weekend break.

The package was included in the substitute amendment, which we filed back before the August break.

Since that time, we worked closely to take the next step. We have 47 amendments for a second managers' package, and this has been agreed upon by the ranking member and by me and by our membership, split evenly between Republicans and Democrats. It contains numerous bipartisan items. We might not take all 17 votes, but we have teed up 17 votes—again, split evenly or split as evenly as possible between Republican bills and Democrat bills.

I say to you, Mr. President, and I say to the leadership of the Democratic minority in this Senate, we are ready to vote on the NDAA. We are ready to show on both sides of the aisle that the Senate can act in the interest of national security and get something done on a bipartisan basis.

For heaven's sake, we need to do that at this moment, even more importantly than at other times. We have a great product before us. It makes huge changes—significant changes—and we need to send the signal that we can do this, get it then coordinated with the House version, which has already been passed, and move it to the President of the United States for his early signature.

I, genuinely, thank my partner, Senator JACK REED, for his tireless work with me to get to this point. I was looking forward to locking in a unanimous consent request at this moment, but I have been told to hold off. It could be coming in just a few minutes. But we have to get that unanimous consent to avoid vote after vote after vote on cloture on these various proposals and amendments. We have to lock that in. We must do it this morning—in the next hour perhaps—between now and the first vote, which I believe begins in about 30 minutes.

We simply cannot delay this process any longer. Let me make it clear: If we do not bring this to the floor today, this matter will not have time for deliberation on the Senate floor, and we will have to basically pretend that we are having a conference between House and Senate Members, and a very small group of Senators will have to write this bill and bring it to the floor for final passage. That is not the way this ought to be done, and it can be avoided with a unanimous consent request in just a very few minutes.

The good news is, we are ready to proceed. The good news is, the committee is united, 26 to 1, and my ranking member and I are ready to proceed. We simply need a Democratic leader to come down here and agree to unanimous consent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

DISAPPROVAL OF THE CENTRAL YUKON RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we have all talked about what the primary goal is right now in the Senate. It is to reopen the Federal Government, but that is not all we need to reopen right now.

As we focus on ending this shutdown, I have come to speak in support of a disapproval resolution that is now pending. This is H.J. Res. 106. This is the companion to the resolution that Senator SULLIVAN and I have introduced to reopen the Central Yukon resource management plan after BLM finalized it over our objection last fall.

The formal name of this rule is the Central Yukon Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan. The name is big, and it is a really big area, encompassing nearly 56 million acres, mostly in Northern and Interior Alaska, so the full State of Alaska.

But it is this central area here that is really quite substantial. Not all of that is Federal land. You will see the different colors here. In fact, most of it is not. This RMP is only supposed to affect 13.3 million acres managed by BLM. That is still a lot of land. To put it into perspective, it is more than twice the total acreage of Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Vermont. That is what you are looking at here within this region.

We do need an RMP, resource management plan, to guide management of the Central Yukon's Federal acres. This plan is meant to replace older regimes that were put in place back in 1981, 1986, and 1991, as well as some lands that are unplanned. This is a big undertaking. It has been going on for a long time. It started back in 2013, 12 years ago, costing taxpayers millions of dollars to complete.

I didn't want to have to overturn this RMP because I really do respect much of the work that was done—certainly, the people who worked really hard to do it. I also recognize that some Alaskans support pieces of last year's final plan and are concerned that their input could be lost if it is reopened.

But the problem we have here and why we are taking this resolution up today, is that the Biden administration, which was in office during the last few years of this 12-year process, really has left us with no choice here. They lost sight of the need for balanced management. They dropped any pretense of it from the final plan.

So despite objections from me, from Senator SULLIVAN, the State of Alaska, many Alaskan stakeholders, BLM kind of plowed ahead, and they finalized a plan that overwhelmingly prioritizes conservation but fails to reflect the principle of multiple use, multiple use that is required with our public lands and fails to honor the explicit requirements of a Federal law.

There are some very significant issues within this plan. There are further deficiencies based on what BLM pledged to do and then refused to do. And that combination is what caused us to file this resolution and to seek a more balanced plan going forward.

Let's go through those problems in a little bit greater detail. I expect that one of the things you are going to hear today in opposition is that this is unprecedented; that Congress is now overturning 12 years of nonpolitical, legally sound Agency work. If that were true, I would not be standing here in opposition to this. I would be a no on the resolution, but that is not where we are.

In December of 2020 and BLM's eighth year of work on this RMP, the Agency released a draft plan with a pretty reasonable preferred alternative. This is a proposal that would have protected sensitive areas; it would have upheld subsistence and recreational uses; it would have provided opportunities for resource development and other legal uses on BLM land. Under that proposal, many outdated public land orders—we call them PLOs—would have been lifted, and the majority of BLM lands would have been accessible.

Just a few years later, we saw a very different preferred alternative emerge from BLM. This was in the middle of the Biden administration. The final Record of Decision issued last November is 362 pages long. There are multiple appendices that total another 1,428 pages. It is 1,800 pages. This is the stack of the maps and the pages of the final Record of Decision—1,800 pages showing those various designations and restrictions.

This is in not a user-friendly plan. It is not a printer-friendly plan, that is for sure. But it is also not a BLM employee-friendly plan. It is long and complex. And unless you are really superinvested in learning what was designated as visual resource management class II as opposed to class III or IV, you are probably not really going to enjoy reading it.

The differences between what the BLM proposed in 2020 and what BLM finalized in 2024 show how this process went off the rails. I will give you a couple of examples here. In 2020, BLM proposed one area of critical environmental concern—we call them ACECs—and research natural area. These are administrative withdrawals for conservation and restrict other uses. This covered 77,000 acres.

Then, last year, BLM's final RMP ballooned this to include 21 ACECs and RNAs, covering 3.6 million acres. This is imposing restrictions on nearly 47 times more land.

In 2020, BLM proposed 497,000 acres of special recreation management areas. In 2024, we saw that triple to 1.453 million acres. In 2020, BLM proposed a little over a million acres of utility and transportation corridors. In 2024, that fell by two-thirds to just 33,000 acres.

In 2020, BLM proposed to have almost 7.5 million acres open to fluid mineral leasing. Then, in 2024, it leaves just 845,000 acres, and that is 89 percent

less. So you can see the dramatic differences between the plan in 2020 and the plan in 2024.

There is a lot more I could go through, but the point is that restrictions exploded in the final plan while opportunities for economic development were severely curtailed. We saw it over and over in Alaska over the last 4 years. We don't think it was any accident. You have heard my colleague speak on the floor about this a great deal, but it was just, really, the last administration's goal to reduce and curtail many of these activities. BLM's treatment of public land orders, which have been obsolete in Alaska for decades, also backslid dramatically. These came to be in the 1970s when Alaska's land ownership was greatly unsettled, but they should have been revoked a long time ago.

In 2020, BLM proposed to revoke 5.863 million acres of so-called d-1 withdrawals, but then, in 2024, BLM zeroes that out. Instead, they have only lifted withdrawals for one narrow purpose. It is an important purpose, but it is very narrow, and that is allotments for eligible Alaska Vietnam veterans but no others. In 2020, BLM proposed to lift PLO 5150, reflecting State and Native selections around our Trans-Alaska Pipeline corridor, but then, in 2024, BLM reversed course. It refused to lift a single acre of PLO 5150 within the RMP process.

The problem is that BLM told us—they told me; they told my team—that they would address PLO 5150 through a separate process. They called it a tiered environmental assessment, and they said that that was going to begin immediately after the finalization of the Central Yukon RMP. They just had to get to that point, and they just needed us to back off so they could. Guess what never happened. The day after the State of Alaska's consistency review period for the Central Yukon RMP ended, BLM canceled its separate process for PLO 5150. It was an absurd decision.

BLM spent years—they spent years—telling us that they could only lift public land orders within the RMP process. And then, as the Central Yukon RMP nears completion, they then tell us that they could only lift one of the most visible PLOs in Alaska outside of it. And then as soon as we reach that point, they break their promise, immediately pulling the whole thing down.

My team was actually on the phone with BLM when this happened. They asked about the process, and they were told everything was on track. Everything was going just fine. Right after—probably not even more than 30 minutes after that—BLM calls State officials to tell them it is off and is never coming back. If that is not a bait and switch, you know, I don't know what is. This is where you can start to see how BLM's actions—both what it did and what it refused to do in this RMP—directly contradict multiple Federal laws.

The first is ANILCA, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. That was Alaska's grand bargain. This is where Congress withdrew and conserved tens of millions of acres in our State in exchange for reasonable opportunities for economic development, whether it be within the 1002 Area, the Ambler Road, but this was the deal back in 1980. And to confirm that Alaska had done its part for national conservation, ANILCA also includes several of what we call ''no more'' clauses, reflecting the fact that we were done and that no more wilderness needed to be designated in the State of Alaska.

It should be pretty apparent that the unilateral, administrative designation of 3.6 million acres of ACECs, dozens of other restrictions across millions of other acres, and the retention of virtually all land withdrawals, which were supposed to be lifted decades ago, are all directly contrary to ANILCA.

The Central Yukon plan also conflicts with a law that I wrote called the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act. Some people around here are still surprised that Alaska's land ownership is still not settled yet. Sixty-six years after statehood, neither our State nor our Native land entitlements have been fulfilled. We have got millions of acres remaining outstanding on both of these, and their settlement hinges on the Federal Government making available and then transferring selected lands.

Congress agreed to enact my Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act back in 2004. We set this goal that our land entitlements would be complete by 2009. That was the 50th anniversary of statehood. Well, that didn't happen, but some good did come from it. BLM surveyed its land withdrawals in Alaska. Then, in 2006, there was a report to Congress that recommended that 95 percent of them—covering 152 million acres—could be lifted consistent with the protection of the public's interest. The only caveat here was that BLM preferred to lift its orders through its land planning process.

So we worked with them. We pushed to make that happen. We have appropriated funding to make it happen. But when BLM undertakes a new RMP and decides that not a single acre of a single PLO can be lifted across 13.3 million acres for any other purpose other than Native allotments, you are going to see patience run out, and then it turns to frustration; it turns to opposition. Then it takes us to where we are today, which is to the congressional disapproval of a resource management plan.

I would also point out that the Central Yukon RMP conflicts with ANCSA, or the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The regional ANC in the Central Yukon area, Doyon, has rightly pointed out that BLM's actions in this RMP would make it difficult, if not impossible, to utilize its lands for the benefit of its people in line with congressional intent.

In a letter to Alaska's congressional delegation, Doyon explained how BLM's restrictive land designations will ''complicate access to and use of Doyon lands and potentially prevent Doyon from fully realizing the economic and other benefits that Congress intended it would enjoy as a result of ANCSA's settlement of aboriginal land claims.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks.

We also received a letter of support for this resolution from the North Slope Trilateral, which includes the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, the North Slope Borough, and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, ASRC. Their letter lays out a series of fundamental flaws within the final Central Yukon plan, including its failure to account for North Slope priorities, the impact that it would have on Native lands, the barriers it creates to cooperative land management, the restrictions it imposes to foreclose the production of rare earth elements and other resources, as well as the lack of consultation with Alaska Natives who live on the North Slope during its development.

As the Trilateral writes, ''The result is a plan that ignores congressional intent under both ANCSA and ANILCA, disregards the economic needs of North Slope communities, and creates unnecessary obstacles to infrastructure, energy, and community health across northern Alaska.''

So, again, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the North Slope leaders be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

The sad part is that what these Alaskans are pointing to—restrictions that encumber access to lands and opportunities—was largely the point of BLM's final RMP, and that again points to why we are here to disapprove this plan.

I should point out that there is a big misunderstanding about the effects of this resolution. There have been some false claims out there, and I think there has been some kind of sloppy reporting of them. But when the House passed this resolution, we saw over and over again in different articles that somehow or other the passage of that resolution had approved the Ambler Access Project, which is not the case. That project has been in permitting for a decade. Then, just on Monday, President Trump issued a determination reapproving it, which we appreciate, but nothing in this disapproval resolution approves that project. So that is just misinformation out there.

What is true is that, over the course of decades, Congress has ceded a lot of authority on Federal land management to the executive branch. We trust them to follow the laws that we have made and find a balance between competing uses and priorities. We know it is not

an easy job, especially in a State where you have more than 223 million Federal acres, but when the Agencies lose sight of that, it is our job here—it is our responsibility—to rein them in.

That is what we are doing. We are reminding BLM that these are public lands that are generally available for multiple use, not exclusively conserved lands with layer after layer of administrative restrictions heaped onto them.

Before I end here, I would like to briefly discuss what comes next if we are able to pass this disapproval resolution.

It should be very clear. Passage does not invalidate 12 years of Agency work. It does not overturn the environmental analysis that has been done or the public comments that have been received. We are simply reopening this plan, and we are telling BLM: Return. Come back with a new one that is more balanced. That shouldn't be hard, and it shouldn't take that long because the plan already exists. It was just abandoned once the Biden administration took office.

For 8 years, BLM was on the right track in this process. It has a ready-made plan in the form of its preferred alternative from 2020. The record of decision from last year even acknowledges that the 2020 preferred alternative features a ''blend of resource protection and resource development.'' It is an actual balance between the two, and that is what we should be seeking. It is time to go back to that proposal, update it as needed based on the passage of time, and put into place a final Central Yukon plan that maintains access, respects multiple use, and conserves where necessary and appropriate.

It is entirely possible to serve the varied interests of this region, and through this resolution, that is exactly what we are telling BLM to do. When they do, we will have a final Central Yukon resource management plan that Alaska's delegation, the State of Alaska, the largest landowner in the region—Doyon—and a wide range of Alaska stakeholders can support. So I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

JULY 21, 2025.

Hon. NICHOLAS J. BEGICH III,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BEGICH: Thank you for introducing H.J. Res. 106, to disapprove the November 12, 2024, Central Yukon Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (Central Yukon RMP). Doyon, Limited (Doyon) strongly supports this joint resolution and urges Congress's and the President's swift action to reject this misguided and harmful planning decision.

Doyon is a major stakeholder in the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) Central Yukon RMP planning process. Many large tracts of lands that were conveyed to Doyon under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) are surrounded by, or abut, BLM-managed public lands. Doyon owns substantial interests in the Central Yukon Planning Area, holding an ownership interest in approximately 4.65 million acres. In addition, it has selected an additional 127,000 acres in the Planning Area under ANCSA that have not yet been conveyed. Doyon's land base shares approximately 3,000 miles of border with BLM lands—potentially more than any other Indigenous landowner in the nation. Consistent with ANCSA's intent, much of the land that Doyon selected was selected for its economic developmental potential.

As Doyon explained to BLM throughout the Central Yukon RMP planning process, futher enveloping Doyon's lands within new or expanded Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) and other restrictive land designations, and otherwise imposing restrictions on use of surrounding lands, will further complicate access to and use of Doyon lands, and potentially prevent Doyon from fully realizing the economic and other benefits that Congress intended it would enjoy as a result of ANCSA's settlement of aboriginal land claims. In addition, because oil and gas, mineral, and other resource prospects often straddle federal, state, and/or private lands, the more that BLM planning processes place lands off limits to multiple uses, the more likely resource development opportunities will be unavailable on Doyon (and other non-federal) lands in the vicinity, impeding Doyon's ability to make economically productive use of its lands as Congress intended when it settled aboriginal land claims in Alaska. The management decisions made in the 2024 Central Yukon RMP also will have long-term implications for communications, electric transmission, and other infrastructure activities in the region, adding further obstacles to what already are extraordinary challenges to connecting rural communities in Alaska.

Doyon devoted significant resources to engaging with BLM over the course of the Central Yukon RMP planning process to ensure that the result of that process reflects the principles of multiple use and sustained yield established under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, as well as the unique framework that Congress established in Alaska under ANCSA and Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). Unfortunately, despite these concerted efforts of Doyon and others, the 2024 plan fails to do that.

Key flaws justifying congressional disapproval of the 2024 Central Yukon RMP—as further detailed in the protest that Doyon submitted in response to the Central Yukon Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement released by BLM on April 19, 2024—include the following:

The 2024 Cental Yukon RMP improperly designates certain ACECs/Research Natural Areas by including areas that do not meet applicable requirements for designation and management of ACECs and improperly determines special management attention is required. It also improperly designates ACECs that effectively surround or restrict access to Doyon-conveyed lands, as well as that include Doyon-selected lands.

The 2024 Central Yukon RMP fails to appropriately address impacts of right-of-way exclusion and avoidance areas on access and other activities.

The 2024 Central Yukon RMP fails to adequately and appropriately address access rights guaranteed under Section 1323(b) and Title XI of ANILCA.

The 2024 Central Yukon RMP inappropriately concludes that hypothetical future development of mineral deposits in the Amber Mining District, Wiseman East and West desposits, and the Ray Mountains could ''significantly restrict subsistence uses and have a disproportionate negative impact'' on certain ''environmental justice communities'' as well as ''significantly restrict subsistence uses for'' certain communities.

The 2024 Central Yukon RMP fails to fully consider potential impacts of designating certain lands as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II and redesignate them as VRM Class III or IV.

The 2024 Central Yukon RMP improperly ignores the long history of BLM's calling for the lifting of the ANCSA 17(d)(1) withdrawals and fails to provide a rational explanation for retaining those withdrawals other than for the limited purposes of selection by Alaska Native Vietnam-era veterans.

The 2024 Central Yukon RMP violated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in adopting a new alternative not made available to the public for review and comment and in not providing the public an opportunity to provide informed comment after correction of an error in stated ANCSA 17(d)(1) acreages.

We appreciate your efforts to move forward with disapproval of the 2024 Central Yukon RMP and we urge Congress and the President to move quickly to enact this joint resolution.

Please let us know if you have any questions or if we can provide any additional information.

Sincerely,

SARAH E. OBED,
SVP External Affairs,
Doyon, Limited.

OCTOBER 3, 2025.

Re Support for H.J. Res. 106 and the Senate Companion—Disapproval of the 2024 Central Yukon RMP.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. DAN SULLIVAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. NICHOLAS BEGICH III,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS MURKOWSKI, SULLIVAN AND REPRESENTATIVE BEGICH: We write in strong support of H.J. Res. 106 and the Senate companion resolution disapproving the November 12, 2024, Central Yukon Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (Central Yukon RMP) and urge swift congressional and presidential action to reject this harmful and unlawful planning decision.

The Central Yukon RMP, if allowed to stand, would have significant and far-reaching consequences for Alaska Native landowners, critical transportation and infrastructure, economic development opportunities, and the ability of our people to exercise the selfdetermination guaranteed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA). Like our neighbors in Interior Region of Alaska and Doyon, Limited, whose lands are directly impacted, we have consistently raised concerns about how the 2024 plan undermines ANCSA's framework, disregards the principles of multiple use and sustained yield under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and violates key provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA).

BACKGROUND

The North Slope Iñupiat have lived in the Arctic for over 10,000 years. We are proud of our self-determination efforts to ensure future generations of Iñupiat continue to reside in our communities and have access to essential services. Without a stable economy, our communities will suffer and so too will our ability to engage in our Iñupiaq cultural traditions, including a subsistence way of life.

The North Slope of Alaska spans an area nearly the size of the state of Minnesota and, within that expansive area, there are eight Iñupiaq communities—Anaktuvuk Pass, Atqasuk, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut, Point Hope, Point Lay, Utqiaġvik, and Wainwright. None of our communities are connected by a permanent road system; all supplies must be flown or barged in, making the cost of living extremely high and economic opportunities generally low.

Fifty years ago, the Federal Government directed Alaska Native people to organize in a new structure of indigenous representation. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA) was a dramatically different approach by the Federal Government to federal Indian policy. The fact that our ancestral lands were claimed by the Federal Government before our people had a right to settle aboriginal land claims should inform every decision of the Federal Government in managing those lands.

Unlike the Lower 48 model of indigenous representation where tribal governments typically administer the delivery of services such as healthcare, public safety, education, land management, and economic development, the passage of ANCSA created a shared system of Alaska Native representation and delivery of services. Our region has a multitude of Alaska Native entities that work together to effectively serve, provide for, and enrich the lives of the North Slope Iñupiat we represent. Our three regional entities, the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope (ICAS), the North Slope Borough (Borough), and Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC) are three of those entities. While our roles differ, our constituencies overlap, which is why we work closely together to protect the cultural and economic interests of the North Slope Iñupiat.

While our leaders over fifty years ago were initially wary of any development on our lands, our Iñupiaq leaders have spent decades focused on open communication and transparency in planning with industry. We have exercised true self-determination through a unique framework of Alaska Native governance—a framework that relies on our tribal governments, municipal governments, and Alaska Native corporations established by Congress to serve our indigenous constituents. For millennia Iñupiaq ingenuity has transformed our relationship with industry into a partnership that has both protected our environment and our way of life and has brought significant economic benefits to the region that would have otherwise been absent. Our North Slope residents are keenly aware that advances in our communities—running water, local schools, health care, public safety, electricity, and more—have come because of the coordination and cooperation of Alaska Native leaders and entities across the region.

ICAS

Established in 1971, the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope is the federally recognized regional tribal government for the North Slope and represents over 13,000 Iñupiaq tribal members. The mission of ICAS is to exercise its sovereign rights and powers for the benefit of tribal members, to conserve and retain tribal lands and resources including subsistence. For millennia Iñupiaq ingenuity has transformed our relationship with industry into a partnership that has both protected our environment and our way of life and has brought significant economic benefits to the region that would have otherwise been absent. Our North Slope residents are keenly aware that advances in our communities—running water, local schools, health care, public safety, electricity, and more—have come because of the coordination and cooperation of Alaska Native leaders and entities across the region.

NORTH SLOPE BOROUGH

The Borough is a home rule government located above the Arctic Circle that represents roughly 10,000 residents. The Borough's jurisdiction includes the entire NPR-A and the eight villages within it. In 1972, the North Slope Iñupiat formed the Borough, in part, to ensure our communities would benefit from oil and gas development on their ancestral homelands. It was the first time Alaska Natives took control of their destiny using a regional municipal government. The Borough exercises its powers of taxation, property assessment, education, and planning and zoning services to serve our communities. Taxes levied on oil and gas infrastructure have enabled the Borough to invest in public infrastructure and utilities, support education, and provide police, fire, emergency, health, and other services. Elsewhere in rural Alaska, these services are typically provided primarily by the State or Federal Government, or both.

ASRC

ASRC is a for profit, land-owning Alaska Native regional corporation formed pursuant to ANCSA. ASRC represents the same region as the Borough and ICAS, and the same eight villages whose residents are predominantly Iñupiat, and who comprise many of our approximately 14,000 Alaska Native shareholders. ASFRC holds the title to approximately five million acres of land on the North Slope, including both surface and subsurface lands. These lands—the ancestral lands of the North Slope Iñupiat—were conveyed to ASRC by the United States pursuant to ANCSA to provide for the economic and cultural wellbeing of our Iñupiaq shareholders.

ASRC is committed both to providing sound financial returns to our shareholders, in the form of jobs and dividends, and to preserving our Iñupiaq way of life, culture, and traditions, including the ability to maintain a subsistence lifestyle to provide for our communities. In furtherance of this congressionally mandated mission to provide benefits to our shareholders, ASRC conducts and will continue to invest in a variety of activities related to infrastructure and natural resource development and other economic initiatives.

ASRC's perspective is based on the dual realities that our Iñupiaq culture and communities depend on a healthy ecosystem and subsistence resources, as well as infrastructure and resource development as the foundation of sustainable North Slope communities.

DISAPPROVAL OF THE 2024 CENTRAL YUKON RMP

Several fundamental flaws justify disapproval of this plan:

Access and Infrastructure: The RMP fails to account for the North Slope Borough's Community Winter Access Trails (CWAT) project and the Arctic Strategic Transportation and Resources (ASTAR) initiative, both of which are vital to lowering costs and connecting isolated communities. The plan also misrepresents existing rights-of-way and ignores the mandates of Section 1323(b) and Title XI of ANILCA, which guarantee reasonable access to Native-owned inholdings.

Impact on Native Lands: The RMP designates 21 ACECs and other restrictive areas that surround ASRC lands, devaluing them by blocking development potential and preventing reasonable use. These decisions not only harm ASRC's economic viability but also diminish potential revenue-sharing distributions under ANCSA Section 7(i), reducing benefits for Alaska Natives statewide.

Allotments and Alaska Native Veterans: By restricting surrounding BLM lands, the plan cuts off opportunities for individual Alaska Native allotment owners—including veterans eligible for allotments under recent legislation—to pursue development and long-term economic benefits from their property.

Land Status Conflicts: The RMP disregards the unique patchwork of ownership in the Planning Area, where BLM manages only limited tracts compared to ASRC and the State. In several parcels, BLM manages only the surface estate while ASRC holds subsurface rights, yet the plan creates barriers to cooperative management and development.

Economic and Energy Development: The RMP forecloses future opportunities on the North Slope unnecessarily limits exploration for rare earth elements critical to U.S. energy security. At the same time, it fails to acknowledge that adjacent lands already provide extensive wilderness values under ANILCA, making additional restrictive designations duplicative and unjustified.

Procedural Failures: After a decade of consultation contrary to those consultations, the Central Yukon RMP was finalized through a flawed process that included adopting alternatives not subject to public review, retaining outdated ANCSA 17(d)(1) withdrawals without justification, and failing to engage in meaningful government-to-government consultation with Alaska Native entities like ICAS and ASRC.

The result is a plan that ignores congressional intent under both ANCSA and ANILCA, disregards the economic needs of North Slope communities, and creates unnecessary obstacles to infrastructure, energy, and community health across northern Alaska.

Despite claims to the contrary, the Central Yukon Plan doesn't open the Armbler Access Road and covers a planning area of fifty million acres of land which largely are unmanaged by the BLM while directly preventing our ability to exercise self-determination through our respective entities.

SUPPORT FOR H.J. RES 106 AND SENATE COMPANION

We therefore strongly support H.J. Res. 106 the Senate companion resolution and urge Congress and the President to act swiftly to disapprove the 2024 Central Yukon RMP. The North Slope Regional Trilateral stands ready to provide additional information and testimony as needed to ensure Alaska Native rights and priorities are upheld.

Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

NICOLE WOJCIECHOWSKI,
President, Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope.
JOSIAH PATKOTAK,
Mayor, North Slope Borough.
REX A. ROCK SR.,
President and CEO, Arctic Slope Regional Corporation.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I yield the floor to my colleague from Alaska, who has worked very, very hard on this resolution, and I appreciate his leadership of the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

WAIVING QUORUM CALLS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls with respect to cloture on the motions to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882, and Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371.

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

DISAPPROVAL OF THE CENTRAL YUKON RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI for her remarks on the vote that we are getting ready to take on the CRA that deals with the Central Yukon plan.

I am going to be a little bit more brief since she covered a lot of material and did a great job of doing it, but I want to give my colleagues just a little sense of the elements of why this plan—''plan''—needs to be repealed by the U.S. Senate as part of a CRA.

By the way, Mr. President, this is going to continue in the vein of what we did with your great State of Montana and North Dakota the last 2 days on the Senate floor with these CRAs.

What is going on here? We all know what is going on here both with regard to Montana and with regard to North Dakota and, of course, with regard to Alaska. The previous administration came in and said: Even though it is probably illegal, we are going to try to lock up these States because we don't want resource development in these States.

Imagine, Mr. President, as Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, the Central Yukon plan that the Biden administration issued—we didn't want it. Nobody really wanted it in Alaska. It is almost 56 million acres. That is the size of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania combined, just that one plan. It gives you a sense of how big my State is. But can you imagine a President of the United States, if you are a Republican, telling the people of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania that they are going to be saddled with a plan they didn't want to large swaths of their land, destroying thousands of jobs, which is what this plan would do? Nobody would accept that.

This planned scheme of the Biden administration disregards local voices, ignores protections guaranteed under Federal law—ANCSA and ANILCA—and undermines the ability of Alaska Native corporations, which did not want it, to access and responsibly develop their lands, which Congress gave them in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act in 1971.

These are the key elements of why it is a problem. It is also part of a long pattern with the Biden administration that I never tire of reminding people.

This is the chart we call the last frontier lockup. The last administration issued 70 Executive orders and Executive actions singularly focused on Alaska—7–0. I confronted President Biden in the Oval Office respectfully when we were at 48. Here is the list of them, by the way, of the 70. That is each one, 7–0—only against Alaska.

I said: Mr. President, why are you doing this? Why are you going to war with my people—working families, Americans? You are sanctioning Alaska more than you sanctioned Iran and Venezuela, and they are terrorist regimes.

He didn't know. I don't think he knew what was going on. But it was wrong.

This, by the way, this Central Yukon management plan, was one of the 70 that we didn't want; that the vast majority of the Native people didn't want; certainly that the Native corporation Doyon—most of their land—they didn't want it.

What we need to do instead, as opposed to locking up Alaska—I said to President Biden: It is not good for Alaska, sir, but it is also not good for America—is we need to do this: unleash Alaska's extraordinary resource potential.

By the way, thank you, President Trump.

This is a day-one Executive order, one of the first Executive orders President Trump issued when he came into office in January and said: We are not going to lock up Alaska; we are going to unleash it.

In his Executive order, we also have essentially getting rid of this Central Yukon management plan from the Biden administration.

So thank you, Mr. President.

Now, my colleagues—I am asking all of them, and I am particularly asking my Democratic colleagues, because I want you guys to show that you are not so anti-Alaska.

The Democratic Party at the national level has become the anti-Alaska party, and that is the anti-Alaska Native party. So many things that we care about in my State in the interest of the Native people—all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle make it a point—a point—to try to crush us in our opportunity and cancel Native voices—yes, indigenous voices. They are always working to cancel them.

Here is your opportunity, Democrat colleagues, to vote yes on this CRA. Listen to me and Senator MURKOWSKI, the people who represent the people in the great State of Alaska. Listen to President Trump. That is what we want.

I am going to mention just one final thing on why this is so important, why I get really animated about this with all of my colleagues.

A lot of people have seen this chart, but I like showing it because it is a really important issue. This is a chart from the American Medical Association from 1980 to 2014. It has life expectancy in America. The places that are blue, darker blue, and purple, if you look at the chart, these people are living longer. Purple is 13 years. So in 24 years, in certain parts of America, the life expectancy of Americans increased by 13 years.

Unfortunately, in our great Nation—look at the yellow, orange, and red on this chart. That is actually life expectancy decreasing. Of course, nobody wants that. A lot of that was the opioid epidemic and things.

But guess which State had the greatest increase in life expectancy of anyplace in America from 1980 to 2014 according to the American Medical Association. Alaska—especially the North Slope region, interior Alaska, the Aleutian Island area, southeast Alaska.

So what happened from 1980 to 2014 in that part of Alaska? I will tell you what happened. Responsible resource development happened, and people started living longer. They got jobs. They got water and sewer, flushed toilets, gymnasiums, health clinics—things that the lower 48 just takes for granted that we didn't have in a lot of our State. Because we had responsible resource development—mining oil and gas on the North Slope, fishing out on the Aleutian Island chains—all because of laws we made here in Congress, the people of Alaska, particularly the Native people, started living longer—living longer.

I have asked my colleagues—and I have used this chart a lot—to give me an indicator of policy success more important than the people you represent living longer. There isn't one. That is the most important. The people you represent are living longer. Why? Because of responsible resource development. There is no doubt. Here is the chart. Alaskans are living up to 13 years longer.

Now, Native people in my State, unfortunately, started at a really low level—some of the lowest levels of life expectancy—but because we are developing our resources responsibly, my constituents are living longer.

So when you have these groups and you have the Biden administration and, no offense, you have a lot of my Senate Democratic colleagues trying to shut down my State, which they always do, do you know what you are doing? You are actually impacting people's lives and how long they live.

This is really important for me and the people I represent. This is a good opportunity to tell the Biden administration: Hey, you are not going to do this. You are not going to do it to Montana, you are not going to do it to North Dakota, and you certainly are not going to do it to Alaska because you are going to negatively impact people's lives.

I really hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and I really hope at least one or two Democrats have the courage to come and say: Do you know what, Dan, you have been talking about this for 10 years. I agree with you. I am going to vote to rescind this Biden CRA or this Biden Yukon management plan that nobody wanted, to help your State and help America.

One more thing. In this part of the State where that Central Yukon management plan is—like I said, 56 million

acres—51 of the 56 critical minerals that our country needs are in this area.

I was in an Armed Services hearing recently, and everybody, including a lot of my Democrat colleagues, said: Gosh, we are so reliant on China for critical minerals. What can we do?

I can tell you what you can do: Quit shutting down my State. Let us develop critical minerals in Alaska as opposed to relying on them from China.

That is another reason this is important—for the national security of our country.

With that, I ask all of my colleagues to support this CRA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, and notwithstanding rule XXII, it be in order to call up the following amendments to Calendar No. 115, S. 2296: Paul, No. 3761; Cruz, No. 3274; Scott of Florida, No. 3535; Marshall, No. 3213; Moran, No. 3814; Curtis, No. 3697; Lee-Duckworth, No. 3288; Cotton-Gillibrand, No. 3759; Cornyn-Cortez Masto, No. 3926; Hagerty-Peters, No. 3841; Schumer, No. 3109; Van Hollen, No. 3872; Duckworth, No. 3210; Warnock, No. 3010; Kaine, No. 3337; Sanders, No. 3853; and Merkley, No. 3927; further, that with respect to the amendments listed above, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate vote on the amendments in the order listed, with no further amendments or motions in order and with 60 affirmative votes required for adoption and that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; further, that upon disposition of the Merkley amendment, No. 3927, the following amendments be called up and made pending en bloc and that they be the only remaining amendments in order to S. 2296: Scott of South Carolina, No. 3340; Hassan, No. 2928; Grassley, No. 3355; Warnock, No. 2952; McCormick, No. 3376; Ossoff, No. 2971; Cornyn, No. 3405; Kaine, No. 3039; Capito, No. 3435; Gallego, No. 3136; Lankford, No. 3439; Duckworth, No. 3156; Blackburn, No. 3489; Shaheen, No. 3351; Kennedy, No. 3703; Booker, No. 3530; Daines, No. 3732; Slotkin, No. 3557; Ricketts, No. 3788; Peters, No. 3570; Hawley, No. 3799; Hickenlooper, No. 3601; Rounds, No. 3810; Coons, 3712; Tillis, No. 3811; Cortez Masto, No. 3724; Moran, No. 3813; Klobuchar, No. 3751; Grassley, No. 3823; Klobuchar, No. 3818; Kennedy, No. 3702; Durbin, No. 3825; Fischer, No. 3842; Padilla, No. 3834, Cruz, No. 3890; Hirono, No. 2979; Grassley-Durbin, No. 3272; Cruz-Cantwell, No. 3742; Scott of South Carolina-Warren, No. 3901, Risch-Shaheen, No. 3819; Graham, No. 3899; Sullivan-Whitehouse, No. 3888; Collins, No. 3880, Hirono, No. 3015; Peters, No. 3753; Shaheen-Risch, No. 3826; Coons, No. 3728; Gallego, No. 3928; that the Senate vote on the amendments en bloc; that upon disposition of the amendments, the pending Thune amendments and motions be withdrawn, the Ernst amendment No. 3427 be agreed to, and the Wicker-Reed substitute amendment No. 3748, as modified, and as amended, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and that the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage; and that if passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the two leaders to enter motions to reconsider without being on the prevailing side with respect to the cloture votes on the motion to proceed to S. 2882 and H.R. 5371.

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

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 XXIII 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 a 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 Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, John Hickenlooper, Richard Blumenthal, Alex Padilla, Tammy Duckworth, Michael Bennet, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Mazie Hirono, Margaret Hassan.

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?

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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 557 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Hawley	Schmitt

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 50.

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

The motion was rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371, a bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 558 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

(Mr. SCOTT of Florida assumed the Chair.)

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

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The minority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 106.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 559 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Hawley	Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. MORENO assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. CASSIDY assumed the Chair.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO).

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 106) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to ''Central Yukon Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, we are now 9 days into the government shutdown, and the disruption of the shutdown is being felt by many Americans. Particularly, what I want to talk about is the many Americans who are traveling or working in the aviation industry.

Government shutdowns are detrimental to some of our most basic functions of government, and our already-fragile air traffic control system is facing strain from this occurrence.

We are reminded how fragile our air system is by the facts of what occurred on January 29, when a flight from Kansas to Washington, DC, did not land safely at Washington Reagan, and it claimed the lives of 67 people.

Over the time that I have been in Congress, we have had a number of shutdowns and, in many instances, even Kansans told me: Shut her down. It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter to me.

I have never found the value in a government shutdown. That accident that I just mentioned forced Congress and our Nation to reckon with an issue that has plagued us for decades: Why have we not effectively modernized our airspace system?

Since that crash, steps have been taken to train more controllers and enhance the aviation system, including a $12.5 billion investment in modernizing our airspace. But those efforts become much more difficult while Congress fails to keep the government operating and the shutdown is in place.

The Wall Street Journal, just this week, aptly summed up the current crisis stating: We ''have a system under pressure that now just has another 100 pounds of weight on it.''

The failure to pass a continuing resolution is slowly crushing our aviation system. Our system is too fragile and the stakes are too high for us to continue operating the national aviation system in the manner we are doing so. We will reach a breaking point, and this could result in the closing of our airspace or portions of it.

The consequences of the shutdown on our aviation system aren't isolated to major cities and large airports as the viability of the Air Service Program is also now put at risk. This program incentivizes airlines to provide commercial flights to rural communities that normally wouldn't be able to attract business from major airlines on their own. In Kansas, there are five such airports that use this program to provide flights to their communities. These flights allow my constituents to fly to larger cities for business, to see the family, for doctors' appointments, and so many other things. Several of these airports have seen and continue to see record levels of passenger growth.

All of these factors are chipping away at the sustainability and safety of our Nation's aviation system. In a previous Congress, I introduced the Aviation Funding Stability Act, which allows the FAA to draw from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund to make certain that critical operations continue when there is an appropriations lapse. In March of this year, I reintroduced this bill as we faced this threat of a shutdown. This legislation is still important, but the fact is that the only real solution here is to pass the continuing resolution.

We set out earlier this year, in a bipartisan manner, to transform our aviation system to make it safer for everyone, but that work is now significantly hindered without having an open and functioning government. The Senate Appropriations subcommittee, of which I am a member—the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee—has done its job. I joined my colleagues in advancing the fiscal year 2026 funding bill for the Department of Transportation but including all the aviation matters at the FAA and otherwise. We did that in July.

It included more than $22 billion for the FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration, with $5 billion for the FAA's facilities and equipment account—critical funding for modernizing outdated equipment in our national airspace. This legislation also included funding to hire 2,500 air traffic controllers to close the gap in our workforce. For every day we remain in a shutdown, the air traffic controller shortage gets worse, and the strain on the aviation system intensifies. Our system has a breaking point, and I hope that this dysfunction that we are undergoing stops before we see dramatic and damaging consequences.

My point is that the continuing resolution is standing in the way of the appropriations process. We have a majority leader who is willing to bring appropriations bills to the floor. They deserve the Senate's consideration of those appropriations bills. The challenge we face is getting them done by the end of the fiscal year; therefore, we have put in place a continuing resolution until a date in later November. This is a straightforward continuing resolution to give us the time to complete the appropriations process, including the money for the Transportation Department and the safety components that are included therein.

My second point is that a continuing resolution is necessary to avoid a shutdown. That point is that the shutdown is damaging to us in many ways to our Nation. It is broadly damaging to us because it allows those who are critics and those who are adversaries to realize that we are not as capable of functioning as we should be so that even our allies wonder what is going on in the United States.

The point I want to make is that there are consequences to the position we have allowed ourselves to get in, and it affects the safety of Americans every day. In having experienced the loss of life from the flight on January 29 from Wichita, KS, to Washington, DC, we should be doing everything we can to make certain that our air traffic system and the necessary components are in place to make sure that traveling American citizens and the citizens of the world who use our airline system have a safe and secure flight when they board a plane in the United States. The silliness of where we are today is impeding our ability to make that true.

I don't know when a shutdown makes sense, but the consequences of this one, in lieu of a short-term, clean CR for a few more weeks to complete our appropriations work, is a shutdown that makes absolutely no sense or is of any benefit to America.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to act now to pass this short-term continuing resolution so we can alleviate the pressures on our aviation system, return to doing our jobs in appropriating government funding, and provide much needed certainty and stability for our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are just over a week into Republicans' shutdown and just over 3 weeks from open enrollment, when massive premium hikes become a stone-cold reality for our families. Yet Republican leaders refuse to sit down and talk with us about addressing both of those challenges.

President Trump and Russ Vought are just openly—gleefully—plotting how they can make this shutdown as painful as possible. House Republicans are not even here for the third week in a row, and Leader Thune has refused to do anything other than vote on the same, failed, partisan CR over and over and over. The clock is ticking. Republicans would rather sit on their hands than sit down at the table.

When we ask to talk about healthcare, the only word that the Republican leader seems to know is ''later.'' Excuse me. But why couldn't we have addressed this challenge any earlier? The Republican leader bent over backward to shovel new tax cuts at billionaires earlier this year. He did not tell CEOs to wait when it came to Republican tax breaks that expire at the end of this year. Why is he telling families now to wait when rates are being set now? when price announcements will be in the mail any day now? and when open enrollment is right around the corner? Why do Republicans want to wait until higher rates are locked in and families are priced out of healthcare? We have to tackle this before those rates are locked.

I have been warning for months about what this will mean for Washington State and for our country. Maybe the Republican leader needs to hear about what this means for his constituents.

In South Dakota, there are 50,000 people who rely on the healthcare tax credits to get their health coverage. On average, those South Dakota families will see their premiums more than triple if Republicans refuse to save the tax credits. These are hard-working families, including many farmers. And it is not just a challenge in South Dakota. Over a quarter of farmers in our country are covered through those exchanges. Do any of my colleagues think we should do nothing while farmers lose their healthcare? Do any of my colleagues want to stand by while families across the country see their premiums double?

You know, we have common ground here, but that doesn't do any good when Republicans refuse—outright refuse—to come to the table and negotiate. It doesn't do a lot of good when House Republicans are out on vacation for the third week in a row. You know, this clock has been ticking all year long, and the time to avoid those massive premiums is just about up. There is no waiting. There is no later. You can either start talking with us now to reopen the government and act to stop premium hikes before the open enrollment or you can talk to your constituents about why you decided to sit on your hands and do diddly-squat as their premiums went through the roof. The choice is yours.

The Democrats are here. We are still at the table. We have always been here. We have never left. We are ready today—today—to work out a serious deal to address the healthcare crisis and reopen the government.

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.

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

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, right now, Republicans control the White House, the House, and the Senate. In other words, Republicans control the

Federal Government. Since day one of the Trump regime, they have used that control to sow chaos and attack programs and services that the American people rely upon. Here are but two examples:

Earlier this year, Trump tried to shut down Social Security offices across the country, making it much harder for recipients of Social Security benefits to call Social Security, find out the information they needed, and to access their benefits. So Social Security reversed course on this I call it lamebrain idea to close some of the offices when they responded to the huge hue and cry from people who said that was not something that should be happening to Social Security recipients.

Another example: This regime slashed the Department of Education, firing more than half of the Education Department's staff, as part of an all-out assault on the Federal support for public education in our country. If President Trump had his way, he would just get rid of the Federal Department of Education altogether, but since only Congress can do that, they did things like firing half of the staff.

Now they are coming after programs millions of Americans rely on for their healthcare. Republicans created this healthcare crisis when they passed their ''Big Ugly Bill,'' which guts Medicare, Medicaid, and SNAP, among other programs.

At the same time, Donald Trump zeroed out funding for research on diseases such as cancer. And when we are talking about research on children's cancer, to cut off funding for that kind of research is more than mean. They also cut out funding for research on diabetes, Alzheimer's, halting studies that could unlock major breakthroughs and literally save lives.

Unsurprisingly, the majority of Americans oppose what this regime is doing regarding healthcare. Republicans know their position is indefensible, which is why they are resorting to lies and excuses—lies that get more desperate by the day. They are lying because they don't want the American people to know the truth.

What is that truth? The truth is that Republicans are happy to make permanent massive tax cuts for billionaires in their ''Big Ugly Bill'' but refused—refused—to make permanent tax credits hard-working families rely on to get their healthcare.

Misplaced priorities are nothing new for Republicans. I was in the House when we passed the Affordable Care Act—the ACA—which expanded healthcare to more than 20 million Americans who up to that point did not even have healthcare. I was here in the Senate as Republicans tried over and over again to repeal the ACA and kick those millions of Americans off their healthcare.

It is rich that these same Republicans who crusaded for years to get rid of the ACA now stand before the American people talking about how much they care about their healthcare. Why should the American people believe these lies as they are, even as we speak, getting notices of huge increases in their healthcare costs? The American people don't believe the Republican lies. They see right through them.

Meanwhile, Republicans, unwilling to do what the American people want, now claim that, well, extending these credits isn't urgent, so we can do this a few months from now. We don't have to do it now. There is no sense of urgency.

Another lie.

Time is of the essence. Open enrollment under the ACA starts in just a few weeks, and because of Republicans' refusal to act—I repeat—people across the country are getting notices saying: Here is what your ACA premiums are going to cost you.

The figures are astounding. Without an extension of these credits, average out-of-pocket premium costs for a family of four in Hawaii are expected to increase from $10,000 to more than $16,000 a year—an increase of more than $6,000, or $500 a month.

Maybe in Trump's world, $500 isn't much, but to everybody else, that is a lot. Billionaires may not care that millions of people in our country are getting these notices about their increase in healthcare, but the rest of us do. For so many families, these huge increases could well break the bank.

Let's face it—this is not a red State or blue State issue. Hard-working Americans in every State across the country rely on the ACA for healthcare coverage, and they are all about to see their costs skyrocket.

In Speaker JOHNSON's home State of Louisiana, where nearly 300,000 people—his constituents—get their healthcare through the ACA, a family of four in Louisiana can expect to see their premiums increase by more than $9,000 a year.

In South Dakota, Senate Leader THUNE's home State, out-of-pocket costs for a family of four will increase by more than $13,000 a year. Think about that. Without action, Leader THUNE's constituents will be paying $13,000 more than last year for the very same coverage and the same benefits.

Nationwide, it is estimated that healthcare premiums will more than double for hard-working families. Make no mistake, plenty of families won't be able to afford these significant hikes and will be forced to go without healthcare—all because Republicans refuse to act.

Working families are awakening to this healthcare crisis because—and I repeat—they are getting their increase notices even as we speak. And they know who is responsible. It is the Republicans, with their ''Big Ugly Bill.''

Trump returned to office promising to lower costs on day one—yet another lie. It is not happening. More than 250 days later, Americans are facing the fallout from this regime's reckless economic policies, including the disastrous tariffs that are decimating small businesses.

So instead of actually doing anything to lower costs for our hard-working families, the Republicans have shut down the government because they really don't care that families have to pay so much more for healthcare. Many of them—millions of them—are going to drop healthcare because they will not be able to afford these increases.

Under the Trump regime, Americans are poorer because costs are not going down, and they are about to get sicker when they no longer can afford the healthcare that was provided through the ACA tax credits.

Democrats, on the other hand, know that the health and welfare and well-being of the American people are worth fighting for and that keeping the government running shouldn't come at the cost of Americans' healthcare.

We talk about what I would call a completely stupid choice—not even a choice. We should keep the government running, but if the Republicans are so intent on giving permanent tax breaks to the billionaires, they should give permanent tax credits to the millions of Americans who need and deserve this healthcare.

Frankly, Republicans can end the government shutdown today if they agree to restore healthcare to the American people. Until then, Democrats are going to keep fighting to protect Americans' healthcare, reopen the government, and hold this regime accountable for the harm they are inflicting on this country every single day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUDD). The Senator from Illinois.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, one of the proudest moments of my life was the first time I ever laced up my boots, put on my uniform, and raised my right hand to swear my oath to the Constitution as a member of the Illinois Army National Guard, and I cherished every day that I got to wake up and call myself a soldier.

And it is because I love our military so deeply that I refuse to let a five-time, draft-dodging coward abuse it for his own personal gain. At Quantico last week, Trump told our top military leaders that he wants American servicemembers to ''train'' against the same citizens they swear an oath to protect.

Last month, he essentially declared war on Chicago, one of the largest cities in the country that he leads, with a meme from a Vietnam war movie about the loss of all humanity when military action is unchecked by ethics or the laws of war. And this week, he made good on his threats, forcing hundreds of National Guardsmen into our city, against the will of the people of Illinois or its legally elected representatives.

For months, Trump has fabricated claims of chaos and crime on American streets to justify false claims that

there is a need to deploy troops into our cities against local officials' wishes—first to L.A., then DC. And he isn't stopping there. He is also attempting to deploy troops to Portland, though a Federal judge he appointed blocked his efforts there twice because, in his own hand-picked appointee's words, Trump's claims about why they are needed were ''untethered to facts.'' Another way to put that is that he is lying.

In the last few weeks in Chicago, we have seen Trump's agents detain innocent Americans, deny citizens their right to legal representation, point weapons at civilians, zip-tie children, arrest elected officials, ransack apartment buildings, injure journalists, and shoot a priest in the head with pepper balls for the so-called crime of peacefully praying for nonviolence. They have even shot two people, leaving one—a father of two young children—dead, making dubious and unsubstantiated claims in their attempt to justify their use of lethal force.

It is obvious what Trump is doing. He is targeting and punishing the cities who dare to push back against his abuse of power. And while he is currently targeting blue cities with his lies, if these deployments are not stopped, there will be nothing to stop him—or any future President—from doing this to anyone, anywhere, for any made-up reason that is also untethered to reality.

So let's be clear. Ordering our troops to intimidate Americans in their own communities doesn't make our Nation safer. Policing Americans in their own communities is not the National Guard's job. They can't make arrests, and they are not adequately trained to carry out police duties in urban environments.

These deployments are yet another Trump move straight out of the Authoritarian 101 textbook. They further jeopardize civil rights while distracting our troops from executing their core mission of keeping Americans safe from the real adversaries who wish us harm.

We know that Trump's actions are not about law and order—because if he cared about law and order, he wouldn't gleefully refuse to coordinate with State and local officials. He wouldn't have literally defunded our police by freezing and slashing Federal dollars that help hire, train, and equip law enforcement. He wouldn't be diverting Federal resources and agents away from operations that investigate drug cartels and drug traffickers, from missions that identify and disrupt foreign terrorist plots, and from actions that protect our families from cyber attacks to do it. But he is.

And instead of supporting and expanding proven violent crime prevention strategies, he is wasting millions of taxpayer dollars to terrorize law-abiding citizens who are exercising their First Amendment rights.

Trump is taking our troops away from their missions just to do his personal bidding, forcing them to confront peacefully protesting Americans, instead of using their time to train to protect our Nation in case of future conflicts with America's adversaries around the world.

Our troops didn't sign up for this. They signed up to defend Americans' rights to free speech, not to intimidate Americans from exercising that right. Our troops are willing to die to defend this country, not to defend one man's ego.

Los Angeles did not ask for this; Washington, DC, did not ask for this; Portland did not ask for this; Chicago did not ask for this; our servicemembers did not ask for this.

I am relieved to announce that just moments ago I secured a Senate hearing in the coming weeks with witnesses from the Trump administration where I will ask tough questions and demand answers on these unjustifiable actions because I refuse to stay silent as our military and our servicemembers' sacrifices are disrespected and abused by a man who was never brave enough to serve himself.

I cannot let him keep giving our troops the middle finger while eroding the hard-won trust and confidence they have earned from the American public over generations of military service. These days, I may no longer be wearing my Army uniform, but it still hangs proudly in my Senate office. And now, I spend a lot of my time seated on the Senate floor rather than beneath my Black Hawk's main rotors, but my core mission is still the same as when I was in the National Guard: to keep America as strong and as safe as she should be.

If only Donald Trump cared about doing the same.

I yield the floor and recognize my colleague, the senior Senator from the great State of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Illinois Senator DUCKWORTH for inviting me to join her on the floor to discuss what is happening in our State.

Before I do, I want to make sure it is well known for those who follow this debate to explain how she became my Senate colleague.

There was a day some 20 years ago when I was given two tickets to the Presidential State of the Union Address, and my staff had asked me if there was any particular guest I would like to invite. I said: No, why don't you call out to Walter Reed military hospital and see if there is an Illinois veteran who can come and join us. They told me, shortly after that, that they had found someone who was coming.

I didn't know that person. Her name was TAMMY DUCKWORTH. She was in full dress uniform when she came into my office, merely a few weeks since her helicopter had been shot down over in Iraq, and she had gone through some terrible surgeries and was recovering. But she came into my office with a large smile on her face and her husband Brian pushing her wheelchair.

That was how we met. She was my guest at the State of the Union Address.

We became friends. I became an ombudsman for Walter Reed. She had soldiers calling me from all over the United States asking for help. I didn't regret it one bit. I was honored to do it.

So I worked up the courage to ask her if she would consider running for Congress, and she said to me: I would have to talk it over with Brian.

I thought, I have got a live one here. She sounds like she is interested, which she was.

Her first try for office was not successful for Congress, but she later became head of the Veterans' Administration for the State of Illinois and then ran successfully to serve with me as a Member of the House. When there was a vacancy available for the U.S. Senate seat, I not only encouraged her but endorsed her and did everything I could to help. I am honored to have her as my colleague.

She is an extraordinary person, has more bravery than any 10 people I know, and she has shown her devotion for this country by serving in the Guard for over 20 years—23 years?—23 years in the Guard.

So when it comes to issues involving the Guard, there is no better expert that has ever served in the U.S. Senate. Illinois is lucky; America is lucky to have TAMMY DUCKWORTH, and I am lucky to be able to join her today.

We are proud of our heritage in the State of Illinois. We call it the ''Land of Lincoln,'' and I recall an incident that is worth repeating.

In 1858, Abraham Lincoln gave a speech in Edwardsville, IL. That is downstate near St. Louis. In this speech, he asked:

> What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence?

Lincoln emphasized that it was not America's army or the power of our weapons. The founder of the Republican Party Abraham Lincoln said:

> [It is] the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere.

This is what is responsible for the maintenance of our freedoms. How the Republican Party has changed from those early days.

Yesterday, President Trump deployed 500 National Guard troops to our State of Illinois. The President ignored the pleas from elected officials across Illinois that these deployments were unnecessary and unwanted and a dangerous escalation of a situation the President himself has created.

Leaders of the chamber of commerce and businesses in our State held a press conference and begged the President: Don't send in the troops. You are sitting here peddling a message which is not true. It is not unsafe in Illinois. People there are proud to be part of that State. We know we are not perfect. Like every other place, we can be

better and safer. But the use of Guard troops from Illinois or even from Texas is totally unnecessary and creates unwanted pressure.

That message was clear from the business leaders in my State, but President Donald Trump didn't care what they had to say. He wanted to deploy our Nation's military to Illinois to spread fear and sow chaos. And in both those efforts, sad to say, he succeeded.

The President has no legal basis for deploying Federal troops to Illinois against the wishes of the Illinois Governor. There is no rebellion or insurrection happening in our State. Americans have the right, under the First Amendment, to protest this administration's cruel and misguided immigration policy. There is no room for violence whatsoever in this exchange of information and points of view, but it is part of our constitutional guarantee.

There is no argument, as some of my colleagues claimed during our Judiciary Committee markup meeting this morning, that this is anything like the civil rights-era abuses of the National Guard by multiple Presidents to enforce desegregation laws when segregationist Governors in the South were defying Federal law and court orders.

President Dwight David Eisenhower, a general himself, federalized the Arkansas National Guard after the Governor outright refused to comply with the law and was preventing the Little Rock Nine from entering the previously all-White Central High School, following the Supreme Court's ruling in Brown v. Board of Education.

There is no argument and no evidence whatsoever that the Governor of Illinois is disobeying any Federal law or court order. There is no historical analogy between the situation in the 1960s and the situation in Illinois today.

In fact, the current administration has sued Illinois to attempt to commandeer State law and force Illinois to implement this administration's immigration policies. Courts have repeatedly found that Illinois does not have a responsibility to implement Federal immigration laws.

There is no statute or provision in the Constitution that allows the President to use the National Guard as props in his political theater or to suppress constitutionally protected dissent against his inhumane immigration crackdown.

In addition, the Trump administration has recklessly surged hundreds of Federal law enforcement officers who are employing increasingly aggressive tactics against immigrants and their families and those suspected of being immigrants. They have said quite boldly: We are looking for people who look like this, subject to jurisdiction.

They have pulled FBI, DEA, and ATF agents from their assignments to carry out the President's immigration agenda, taking them away from the mission to combat crimes like terrorism, gun violence, human trafficking, and drug smuggling.

How does this make America safer?

We all know the litany that Donald Trump has repeated over and over again at political rallies and meetings since he was reelected as President. He is trying to stop murderers, rapists, terrorists, criminally insane people, and sexual predators from coming into this country.

Look what is happening with this mass deportation effort that he has authored. Over 70 percent of those who have been detained by ICE so far—over 70 percent—have no criminal record whatsoever, none whosoever.

This is not about stopping crime. This is about going after immigrants. If the Trump administration truly wanted to help my city of Chicago and our State of Illinois, it wouldn't defy Illinois-elected leaders; it would work with us. It would restore the millions of dollars that it suspended in crime prevention and public safety grants.

How can this President say with a straight face that he wants to reduce crime in our State and cut back the very programs law enforcement counts on to train and be prepared and effective in the field when reducing crime? He has chosen to put boots and guns on the street and call in the military from Texas.

At the end of the day, these deployments are about President Trump and Stephen Miller's personal agenda to send troops primarily into blue cities and to deport immigrants without any criminal history at the expense of national security and public safety.

Nearly a quarter of all FBI agents—a quarter of them, one out of four—are now focused on immigration. How can this possibly make America safer? The tactics that are being used by ICE and others in support of the President's mission are outrageous.

On Tuesday, September 30, there was a raid in the middle of the night on an apartment house in South Shore in the city of Chicago. Three hundred ICE agents flew in Black Hawk helicopters and rappelled down to the roof of an apartment building. It was a scene made for the movies. That is exactly what it was.

They ransacked apartments that people were living in, crashed down their doors and pulled them out of bed and lined them up on the street. They bound the children with ties—plastic ties or handcuffs—and they decided to make it all a movie production for television and video.

It was supposedly to stop drug activities by gangs. No evidence whatsoever has been produced of that. It was a horrible scene. I am sure these children will never forget as long as they live being pulled out of bed in the middle of the night and watching their parents being interrogated, arrested, and detained.

That is the idea of this administration in enforcing the law. It just goes too far. Steve Miller, the President's domestic adviser, is the architect of this travesty. For any of you who may not think these deployments may not affect you, it is just Illinois' problem, you are wrong.

The very act undermines our Constitution and belief in liberty above all. As President Lincoln warned us in that same speech, ''Destroy this spirit [of liberty] and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors.''

While the Guard is in Illinois now, it could be in your State next; it could be your family taken from their homes and their beds in the middle of the night in an indiscriminate raid.

Does it sound preposterous? The 2,200 South Shore apartment building people can tell you it is not preposterous. It is actually what happened—have tear gas and guns pointed at you for speaking out.

Congress must act and speak out against this increasingly authoritarian administration. We are a coequal branch of government, and it is time we act like one. I implore my Republican colleagues—and I know they are loyal to President Trump—I implore them to join Senator DUCKWORTH and me and describe these deployments for what they are; they are an illegal, immoral power grab by a President determined to consolidate his power and stifle any dissents.

If we here in this Senate Chamber, fortunate enough to represent the people in this country, will not stand up, then who will?

Once again, I want to thank my colleague Senator DUCKWORTH for calling us down to the Senate floor to raise this issue. She and I are hoping, if the Senate schedule allows, we will be able to get back to Illinois this weekend and then have an opportunity to learn even more about this grave situation.

In the meantime, I ask people involved to show courage, to understand that the odds are against them, and the people who are trying to harass them are well-armed and can be very serious with what they do. But America's values will prevail over this President and this situation, and my State of Illinois will return to a situation where it is not being invaded by the Guard of other States.

Incidentally, I will close by saying this: I have no animus against members of the Guard, either in Illinois or in Texas. They are good men and women who put their hands in the air and swore an oath to our Constitution to serve our country. They are in a situation where they are being used, unfortunately, for a bad situation with this President, but we need them, and I continue to look forward to working with them in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, last year, I was privileged to lead a bipartisan delegation of 20 of our colleagues to Normandy, celebrating the

80th anniversary of the historic landing there, where American boys—and they were boys, 17 and 18 years old—stormed the beaches of France to liberate Europe. It was one of the most moving experiences of my lifetime.

I believe the Presiding Officer was there. We were part of a bipartisan group, evenly divided—10 Republicans and 10 Democrats. What we heard and saw I think will stay with us for a lifetime, particularly from the veterans who remembered that day. They are in their hundred-year-old ages of their lives.

After speaking to them, we heard speeches from the President of the United States, of France, and leaders of Europe. But what stuck with me was what I heard from the veterans.

One of them said to me, ''This was our moment.''

''This was our moment.''

We walked through the American cemetery, those silent rows of white grave markers, down to the beach, Omaha Beach, where I thought of those 18- and 20-year-old boys jumping out of landing craft with 80 pounds on their backs, into 8 feet of water, under a hail of machine gun bullets and mortar fire, onto a beach three football fields long—three football fields long—without any cover. There were no trees, there were no dunes, and the hail of gunfire and mortars kept coming.

I think 90 percent died in the first wave, maybe 80 percent in the second. They kept going—a third and a fourth wave, storming the cliffs, taking back Europe, and saving democracy.

I kept thinking, as I walked on that bleak beach, windswept, waves crashing, ''That was our moment.'' I kept thinking about the veteran who said that to me. It was an American moment, and our reason for going to Normandy was to honor those young men who saved democracy.

This is our moment. This is our moment to save democracy. I know it sounds like an exaggeration to say that our democracy is now under attack, but it is from adversaries and enemies abroad—China, Russia, Iran, North Korea. But we also have to make sure that we safeguard our liberties at home against attack and efforts to undermine them, even if some may feel they are well-meaning.

One of them and only one of them is the illegal and unconstitutional use of our military and the deployment of National Guard into American cities to do what local law enforcement—our police and others, State and local law enforcement—are supposed to do under our scheme of government, where our military protects us from adversaries abroad, and the FBI, the DEA, and our State and local police make sure we are safe at home.

For 250 years, the military has defended our great Republic without fail. It is the bulwark of freedom for this Nation. It is the hope for millions and millions around the world who yearn for freedom. It is nonpolitical. It remains one of the few institutions the American people still revere. Americans have faith in the military because it is nonpolitical.

So what the President is risking by using our military, whether it is the National Guard or Active-Duty marines or another branch of service, is not only a threat to the individual liberties of people in those cities but also the credibility and reverence that the American people have for this venerable institution that has protected us from aggression and threats abroad.

By pursuing political goals with our young men and women in uniform, he risks recruitment for the military; he risks the respect that our constituents have that enables us to work for full funding and support for our military, embodied by the National Defense Authorization Act that we will consider hopefully just within a few hours.

When the Armed Services Committee considers the National Defense Authorization Act, the votes at the end are almost always near unanimous. In fact, in my 15 years on that committee, they have been nearly unanimous every year. And we vote on it in a timely way to make sure that we show support for this necessary institution.

The risk to our military as well as to our individual rights and liberties is what prompted me to introduce the Insurrection Act of 2024.

We all know that the Insurrection Act has a long history. It was written over 200 years ago, in the aftermath of the Whiskey Rebellion and the Battle of Wabash—in those instances, probably not at the tip of the tongue of most of us.

The forces of law enforcement were limited and poorly equipped. They were barely existent. Local police. Virtually no State had its own police. So there was a need for potential use of the military in those instances. But even then, use of military was limited under the original Insurrection Act because Americans feared a permanent standing police doing local law enforcement.

I drafted this legislation in an effort to amend that outdated law, which gives the President enormous, unchecked powers to deploy the military to quell domestic rebellion.

Now, the lack of defining terms, the absence of real accountability, and the vagueness of that statute are the reasons we now need reform.

Limits were imposed, but the limits are filled with loopholes, practical gaps that fail to check the President's power. The problems the act was designed to address are no longer commensurate with the dangers it is now creating.

I reintroduced this legislation for this Congress, and I thank my colleagues for supporting this effort.

The President's actions over the last 8 months demonstrate the need for this urgent reform and increased congressional oversight.

Earlier this week, the President suggested that he would invoke the Insurrection Act to deploy more guardsmen in major cities if the courts or Governors delayed deployment. So I stand here with my colleagues from Oregon, Illinois, and California, whose constituents are living through this threat. It is now a reality as much as a threat.

I warned this body 2 years ago of this reality—unchecked power deployed unconsciously.

I should say that this kind of use of the military poses a tremendous threat to all of our civil liberties even if we are not from California or Oregon or Illinois. It could happen in Connecticut. And the lack of a factual basis for it is well documented in the district court decision issued by a Federal judge days ago citing the absence of any real need on the ground in real time, with evidence before her court—statements from ICE officers that there was no need.

Her findings, which are airtight and persuasive, are the reason why I am here to say the National Guard should not be deployed there. Reliance should be placed on local and State police. There should be challenges to any deployment in Illinois or California to test whether it is actually needed to preserve order.

The National Guard has always been a symbol of hope for communities. We have seen it in Connecticut when disaster struck. When there are weather catastrophes, the National Guard is in our neighborhoods to help remove downed trees or provide access to homes and to preserve order when local police can't do it. But now, they are being used to turn the military into the President's personal army.

The Founders warned of threats to liberty that a standing army would create. It was one of their biggest fears because they had lived through a time when the British had a standing army in their neighborhoods—in fact, went into their homes and, without permission, used their homes and shelters and food.

Through the years, through great force of effort at times, the military has remained politically independent. It is under the Commander in Chief, but it is nonpolitical. My bill would protect not only American citizens from Executive overreach but also the military from becoming pawns in any kind of political game.

This legislation would create checks and balances, limit the scope of these deployments, authorize extensions via joint resolution, and create a judicial review process. These commonsense solutions would amend an outdated law that no longer fully serves the interests of this Nation.

For the sake of our military and the constituents we represent, I hope my colleagues will support this effort because this use of the military is part of a larger effort to shift the focus of our national defense to policing the homeland rather than protecting us from threats abroad.

We need to provide strong, vibrant, vigorous law enforcement and support

local and State or Federal policing funds, and that is why I have been so upset and angry that this administration has cut funding—hundreds of millions of dollars that aid and train local police, that increase their numbers and provide aid for victims. The programs have been decimated in the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security.

We need to put our money where our mouth is. This administration needs to support our State and local police not just in rhetoric but in reality. The reality is that there must be reform in the Insurrection Act, not just to protect our citizens and our liberties at this moment—this is our moment—but also the well-being and strength of the American military.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues, today, in standing up for Americans' basic constitutional rights.

Donald Trump has again deployed agents and troops to my hometown of Portland, OR, and to other American cities. He announced this authoritarian occupation with orders for Federal agents to use ''full force.''

Since then, he has deployed Federal law enforcement from the Department of Homeland Security, and he has activated 200 Oregon National Guard members, over the objection of the Governor of Oregon, local leaders in Portland, and local law enforcement. He has tried to deploy an additional 300 troops from California—from the National Guard there—and 400 troops from the Texas National Guard, all to my hometown.

Colleagues, during this government shutdown, our Guard members will not even be paid for this unnecessary, unwanted deployment. Activating the Oregon National Guard alone is going to cost $10 million and will pull Guard members away from much more important work.

If Donald Trump truly wanted to help Oregon or Illinois or California, the money would be better spent cracking down on fentanyl traffickers, ending his tariffs that are gutting small businesses, and holding down health costs.

Instead, Donald Trump says U.S. cities like Portland ought to be used as ''training grounds'' for the military.

I would say to the Senate: Let that one sink in. The President of the United States thinks it is acceptable to use American cities as training grounds for the military. In my view, that is unconscionable.

My hometown is a vibrant and peaceful city. It doesn't require any deployment of Federal troops or additional Federal agents to keep our community safe. In fact, the Federal judge, who was appointed by Donald Trump himself, has ruled repeatedly against a troop deployment. She said there was ''no showing that military help is necessary to protect law enforcement or the one federal building for ICE.''

Portland's police department has said there is no need for Federal agents in our city, as well, and that the administration's deployment of ICE agents is making it actually harder for them to do their jobs and keep our cities safe.

The notion that my hometown is somehow a war zone in need of saving is a fantasy made up by Donald Trump and far-right trolls.

Oregonians have taken to social media to show that my community is really peaceful. You see it in our gardens, in our vegetable stands. You see it in musicians playing on the sidewalks.

My constituents have long engaged in peaceful First Amendment activity. The Governor and mayor of Portland have the appropriate resources to maintain peace and order in our communities.

My view is this Trump unilateral action is an abuse of Executive authority. He is clearly hoping that he can incite violence and undermine the constitutional balance of power between the Federal Government and our States.

In addition to the judicial ruling in Oregon last month, a Federal judge in California ruled that the Trump administration actually violated black letter law through the deployment of troops to Los Angeles. His Los Angeles deployment violated the Posse Comitatus Act, which explicitly limits the power of the Federal Government to use the military for domestic purposes.

Unfortunately, none of this is new to my hometown. Five years ago, Portland experienced the consequences of an unnecessary and outrageous Federal deployment under Donald Trump's first Presidency.

In the summer of 2020, the White House unleashed Federal agents on Portland. It was like an occupying army, complete with military-grade equipment and violent tactics that were totally unacceptable on American soil. Federal agents shot at Portland residents, tear-gassed families, drove in unmarked vehicles, and grabbed people off the street without an explanation.

Federal agents didn't identify themselves. They didn't wear uniforms. They beat up on those who asked them basic questions about their actions.

There is no question in my mind that another deployment by this administration is going to result in similar abuses, similar violations of Americans' constitutional rights. Inciting violence is clearly Donald Trump's intent.

And I want to make it clear: As Oregon's senior Senator, I am going to continue doing everything to work with my colleagues to fight back against Trump's Federal occupation and show America, from coast to coast, the beauty and the strength of my hometown.

I yield the floor, and I note my partner in the Oregon congressional delegation. He and I have teamed up every step of the way and will continue to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, my colleague from Oregon has laid out the situation very well. An authoritarian President emboldened by a rubberstamp Congress, emboldened by a deferential Supreme Court, is sending military troops against American citizens who are peacefully protesting in city after city.

This is un-American. It is a fundamental violation of the purpose of our military, which is to defend us from foreign powers, not to be a tool in a President's hand to attack people who disagree with his point of view. That happens in countries that don't have a President but have a King—that have a dictator. That is not our tradition here. Our whole entire Constitution is about government by and for the people, not by and for a man at the top of the executive branch, using the military against his own citizens.

By law, federalizing the National Guard is quite limited. It can only be done, unless it is done in partnership with a Governor, if there is an invasion or if there is a rebellion. At the time these laws were written, it was well-understood exactly what those are—an invasion, just what you picture: a military force on our border about to cross that border and attack the United States of America, or they have already crossed the border. That is an invasion. Or a rebellion—a rebellion: a large group, well organized, well weaponized, that is trying to overturn the Government of the United States of America.

At the very start of our Republic, there was a rebellion called the Shays' Rebellion. A whole group in the northeastern part of our country were very upset about the challenges they were facing as farmers. They got organized. They had weapons, and they were shutting down the courts that were doing foreclosures on their farms. And they were seeking access to a Federal armory.

Shays' Rebellion—a large group, well organized, weaponized, trying to overturn the government.

The last time we saw a rebellion in the United States of America was when President Trump, in his first term, organized a mob to attack this Capitol to prevent the votes from being counted in the electoral college. That would meet the test of a rebellion.

But peaceful protesters holding signs of concern about the policies of this President or the actions of one of his

Agencies—that is freedom of speech; that is freedom of assembly. That goes to the core of who we are as Americans.

Obviously, there is nothing approaching an invasion or a rebellion in the city of Portland. Senator WYDEN and I were outside of ICE a couple weekends ago. I saw three women in a group holding a couple of signs. Right now there is a group called Paws for Peace. They are getting together with puppy dogs and dogs. And the ''paws'' is P-A-W-S. Creative, Portland-style protesting to say they are not happy with the administration.

I don't think a bunch of folks holding their puppy dogs constitute a well-organized, well-armed group trying to overthrow the government.

Then there is another group that is called Pastry and Pajamas, and they are out there in the morning handing out pastries to people. They are in their pajamas, encouraging peaceful protesting. They may disagree with the administration, but what they are exercising is as American as an apple pie or an apple pie pastry—making their voice known.

But Trump decided he wanted to create a riot in Portland. Why does he want to create a riot in Portland? Because he wants a violent encounter in order to justify putting the military in our cities—in other words, put the military into the cities to create a riot, then use that as a justification for the military being in the cities.

That is an extraordinary risk to our Republic. That is an extraordinary risk to people—a government of, by, and for the people—and not just in Portland but in L.A., in DC, in Chicago.

What the instructions appear to be to his Federal agents is to provoke violence by attacking peaceful protesters. The Oregonian, a major newspaper in our State, did a report in which they said their staff witnessed the Federal agents attacking peaceful protesters. I thought that was a very unusual article. It wasn't the newspaper reporters saying people present at the protest alleged that the Federal agents attacked peaceful protesters. No, it said: Our staff witnessed this.

Then there is Oregon Public Broadcasting. Oregon Public Broadcasting was down there with videographers. What they witnessed was this: The Federal agents asked the protesters to move back several blocks, and they did. And there was no conflict between the protesters and the Federal agents. Behind this line of Federal agents were videographers.

Why were the videographers right behind the line of Federal agents? Well, a very interesting thing happened. After the protesters moved back—not just one block or two blocks but three blocks—and the Federal agents have a line across the street with the videographers right behind them. Upon command, the Federal agents threw down tear gas. They threw down these bang-snap devices that sound like gunfire going off—flash-bangs, they are called; it sounds like gunfire—and pepper balls. And, of course, you suddenly have a cloud of smoke. You are hearing what sounds like gunfire, and people are retreating from the tear gas. And they were taking videos of that, trying to say they were disrupting a riot; they were dispelling a riot.

This is like ''Wag the Dog,'' where a totally artificial war is reported, only in that case, it happened overseas. This is the first time I know of in American history that a President has staged a fake riot to try to convince the courts or one of his news stations that serve him so well that something is there that isn't there; that a riot is there when it is not there.

Any true-blooded patriot of the United States of America should be terrified that we have a government faking a riot to try to be able to justify sending troops into our cities. That is what we face right now.

This picture to my right was witnessed by the news media. They put this up. You have a woman who is talking to two officers. She had not disobeyed any command they had given her. There was no physical confrontation.

A third agent walks up holding pepper spray in his hand and, after a few seconds, fully unleashes it straight into her face and to the man standing next to her.

That is the type of assault from these Federal agents occurring on peaceful protesters, recorded by the news media and reported. This is not something from some bystander who happened to put the scene up on TikTok, who didn't witness the entire thing or understand what was happening, but from the major news media.

Here is a case in Chicago. A pastor in the traditional motion of praying and blessing is standing outside the building, by himself—no obvious resistance to any kind of command—and he is shot in the head from agents on top of the building. He reports that he was hit twice in the head and, I think, five times on the body.

Wow.

These folks are unleashing rapid-fire attacks, apparently with pepper balls or, as he described it, some kind of ammo that releases some kind of chemical taking him right down to the street by this attack, for praying—an attack by Federal agents on a pastor praying in front of a building.

This is an extraordinarily dangerous moment in which an authoritarian President is proceeding to attack due process, to attack freedom of speech, to attack freedom of the press, to weaponize the Department of Justice, using it against those who disagree with him, and then seeking to get the court's permission to send the military in the streets to attack people who are peacefully protesting who disagree with him.

We are at the moment right now where we are awaiting a decision from a panel of three judges in the Ninth Circuit. The district judge who adjudicated the effort by Trump to federalize the Oregon National Guard said: There is nothing close to rebellion. There is nothing close to an invasion. So the standard is not met.

Then President Trump said: I am going to send the federalized force from California and Texas to Oregon.

In fact, 100 agents arrived from California. The same judge said: The same standard applies.

Regardless of what happened that federalized those folks in California or Texas, the question is: Is there a rebellion or invasion in Oregon?

And there is not. So she put a temporary stay on it.

The Ninth Circuit said: We are going to take a look at this. So we are going to freeze things in place.

Those Oregon National Guards and those 100 from California are going to stay at a training ground until they make their ruling. Their ruling—they held a hearing today—may be tomorrow. It may be days from now. We don't know.

Of course, that will be appealed to the Supreme Court.

There are legal scholars who are saying: Here is the challenge. Although there is an objective standard in the law, we have a Supreme Court that has already invented things that are not in the Constitution, interpreted things in a way that was totally different from the way they were considered at the time the law was written.

So the Supreme Court may say—in spite of the fact that there is an objective standard for federalizing the National Guard, the Supreme Court may say we are simply deferring to the President.

Are you kidding me?

This is a fundamental issue in the United States of America, that the military might be used against American citizens. There is a standard in the law.

Supreme Court, wake up. Do your job in the framework of the Constitution and in the framework of the laws that were passed. Quit inventing things to create an authoritarian state.

Why am I so worried that our Supreme Court has gone so far off track? Because, last year, they found invisible ink in the Constitution.

They had a case, Trump v. the United States of America. In that case, the question was: Is the President above the law? Is the President immune from any potential criminal prosecution for acts that he deems acts of the government?

I thought, well, absolutely not, of course. Our Founders were terrified that a President would become a King. If they wanted the President immune from prosecution, they could have put that in the Constitution.

Can you find that in the Constitution? Can any of my colleagues on the left side of the aisle or the right side of the aisle show me that in the Constitution? It is not there because our

Founders were that worried about the President becoming a King. So they did not give the President immunity from prosecution.

But the Supreme Court did because they thought that is too big a burden for the President to bear. They thought: In our judgment, we think it is a good idea to give the President protection, so he doesn't have to stay up late at night worrying whether he is creating a crime or not.

Well, let me tell you, the Constitution says policy is written here—written here in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives down the hall. That becomes policy when the President signs it. Policy is not the purview of the Supreme Court of the United States. They are supposed to be defending the Constitution.

The pastor said:

It was clear to me that the officers were aiming for my head.

He was shot seven times with pepper balls in the face and arms and torso without warning, a Presbyterian pastor.

That is what our country is coming to—an assault on anyone who stands up and exercises freedom—freedom—to share their opinion.

Aren't there 100 Senators here who stand for freedom? Why is there not one Senator across the aisle standing for freedom here on the floor of the Senate today, not one? Why? Why is there not one Senator standing up and saying that there is no clause in the Constitution that makes the President a King—immune from prosecution for crimes committed under their law? Why is there not one Senator across the aisle saying that we will not stand for the attack on due process? the attack on free speech?

I assure you, if there were a President saying to FOX News that ''you have to take a program off the air'' that the President doesn't like, every Senator across the aisle would be standing up and saying that that is a breach of free speech. I would be standing up and saying the same thing, just as I am now, because it shouldn't matter whether it is a right-leaning or a left-leaning network. They should be able to put on air what they want. That is what freedom of the press is.

So we have seen 9 months of this President making this country sicker and poorer; 9 months of personal corruption, selling access to himself through his crypto enterprises; 9 months of covering up the Epstein files that he doesn't want released because his name is in them; 9 months of slashing healthcare for families to fund tax breaks for billionaires; 9 months of cutting nutrition for children to fund tax breaks for billionaires. A bill passed this body that runs up $30 trillion in additional debt, over 30 years, to fund tax breaks for the richest Americans.

It is a families lose, billionaires win vision, and it is the wrong vision here in a Republic where we celebrate government by and for the people. A Republic that is exercising appropriately would be families thrive and the affluent and the powerful pay their fair share. That is the vision that all of us should be pursuing.

The fact that this horrific bill came out and passed—the ''Big Ugly Betrayal of Americans Act''—that slashed healthcare in order to fund more riches for the richest among us shows you it is not working right.

What is really not working right is that the President of the United States is deploying military forces, hoping to establish that it is OK to do so; that it is OK for them to accept orders to go out and attack our cities, to attack peaceful protesters; that he will get a court decision that gives him this power.

Colleagues, let's be 100 strong behind the vision of freedom, the vision of rights for Americans and say: Hell no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I want to take a look at the last 9 months in this country, at the first 9 months of this administration, and see just how far we have traveled down the road toward dictatorship in 9 months. So let me see if in less than 9 minutes I can summarize 9 months.

First, let's look at the President's early attacks on our universities and the President withholding Federal funding from universities that are using a curriculum he doesn't like or employing professors he doesn't want or that are unwilling to make changes that sacrifice their academic freedom and that suit the ideological predilections of the administration. An attack on our institutions of higher learning is unprecedented in our history. Some of the first attacks on the freedom of the American people were attacks on our universities.

They were, in quick succession, followed by attacks on law firms; that is, the President of the United States telling law firms that you must not represent these unpopular clients—unpopular to the President—because they took action against the President or they spoke out against the President or they belonged to the Justice Department when the Justice Department was investigating the President's corruption. So the President has tried to dictate to the legal community who it can defend and who it cannot.

In our country, our Founders underscored the importance of the right of representation, of the right to a jury trial, of the right even for unpopular causes to have representation. Indeed, John Adams took on one of the most unpopular cases of his time and represented those clients because he wanted to establish the principle in American jurisprudence that everyone is entitled to counsel, but under this administration, that is not true.

This administration has attacked law firms and said: You shall not represent these clients, and if you do, we will cut off your access to courthouses or we will cut off your access to Federal contracts or security clearances that you would need to represent your clients.

Sadly, as in the case of universities, many law firms have crumbled. Having given years of lip service—decades of lip service—to the idea that everyone is entitled to vigorous representation, they have crumbled.

But the administration wasn't content to try to silence universities or professors or to silence law firms. The censorship and the intimidation campaign continued in the President using the power of the regulatory body of the Federal Communications Commission to try to silence late-night comedians because they told jokes about the President. Effectively, with Paramount, which wanted to merge with Skydance, it was made abundantly clear that that merger—that multimillion-dollar merger—wouldn't go forward unless you paid off the President in his litigation against CBS. Unless you paid the President millions of dollars, personally, that merger was not going to go through. And what is more, that pesky, late-night comedian Stephen Colbert needs to go. So Stephen Colbert gets his show canceled. Jimmy Kimmel gets his show canceled. His show was, thankfully, brought back, but the administration is using regulatory power to censor late-night comedians.

He is going after the press, the freedom of the press, telling the AP: If you don't use my Gulf of America lexicon instead of the Gulf of Mexico, you are not going to be able to cover certain things at the White House. You are not going to be able to accompany the President on certain trips.

He is suing the Wall Street Journal because they are reporting about his contacts with Jeffrey Epstein.

He is trying to silence the media, intimidate the media, chill the media, and it is working. You see the Washington Post change their editorial policy. You see the LA Times withhold its editorial of the Presidential election. The censorship is working.

But it is not just the press. It is not just late-night comedy. It is not just universities. It is not just law firms. The President is telling corporate America: You can't hire this person. Microsoft, you can't hire this person.

The threat is, if they do, they won't get government contracts.

The President is saying to other companies: You want to export your product? You have got to give the U.S. Government a share. You have got to make the U.S. Government an equity partner in your company.

And if under Bill Clinton the era of Big Government was over, the era of Big Government is back with Donald Trump—a Big Government that can make decisions about whom corporations can do business with and where and what they can export and whom they can hire.

But it doesn't stop there, of course, because now the President is using the

Justice Department to go after his political enemies. This week, it is James Comey. Next week, it will be someone else, and the week after that, who knows? It is a long and growing list of enemies with the President tweeting out whom he wants prosecuted, whom he wants investigated—commanding, dictating vindictive prosecutions almost every day—abusing the Department that I once served in for almost 6 years in a way we have never seen before in this country. He is threatening to take people's liberty away from them if they stand up to the President.

Now we have this—what brings us to the floor tonight—and that is the unprecedented use of the military, the U.S. military, and our Guard against our own people.

You have the President telling a roomful of generals and admirals that there is an enemy within, and that enemy is the American people or at least those American people who didn't vote for him. They are the enemy within, and he is going to go after them. He wants the military to use those American cities that didn't vote for him as their training grounds. No sooner is it said than we see helicopters over the skies in Chicago, and we see military troops rappelling from Black Hawks. We see the military being used against their own citizens. We see children shackled, crying for their parents in the middle of the night. We see signs of horror and chaos.

We see a President so determined to use the military against our own people that, when a Governor says: No, you cannot use our National Guard in this lawless way, he commandeers the military anyway. California was the test case. We were the first. Los Angeles was the first. Over the objections of the mayor of Los Angeles and the objections of the Governor of California, the President of the United States commandeered California's National Guard to be used against our own people to increase the risk of violence and disorder so that the President might have a pretext to order in more military troops.

Now, in California, like in most States, we revere our National Guard for what they do for us during good times and hard times; how they protect us from fire and flood. So to abuse the Guard in that way, to try to breach the trust the Guard has with our own citizens, is a calamity. It is gravely damaging the morale of the troops in the Guard even as it is damaging the trust of the people of the State in their Guard.

Now we see this replicated in Portland—this militarization, this attack on American cities. We see this in court in Portland, wherein the judge, in hearing the government's case for the use and misuse of this military force, says that its presentation is untethered to fact—untethered to fact; that there is no lawful basis, no factual basis, to use the military in this way.

Now they are doing the same in Chicago, and they are threatening San Francisco. And if they can't get a State's own National Guard to be used against its own citizens, they are now inviting the Guard from other States, like Texas, to leave their State, with a willing Governor, to send them to another State.

I was grateful to hear the Republican Governor of Oklahoma speak out against this terrible abuse of the National Guard, which not only undermines the military readiness of our forces to be abused in this way but is so deliberately divisive that we would have one State now turn against another State; that we would have Texas against Illinois and deploy Texas's military in that way—its Guard in that way—was previously unthinkable. It should be unthinkable today.

Today, it is California. Today, it is Illinois. Today, it is Oregon. Where will it be tomorrow? Where does this end? I will tell you where it ends. It ends in more civil strife. It ends in more morale problems in the military. It ends in a lesser democracy. If we are here in 9 months, where will we be with 4 years of this? I will tell you this: We will not be a democracy. At the pace we are going, in 4 years, we will not be a democracy.

But today, 9 months into this, it is not too late to put a stop to this. All that it would require is a handful of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to say: Enough. Enough already. Enough of the attacks on our universities and our press. Enough of the attacks on our cities. Enough of the weaponization of our Department of Justice. Enough of the lawlessness. We are going to be Senators once again. We are going to assert the power of Congress once again to put an end, to put a stop to this lawlessness.

That is all it would take, is a few people of conscience to stand up to this President and say: Enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2296

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all en bloc amendments be considered to the Wicker-Reed substitute amendment No. 3748.

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

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 106

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

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

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 560 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kelly	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Luján	Smith
Coons	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—4

Cortez Masto		
Cotton	Cruz	McConnell

The joint resoluton (H.J. Res. 106) passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate execute the order of October 8 in relation to the Mascott nomination. I ask unanimous consent that all subsequent votes be 10 minutes in duration, and I would advise our colleagues that we intend to enforce that.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

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

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER LEE MASCOTT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote to confirm Jennifer Lee Mascott, nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Ms. Mascott is a nominee who was selected for her loyalty to President Trump and her extreme view on expansive Presidential power, which she has advocated for many years.

At a Federalist Society event in 2018, she agreed with John Eastman, President Trump's disgraced and disbarred lawyer, in stating that any independence of independent Agencies is ''too much.'' And just days before she joined the White House Counsel's Office, she stated that the Supreme Court should overrule Humphrey's Executor, the landmark 90-year precedent establishing the constitutionality of laws protecting the heads of independent Agencies from being fired. She claimed that ''the President needs to be able to . . . get rid of folks who don't follow his instructions'' at independent Agencies.

If Ms. Mascott's arguments carry the day, President Trump will be free to continue his holy war against bipartisan independent Agencies entrusted with protecting the rights and safety of Americans like the Federal Trade Commission and the Consumer Product Safety Commission. If he succeeds, something as important as consumer protection will be based on the whims of the political party in power, not the valued expertise of subject matter experts.

Just last year, Ms. Mascott told this committee that the Supreme Court's outrageous decision granting sweeping immunity to President Trump was ''modest.''

I am also troubled by Ms. Mascott's selection process for this Delaware seat. Nominees are required to provide details about how they were selected, but Ms. Mascott failed to provide the dates when she was interviewed by the White House Counsel's Office. Notably, the Delaware Senators suggested to the White House several well-qualified conservative jurists who had strong ties to the Delaware legal community. Ms. Mascott was selected although she has never lived in Delaware nor any State in the Third Circuit; she is not licensed to practice in Delaware; and she was only admitted to the Third Circuit this May.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose her nomination.

VOTE ON MASCOTT NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 561 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cortez Masto	Cotton	Cruz

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and execute the order with respect to Calendar No. 115, S. 2296.

I would reiterate that last vote was a 10-minute vote that took 27 minutes. People should stay close to the floor. Ten-minute votes, OK? Ten-minute votes.

Thank you.

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

The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 3761 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 3761 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 3761 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit earnings on balances maintained at a Federal Reserve bank by or on behalf of a depository institution)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON EARNINGS AND OVERNIGHT REVERSE REPURCHASE AGREEMENT FACILITIES.

(a) EARNINGS.—Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (12) and inserting the following:

''(12) EARNINGS ON BALANCES.—No Federal Reserve bank may pay earnings on balances maintained at a Federal Reserve bank by or on behalf of a depository institution.''.

(b) OVERNIGHT REVERSE REPURCHASE AGREEMENT FACILITIES.—Section 14(b)(2) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 355(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(2) To'' and inserting ''(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), to''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) No Federal reserve bank may participate in any overnight reverse repurchase agreement facility or enter into any reverse repurchase agreement.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the debate be 4 minutes, equally divided.

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve pays both foreign and domestic banks to simply park their money in Fed accounts—in other words, to not loan money at all.

Over the past 5 years, the Fed's big bank bailout amounts to over half a trillion dollars. This bailout causes the Fed to operate at a loss, which means the Fed cannot remit profits to the taxpayer as it normally does. According to the economist Judy Shelton, if these payments stopped, ''banks would [buy] Treasury Securities,'' and it would bring interest rates down. Some people say that this program is a floor to interest rates.

My amendment ends these subsidies. Let's end the Fed's big bank bailout. Let's lower interest rates. Please vote for my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, during the 2008 financial crisis and the $700 billion bailout for giant banks, the Federal Reserve exploited another authority to shovel money out the back door and into the hands of those giant banks.

For the first time ever, the Fed started paying interest on overnight funds that big financial institutions deposit with the Fed. This was a dream come true for those financial giants—no risk and lots of free money printed by the Fed.

How much money? Seven hundred eighty-five billion dollars since 2008.

Some of that money could have been used to pay down the national debt or fund tax cuts or whatever Congress wanted. Instead, public money went

straight into the pockets of giant banks.

And the Fed has a very convoluted argument about why they should be allowed to pay interest, claiming it helps them set interest rates. But no one is fooled. Before 2008, the Fed managed interest rates while paying zero on overnight funds and never had a problem.

Let's call this out for what it is: another taxpayer subsidy for giant banks.

If another emergency happens and the Fed needs authority to lend out money like that, make them come to Congress, and let's get a vote on it.

Last year alone, the banks earned $270 billion in profits. Jamie Dimon made $39 million. Other megabanks' CEOs made at least $30 million. The banking industry does not need another subsidy from American taxpayers.

This bipartisan proposal would end that subsidy. I urge a ''yes'' vote on Paul No. 3761. And understand, today's vote is just the start of a bipartisan fight to get this bill signed into law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I oppose the Paul amendment. This amendment would remove one of the primary tools used by the Federal Reserve to implement monetary policy. The Fed used these tools that have been indicated on the floor with great effectiveness to contain the damage in financial crises in 2008 and 2020.

In this uncertain economic moment, handcuffing the Fed would be a grave mistake. Unemployment is increasing, inflation is not contained, markets are highly volatile, tariffs are imposed and rescinded, and the Fed is under constant attack from the White House.

The Fed needs all the tools in its box to prevent a crisis. We cannot wait in another crisis to have the Fed ask Congress to respond. That would be going in the wrong direction. If Congress does remove these tools, then the Fed could be forced to begin a fire sale on Treasury securities and mortgage-backed securities worth trillions of dollars, and the Fed will no longer be able to control the monetary system.

We have to do what we can to ensure that the Federal Reserve can prevent a crisis, and that it is not left waiting on the sidelines in the crisis unable to respond effectively.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, briefly, a number of Members are at their desks and will vote from their desks. I am told that the majority leader means it when he says we are going to have 10-minute votes. I would urge my colleagues, we can have a speedy disposition of all of these important amendments or we can go into the wee hours. I urge my Members to consider their votes.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3761

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 83, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 562 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Cantwell	Markey	Sanders
Durbin	Marshall	Scott (FL)
Hawley	Merkley	Warren
Lee	Murphy	Welch
Lummis	Paul	

NAYS—83

Alsobrooks	Graham	Padilla
Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Banks	Hagerty	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Ricketts
Bennet	Heinrich	Risch
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt Rochester	Hoeven	Schatz
Booker	Husted	Schiff
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Britt	Johnson	Schumer
Budd	Justice	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kelly	Sheehy
Collins	Kennedy	Slotkin
Coons	Kim	Smith
Cornyn	King	Sullivan
Cotton	Klobuchar	Thune
Cramer	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Luján	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Van Hollen
Daines	McCormick	Warner
Duckworth	Moody	Warnock
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Moreno	Wicker
Fischer	Mullin	Wyden
Gallego	Murray	Young
Gillibrand	Ossoff	

NOT VOTING—3

Cortez Masto	Cruz	Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 14, the nays are 83.

The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3761) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 3274 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would call up amendment No. 3274 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN], for Mr. CRUZ, proposes an amendment numbered 3274 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To extend the prohibition on certain reductions to B–1 bomber aircraft squadrons)

At the appropriate place in subtitle D of title I, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN REDUCTIONS TO B–1 BOMBER AIRCRAFT SQUADRONS.

Subsection (d)(1) of section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81; 135 Stat. 1574), as most recently amended by section 146 of the Servicemember Quality of Life Improvement and National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025 (Public Law 118–159; 138 Stat. 1810), is further amended by striking ''September 30, 2026'' and inserting ''September 30, 2030''.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this amendment would make sure there is no gap between the deployment of the B–1 bomber currently housed in Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota and Dyess Air Force Base in Texas. No gap—we don't retire this workhorse prematurely until the development and deployment of the B–21 bomber.

This not only has the largest payload of any U.S. aircraft, it is also the U.S. Air Force's testbed bomber for hypersonic weapons, making it a supersonic standoff missile truck ready for future conflict.

I would ask all of my colleagues to support it, and we would be happy to have a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment would not change the current budget or program of the U.S. Air Force. The Air Force is already planning to keep the B–1 fleet longer than 2030, but this will signal a congressional intent to do so.

I would also request a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, this is an excellent amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to the Cruz amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3274

The question occurs on adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3274) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 3535 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes for each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would you call up your amendment, please.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3535 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SCOTT] proposes an amendment numbered 3535 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of the Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection)

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

SEC. 1067. PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENT OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM AND THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 401—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,'' after ''National Security Agency,''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;'' after ''National Security Agency;'';

(2) in section 415—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by striking ''the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection,'';

(B) in subsection (c), by striking the third and fourth sentences; and

(C) in subsection (g)—

(i) by striking paragraph (3); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3);

(3) in section 418, by striking ''or 421'' and inserting ''421, or 425''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''§ 425. Special provisions concerning the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall have all of the authorities and responsibilities provided by this chapter—

''(1) with respect to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, as if the Bureau were part of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; and

''(2) with respect to a Federal reserve bank without the permission of the Federal reserve bank.

''(b) RELATIONSHIP TO DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY.—The provisions of subsection (a) of section 412 of this title (other than the provisions of subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (E) of subsection (a)(1) of section 412 of this title) shall apply to the Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the same manner as such provisions apply to the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 424 the following:

''425. Special provisions concerning the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 31, 2029.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask that each side have 2 minutes to discuss it.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my amendment, Scott No. 3535, to bring accountability and transparency to every American, including our brave service men and women.

For too long, our Nation's central bank, under the leadership of Jay Powell, has failed to do its basic duty of providing stability for American families.

Jay Powell's Federal Reserve has not only mismanaged the Federal's monetary policy but is overseeing regulatory and bank failures, reports of corruption, unethical practices among its own members, and a flagrant disregard for the best interest of American families.

This is all being completely overlooked by their inspector general because he is handpicked by the Fed Chairman, reports to the Fed Chairman. He gets paid by the Fed Chairman. He sets his salary. It is a clear conflict of interest.

We need accountability at the Fed to rebuild the public's trust, and that means bringing in an independent, Senate-confirmed inspector general at the Federal Reserve.

I urge all my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort to establish an independent inspector general at the Federal Reserve so we can bring true accountability to the Fed and ensure the central bank is working in America's best interest.

I yield to my colleague Senator WARREN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise to support Senator SCOTT's bill that would increase oversight of the Federal Reserve.

I believe in Fed independence so the Fed can do its work setting interest rates and maximizing employment, but independence does not mean insulation from following the rules—especially ethics rules.

For years, the Fed has rebuffed congressional oversight, and for years, Fed officials have been caught up in ethics scandals without any accountability.

Unlike virtually every other major Federal Agency, the Fed hires and fires and sets the salary for its own inspector general. That means that in 2021, when high-level Fed officials were embroiled in a scandal involving financial trades they made during the COVID pandemic, the Fed's own in-house IG conducted the only investigation and said, essentially: Nothing to see here.

Maybe that is right, but the Fed's watchdog should be truly independent and able to call out abuses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. WARREN. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose this amendment.

I will say there is no argument that we should reform parts of the process for an IG for the Federal Reserve, but this amendment is not that reform that is necessary.

What this amendment does is it will increase the political control over an independent central bank by allowing the President—the President—to hire and fire the Federal Reserve's independent inspector general at will.

This is part of the administration's attack on the Fed's independence—the independence that is absolutely integral to our economy's success. The President has attempted to illegally remove a Governor from her post and threatened to fire the Chair of the Board. He is doing this to exert political control over the Fed's monetary decisions.

No President, current or future—this should also apply to future Presidents—should have increased powers to politicize our central bank and its critical monetary policy decisions, whether it is by attempting to take it over through the OMB, manufacturing partisan investigations at the Justice Department, or appointing a political operative as the inspector general.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against increasing Presidential power and threatening the independence of the Federal Reserve. We are seeing that now. We cannot further that attempt.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3535

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on adoption of the amendment.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 563 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Fischer	Moreno
Barrasso	Graham	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murphy
Boozman	Hawley	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Risch
Budd	Husted	Sanders
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Markey	Tuberville
Curtis	Marshall	Warren
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fetterman	Moran	

NAYS—43

Alsobrooks	Gillibrand	King
Baldwin	Grassley	Klobuchar
Bennet	Hassan	Luján
Blumenthal	Heinrich	McConnell
Blunt Rochester	Hickenlooper	Murkowski
Booker	Hirono	Murray
Collins	Kaine	Ossoff
Coons	Kelly	Padilla
Duckworth	Kennedy	Peters
Gallego	Kim	Reed

Rosen	Shaheen	Warnock
Rounds	Slotkin	Welch
Schatz	Smith	Whitehouse
Schiff	Van Hollen	
Schumer	Warner	

NOT VOTING—4

Cortez Masto		
Cruz	Paul	Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 43.

The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3535) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendment in order be the Curtis amendment No. 3697.

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

The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 3697 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 3697 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. CURTIS] proposes an amendment numbered 3697 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a review of the methodologies used to determine the amounts of locality-based comparability payments and to require the President's Pay Agent to conduct a pilot program establishing alternative models for determining the amounts of those payments)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. MODERNIZATION OF THE PAY COMPARABILITY SYSTEM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMPARABILITY PAYMENT.—The term ''comparability payment'' means a comparability payment payable under section 5304 or 5304a of title 5, United States Code.

(2) GENERAL SCHEDULE POSITION; PAY DISPARITY.—The terms ''General Schedule position'' and ''pay disparity'' have the meanings given those terms in section 5302 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) PAY AGENT.—The term ''Pay Agent'' means the agent designated by the President under section 5304(d) of title 5, United States Code.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Pay Agent shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Public Administration under which, not later than 380 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Academy of Public Administration, in consultation with the Pay Agent, the Secretary of Defense, the Federal Salary Council, and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall—

(1) conduct a review of the methodologies used to determine the amounts of comparability payments, which shall include—

(A) an assessment of the extent to which comparability payments align with cost-of-living and labor market data, as derived from—

(i) salary data from the National Compensation Survey and Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics programs administered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor;

(ii) the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor;

(iii) regional price parity indices published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce;

(iv) the House Price Index published by the Federal Housing Finance Agency;

(v) the National Housing Market Indicators produced by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; and

(vi) other Federal indicators or reputable publicly available indicators, as determined appropriate by the Pay Agent; and

(B) a specific analysis of—

(i) pay disparities in Utah; and

(ii) regional pay disparities affecting the recruitment and retention of Federal employees in defense-related roles, using Utah as a case study for areas undergoing rapid economic growth; and

(2) recommend alternative models for determining the amounts of comparability payments, including by—

(A) making adjustments based on broader economic indicators;

(B) comparing the rates of pay payable under General Schedule positions with the rates of pay payable under positions in the Federal Government that are not General Schedule positions, such as rates of pay established under the AcqDemo Project of the Department of Defense carried out under section 1762 of title 10, United States Code; and

(C) using regional housing market trends, with a particular focus on the markets in Salt Lake City, Ogden, Layton, Utah, and other similarly fast-growing areas, as determined by the Pay Agent.

(c) PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 5304 and 5304a of title 5, United States Code, after the National Academy of Public Administration completes the review described in subsection (b), the Pay Agent shall carry out a pilot program under which the Pay Agent, after consideration of the alternative models recommended under subsection (b)(2), uses alternative models to determine the amounts of comparability payments that shall be paid in Utah and each area in which a pay disparity described in subsection (b)(1)(B)(ii) exists.

(2) LENGTH OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The pilot program under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 3 years after the date on which the National Academy of Public Administration completes the review under subsection (b).

(3) NOTIFICATION.—Before implementing a pilot program under this subsection, the Pay Agent shall provide notice regarding, and an explanation of, that pilot program to Congress and the public.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of an agency under section 5305, 5753, or 5754 of title 5, United States Code, to establish special salary rates or offer recruitment, relocation, or retention bonuses while the Pay Agent is carrying out the requirements under subsection (b) or any pilot program under subsection (c).

(e) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as granting authority to use alternative models to determine the amounts of comparability payments after the termination of the pilot program under subsection (c)(2).

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be up to 2 minutes, equally divided.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of my amendment to create a pilot program to address the shortcomings in the locality pay system that are impacting Utah and likely impacting all of you in your military installations and all of your Federal employees around this country.

The outdated locality pay formula has several flaws in its metrics. In my State, it doesn't take into account blue-collar workers. It doesn't even take into account cost of living.

My amendment creates a pilot program for OPM to use Utah's situation as a case study on these pay disparities to improve the formulas for all of us. It is a top priority for Hill Air Force Base and a top priority for me. I suspect, in many of your cases, it is a priority as well.

I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, first off, I would just like to say I thank my colleague from Utah for raising this incredibly important issue.

I have also heard about this issue with Federal locality pay in my home State of Michigan. And I don't think this is a problem just in Utah and Michigan; it is in all of our States. However, I have concerns about how this amendment, as drafted, could unintentionally weaken existing safeguards that ensure consistency and competitive salaries across the Federal workforce. Opening the door to these kinds of changes, in this current environment that we are in right now, is particularly concerning.

The administration has already frozen locality pay and is reshaping the Federal workforce in ways that I certainly do not support. This amendment would give the administration too much authority to inflict additional pain on Federal employees. I would be happy to work together with my colleague on a bill that provides Federal employees with the competitive compensation that they certainly deserve and includes appropriate safeguards to prevent unintended consequences that I know the sponsor of this amendment wants to avoid as well.

But I would urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment until we can go through the work necessary. And I give my commitment to do that to my colleague and friend the Senator from Utah and that we will get this right because it is an issue. It is just not ready today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, my thanks to my colleague from Michigan. I think it is clear that we share the objective together.

I also want to point out that I do share your concerns and am anxious to work with you. In my perfect world, we would do this in conference because every day this is not figured out is a day that our troops are not getting the

appropriate pay. If that doesn't happen, let's work together; let's find that common ground between the objective we are trying to accomplish here and the safeguards that you are worried about.

I yield back my time.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3697

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of amendment No. 3697.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 564 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cortez Masto	Cruz	Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MOODY). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46. The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3697) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendment in order be the Cotton-Gillibrand amendment, No. 3759, and I further ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to that amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3759 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3759 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mrs. GILLIBRAND], for Mr. COTTON, proposes an amendment numbered 3759 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the authority to protect certain facilities and assets of the United States from incursions)

At the end of subtitle E of title III, add the following:

SEC. 350. MODIFICATION OF PROTECTION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES AND ASSETS FROM INCURSIONS.

Section 130i of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''any provision of title 18'' and inserting ''sections 32, 1030, and 1367 and chapters 119 and 206 of title 18''; and

(B) by striking ''officers and civilian employees'' and inserting ''officers, civilian employees, and contractors'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''Detect'' and inserting ''During the operation of the unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft, detect''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', including through the use of remote identification broadcast or other means'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''Any unmanned'' and inserting ''(1) Any unmanned''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Any forfeiture conducted under paragraph (1) shall be made subject to the requirements for civil, criminal, or administrative forfeiture, as the case may be, under applicable law or regulation.'';

(4) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the regulations prescribed or guidance issued under paragraph (1) require that, when taking an action described in subsection (a)(1), all due consideration is given to—

''(i) mitigating impacts on privacy and civil liberties under the First and Fourth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States;

''(ii) mitigating damage to, or loss of, real and personal property;

''(iii) mitigating any risk of personal injury or death; and

''(iv) when practicable, obtaining the identification of or issuing a warning to the operator of an unmanned aircraft system or unmanned aircraft prior to taking action under subparagraphs (C) through (F) of subsection (b)(1), unless doing so would—

''(I) endanger the safety of members of the armed forces or civilians;

''(II) create a flight risk or result in the destruction of evidence; or

''(III) seriously jeopardize an investigation, criminal proceeding, or legal proceeding pursuant to subsection (c).

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit the inherent right to self defense of a member of the armed forces.'';

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) the interception, acquisition, maintenance, or use of, or access to, communications to or from an unmanned aircraft system under this section is conducted in a manner consistent with the First and Fourth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States and applicable provisions of Federal law;'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''a function of the Department of Defense'' and inserting ''an action described in subsection (b)(1)'';

(C) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) records of such communications are maintained only for as long as necessary, and in no event for more than 180 days unless the Secretary of Defense determines that maintenance of such records—

''(A) is necessary to investigate or prosecute a violation of law or to directly support an ongoing security operation; or

''(B) is required under Federal law or for the purpose of any litigation;''; and

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) is necessary to support an ongoing action described in subsection (b)(1);'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) is necessary to support the counter unmanned aircraft systems activities of another Federal agency with authority to mitigate the threat of unmanned aircraft systems or unmanned aircraft in mitigating such threats; or''; and

(v) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and'';

(6) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) as subsections (g), (h), (j), (k), (l), respectively;

(7) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) CLAIMS.—Claims for loss of property, injury, or death pursuant to actions under subsection (b) may be made consistent with chapter 171 of title 28, and chapter 163 of this title, as applicable.'';

(8) in subsection (h), as redesignated by paragraph (6), by striking ''March 1, 2018'' and inserting ''March 1, 2026'';

(9) by inserting after subsection (h), as so redesignated, the following:

''(i) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and publish on a publicly available website a report summarizing all detection and mitigation activities conducted under this section during the previous year to counter unmanned aircraft systems.

''(2) Each report under paragraph (1) shall include—

''(A) information on any violation of, or failure to comply with, this section by personnel authorized to conduct detection and mitigation activities, including a description of any such violation or failure;

''(B) data on the number of detection activities conducted, the number of mitigation activities conducted, and the number of instances of communications interception from an unmanned aircraft system;

''(C) whether any unmanned aircraft that experienced mitigation was engaged in or attempting to engage in activities protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

''(D) whether any unmanned aircraft or unmanned aircraft system was properly or improperly seized, disabled, damaged, or destroyed and an identification of any methods used to seize, disable, damage, or destroy such aircraft or system; and

''(E) a description of the efforts of the Federal Government to protect privacy and civil liberties when carrying out detection and mitigation activities under this section to counter unmanned aircraft systems.

''(3) Each report required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted and published in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.''.

(10) by striking subsection (k), as so redesignated, and inserting the following:

''(k) SUNSET.—This section shall terminate on December 31, 2030.''; and

(11) in subsection (l), as so redesignated—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs,'' after ''the Committee on the Judiciary,''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''the Committee on Homeland Security,'' after ''the Committee on the Judiciary,''; and

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by redesignating clauses (i) through (ix) as subclauses (I) through (IX), respectively, and moving those subclauses, as so redesignated, two ems to the right;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and moving those clauses, as so redesignated, two ems to the right; and

(iii) in the matter preceding clause (i), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking ''means any facility or asset that—'' and inserting ''means—

''(A) any facility or asset that—'';

(iv) in clause (iii), as redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) in subclause (VIII), as redesignated by clause (i), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(II) in subclause (IX), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(III) by adding at the end the following new subclauses:

''(X) protection of the buildings, grounds, and property to which the public are not permitted regular, unrestricted access and that are under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the Department of Defense and the persons on that property pursuant to section 2672 of this title;

''(XI) assistance to Federal, State, or local officials in responding to incidents involving nuclear, radiological, biological, or chemical weapons, high-yield explosives, or related materials or technologies, as well as support pursuant to section 282 of this title or the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq); or

''(XII) activities listed in section 2692(b) of this title; or''; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) any personnel associated with a facility or asset specified under subparagraph (A) while engaged in direct support of a mission of the Department of Defense specified in clause (iii) of such subparagraph.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I rise in support of amendment No. 3759, the Comprehensive Operations for Unmanned-System Neutralization and Threat Elimination Response Act, or the COUNTER Act.

This is a commonsense amendment to mitigate threats to military facilities from unmanned aircraft systems. Hundreds of drones have been spotted in the vicinity of military installations over the past 2 years, including military sensitive sites like Langley Air Force Base.

But current laws give the Department of Defense quite limited authority to mitigate these threats, and the patchwork of interagency coordination required to address them leaves gaps that endanger our military bases and the men and women who serve there.

This is an alarming threat to our national security.

That is why this amendment is so important. It would give the DOD the authority to secure all of its bases, enhancing the protection against unmanned aircraft system incursions.

It would also allow the DOD to share information about threats posed by UAS with the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security to improve the interagency mitigation efforts.

Additionally, the amendment includes language that protects Americans' privacy and constitutional rights, while still meeting the needs of the military to protect our servicemembers and sensitive military sites.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment to strengthen our national security and protect our military facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I thank Senator GILLIBRAND for her work on this legislation. I think most Americans, if not a few Senators, are shocked when they learn how little defenses our troops have against drones that are approaching their military bases. They really have to wait until an unidentified drone demonstrates hostile intent before they can neutralize the threat. That is not what we would say if a box truck was driving up to a base. We shouldn't have to say it when a drone is approaching a base.

Senator GILLIBRAND has cited a lot of recent threats here. This legislation would close the gap, simplify military guidance, and make our troops safer.

I would urge everyone a ''yes'' vote, and I think Senator GILLIBRAND and I would welcome a voice vote as well.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3759

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of amendment No. 3759.

The amendment (No. 3759) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the next amendment in order be the Marshall amendment No. 3213, and I further ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to that amendment.

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

The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 3213 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3213 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. MARSHALL] proposes an amendment numbered 3213 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the flying, draping, or other display of any flag other than the flag of the United States at covered public buildings)

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

SEC. 1067. PROHIBITION ON FLAGS OTHER THAN THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED PUBLIC BUILDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''covered public building'' has the meaning given the term ''public building'' in section 3301(a) of title 40, United States Code.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''covered public building'' includes—

(i) a building in use by the Senate or House of Representatives or otherwise under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol;

(ii) a military installation; and

(iii) any embassy or consulate of the United States.

(2) FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ''flag of the United States'' has the meaning given the term in section 700(b) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The term ''military installation'' has the meaning given the term in section 2801(c) of title 10, United States Code.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subsection (c), no flag that is not the flag of the United States may be flown, draped, or otherwise displayed—

(1) on the exterior of a covered public building; or

(2) in an area of a covered public building that is fully accessible to the public, including an entryway or hallway.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibitions under subsection (b) shall not apply to—

(1) a National League of Families POW/MIA flag (as designated by section 902(a) of title 36, United States Code);

(2) a Hostage and Wrongful Detainee flag (as designated by section 904(a) of title 36, United States Code);

(3) any flag that represents the nation of a visiting diplomat or a representative of the government of that nation visiting the covered public building at which the flag is displayed;

(4) in the case of a Member of Congress, the State flag of the State represented by the Member that is located outside or within the office of the Member;

(5) any flag that represents a unit or branch of the Armed Forces or any flag that supports the Armed Forces;

(6) any flag of historical significance to the United States, including the Betsy Ross flag, the Gadsden flag, and the Bennington flag;

(7) any flag that represents public safety;

(8) any flag commemorating a special national observance, including any 9/11 memorial, Remembrance Day, Veterans Day, or Memorial Day flag;

(9) in the case of a religious liturgy or ceremony at a military installation or facility, any flag that represents a religious organization or church that is described in section

501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code;

(10) in the case of a Federal agency, any flag that represents the Federal agency;

(11) any flag that represents an Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)); or

(12) any flag that represents the State, territory, county, city, or local jurisdiction in which the covered public building is located.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, the American flag represents something deeply personal to most of us in this room. Someone from every generation in my family, going back to the Civil War, has served under one flag—the American flag.

It is more than stars and stripes. This one flag is a symbol of sacrifice, of freedom and unity. Every time we place our hands over our hearts, we are reminded that we are one Nation under God. We are not a patchwork of ideologies competing for space on a flagpole. No flag that divides or politicizes should ever be flown on a Federal building.

This is about respect. It is about unity and putting America first, standing together under one flag—the Stars and Stripes—and that is why I urge my colleagues to support our amendment, ensuring only the American flag is flown on Federal buildings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, Senator MARSHALL's amendment would prohibit any flag other than the U.S. flag from being flown outside or in publicly accessible areas of military installations, public buildings in the United States, American Embassies and consulates, and public areas of congressional office buildings, including hallways.

This amendment raises serious constitutional concerns about the right of free expression. But one example would be that a Member of Congress could not fly the flag of Israel, for example, unless he or she were being visited by an Israeli Ambassador. And that is a constraint, I think, on speech and the rights of Members of Congress, as well as others.

So I would urge a ''no'' vote on this.

With respect to specific military installations, in the fiscal year 2024 national defense bill, section 1052 gave the Secretary of Defense discretion to indicate what flag would be appropriate on a military installation. So we have dealt with this issue before in a bipartisan manner.

I would urge a ''no'' vote on Senator MARSHALL's amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3213

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of amendment No. 3213.

The amendment (No. 3213) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 3814 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3814 to substitute amendment No. 3748 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. MORAN] proposes an amendment numbered 3814 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the availability of care for veterans from facilities and providers of the Department of Defense)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 724. IMPROVEMENT OF AVAILABILITY OF CARE FOR VETERANS FROM FACILITIES AND PROVIDERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) OUTREACH ON AVAILABLE CARE.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct outreach to increase awareness among veterans enrolled in the system of annual patient enrollment of the Department of Veterans Affairs established and operated under section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, of the ability of those veterans to receive care at military medical treatment facilities.

(b) TRAINING ON REFERRALS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure training for staff and contractors involved in scheduling, or assisting in scheduling, appointments for care under the community care program specifically includes training regarding options for referral to facilities and providers of the Department of Defense.

(c) PREFERRED PROVIDERS.—Subsection (g) of section 1703 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting ''AND PREFERRED PROVIDERS'' after ''NETWORK''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) The Secretary shall consider providers under subsection (c)(2) to be preferred providers under this section.''.

(d) ACTION PLANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop and implement action plans at covered facilities—

(A) to expand the partnership between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to the provision of health care;

(B) to improve communication between the Department of Veterans Affairs and pertinent command and director leadership of military medical treatment facilities;

(C) to increase utilization of military medical treatment facilities with excess capacity;

(D) to increase case volume and complexity for graduate medical education programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(E) to improve resource sharing agreements or permits, as applicable, between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, which would also ensure lessened barriers to shared facility spaces; and

(F) to increase access to care for veterans described in subsection (a) in areas in which a military medical treatment facility is located that is identified by the Secretary of Defense as having excess capacity.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The action plans required under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Cross-credentialing and privileging of health care providers, including nurses, medical technicians, and other support staff, to jointly care for beneficiaries in medical facilities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) Expediting access to installations of the Department of Defense for staff and beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(C) Including in-kind or non-cash payment or reimbursement options for expenses incurred by either the Department of Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(D) Allowing eligible veterans to seek certain services at military medical treatment facilities without referral or preauthorization from the Department of Veterans Affairs, for which reimbursement to the Department of Defense will be made.

(E) The designation of a coordinator within each covered facility to serve as a liaison between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and to lead the implementation of such action plan.

(F) A mechanism for monitoring the effectiveness of such action plan on an ongoing basis, to include establishing relevant performance goals and collecting data to assess progress towards those goals.

(G) Prioritize the integration of relevant information technology and other systems or processes to enable seamless information sharing, referrals and ancillary orders, payment methodologies and billing processes, and workload attribution when Department of Veterans Affairs personnel provide services at Department of Defense facilities or when Department of Defense personnel provide services at Department of Veterans Affairs facilities.

(H) Any other matter that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs consider appropriate.

(3) APPROVAL OF ACTION PLANS.—Before implementing any action plan required under paragraph (1) at a covered facility or covered facilities, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that approval for the action plan is obtained from—

(A) the co-chairs of the Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee established under section 320 of title 38, United States Code;

(B) the local installation commander for the covered facility of the Department of Defense; and

(C) the director of the relevant medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to any covered facility or covered facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(4) REPORTS.—

(A) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing the action plans required under paragraph (1).

(B) SUBSEQUENT REPORT.—Not later than one year after submitting the report required under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing—

(i) a status update on the progress of implementing the action plans required under paragraph (1); and

(ii) recommendations for developing subsequent action plans for each facility with respect to which there is a sharing agreement in place.

(e) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SHARING AGREEMENTS.—

(1) LEAD COORDINATOR.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that there is a lead coordinator at each facility of the Department of

Defense or the Department of Veterans Affairs, as the case may be, with respect to which there is a sharing agreement in place.

(2) LIST OF AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall maintain on a publicly available website a list of all sharing agreements in place between medical facilities of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(f) TREATMENT OF EXISTING LAWS REGARDING SHARING OF HEALTH CARE RESOURCES.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out this section notwithstanding any limitation or requirement under section 1104 of title 10, United States Code, or section 8111 of title 38, United States Code.

(g) FUNDING.—The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may use funds available in the DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund established under section 8111(d)(2) of title 38, United States Code, to implement this section.

(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall be construed to require veterans to seek care in facilities of the Department of Defense.

(i) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN LIMITS ON PAYMENTS OF PENSION.—Section 5503(d)(7) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''November 30, 2031'' and inserting ''April 30, 2032''.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) COMMUNITY CARE PROGRAM.—The term ''community care program'' means the Veterans Community Care Program under section 1703 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) COVERED FACILITY.—The term ''covered facility'' means—

(A) a military medical treatment facility ias defined in section 1073c(j) of title 10, United States Code; or

(B) a medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs located nearby a military medical treatment facility described in subparagraph (A).

(4) SHARING AGREEMENT.—The term ''sharing agreement'' means an agreement for sharing of health-care resources between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 1104 of title 10, United States Code, or section 8111 of title 38, United States Code.

(5) VETERAN.—The term ''veteran'' has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to support amendment No. 3814 to the NDAA. This amendment would improve collaboration between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense to expand access to care for veterans and support greater utilization of military medical treatment facilities. Current law allows DOD to downgrade the scope of a military treatment facility if the facility volume doesn't justify the capacity of patients and if surrounding communities can absorb this capacity.

My amendment, which incorporates feedback from DOD and VA, would require improved outreach, education, training, and partnership between the VA and DOD. It would make certain that excess capacity at military medical treatment facilities is used to increase access to care for veterans living in that community, while also providing more training opportunities for DOD personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to the Moran amendment No. 3814.

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

Is there further debate?

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3814

The question now occurs on adoption of amendment No. 3814.

The amendment (No. 3814) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 3288 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I call up the Lee-Duckworth amendment No. 3288 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 3288 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To address the treatment of funds received by National Guard Bureau as reimbursement from States)

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. TREATMENT OF FUNDS RECEIVED BY NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AS REIMBURSEMENT FROM STATES.

Section 710 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) TREATMENT OF REIMBURSED FUNDS.—Any funds received by the National Guard Bureau from a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, or the Virgin Islands as reimbursement under this section for the use of military property—

''(1) shall be credited to—

''(A) the appropriation, fund, or account used in incurring the obligation; or

''(B) an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the purposes for which the expenditures were made; and

''(2) may only be used by the Department of Defense for the repair, maintenance, or other similar functions related directly to assets used by National Guard units while operating under State active duty status.''.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, across the country, our guardsmen are on the frontlines of our national security.

They are on the frontlines of our national security, securing our cities and our border, and, most commonly, leading natural disaster recovery efforts in our various States.

In 2022, over half of the National Guard's members responded to natural disasters, including wildfires, hurricanes, winter storms, tornadoes, and even volcanoes.

The National Guard's motto is ''Always Ready, Always There,'' and yet there is an unnecessary bureaucratic hurdle jeopardizing the readiness of Guard assets for future missions. When the National Guard is used in a State Active-Duty status for missions like disaster response, the State may use Federal equipment to complete the mission but must reimburse the Federal National Guard Bureau for the associated expenses. Current law requires those reimbursements to flow through the Treasury Department rather than the Guard unit incurring the expense.

Why does this matter? Well, it matters because we need to get rid of this unnecessary step that is harming the States and the Guard.

The amendment simply directs reimbursements to the appropriate Guard unit directly, the unit where the asset resides, to ensure its readiness for future missions.

If we are going to expect the Guard to be always ready and always there, we must streamline the State Active-Duty reimbursement process and ensure the Guard is made whole.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, this is a bipartisan amendment that deals with a longstanding, multiyear issue supported by 49 State adjutant generals. When the National Guard units are mobilized by their Governors and paid for by the Federal Government, our antiquated reimbursement system for reimbursing the National Guard for maintenance of their Federal equipment leads to long delays for States to receive the promised funds.

This amendment only modernizes our payment system to ensure that the Federal Government more efficiently reimburses States to ensure that Federal National Guard equipment that is used for title 32 or State Active-Duty missions of our Guard, such as responses to natural disasters, can be adequately maintained.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, this amendment has widespread support. I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to the Lee-Duckworth amendment No. 3288.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3288

The question now occurs on adoption of amendment No. 3288.

The amendment (No. 3288) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 3926 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

(Purpose: To protect the national security of the United States by imposing sanctions with respect to certain persons of the People's Republic of China and prohibiting and requiring notifications with respect to certain investments by United States persons in the People's Republic of China.)

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I call up the Cornyn and Cortez Masto amendment No. 3926 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 3926 to amendment No. 3748.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of October 7, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I would ask unanimous consent that Senator WARREN and I be allowed to speak with 2 minutes divided between us, a minute each.

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

Mr. CORNYN. If this amendment sounds familiar, it is. It passed the 118th Congress by a vote of 91 to 6. Simply stated, this is a transparency bill that will give us some insight into the amount of money being invested in the People's Republic of China and the extent to which those investment dollars are directly flowing into the arsenal of our greatest strategic adversary: the People's Republic of China.

The U.S.-China Economic and Security Commission noted that the United States is the most important foreign source of investment to semiconductors, quantum computing, and AI in China.

Because of China's military fusion strategy, these investments are directly bolstering the People's Liberation Army. Voting for this amendment will provide transparency to us as policymakers to know where the money is going and how it is being used in China—hopefully, the way that we can protect ourselves and protect our interests in the Indo-Pacific.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, we have a responsibility to ensure that the United States remains the world's leader in advanced technology. There is broad bipartisan agreement that we should be developing the most sensitive, cutting-edge technologies right here at home, rather than funding their development in countries that do not share our values.

This amendment would advance that goal by codifying a program to screen specific types of U.S. investments in China and other countries of concern.

It would protect our national security and help ensure that American ingenuity, innovation, and investment do not end up turbocharging these countries' advancements in fields like artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and microelectronics.

I commend Senators CORTEZ MASTO and CORNYN for their leadership in this effort and look forward to working with my colleagues to get versions of this important legislation signed into law.

Today's vote is an important bipartisan step to protect American innovation and safeguard our national security.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we would be happy to have a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, this is an extremely important amendment which will protect America's interests, and I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to the amendment, Cornyn-Cortez Masto No. 3926.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3926

The question now occurs on adoption of amendment No. 3926.

The amendment (No. 3926) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT NO. 3841 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

(Purpose: To prohibit contracting with certain biotechnology providers.)

Mr. HAGERTY. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3841 to substitute amendment No. 3748 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HAGERTY] proposes an amendment numbered 3841 to amendment No. 3748.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 9, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. HAGERTY. Madam President, I stand before you today to urge the adoption of the Hagerty-Peters amendment for the bipartisan BIOSECURE Act.

The BIOSECURE Act is rooted in basic common sense. It would stop U.S. taxpayer money from going to Chinese technology companies that are aligned with the People's Liberation Army, companies like BGI.

The threat we face is real, and it is growing. Communist China has openly identified biotechnology as a key domain for future warfare. To cite just one chilling example, in 2017, National Defense University of the People's Liberation Army wrote about the possibility of ''specific ethnic genetic attacks'' that ''can be a precise, targeted attack''—get this—''that destroys a race, or a specific group of people, or a specific person.'' This is bone-chilling, this is real, and this is the objective of the CCP and the PLA through this DNA data collection.

The Chinese military entity added that ''its potentially huge war effectiveness can bring extreme panic to human beings.'' Of course it would.

That is not science fiction; that is a PLA strategy document.

Companies like BGI—one of the so-called national champions of Chinese biotech—are in position to facilitate what was once heretofore unthinkable: a genetically targeted bioweapon. Evidence suggests that BGI is working with China's military to conduct joint research. It is using the Chinese military supercomputers to process biodata, and it is collaborating with Chinese military hospitals to genetically enhance the performance of Chinese soldiers. Can you believe this?

Under China's national intelligence laws, all Chinese companies, regardless of where they operate in the world, must turn over any data they have collected if the Chinese Government wants it. Given the stated interest of the PLA in bioweapons, you can be sure they will be interested in the genetic data of Americans.

Make no mistake, BGI and companies like it are not just commercial actors; they are tools of the CCP—collecting, storing, and analyzing DNA for millions of people worldwide, including the genetic data of Americans that they collect, very often without informed consent. That is why the Department of War has already singled out BGI on its list of communist companies that operate in the United States and that collaborate with the People's Liberation Army.

The solution is simple. The BIOSECURE Act stops U.S. taxpayer money from flowing to biotechnology companies of concern. It ensures that the Federal Government cannot buy from, contract with, nor subsidize CCP-controlled biotech firms that put at risk the DNA of American citizens and the security of the United States. It gives industry an adjustment period when new entities are designated as ''biotechnology companies of concern.'' It provides limited waiver authority where absolutely necessary on a case-by-case basis.

Just last month, Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin were overheard talking about biotechnology, organ transplants, and even the possibly of extending life to 150 years. They know what is at stake. We must acknowledge it too.

This amendment is about protecting Americans' most personal information—their DNA. I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I commend Senator HAGERTY and Senator PETERS, who is not on the floor right now, but I also commend him for his leadership on this amendment, which should pass overwhelmingly.

I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to the Hagerty-Peters amendment No. 3841.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3841

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3841) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 3109 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3109 to

amendment No. 3748 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 3109 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to procure or modify foreign aircraft for presidential airlift)

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

SEC. 1038. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PROCURE OR MODIFY FOREIGN AIRCRAFT FOR PRESIDENTIAL AIRLIFT.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of Defense may be made available for the procurement, modification, restoration, or maintenance of an aircraft previously owned by a foreign government, an entity controlled by a foreign government, or a representative of a foreign government for the purposes of providing presidential airlift options.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, back in May, President Trump accepted the largest foreign gift to an American President in modern history—a $400 million luxury Boeing 747 for use as Air Force One.

It is outrageous that President Trump wants to fly around the world like a King while Americans are getting hammered by tariffs and paying more for healthcare, groceries, rent, and electricity.

Some say that this plane was gifted and that it didn't cost the United States anything, but make no mistake about it, merely retrofitting this foreign-owned luxury jet to make it fully operational will cost hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars.

That is money that shouldn't be wasted, so, today, I have an amendment that will make sure not a penny of taxpayer dollars provided in this NDAA will go to any remodeling or maintenance of the President's foreign-owned Air Force One.

It would prohibit funds authorized by this bill from being diverted for procurement, modification, restoration, or maintenance of an aircraft previously owned by a foreign government for the purpose of providing a Presidential airlift, and it would ensure the security and continued reliability of the Air Force One fleet.

Republicans like to talk about eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse. Spending even a penny of taxpayer dollars on retrofitting this luxury is about as wasteful—as wasteful—as it gets.

I urge my Republican colleagues who care about spending taxpayer dollars responsibly to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it would have a significant negative effect on our U.S. nuclear deterrence.

In addition to the obvious stab at President Trump, the way the amendment is drafted would affect one of our military's most important programs: the Survivable Airborne Operations Center—otherwise known as the Doomsday Plane.

This aircraft program is crucial to ensuring command and control for the President if we are attacked with nuclear weapons. It is an important part of our nuclear deterrent.

The program purchased a Boeing 747 aircraft from Korean Air, and thus this program would be unable to spend appropriated money this year if this amendment passes.

For those reasons, I urge a ''no'' vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3109

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 565 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kelly	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Luján	Smith
Coons	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—50

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

NOT VOTING—4

Cortez Masto	Hawley	Tillis
Cruz		

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 50.

The 60-vote threshold not having been achieved, the amendment is rejected.

The amendment (No. 3109) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 3872 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I call up my amendment No. 3872 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. VAN HOLLEN] proposes an amendment numbered 3872 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify certain limitations on full-time National Guard duty performed in a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia)

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. REQUIREMENT OF CONSENT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR CERTAIN FULL-TIME NATIONAL GUARD DUTY PERFORMED IN A STATE, TERRITORY, OR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Subsection (f) of section 502 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Under'' and inserting ''Subject to paragraph (2) and under''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) Support of operations or missions undertaken by the member's unit at the request of the President or Secretary of Defense, with the consent of—

''(i) the chief executive officer of each State (as that term is defined in section 901 of this title) in which such operations or missions shall take place; and

''(ii) if such operations or missions shall take place in the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia.''.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, this amendment says that the Governor of one State may not deploy its National Guard to another State without the consent of the Governor of the recipient State.

As the Republican Governor of Oklahoma Kevin Stitt said today, ''As a federalist believer, one governor against another governor, I don't think that's the right way to approach this.''

I agree. And it is worth noting that Governor Stitt is the current chairman of the National Governors Association.

Voluntary cooperation is one thing, but I don't think any of my colleagues would appreciate it if the Governor of Maryland used Federal dollar-supported National Guard troops in Maryland to deploy to any of your States without the consent of your State. That is the principle behind this amendment.

I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. One thing my friend did not mention is this also affects Washington, DC. Another reason I oppose this amendment is it would weaken Federal authority over the DC National Guard and hinder its ability to respond to a crisis.

Cooperation with the Mayor of DC is valuable, but collaboration does not require granting the Mayor Commander-in-Chief powers over a Federal military force. The President must retain that authority to ensure unity in command in a rapid, coordinated Federal response when it is needed most.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3872

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 566 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cortez Masto	Cruz	Tillis

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

The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3872) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 3210 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

(Purpose: To limit the provision of support by the Armed Forces to civilian law enforcement activities.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3210 to amendment No. 3748 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Ms. DUCKWORTH] proposes an amendment numbered 3210 to amendment No. 3748.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 31, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, in the last few months, we have seen President Trump force military troops, uninvited, into American cities—first into Los Angeles, then into our Nation's Capital, and now into Chicago.

Let's be clear: Ordering our troops to intimidate the very Americans they were willing to risk their lives to protect does nothing to make our Nation stronger. It is just another move straight out of an authoritarian 101 playbook. A move that tramples on civil rights instills fear among Americans and distracts our troops from their core mission of keeping Americans safe from actual adversaries who wish to do us harm. Our National Guard signed up to serve and protect this country, not to protect one man's thin skin.

That is why, today, I am introducing a provision that would reduce the misuse of the military for nonmilitary purposes. It would install commonsense congressional oversight by requiring Congress to approve any redirection of expensive military assets to support law enforcement for longer than 30 days. This is essential to protecting against civil rights abuse, including the use of military bases for detentions or providing DOD surveillance to support policing on U.S. soil.

To be clear, my provision would allow States facing situations that overwhelm their capacities from natural disasters and public health emergencies to benefit from research in military and logistical support for a month. It would also help ensure that America's elected representatives, not a wannabe dictator, get to decide whether to bring in military readiness of such extraordinary measures.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle care about respecting our troops as much as they claim to, they have no choice but to join me in voting yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, protecting the American people and their property is fundamental to the government. In fact, it is a core principle and the responsibility of the Federal Government. I see no need or any good reason to remove the tools that the President has to do exactly that—to protect people and property.

The use of our military to support local law enforcement, not to become law enforcement, is legal. President Trump has proven it to be effective. I think that just because you don't like the current President, it is not a reason to make dramatic changes to the laws that restrict him from doing the very thing he promised he would do when he ran for the office.

I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3210

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 567 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kelly	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Luján	Smith
Coons	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	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	
Graham	Moreno	

NOT VOTING—2

Cortez Masto	Cruz

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

The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3210) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 3337 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3337 to amendment No. 3748 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. YOUNG], for Mr. KAINE and himself, proposes an amendment numbered 3337 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq)

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1219. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION.—The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102–1; 105 Stat. 3; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002.—The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Iraq war started 22 years ago; the Gulf war, 34 years ago. Today, Iraq is a partner, not an adversary, and it is time for the law to reflect that.

DOD has assured Congress that operations can continue without these expired AUMFs. Our amendment does not implicate the 2001 AUMF, which is critical to ongoing operations.

Both Chambers have passed the same repeal before on a bipartisan basis. The House included it in its NDAA this year. Let's do the same here in the Senate and close the book on these forever wars.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I would like to ask unanimous consent to just speak for a minute.

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

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague. Senator YOUNG and I have worked on this for a number of years. As he mentioned, the first Gulf war started in 1991, the second Gulf war in 2002, and it was over in 2011—14 years ago.

Last week, the Pentagon issued a statement about the drawdown of U.S. troops in Iraq, and this was the statement from the Pentagon:

This reduction reflects our combined success in fighting ISIS and marks an effort to transition to a lasting U.S.-Iraq security partnership.

An adversary to a partner beating a sword into a plowshare.

Both Houses have voted to repeal this war, and it is time that we take this action. This will be the first congressional repeal of a war authorization since the Gulf of Tonkin in 1971.

I ask for a ''yes'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I intend to vote against this. I think keeping this AUMF actually would help us assure continued success.

I think I see how the wind is blowing, and I will consent to a voice vote. Understanding that that is the sentiment of the body, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the 60-vote threshold in relation to amendment No. 3337.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3337

The question is on adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3337) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 3853 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 3853 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] proposes an amendment numbered 3853 to amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the bloated Pentagon budget by 10 percent and instead expand veteran dental care at the Department of Veterans Affairs)

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

SEC. 1067. FUNDING FOR DENTAL CARE FROM DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2026 by this Act is—

(1) the aggregate amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2026 by this Act (other than for military personnel and the Defense Health Program); minus

(2) the amount equal to 10 percent of the aggregate amount described in paragraph (1).

(b) ALLOCATION.—The reduction made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) apply on a pro rata basis among the accounts and funds for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated by this Act (other than military personnel and the Defense Health Program);

(2) be applied on a pro rata basis across each program, project, and activity funded by the account or fund concerned; and

(3) be used by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide direct dental care to all veterans eligible for health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs through expansions in dental treatment rooms and equipment and hiring of additional dentists and other clinicians.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, amendment No. 3853 is very simple. It would cut 10 percent from this Defense bill, excluding military personnel and the Defense Health Program, and it would use those funds to provide direct dental care to all veterans eligible for healthcare from the VA.

We are now spending over $1 trillion a year on the military—more than the next nine nations combined.

While Congress has cut funding for housing, education, nutrition, this bill increases military spending by over 8 percent.

Meanwhile, the Pentagon is the only major Federal Agency not capable of passing an independent audit, and nobody denies that there is not massive waste, fraud, and abuse within the DOD.

As the former chair of the Veterans' Committee, I agree with all of the major veterans organizations, that we have got to strengthen VA healthcare, and one of the gaps in that system is a lack of dental care. We have got veterans whose teeth are rotting in their mouth. They cannot get dental care.

I think we should get our priorities right. Let's cut a very large military budget, spending much too much. Let's protect our veterans. Let's pass this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, our military budgets are already carefully balanced. It is based on our national security priorities. Indiscriminate cuts contemplated in this amendment would undercut our readiness.

I ask for a ''no'' vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3853

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 88, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 568 Leg.]

YEAS—10

Baldwin	Sanders	Welch
Markey	Smith	Wyden
Merkley	Van Hollen	
Murphy	Warren	

NAYS—88

Alsobrooks	Grassley	Murray
Banks	Hagerty	Ossoff
Barrasso	Hassan	Padilla
Bennet	Hawley	Paul
Blackburn	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Ricketts
Booker	Hoeven	Risch
Boozman	Husted	Rosen
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Budd	Johnson	Schatz
Cantwell	Justice	Schiff
Capito	Kaine	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kelly	Schumer
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Coons	Kim	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	King	Shaheen
Cotton	Klobuchar	Sheehy
Cramer	Lankford	Slotkin
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Curtis	Luján	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Tillis
Duckworth	Marshall	Tuberville
Durbin	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	McCormick	Warnock
Fetterman	Moody	Whitehouse
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Gallego	Moreno	Young
Gillibrand	Mullin	
Graham	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Cortez Masto Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 10, the nays are 88.

The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3853) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 3927 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3748

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 3927 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 3927 to Amendment No. 3748.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To limit the use of Federal law enforcement officers for crowd control, and for other purposes)

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

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

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Federal law enforcement officer'' means—

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

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

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

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

(b) REQUIRED IDENTIFICATION.—

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

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

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

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

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) provide any new authority or expand existing authority for members of an armed force to engage in law enforcement activity; or

(2) affect existing law regarding the deployment of members of an armed force for law enforcement activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, back in 2021, in the NDAA, we had a clause that said Federal military police who were responding to a civil disturbance need to wear visible identification, including an individual identifier, which could, in fact, be a number or a name, and the name of the armed services, but there are three points of confusion that exist in this 2021 law.

The first is, what is included in civil disturbance? So this amendment clarifies that it includes crowd and riot control and arrests at protests and demonstrations.

Second of all, what about security contractors that serve the Federal police or Federal services? It says, yes, those are covered.

Third, that when you are going to a civil disturbance in support of the Federal Government, it also includes whether you are going in support of local police, to clarify that distinction.

That is all it is—three simple things—and it is so important to engender trust in America that we have this type of basic provision but clarified so we understand exactly when it applies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but let me explain why. During the discussions in our Armed Services Committee, we recognized that there was an issue that Republicans and Democrats both agreed on. Senator DUCKWORTH offered a bipartisan amendment that specifically addressed this particular issue. It requires members of the armed services to wear their name tag, with one exception that Senator MERKLEY does not address appropriately, we believe; and that is the issue of a riot.

In the case of a riot, we decided that it was not appropriate to require these young men and women to wear that name tag. They still have to have their uniforms on, but they don't have to wear a name tag during that time period.

It is a good, bipartisan amendment. It is already found within the body of this bill.

I would rise in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, let me just note that that provision now creates a conflict with the 2021 law that does require an individual identifier. So this amendment resolves that conflict and ensures there is trust by having that trust-building name or number on the uniform as well.

I encourage an ''aye'' vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3927

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 569 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—3

Cortez Masto Cruz Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 50. The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3927) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

AMENDMENT NOS. 3340, 2928, 3355, 2952, 3376, 2971, 3405, 3039, 3435, 3136, 3439, 3156, 3489, 3351, 3703, 3530, 3732, 3557, 3788, 3570, 3799, 3601, 3810, 3712, 3811, 3724, 3813, 3751, 3823, 3818, 3702, 3825, 3842, 3834, 3890, 2979, 3272, 3742, 3901, 3819, 3899, 3888, 3880, 3015, 3753, 3826, 3728, 3928, EN BLOC

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I call up the amendments en bloc as provided by the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the following

amendments are called up en bloc, which the clerk will report by number:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] proposes amendment Nos. 3340, 2928, 3355, 2952, 3376, 2971, 3405, 3039, 3435, 3136, 3439, 3156, 3489, 3351, 3703, 3530, 3732, 3557, 3788, 3570, 3799, 3601, 3810, 3712, 3811, 3724, 3813, 3751, 3823, 3818, 3702, 3825, 3842, 3834, 3890, 2979, 3272, 3742, 3901, 3819, 3899, 3888, 3880, 3015, 3753, 3826, 3728, 3928, en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3340

(Purpose: To require the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to annually review, update, and report on the facilities and property of the United States Government determined to be national security sensitive for purposes of review of real estate transactions under section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950)

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

SEC. 1067. REVIEW OF AND REPORTING ON NATIONAL SECURITY SENSITIVE SITES FOR PURPOSES OF REVIEWS OF REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) LIST OF NATIONAL SECURITY SENSITIVE SITES.—Section 721(a)(4)(C) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(a)(4)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) LIST OF SITES.—For purposes of subparagraph (B)(ii), the Committee may prescribe through regulations a list of facilities and property of the United States Government that are sensitive for reasons relating to national security. Such list may include certain facilities and property of the intelligence community and National Laboratories (as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)).''.

(b) REVIEW AND REPORTS.—Section 721(m) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565(m)(2)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(L) A list of all notices and declarations filed and all reviews or investigations of covered transactions completed during the period relating to facilities and property of the United States Government determined to be sensitive for reasons relating to national security for purposes of subsection (a)(4)(B)(ii).

''(M) A certification that the list of sites identified under subsection (a)(4)(C)(iii) reflects consideration of the recommended updates and revisions submitted under paragraph (4)(B). Upon request from any Member of Congress specified in subsection (b)(3)(C)(iii), the chairperson shall provide a classified briefing to that Member, and staff of the member with appropriate security clearances, regarding the list of sites identified under subsection (a)(4)(C)(iii).'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) ANNUAL REVIEW OF LIST OF FACILITIES AND PROPERTY.—Not later than January 31 of each year, each member of the Committee shall—

''(A) review the facilities and property of the agency represented by that member that are on the list prescribed under subparagraph (C)(iii) of subsection (a)(4) of facilities and property that are sensitive for reasons relating to national security for purposes of subparagraph (B)(ii) of that subsection; and

''(B) submit to the chairperson a report on that review, after approval of the report by an Assistant Secretary or equivalent official of the agency, which shall include any recommended updates or revisions to the list regarding facilities and property administered by the member of the Committee.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2928

(Purpose: To make certain spouses eligible for services under the disabled veterans' outreach program)

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ELIGIBILITY OF SPOUSES FOR SERVICES UNDER THE DISABLED VETERANS' OUTREACH PROGRAM.

Section 4103A of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and eligible persons'' after ''eligible veterans''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting '', and eligible persons,'' after ''Other eligible veterans'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''and eligible persons'' after ''veterans'' each place it appears; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting ''or eligible person'' after ''veteran'' each place it appears; and

(ii) by inserting ''or eligible person's'' after ''veteran's'';

(2) in subsection (d)(1)—

(A) by inserting ''and eligible persons'' after ''eligible veterans'' each place it appears; and

(B) by striking ''non-veteran-related''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) ELIGIBLE PERSON DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'eligible person' means—

''(1) any spouse described in section 4101(5) of this title; or

''(2) the spouse of any person who died while a member of the Armed Forces.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3355

(Purpose: To expand the authority of the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to protect retired and former Chief Justices and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States)

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

SEC. 1067. AUTHORITY OF MARSHAL OF THE SUPREME COURT AND SUPREME COURT POLICE.

Section 6121(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) if the Marshal determines such protection is necessary—

''(i) any retired or former Chief Justice or Associate Justice of the Supreme Court; or

''(ii) any member of the immediate family of the Chief Justice, any Associate Justice, any retired or former Chief Justice or Associate Justice, or any officer of the Supreme Court.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2952

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to implement recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States relating to critical military housing supply and affordability)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2827. IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO CRITICAL MILITARY HOUSING SUPPLY AND AFFORDABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall implement each recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States contained in the report dated October 30, 2024, and entitled, ''Military Housing: DOD Should Address Critical Supply and Affordability Challenges for Service Members'' (GAO–25–106208), as those recommendations are modified under subsection (b).

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE IMPLEMENTED.—In carrying out the requirements under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall implement the recommendations specified under such subsection as follows:

(1) The Secretary shall—

(A) perform a structured analysis to develop a comprehensive list of housing areas in which members of the Armed Forces and their families may face the most critical challenges in finding and affording private sector housing in the community;

(B) in conducting the analysis under subparagraph (A), consider the unique characteristics of a location, such as vacation rental areas; and

(C) regularly update the list required under subparagraph (A) not less frequently than once every two years.

(2) The Secretary shall obtain and use feedback on the financial and quality-of-life effects of limited supply or unaffordable housing on members of the Armed Forces, through the status of forces survey and other service or installation-specific feedback mechanisms.

(3) The Secretary shall, in coordination with the Secretary of each military department—

(A) develop a plan for how the Department of Defense can respond to and address the financial and quality-of-life effects in housing areas identified under paragraph (1); and

(B) in developing the plan under subparagraph (A), examine strategies for increasing housing supply or providing alternative compensation to offset the effects of limited supply or unaffordable housing in housing areas identified under paragraph (1).

(4) The Secretary shall clarify, through the issuance of guidance to the military departments, the role of the Office of the Secretary of Defense in oversight of the Housing Requirements and Market Analysis process of the military departments to ensure that—

(A) the military departments conduct such process in a timely manner; and

(B) the Secretary submits to Congress any plans or other matters relating to such process for each fiscal year as required by existing law.

(5) The Secretary shall ensure that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment provides updated guidance to the military departments on how installations of the Department of Defense should coordinate with local communities, including by clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of commanders and military housing offices of such installations in addressing housing needs.

(c) NON-IMPLEMENTATION REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—If the Secretary of Defense elects not to implement a recommendation specified under subsection (a), as modified under subsection (b), the Secretary shall, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report that includes a justification for such election.

AMENDMENT NO. 3376

(Purpose: To require a strategy for United States security assistance to Mexico)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1265. STRATEGY FOR UNITED STATES SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of

the House of Representatives a report with a strategy for United States security assistance to Mexico.

(b) STRATEGY ELEMENTS.—The strategy required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A detailed plan for how United States security assistance will—

(A) dismantle transnational criminal networks that traffic illicit drugs, including fentanyl, into the United States and profit from other criminal activities, including pervasive human trafficking and human smuggling, weapons trafficking, cybercrimes, money laundering, and the importation of precursor chemicals to mass-produce illicit drugs;

(B) increase the capacity of Mexico's military and public security institutions to improve security at Mexico's northern and southern borders and degrade transnational criminal organizations; and

(C) enhance the institutional capacity of civilian law enforcement, prosecutors, and courts to strengthen rule of law, redress public corruption related to the activities and influence of transnational criminal organizations, and combat impunity.

(2) A detailed summary of activities to implement the plan described in paragraph (1), including a list of implementing government entities and nongovernmental organizations.

(3) A detailed summary of priorities, milestones, and performance measures to monitor and evaluate results of the strategy.

(c) BILATERAL COOPERATION REPORTING.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include an overview of bilateral cooperation mechanisms and engagements between the United States Government and the Government of Mexico, such as diplomatic engagements, security assistance programs, technical assistance, and other forms of cooperation that advance the priorities described in subsection (b).

(d) FORM.—The report and strategy required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) BRIEFING.—Not later than 1 year after the submission of the report and strategy required under subsection (a), and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall provide to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a briefing on the implementation of the strategy.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST MEXICO.—Nothing in this section may be construed as an authorization for the use of military force against Mexico or any entity within Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 2971

(Purpose: To direct the Office for Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice to continue implementing the anti-trafficking recommendations of the Government Accountability Office and to report to Congress regarding such implementation)

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

SEC. 1038. CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF ANTI-TRAFFICKING PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Preventing Child Trafficking Act of 2025''.

(b) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ''anti-trafficking recommendations'' means the recommendations set forth in the report of the Government Accountability Office entitled ''Child Trafficking: Addressing Challenges to Public Awareness and Survivor Support'', which was published on December 11, 2023.

(c) IN GENERAL.—The Office for Victims of Crime of the Department of Justice, in coordination with the Office on Trafficking in Persons of the Administration for Children and Families, shall continue implementing the anti-trafficking recommendations by—

(1) working together, in accordance with the leading collaboration practices referenced in GAO–24-106038, to develop and implement strategies to prevent child trafficking and support child trafficking survivors; and

(2) establishing achievable performance goals and targets for anti-trafficking programs for children that reflect leading practices, such as being objective, measurable, and quantifiable, using baseline data from program grantees.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office for Victims of Crime shall submit a report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that explicitly describes the steps taken pursuant to subsection (c).

AMENDMENT NO. 3405

(Purpose: To require a plan to modernize the nuclear security enterprise)

At the appropriate place in subtitle C of title XXXI, insert the following:

SEC. 31_____. PLAN TO MODERNIZE NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall develop a plan—

(1) to accelerate and modernize Material Staging Capabilities to replace aged, oversubscribed facilities within the nuclear security enterprise, which shall include a description of all phases and an estimate of the costs required to carry out such plan; and

(2) to accelerate near-term Critical Decisions milestones in fiscal year 2026.

(b) EXECUTION.—The Administrator for Nuclear Security shall carry out the plan required by subsection (a) concurrently with an infrastructure modernization program for high explosives capabilities, including continued construction of the High Explosives Synthesis Formulation and Production facility (21-D-510).

(c) BRIEFINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Nuclear Security shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the Material Staging Capabilities plan required by subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriated congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 3039

(Purpose: To authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to reimburse the Town of Chincoteague, Virginia, for costs directly associated with the removal and replacement of certain drinking water wells)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DRINKING WATER WELL REPLACEMENT FOR CHINCOTEAGUE, VIRGINIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may enter into an agreement, as appropriate, with the Town of Chincoteague, Virginia, for a period of up to five years, for reimbursement of the Town of Chincoteague's costs directly associated with—

(1) the development of a plan for removal of drinking water wells currently situated on property administered by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(2) the establishment of alternative drinking water wells on property under the administrative control, through lease, ownership, or easement, of the Town of Chincoteague.

(b) ELEMENTS.—An agreement under subsection (a) shall include, to the extent practicable—

(1) a provision for the removal and relocation of the three remaining wells described in that subsection;

(2) a description of the location of the site to which such wells will be relocated or are planned to be relocated; and

(3) a current estimated cost of such relocation, including for the purchase, lease, or use of additional property, engineering, design, permitting, and construction.

(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in coordination with the heads or other appropriate representatives of relevant entities, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress any agreement entered into under subsection (a).

(d) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 3435

(Purpose: To reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007)

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

SEC. 1067. SECOND CHANCE ACT REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) STATE AND LOCAL REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Section 2976 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10631) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) treating substance use disorders, including by providing peer recovery services, case management, and access to overdose education and overdose reversal medications; and

''(10) providing reentry housing services.''; and

(2) in subsection (o)(1), by striking ''2019 through 2023'' and inserting ''2026 through 2030''.

(b) GRANTS FOR FAMILY-BASED SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT.—Section 2926(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10595a(a)) is amended by striking ''2019 through 2023'' and inserting ''2026 through 2030''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAM TO EVALUATE AND IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL METHODS AT PRISONS, JAILS, AND JUVENILE FACILITIES.—Section 1001(a)(28) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10261(a)(28)) is amended by striking ''2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023'' and inserting ''2026 through 2030''.

(d) CAREERS TRAINING DEMONSTRATION GRANTS.—Section 115(f) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 60511(f)) is amended by striking ''2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023'' and inserting ''2026 through 2030''.

(e) OFFENDER REENTRY SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE COLLABORATION PROGRAM.—Section 201(f)(1) of the Second

Chance Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 60521(f)(1)) is amended by striking ''2019 through 2023'' and inserting ''2026 through 2030''.

(f) COMMUNITY-BASED MENTORING AND TRANSITIONAL SERVICE GRANTS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 211(f) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (34 U.S.C. 60531(f)) is amended by striking ''2019 through 2023'' and inserting ''2026 through 2030''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3136

(Purpose: To require a report on the feasibility of implementing artificial intelligence into anti-money laundering investigations relating to activity by foreign terrorist organizations, drug cartels, and other transnational criminal organizations)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INTO CERTAIN ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING INVESTIGATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury, in consultation with the Chair of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Chair of the National Credit Union Administration, shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the feasibility of implementing artificial intelligence into anti-money laundering investigations relating to activity by foreign terrorist organizations, drug cartels, and other transnational criminal organizations that addresses the following:

(1) The types of investigations in which artificial intelligence would be helpful.

(2) The types of artificial intelligence programs that would be effective in such investigations.

(3) The types of schemes artificial intelligence would be best placed to detect.

(4) Any potential issues to implementation of artificial intelligence in such investigations.

AMENDMENT NO. 3439

(Purpose: To prohibit certain reductions to the inventory of E–3 airborne warning and control system aircraft)

At the end of subtitle D of title I, add the following:

SEC. 142. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN REDUCTIONS TO INVENTORY OF E–3 AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2026 for the Air Force may be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or in backup aircraft inventory any E–3 aircraft if such actions would reduce the total aircraft inventory for such aircraft below 16.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR PLAN.—If the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees a plan for maintaining readiness and ensuring there is no lapse in mission capabilities, the prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to actions taken to reduce the total aircraft inventory for E–3 aircraft to below 16, beginning 30 days after the date on which the plan is so submitted.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR E–7 AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT.—If the Secretary of the Air Force procures enough E–7 Wedgetail aircraft to accomplish the required mission load, the prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to actions taken to reduce the total aircraft inventory for E–3 aircraft to below 16 after the date on which such E–7 Wedgetail aircraft are delivered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3156

(Purpose: To include as an additional right or privilege of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service (and their beneficiaries) certain leave provided under title 10, United States Code, to commissioned officers of the Army (or their beneficiaries)

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

SEC. 1067. APPLICATION OF LEAVE PROVISIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 221(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 213a(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''(22) Chapter 40, Leave.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 219 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 210–1) is repealed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3489

(Purpose: To direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, to conduct a study of the national security risks posed by consumer routers, modems, and devices that combine a modem and router, and for other purposes)

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

SEC. 1067. STUDY OF NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS POSED BY CERTAIN ROUTERS AND MODEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the national security risks and cybersecurity vulnerabilities posed by consumer routers, modems, and devices that combine a modem and router that are designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the influence of a covered country.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED COUNTRY.—The term ''covered country'' means a country specified in section 4872(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

AMENDMENT NO. 3351

(Purpose: To authorize grants to implement school-community partnerships for preventing substance use and misuse among youth)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. KEEPING DRUGS OUT OF SCHOOLS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

(2) DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES FUNDED COALITION.—The term ''Drug-Free Communities funded coalition'' means a recipient of a grant under section 1032 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1532).

(3) EFFECTIVE DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAMS.—The term ''effective drug prevention programs'', with respect to a school-community partnership between a Drug-Free Communities funded coalition and a local school, means strategies, policies, and activities that—

(A) are tailored to meet the needs of the student population of the school, based on the environment of the school and the community surrounding the school; and

(B) prevent and reduce substance use and misuse among local youth.

(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ''eligible entity'' means a coalition (within the meaning of section 1032 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1532)) that—

(A) receives or has received a grant under subchapter I of chapter 2 of title I of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1523 et seq.); and

(B) has a memorandum of understanding in effect with not less than 1 local school to establish a school-community partnership.

(5) LOCAL SCHOOL.—The term ''local school'' means an elementary, middle, or high school located in an area served by an eligible entity.

(6) SCHOOL-COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP.—The term ''school-community partnership'' means a partnership between a Drug-Free Communities funded coalition and not less than 1 local school for the purpose of implementing effective drug prevention programs.

(7) SUBSTANCE USE AND MISUSE.—The term ''substance use and misuse''—

(A) has the meaning given the term in paragraph (9) of section 1023 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1523); and

(B) includes the use of electronic or other delivery mechanisms to consume a substance described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of that paragraph.

(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) INITIAL GRANTS.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director may award grants to eligible entities for the purpose of implementing a school-community partnership.

(B) RENEWAL GRANTS.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director may award to an eligible entity who has received a grant under subparagraph (A) an additional grant for each fiscal year during the 3-fiscal-year period following the fiscal year for which the grant was awarded under subparagraph (A), for the purpose of continuing the school-community partnership.

(2) LIMITATIONS.—

(A) AMOUNT.—The amount of a grant under this subsection may not exceed $75,000 for a fiscal year.

(B) RECIPIENTS.—Not more than 1 eligible entity may receive a grant under this subsection to establish a school-community partnership with a particular local school.

(c) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Director may enter into an interagency agreement with a National Drug Control Program agency, as defined in section 702 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 1998 (21 U.S.C. 1701), to delegate authority for—

(1) the execution of grants under this section; and

(2) other activities necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Director under this section.

(d) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this section, in coordination with each local school with which the eligible entity has a school-community partnership, shall submit to the Director an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Director may require.

(2) PLAN.—The application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed, comprehensive plan for the school-community partnership to implement effective drug prevention programs.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall use funds from the grant—

(A) to implement the plan described in subsection (d)(2); and

(B) if necessary, to obtain specialized training and assistance from the organization receiving the grant under section 4(a) of Public Law 107–82 (21 U.S.C. 1521 note).

(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Grants provided under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, Federal and non-Federal funds that are otherwise available for drug prevention programs in local schools.

(f) EVALUATION.—Section 1032(a)(6) of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1532(a)(6)) shall apply to a grant under this section in the same manner as that section applies to a grant under subchapter I of chapter 2 of subtitle A of title I of that Act (21 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2031.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Not more than 8 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) may be used by the Director for administrative expenses associated with the responsibilities of the Director under this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 3703

(Purpose: To address disclosures by directors, officers, and principal stockholders of foreign private issuers)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DISCLOSURES BY DIRECTORS, OFFICERS, AND PRINCIPAL STOCKHOLDERS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Holding Foreign Insiders Accountable Act''.

(b) DISCLOSURES.—

(1) AMENDMENTS.—Section 16(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78p(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''(including, solely for the purposes of this subsection, every person who is a director or an officer of a foreign private issuer, as that term is defined in section 240.3b–4 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation)'' after ''an officer of the issuer of such security'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) with respect to a foreign private issuer, the securities of which are, as of the date of enactment of the Holding Foreign Insiders Accountable Act, registered pursuant to subsection (b) or (g) of section 12, on the date that is 90 days after that date of enactment.''; and

(C) in paragraph (4)(A), by inserting ''and in English'' after ''electronically''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) EFFECT ON REGULATION.—If any provision of section 240.3a12–3(b) of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation, is inconsistent with the amendments made by subsection (b), that provision of such section 240.3a12–3(b) (or such successor) shall have no force or effect beginning on the effective date described in subsection (b)(2).

(d) ISSUANCE OR AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue final regulations (or amend or rescind, in whole or in part, existing regulations of the Commission) to carry out the amendments made by subsection (b).

(2) ADDITIONAL RULEMAKING.—The Securities and Exchange Commission may issue such additional regulations (or amend or rescind, in whole or in part, existing regulations of the Commission) as necessary to implement the intent of this section.

AMENDMENT NO. 3530

(Purpose: To provide for fairness in the issuance of tactical equipment to Diplomatic Security Service personnel)

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

SEC. 1067. FAIRNESS IN ISSUANCE OF TACTICAL EQUIPMENT TO DIPLOMATIC SECURITY SERVICE PERSONNEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In any instance when the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State issues tactical gear to Special Agents, uniform division officers, or personal service contractors, the Service must, whenever such products are commercially available, provide both men's and women's sizing options.

(b) TACTICAL EQUIPMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''tactical equipment'' includes, among other items, ballistic plates, ballistic plate carriers, helmets, media jackets, tactical pants, and gloves.

AMENDMENT NO. 3732

(Purpose: To improve the bill.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 2, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3557

(Purpose: To require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct an audit of foreign exposure from Department of Defense cloud computing contracts and to require the Secretary of Defense to update guidance to reduce, mitigate, or eliminate risk)

At the appropriate place in title XVI, insert the following:

SEC. 16___. AUDIT AND UPDATED GUIDANCE TO REDUCE, MITIGATE, OR ELIMINATE RISK FROM CLOUD COMPUTING CONTRACTS WITH FOREIGN EXPOSURE.

(a) REVIEW OF FOREIGN EXPOSURE FROM DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CLOUD COMPUTING CONTRACTS.—

(1) AUDIT REQUIRED.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall conduct an audit of cloud computing contracts for the Department of Defense to assess the risk of exposure of sensitive information, including data, systems architecture details, procedures, or other controlled unclassified information, as a result of policies that may have allowed computer scientists or engineers from foreign countries of concern to access proposed software updates to underlying cloud computing infrastructure or operating systems.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The audit conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall cover the following:

(A) Determination of how many cloud computing contracts the Department has that may be or have been supported by employees located in foreign countries of concern or are citizens of foreign countries of concern.

(B) Identification of policies or clauses in such cloud computing contracts that allow for the use of so called ''digital escorts'', computer scientists, or engineers from foreign countries of concern.

(C) Assessment of agreements in place that use so called ''digital escorts'' to provide oversight to employees from foreign countries of concern, including identification of instances in which such authorities were used during the period beginning on January 1, 2022, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(D) Assessment of the national security risks that stem from cloud computing contracts that use labor from foreign countries of concern.

(E) Recommendations on ways to reduce, mitigate, or eliminate risk from initiatives such as so called ''digital escorting'', or the use of computer scientists or engineers from foreign countries of concern.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than July 1, 2026, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report setting forth the findings of the Inspector General with respect to the audit conducted pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) GUIDANCE TO REDUCE, MITIGATE, OR ELIMINATE RISK.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—Based on the audit conducted under subsection (a), the Secretary shall issue new guidance to reduce, mitigate, or eliminate risk to Department data or cloud computing infrastructure from foreign countries of concern.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The guidance issued pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) restrict the use of personnel from foreign countries of concern to support Department information technology systems; and

(B) require disclosure to the congressional defense committees if the Secretary finds a Department information technology system is maintained by personnel from a foreign country of concern.

(3) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive any guidance issued under paragraph (1) in any case in which the Secretary certifies in writing that such waiver—

(A) does not pose a risk to national security; and

(B) is necessary in the interest of national security.

(c) DEFINITION OF FOREIGN COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—In this section, the term ''foreign country of concern'' has the meaning given that term in section 9901 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4651).

AMENDMENT NO. 3788

(Purpose: To make improvements to the AUKUS partnership)

At the appropriate place in title XII, insert the following:

Subtitle ____—AUKUS Improvement Act of 2025

SEC. ____. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''AUKUS Improvement Act of 2025''.

SEC. ____. FLEXIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT AND OTHER ARMS TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS.

Section 38(l) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(l)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Defense articles sold by the United States under this Act, whether pursuant to the exemption authorized under this section or identical to defense articles eligible for export under that exemption, may be reexported, retransferred or temporarily imported exclusively between the Government of Australia, the Government of the United Kingdom, or entities eligible under section 126.7(b)(2) of title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulations, notwithstanding the requirement for the consent of the President under section

3(a)(2) of this Act, or under section 505(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2314(a)(1)(B).

''(B) INTRA-COMPANY, INTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL, AND INTRA-GOVERNMENTAL TRANSFERS.—Intra-company, intra-organization, and intra-governmental transfers related to defense articles and defense services described under subparagraph (A) are authorized between officers, employees, and agents who satisfy section 120.64 of title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulations, including dual or third country nationals who satisfy section 126.18 of title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulations.''.

SEC. ___. ELIMINATION OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR COMMERCIAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OR MANUFACTURING LICENSE AGREEMENTS INVOLVING AUSTRALIA AND THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Manufacturing Licensing Agreements and Technical Licensing Agreements for Australia and the United Kingdom that do not involve defense articles that are not subject to the licensing exemption under section 38(l) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(l)) are not subject to the requirements for congressional notification pursuant to section 36(d) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(d)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3570

(Purpose: To establish the Commercial Space Activity Advisory Committee)

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

SEC. 1067. COMMERCIAL SPACE ACTIVITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a Commercial Space Activity Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the ''Committee'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of 15 members appointed by the Secretary.

(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committee shall be composed of representatives from a variety of space policy, engineering, technical, science, legal, academic, and finance fields who have significant experience in the commercial space industry, which may include previous Government experience.

(B) LIMITATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary may not appoint as a member of the Committee any employee or official of the Federal Government.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may appoint as a member of the Committee a special government employee (as defined in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code) who serves on 1 or more other Federal advisory committees.

(3) TERM.—Each individual appointed as a member of the Committee—

(A) shall be appointed for a term of not more than 4 years; and

(B) during the 2-year period beginning on the date on which such term ends, may not serve as a member of the Committee.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the Committee shall be—

(1) to advise on the status and recent developments of nongovernmental space activities;

(2) to provide to the Secretary and Congress recommendations on the manner in which the United States may facilitate and promote a safe, sustainable, robust, competitive, and innovative commercial sector that is investing in, developing, and conducting space activities within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, including through the development and implementation of any regulatory framework applicable to the commercial space industry.

(3) to identify, and provide recommendations in response to, any challenge faced by the United States commercial sector relating to—

(A) the application of international obligations of the United States relevant to commercial space sector activities in outer space;

(B) export controls that affect the commercial space sector;

(C) harmful interference with commercial space sector activities in outer space; and

(D) access to adequate, predictable, and reliable radio frequency spectrum;

(4) to review existing best practices for United States entities to avoid—

(A) the harmful contamination of the Moon and other celestial bodies; and

(B) adverse changes in the environment of the Earth resulting from the introduction of extraterrestrial matter; and

(5) to provide information, advice, and recommendations on matters relating to—

(A) United States commercial space sector activities in outer space; and

(B) other commercial space sector activities, as the Committee considers necessary.

(d) TERMINATION.—The Committee shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date on which the Committee is established.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Office of Space Commerce.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

(3) UNITED STATES ENTITY.—The term ''United States entity'' means—

(A) an individual who is a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a))); and

(B) a nongovernmental entity organized or existing under, and subject to, the laws of the United States or a State.

AMENDMENT NO. 3799

(Purpose: To establish requirements and prohibitions relating to the provision of health care services at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri)

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 718. PROVISION OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES AT FORT LEONARD WOOD, MISSOURI.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, shall conduct an assessment of the adequacy of health care services available to covered beneficiaries under the TRICARE program located at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) An evaluation of the ability of the local area to provide adequate access to care for the covered beneficiary population surrounding Fort Leonard Wood.

(2) An evaluation of potential impacts to access and quality of care for such beneficiaries if the General Leonard Wood Army Community Hospital were to be realigned, downgraded, or have its scope of services reduced.

(3) An evaluation of the ability to establish additional partnerships with the Department of Veterans Affairs for the provision of health care service at the General Leonard Wood Army Community Hospital.

(4) Such other matters as the Secretary considers relevant for determining the continued viability of the General Leonard Wood Army Community Hospital.

(c) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of Defense may not close, downgrade, or reduce the scope of care offered by the General Leonard Wood Army Community Hospital unless—

(1) the Secretary—

(A) completes the assessment required by subsection (a) and delivers such assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

(B) certifies to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that any such changes would not reduce or degrade the health care services available to covered beneficiaries and the local community; and

(2) the Chief of Staff of the Army certifies to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that there will be no degradation of medical readiness of units assigned to Fort Leonard Wood as a result of any changes to the status of the General Leonard Wood Army Community Hospital.

AMENDMENT NO. 3601

(Purpose: To clarify limitations applicable to the authority to transfer functions of the Air National Guard to the Space Force)

At the end of subtitle B of title V, add the following:

SEC. 515. LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER SPACE FUNCTIONS OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD TO THE SPACE FORCE.

Section 514 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025 (Public Law 118–159; 10 U.S.C. 20001 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

''(k) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as—

''(1) authorizing the transfer of a member of the Air National Guard of the United States other than on a one-time basis as specified in subsection (c); or

''(2) setting future precedent with respect to waiving the applicability of any provision of title 32.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3810

(Purpose: To require the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to review and prohibit certain transactions relating to agriculture)

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

SEC. 1067. REVIEW AND PROHIBITIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO AGRICULTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(14) AGRICULTURE.—The term 'agriculture' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by adding at the end the following:

''(I) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL LAND TRANSACTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after receiving notification from the Secretary of Agriculture of a reportable agricultural land transaction, the Committee shall determine—

''(I) whether the transaction is a covered transaction; and

''(II) if the Committee determines that the transaction is a covered transaction, whether to—

''(aa) request the submission of a notice under clause (i) of subparagraph (C) or a declaration under clause (v) of such subparagraph pursuant to the process established under subparagraph (H); or

''(bb) initiate a review pursuant to subparagraph (D).

''(ii) REPORTABLE AGRICULTURAL LAND TRANSACTION DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'reportable agricultural land transaction' means a transaction—

''(I) that the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe is a covered transaction;

''(II) that involves the acquisition of an interest in agricultural land by a foreign person, other than an excepted investor or an excepted real estate investor, as such terms are defined in regulations prescribed by the Committee; and

''(III) with respect to which a person is required to submit a report to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 2(a) of the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 3501(a)).

''(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to apply to the acquisition of an interest in agricultural land by a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States.'';

(3) in subsection (k)(2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (H), (I), and (J) as subparagraphs (I), (J), and (K), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

''(H) The Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to any covered transaction related to the purchase of agricultural land or agricultural biotechnology or otherwise related to the agriculture industry in the United States.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(r) PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO PURCHASES OF AGRICULTURAL LAND AND AGRICULTURAL BUSINESSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Committee, in conducting a review under this section, determines that a transaction described in clause (i), (ii), or (iv) of subsection (a)(4)(B) would result in the purchase or lease by a covered foreign person of real estate described in paragraph (2) or would result in control by a covered foreign person of a United States business engaged in agriculture, the President shall prohibit the transaction unless a party to the transaction voluntarily chooses to abandon the transaction.

''(2) REAL ESTATE DESCRIBED.—Subject to regulations prescribed by the Committee, real estate described in this paragraph is agricultural land (as defined in section 9 of the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 3508)) in the United States that is in close proximity (subject to subsection (a)(4)(C)(ii)) to a United States military installation or another facility or property of the United States Government that is—

''(A) sensitive for reasons relating to national security for purposes of subsection (a)(4)(B)(ii)(II)(bb); and

''(B) identified in regulations prescribed by the Committee.

''(3) WAIVER.—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis, the requirement to prohibit a transaction under paragraph (1) after the President determines and reports to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that the waiver is in the national interest of the United States.

''(4) COVERED FOREIGN PERSON DEFINED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In this subsection, subject to regulations prescribed by the Committee, the term 'covered foreign person'—

''(i) means any foreign person (including a foreign entity) that acts as an agent, representative, or employee of, or acts at the direction or control of, the government of a covered country; and

''(ii) does not include a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States.

''(B) COVERED COUNTRY DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'covered country' means any of the following countries, if the country is determined to be a foreign adversary pursuant to section 791.4 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation):

''(i) The People's Republic of China.

''(ii) The Russian Federation.

''(iii) The Islamic Republic of Iran.

''(iv) The Democratic People's Republic of Korea.''.

(b) SPENDING PLANS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, each department or agency represented on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States shall submit to the chairperson of the Committee a copy of the most recent spending plan required under section 1721(b) of the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4565 note).

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall direct, subject to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the issuance of regulations to carry out the amendments made by this section.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall take effect not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the date that is 30 days after the effective date of the regulations under subsection (c)(2); and

(2) apply with respect to a covered transaction (as defined in section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565)) that is proposed, pending, or completed on or after the date described in paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 3712

(Purpose: To allow the Secretary of the Interior to enter into memoranda of understanding for the purpose of scientific and technical cooperation in the mapping of critical minerals and rare earth elements)

At the appropriate place in subtitle F of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10_____. FINDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR RESOURCE EXPLORATION.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should prioritize, to the greatest extent practicable, the onshoring of critical mineral processing.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALLIED FOREIGN COUNTRY.—The term ''allied foreign country'' means a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or a country that has been designated as a major non-NATO ally under section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321k).

(2) CRITICAL MINERAL.—The term ''critical mineral'' has the meaning given the term in section 7002(a) of the Energy Act of 2020 (30 U.S.C. 1606(a)).

(3) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(4) PARTNER FOREIGN COUNTRY.—The term ''partner foreign country'' means a country that is a source of a critical mineral or rare earth element.

(5) RARE EARTH ELEMENT.—The term ''rare earth element'' means cerium, dysprosium, erbium, europium, gadolinium, holmium, lanthanum, lutetium, neodymium, praseodymium, promethium, samarium, scandium, terbium, thulium, ytterbium, or yttrium.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

(c) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH RESPECT TO THE MAPPING OF CRITICAL MINERALS AND RARE EARTH ELEMENTS.—

(1) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with 1 or more heads of agencies of partner foreign countries with respect to scientific and technical cooperation in the mapping of critical minerals and rare earth elements.

(2) OBJECTIVES.—In negotiating a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall seek to increase the security and resilience of international supply chains, to the maximum extent practicable, for critical minerals and rare earth elements by—

(A) committing to assisting the partner foreign country through cooperative activities described in paragraph (3) that help the partner foreign country map reserves of critical minerals and rare earth elements; and

(B) ensuring that mapping data created through the cooperative activities described in paragraph (3) is protected against unauthorized access by, or disclosure to, governmental or private entities based in countries that are not—

(i) a party to the memorandum of understanding; or

(ii) an allied foreign country.

(3) COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES.—The cooperative activities referred to in paragraphs (2) and (5)(A)(ii) include—

(A) acquisition, compilation, analysis, and interpretation of geologic, geophysical, geochemical, and spectroscopic remote sensing data;

(B) prospectivity mapping and mineral resource assessment;

(C) analysis of geoscience data, including developing derivative map products that can help more effectively evaluate the mineral resources of the partner foreign country;

(D) scientific collaboration to enhance the understanding and management of the natural resources of the partner foreign country to contribute to the sustainable development of the mineral resources sector of that partner foreign country;

(E) training and capacity building in each area described in subparagraphs (A) through (D);

(F) facilitation of education and specialized training in geoscience and mineral resource management at institutions of higher education;

(G) training in relevant international standards for relevant officials of the government and private companies of the partner foreign country; and

(H) cooperation among entities of the partner foreign country that are a party to the memorandum of understanding and entities in the United States, including Federal departments and agencies, institutions of higher education, research centers, and private companies.

(4) NOTIFICATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(A) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this paragraph, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(i) the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources, Foreign Relations, and Appropriations of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committees on Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(B) NOTIFICATION AND REPORT.—Not later than 30 days before the Secretary intends to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Secretary of State shall jointly—

(i) notify the appropriate committees of Congress; and

(ii) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report detailing the implementing partners, scope of the memorandum of understanding, activities to be undertaken, estimated costs, and source of funding.

(5) SECRETARY OF STATE.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—For purposes of negotiating and implementing the memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall be responsible for matters relating to—

(i) ensuring that private companies headquartered in the United States or an allied foreign country are offered the right of first refusal in the further development of critical minerals and rare earth elements in the partner foreign country; and

(ii) facilitating private-sector investment in the exploration and development of critical minerals and rare earth elements.

(B) CONCURRENCE.—The Secretary shall obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of State in—

(i) prioritizing and selecting partner foreign countries with which to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1);

(ii) negotiating a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1);

(iii) implementing a memorandum of understanding entered into under paragraph (1); and

(iv) carrying out paragraphs (4) and (6).

(6) CONSULTATION WITH PRIVATE SECTOR.—The Secretary shall consult with relevant private sector actors, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, in—

(A) prioritizing and selecting partner foreign countries with which to enter into a memorandum of understanding under paragraph (1); and

(B) assessing how a memorandum of understanding can best facilitate private sector interest in pursuing the further development of critical minerals and rare earth elements in accordance with the objectives described in paragraph (2).

(d) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section impedes or otherwise alters any authority of the Director of the United States Geological Survey provided by—

(1) the matter under the heading ''GEOLOGICAL SURVEY'' of the first section of the Act of March 3, 1879 (43 U.S.C. 31(a)); or

(2) the first section of Public Law 87–626 (43 U.S.C. 31(b)).

AMENDMENT NO. 3811

(Purpose: To strengthen relations between the United States and the countries in the Western Balkans, and for other purposes.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 8, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3724

(Purpose: To require that additional factors be included in the design of counseling pathways under the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense)

At the appropriate place in subtitle E of title V, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FACTORS FOR COUNSELING PATHWAYS UNDER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 1142(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (M) as subparagraph (R); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (L) the following new subparagraphs:

''(M) Child care requirements of the member (including whether a dependent of the member is enrolled in the Exceptional Family Member Program).

''(N) The employment status of other adults in the household of the member.

''(O) The location of the duty station of the member (including whether the member was separated from family while on duty).

''(P) The effects of operating tempo and personnel tempo on the member and the household of the member.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3813

(Purpose: To require the provision of certain services to veterans in the Freely Associated States)

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

SEC. 1067. REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE CERTAIN SERVICES TO VETERANS IN THE FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.

(a) TELEHEALTH AND MAIL ORDER PHARMACY BENEFITS.—Section 1724(f)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026, the Secretary shall furnish to veterans described in subparagraph (A), subject to agreements described in such subparagraph, telehealth benefits and mail order pharmacy benefits.''.

(b) BENEFICIARY TRAVEL.—Section 111(h)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''the Secretary may make payments'' and inserting ''beginning not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026, the Secretary shall make payments''.

(c) QUARTERLY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than quarterly, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the status of implementation of the amendments made by this section and the cost of such implementation.

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(d) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN LIMITS ON PAYMENTS OF PENSION.—Section 5503(d)(7) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking ''November 30, 2031'' and inserting ''April 30, 2032''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3751

(Purpose: To improve the safety and security of Members of Congress, immediate family members of Members of Congress, and congressional staff.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 3, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3823

(Purpose: To modify the requirements for transfers of United States defense articles and defense services among the Baltic states)

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230B. MODIFICATION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSFERS OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE ARTICLES AND DEFENSE SERVICES AMONG BALTIC STATES.

(a) EXEMPTIONS FROM REQUIREMENT FOR CONSENT TO TRANSFER.—

(1) RETRANSFERS AMONG BALTIC STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the requirements of section 3(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 USC 2753(a)(2)) and Section 505(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 USAC 2314(a)(1)), retransfers of defense articles related to United States-origin mobile rocket artillery systems among Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia shall not require prior Presidential consent.

(B) EXPIRATION.—The authority provided in subparagraph (A) shall cease to have effect on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) AGREEMENTS.—

(A) CONSENT TO TRANSFER NOT REQUIRED.—An agreement between the United States and a Baltic State under section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(a)) with respect to defense articles or defense services related to mobile rocket artillery systems provided by the United States shall not require the Baltic state to seek approval from the United States to transfer the defense article or defense service to any other Baltic state.

(B) MODIFICATION.—With respect to any agreement under section 3(a)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(a)(2)) in effect as of the date of the enactment of this Act that requires the consent of the President before a Baltic state may transfer a defense article or defense service related to mobile rocket artillery systems provided by the United States, at the request of any Baltic state, the United States shall modify such agreement so as to remove such requirement with respect to such a transfer to any other Baltic state.

(b) COMMON COALITION KEY.—The Secretary of Defense may establish among the Baltic states a common coalition key or other technological solution within the Baltic states for the purpose of sharing ammunition for High Mobility Artillery Rocket Systems (HIMARS) among the Baltic states for training and operational purposes.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BALTIC STATE.—The term ''Baltic state'' means the following:

(A) Estonia.

(B) Lithuania.

(C) Latvia.

(2) DEFENSE ARTICLE; DEFENSE SERVICE.—The terms ''defense article'' and ''defense service'' have the meanings given such terms in section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794).

AMENDMENT NO. 3818

(Purpose: To enhance United States support for identifying and recovering Ukranian children who were abducted by the Russian Federation, and to hold accountable those who are responsible for such abductions)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1265. SUPPORTING THE IDENTIFICATION AND RECOVERY OF ABDUCTED UKRAINIAN CHILDREN.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Abducted Ukrainian Children Recovery and Accountability Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to a White House press release, dated March 25, 2025, ''The United States and Ukraine agreed that the United States remains committed to helping achieve the exchange of prisoners of war, the release of civilian detainees, and the return of forcibly transferred Ukrainian children.''.

(2) To implement the commitment referred to in paragraph (1), the United States Government requires an organized and resourced policy approach to assist Ukraine with—

(A) investigations of Russia's abduction of Ukrainian children;

(B) the rehabilitation and reintegration of children returned to Ukraine; and

(C) justice and accountability for perpetrators of the abductions.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND ADVISORY SUPPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Justice and the Department of State are authorized—

(A) to provide law enforcement and intelligence technical assistance, training, capacity building, and advisory support to the Government of Ukraine in support of the commitment described in subsection (b)(1); and

(B) to advance the objectives described in subsection (b)(2).

(2) TYPE OF ASSISTANCE.—The law enforcement and intelligence technical assistance authorized under paragraph (1)(A) may include—

(A) training regarding the utilization of biometric identification technologies in abduction and trafficking in persons investigations;

(B) assistance with respect to collecting and analyzing open source intelligence information;

(C) assistance in the development and use of secure communications technologies; and

(D) assistance with respect to managing and securing relevant databases.

(3) REPORTS.—Not later than 30 days after the determination to provide assistance in any category identified in this subsection, the Secretary of State shall brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on—

(A) the amount of assistance determined to be obligated;

(B) the type of assistance to be utilized; and

(C) any information on the technology operationalized to support the means identified in this subsection.

(d) COORDINATION.—

(1) NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Department of Justice and the Department of State may coordinate with, and provide grants to, nongovernmental organizations to carry out the assistance authorized under subsection (c).

(2) FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The National Security Council may coordinate with appropriate representatives from the Department of Justice, the Department of State, the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)), and other Federal agencies, as needed, to carry out the assistance authorized under subsection (c).

(e) REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of State is authorized to provide support to the Government of Ukraine and nongovernmental organizations and local civil society groups in Ukraine for the purpose of providing Ukrainian children (including teenagers) who have been abducted, forcibly transferred, or held against their will by the Russian Federation with—

(A) medical and psychological rehabilitation services;

(B) family reunification and support services; and

(C) services in support of the reintegration of such children into Ukrainian society, including case management, legal aid, and educational screening and placement.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives that describes all current or planned foreign assistance programs that will provide the assistance authorized under paragraph (1).

(f) ATROCITY CRIMES ADVISORY GROUP FOR UKRAINE.—The Department of State is authorized to support the Atrocity Crimes Advisory Group for Ukraine by providing technical assistance, capacity building, and advisory support to the Government of Ukraine's Office of the Prosecutor General, and other relevant components of the Government of Ukraine, for the purpose of investigating and prosecuting cases involving abducted children, and other atrocity crimes.

(g) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Department of Justice is authorized to provide technical assistance, capacity building, and advisory support to the Government of Ukraine through its Office of Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance, and Training, which shall be coordinated by the Resident Legal Adviser at the United States Embassy in Kyiv, for the purpose of investigating and prosecuting cases involving abducted children, and other atrocity crimes.

(h) REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives that describes current and planned United States Government support for the Government of Ukraine's work to investigate and prosecute atrocity crimes; and

(2) the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives that outlines—

(A) any discrepancies between the sanctions regimes of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union with respect to those responsible for the abduction of Ukrainian children; and

(B) efforts made by the United States Government to better align such sanction regimes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3702

(Purpose: To improve coordination between Federal and State agencies and the Do Not Pay working system)

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

SEC. _____. IMPROVING COORDINATION BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES AND THE DO NOT PAY WORKING SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 205(r) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(r)), as amended by section 801(a)(7) of title VIII of division FF of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260), is amended by striking paragraph (11) and inserting the following:

''(11) The Commissioner of Social Security shall, to the extent feasible, provide information furnished to the Commissioner under paragraph (1) to the agency operating the Do Not Pay working system described in section 3354(c) of title 31, United States Code, for the authorized uses of the Do Not Pay working system to help prevent improper payments of, and support the recovery of improperly paid, benefits or other payments through a cooperative arrangement with such agency, provided that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3) are met with respect to such arrangement with such agency. The Commissioner of Social Security and the agency operating the Do Not Pay working system shall, while the data described in the preceding sentence is being provided to the agency operating the Do Not Pay working system, enter into an agreement based upon an agreed upon methodology, which covers the proportional share of State death data costs, which the Commissioner of Social Security and the agency operating the Do Not Pay working system may periodically review.

''(12) The Commissioner of Social Security may not record a death to a record that may be provided under this section for any individual unless the Commissioner of Social Security has found it has clear and convincing evidence to support that the individual should be presumed to be deceased.''.

(b) IMPROVING COORDINATION REGARDING INDIVIDUALS INCORRECTLY IDENTIFIED AS DECEASED.—Section 205(r)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(r)(7)), as added by section 801(a)(4) of title VIII of division FF of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260), is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) notify any agency that has a cooperative arrangement with the Commissioner of Social Security under paragraph (3) or (11) of the error.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on December 27, 2026.

AMENDMENT NO. 3825

(Purpose: To authorize the establishment of a Baltic Security Initiative for the purpose of strengthening the defensive capabilities of the Baltic countries)

At the end of subtitle C of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230B. BALTIC SECURITY INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Pursuant to the authority provided in chapter 16 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish and carry out an initiative, to be known as the ''Baltic Security Initiative'', for the purpose of deepening security cooperation with the military forces of the Baltic countries.

(b) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING AUTHORITIES.—An initiative established under subsection (a) shall be carried out pursuant to the authorities provided in title 10, United States Code.

(c) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of an initiative established under subsection (a) should include—

(1) to achieve United States national security objectives by—

(A) deterring aggression by the Russian Federation; and

(B) implementing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's new Strategic Concept, which seeks to strengthen the alliance's deterrence and defense posture by denying potential adversaries any possible opportunities for aggression;

(2) to enhance regional planning and cooperation among the military forces of the Baltic countries, particularly with respect to long-term regional capability projects, including—

(A) long-range precision fire systems and capabilities;

(B) integrated air and missile defense;

(C) maritime domain awareness;

(D) land forces development, including stockpiling large caliber ammunition;

(E) command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;

(F) special operations forces development;

(G) coordination with and security enhancements for Poland, which is a neighboring North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally; and

(H) other military capabilities, as determined by the Secretary; and

(3) with respect to the military forces of the Baltic countries, to improve cyber defenses and resilience to hybrid threats.

(d) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth a strategy for the Department of Defense to achieve the objectives described in subsection (c).

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The strategy required by this subsection shall include a consideration of—

(A) security assistance programs for the Baltic countries authorized as of the date on which the strategy is submitted;

(B) the ongoing security threats to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's eastern flank posed by Russian aggression, including as a result of the Russian Federation's 2022 invasion of Ukraine with support from Belarus; and

(C) the ongoing security threats to the Baltic countries posed by the presence, coercive economic policies, and other malign activities of the People's Republic of China.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $350,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2026, 2027, and 2028 to carry out an initiative established under subsection (a).

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should seek to require matching funds from each of the Baltic countries that participate in such an initiative in amounts commensurate with amounts provided by the Department for the initiative.

(f) BALTIC COUNTRIES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Baltic countries'' means—

(1) Estonia;

(2) Latvia; and

(3) Lithuania.

AMENDMENT NO. 3842

(Purpose: To establish a military-civilian medical surge program)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. 724. MILITARY-CIVILIAN MEDICAL SURGE PROGRAM.

Section 1096 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by adding at the end the following ''**; medical surge program**''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) MEDICAL SURGE PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall carry out a program of record known as the Military-Civilian Medical Surge Program to—

''(A) support locations that the Secretary of Defense selects under paragraph (3)(B); and

''(B) enhance the interoperability and medical surge capability and capacity of the National Disaster Medical System in response to a declaration or other action described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (4).

''(2)(A) The Secretary of Defense, acting through the National Center for Disaster Medicine and Public Health at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (or such successor center), shall oversee the operation, staffing, and deployment of the Program.

''(B) In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall maintain requirements for staffing, specialized training, research, and education regarding patient regulation, movement, definitive care, and other matters the Secretary determines critical to sustaining the health of members of the armed forces.

''(3)(A) In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall establish partnerships at locations selected under subparagraph (B) with public, private, and nonprofit health care organizations, health care institutions, health care entities, academic medical centers of institutions of higher education, and hospitals that the Secretary determines—

''(i) are critical in mobilizing a civilian medical response in support of a wartime contingency or other catastrophic event in the United States; and

''(ii) have demonstrated technical proficiency in critical national security domains, including high-consequence infectious disease and special pathogen preparedness, and matters relating to defense, containment, management, care, and transportation.

''(B)(i) The Secretary shall select not fewer than eight locations that are operationally relevant to the missions of the Department of Defense under the National Disaster Medical System and are aeromedical or other transport hubs or logistics centers in the United States for partnerships under subparagraph (A).

''(ii) The Secretary may select more than eight locations under clause (i), including locations outside of the continental United States, if the Secretary determines such additional locations cover areas of strategic and operational relevance to the Department of Defense.

''(4) The Secretary shall ensure that the partnerships under paragraph (3)(A) allow for civilian medical personnel to quickly and effectively mobilize direct support to military medical treatment facilities and provide support to other requirements of the military health system pursuant to the following:

''(A) A declaration of a national emergency under the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1621 et seq.).

''(B) A public health emergency declared under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247d).

''(C) A declaration of war by Congress.

''(D) The exercise for the President of executive powers under the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

''(E) Any other emergency or major disaster as declared by the President.

''(5)(A) Not later than July 1, 2026, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the status, readiness, and operational capabilities of the Program.

''(B) Each report required under subparagraph (A) shall include an assessment of personnel readiness, resource availability, interagency coordination efforts, and recommendations for continued improvements to the Program.

''(6) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the Department of Defense to control, direct, limit, or otherwise affect the authorities of the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to leadership and administration of the National Disaster Medical System, public health and medical preparedness and response, staffing levels, or resource allocation.

''(7) In this subsection:

''(A) The term 'institution of higher education' means a four-year institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))).

''(B) The term 'National Disaster Medical System' means the system established under section 2812 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh–11).

''(C) The term 'Program' means the Military-Civilian Medical Surge Program established under paragraph (1).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3834

(Purpose: To amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide for certain ways in which credit unions may be Agent members of the National Credit Union Administration Central Liquidity Facility)

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

SEC. 1067. AGENT MEMBERSHIP.

Section 304(b)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1795c(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''all those credit unions'' and inserting ''any such credit unions''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3890

(Purpose: To establish the SkyFoundry Program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SKYFOUNDRY PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program to encourage the rapid development, testing, and scalable manufacturing of small unmanned aircraft systems and components, with potential expansion to associated energetics and other autonomous systems as determined by the Secretary, leveraging existing competencies within the commercial sector and the Department of Defense organic industrial base.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The program established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be known as the ''SkyFoundry Program'' (in this section the ''Program'').

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(A) administer the Program through the Secretary of the Army; and

(B) establish the Program as part of the Defense Industrial Resilience Consortium.

(b) ALTERNATIVE ACQUISITION MECHANISM.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary of Defense shall prioritize alternative acquisition mechanisms to accelerate development and production, including—

(1) other transaction authority under section 4022 of title 10, United States Code;

(2) middle tier of acquisition pathway for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding as authorized by section 3602 of such title; and

(3) software acquisition pathway as authorized by section 3603 of such title.

(c) COMPONENTS.—The Program shall have two components as follows:

(1) INNOVATION FACILITY.—An innovation facility for the development of small unmanned aircraft systems. The facility may be operated by United States Special Operations Command in collaboration with United States Army Materiel Command, serving as the research, development, and testing hub, integrating lessons learned from global conflicts to rapidly evolve United States small unmanned aircraft systems designs in partnership with contractor entities.

(2) PRODUCTION FACILITY.—The Commander of United States Army Materiel Command shall identify a production facility with the competencies for producing various forms of

small unmanned aircraft systems and components of small unmanned aircraft systems. The facility shall be operated by United States Army Materiel Command in collaboration with industry partners to enable scalable production as needed.

(d) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP MODEL.—To support the Program, the Secretary may leverage authorities, including section 2474 of title 10, United States Code, to foster voluntary public-private partnerships. Such partnerships may include—

(1) agreements with private industry, academic institutions, and nonprofit organizations in support of the Program; and

(2) innovative arrangements that allow industry partners to utilize government facilities and equipment, such as co-located hybrid teams of military, civilian, and contractor personnel, to promote technology transfer, workforce development, and surge capacity.

(e) FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Program, the Secretary shall prioritize utilizing or modifying existing Army Depot facilities and select at least two separate sites for the Program, one to house the innovation facility required by paragraph (1) of subsection (c) and one to house the production facility required by paragraph (2) of such subsection.

(2) AUTHORITY TO RENOVATE, EXPAND, AND CONSTRUCT.—The Secretary may renovate, expand, or construct facilities for the Program using available funds, notwithstanding chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) SELECTION OF SITES.—When selecting sites for the Program, the Secretary shall consider that the production facility required by subsection (c)(2) shall be housed at an existing Army Depot.

(f) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that any public-private partnership established under this section provides the United States delivery of technical data and rights in technical data for any systems or technologies developed under the Program using Federal Government funding in accordance with sections 3771 through 3775 of title 10, United States Code.

(g) DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT DESIGNATION.—The President (or the Secretary of Defense under delegated authority) may use authorities under title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4531 et seq.) to support domestic industrial base capacity for small unmanned aircraft systems and associated energetics and autonomous systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 2979

(Purpose: To exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas)

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

SEC. 1067. EXEMPTION FROM IMMIGRANT VISA LIMIT.

Section 201(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) Aliens who—

''(i) are eligible for a visa under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 203(a); and

''(ii) have a parent (regardless of whether the parent is living or dead) who was naturalized pursuant to—

''(I) section 405 of the Immigration Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–649; 8 U.S.C. 1440 note); or

''(II) title III of the Act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1137, chapter 876), as added by section 1001 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 182, chapter 199).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3272

(Purpose: To support law enforcement agencies and crime victims.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of July 31, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3742

(Purpose: To authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 2, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3901

(Purpose: To increase the supply of affordable housing in America.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 18, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3819

(Purpose: To provide for certain authorities of the Department of State, and for other purposes.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 8, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3899

(Purpose: To require the President or his designee to certify whether the Government of Syria is meeting certain conditions following repeal of the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019)

At the end of section 6211 of division E, insert the following:

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for the following 4 years, the President or his designee shall submit to Congress an unclassified report, with a classified annex if necessary, that certifies whether the Government of Syria—

(1) has committed itself to the goal of eliminating the threat posed by ISIS and other terrorist groups and has worked in partnership with the United States to join as a member of the Global Coalition To Defeat ISIS;

(2) is making progress in providing security for religious and ethnic minorities in Syria and includes representation from religious and ethnic minorities in the government;

(3) is not taking unilateral, unprovoked military action against its neighbors, including the State of Israel, and continues to make progress towards international security agreements, as appropriate;

(4) is not knowingly financing, assisting (monetarily or through weapons transfers), or harboring individuals or groups (including foreign terrorist organizations and specially designated global terrorists) that are harmful to the national security of the United States or allies and partners of the United States in the region;

(5) has removed, or has taken steps to remove, foreign fighters from senior roles in the Government of Syria, including those in the state and security institutions of Syria; and

(6) is in the process of investigating and has committed to prosecuting those that have committed serious abuses of internationally recognized human rights since December 8, 2024, including those responsible for the massacre of religious minorities.

(c) NOTIFICATION TO THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA.—The President or his designee shall inform the Government of Syria of the findings of the report required under subsection (b).

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REIMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—If the President or his designee is unable to make an affirmative certification under subsection (b) for two consecutive reporting periods, it is the sense of Congress that sanctions under the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019 (title LXXIV of division F of Public Law 116–92; 22 U.S.C. 8791 note) should be reimposed and remain in effect until the President or his designee makes an affirmative certification under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 3888

(Purpose: To combat illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing at its sources globally.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 15, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3880

(Purpose: To require a report on the United States boot industrial base and Berry Amendment compliance)

At the end of subtitle C of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 849B. REPORT ON UNITED STATES BOOT INDUSTRIAL BASE AND BERRY AMENDMENT COMPLIANCE.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the United States boot industrial base, including a comprehensive plan for the Department of Defense to fully comply with the requirements under section 4862 of title 10, United States Code (commonly referred to as the ''Berry Amendment'') by not later than fiscal year 2028.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A detailed description of current and surge manufacturing capacity for Berry-compliant, government-issued boots, including suppliers of leather, textiles, soles, and components, as well as risks to supply chain resilience and small business participation. Surge manufacturing capacity includes all major domestic manufacturers of boots including those not currently supplying Berry-compliant boots.

(2) A market survey of domestic boot manufacturers regarding interest in producing Berry-compliant boots if there were to be a requirement that all members of the Armed Forces are required to only wear Berry-compliant boots.

(3) A time-phased schedule of actions, milestones, and resources required to achieve full Berry Amendment compliance for combat footwear across all military services by fiscal year 2028.

(4) An assessment of how current policies allowing the wear of ''optional combat boots'' that are not Berry-compliant undermine the intent of the Berry Amendment and weaken the United States industrial base, and recommendations for coming into compliance.

(5) A plan to implement and enforce narrowly tailored availability and medical exemptions, as authorized under section 4862(c) of title 10, United States Code, with controls to prevent overuse.

(6) Steps to expand industrial capacity for Berry-compliant government-issued boots through multiyear contracting, demand forecasting, inventory planning, and attracting new Berry-compliant suppliers by requiring that optional boots must be Berry-compliant.

AMENDMENT NO. 3015

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a feasibility study on the removal of oil from sunken World War II vessels in waters near the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of Palau)

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

SEC. 1067. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON REMOVAL OF OIL FROM SUNKEN WORLD WAR II VESSELS IN WATERS NEAR THE FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA AND THE REPUBLIC OF PALAU.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) there is a significant environmental threat posed by World War II-era sunken Japanese warships, including three oil tankers, located in the waters near the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of Palau;

(2) such sunken vessels contain an estimated 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 gallons of oil, or approximately the equivalent of ⅓ of the *Exxon Valdez* oil tanker spill in 1989; and

(3) as such sunken vessels continue to deteriorate, small amounts of oil are already leaking, threatening to cause an ecological disaster that could negatively impact United States military activities, the marine ecosystem, and surrounding communities.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Indo-Pacific Command and the head of any other relevant Federal department or agency, as appropriate, shall conduct a comprehensive study on the feasibility and advisability of removing oil from the World War II-era sunken tankers, including an analysis of the cost, logistical requirements, environmental risks, and potential methods for removing the oil from the tankers.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2026, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the findings of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) An assessment of the operational and environmental risks posed by the oil remaining in the sunken tankers and warships, including current leakage and the potential impacts of a major spill.

(ii) An evaluation of the cost, logistical challenges, and technical approaches for safely extracting or containing oil from the shipwrecks.

(iii) A review of ongoing and planned efforts by the United States and international partners addressing such matter.

(iv) Recommendations on next steps, including resource needs, interagency and international cooperation, and timelines for potential remediation efforts.

AMENDMENT NO. 3753

(Purpose: To improve coordination of Federal efforts to identify and mitigate health and national security risks through a monitoring system to map essential medicine supply chains using data analytics)

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

SEC. 1067. MAPPING AMERICA'S PHARMACEUTICAL SUPPLY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Mapping America's Pharmaceutical Supply Act'' or the ''MAPS Act''.

(b) U.S. PHARMACEUTICAL SUPPLY CHAINS MAPPING.—

(1) PHARMACEUTICAL SUPPLY CHAIN MAPPING.—The Secretary, in coordination with the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, shall ensure coordination of efforts of the Department of Health and Human Services, including through public-private partnerships, as appropriate, to—

(A) map, or otherwise visualize, the supply chains, from manufacturing of key starting materials through manufacturing of finished dosage forms and distribution, of drugs and biological products, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, that are—

(i) directly related to responding to chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear threats and incidents covered by the National Response Framework; or

(ii) of greatest priority for providing health care and identified as being at high risk of shortage; and

(B) use data analytics to identify supply chain vulnerabilities that pose a threat to national security, as determined by the Secretary or the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) describe the roles and responsibilities of agencies and offices within the Department of Health and Human Services related to monitoring such supply chains and assessing any related vulnerabilities;

(B) facilitate the exchange of information between Federal departments, agencies, and offices, as appropriate and necessary to enable such agencies and offices to carry out roles and responsibilities described in subparagraph (A) related to drugs and biological products described in paragraph (1)(A), which may include—

(i) the location of establishments registered under subsection (b), (c), or (i) of section 510 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360) involved in the production of drugs and biological products, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, described in paragraph (1)(A), and to the extent available, the amount of each such drug and biological product, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, produced at each such establishment;

(ii) to the extent available and as appropriate, the location of establishments so registered involved in the production of the key starting materials and excipients needed to produce each drug and biological product, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, and the amount of such materials and excipients produced at each such establishment; and

(iii) any applicable regulatory actions with respect to each such drug and biological product, or the establishments manufacturing such drugs and biological products, including with respect to—

(I) inspections and related regulatory activities conducted under section 704 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 374);

(II) seizures pursuant to section 304 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 334);

(III) any recalls issued;

(IV) drugs or biological products that are, at the time of the determination, or that were at a previous time, included on the drug shortage list consistent with section 506E of such Act (21 U.S.C. 356e); and

(V) discontinuances or interruptions in the production of such drugs or biological products under 506C of such Act (21 U.S.C. 355d).

(3) REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of departments and agencies with which the Secretary coordinates under paragraph (1), shall submit a report to the relevant committees of Congress on—

(A) the current status of efforts to map and analyze pharmaceutical supply chains, as described in paragraph (1);

(B) activities of the Secretary carried out under this subsection to coordinate efforts as described in paragraph (1), including information sharing between relevant Federal departments, agencies, and offices;

(C) the roles and responsibilities described in paragraph (2)(A), including the identification of any gaps, data limitations, or areas of unnecessary duplication between such roles and responsibilities;

(D) the extent to which Federal agencies use data analytics to conduct predictive modeling of anticipated drug shortages or risks associated with supply chain vulnerabilities that pose a threat to national security;

(E) the extent to which the Secretary has engaged relevant industry in such mapping;

(F) the drugs and biological products, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, described in paragraph (1)(A) that rely on, for more than 50 percent of production, a high-risk foreign supplier or foreign entity of concern (as defined in section 9901(8) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4651(8)));

(G) the drugs and biological products, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, described in paragraph (1)(A) that are sourced from foreign establishments for more than 50 percent of production, including drugs manufactured domestically from active pharmaceutical ingredients sourced from foreign establishments for more than 50 percent of production;

(H) the current domestic manufacturing capabilities for drugs and biological products, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, described in paragraph (1)(A), including the key starting materials and excipients of such drugs, biological products, and ingredients, and whether such capabilities utilize advanced manufacturing technologies; and

(I) any public health or national security risks, including cybersecurity threats and critical infrastructure designations, with respect to the supply chains of drugs and biological products, including the active ingredients of those drugs and biological products, described in paragraph (1)(A).

(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BIANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the relevant committees of Congress a report that lists all drugs purchased by the Department of Defense during the 180-day period preceding the date of the report—

(1) that contain key starting materials, excipients, or active pharmaceutical ingredients sourced from the People's Republic of China; or

(2) for which the finished drug product was manufactured in the People's Republic of China.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADVANCED MANUFACTURING.—The term ''advanced manufacturing'' has the meaning given the term ''advanced and continuous pharmaceutical manufacturing'' in section 3016(h) of the 21st Century Cures Act (21 U.S.C. 399h(h)).

(2) BIOLOGICAL PRODUCT.—The term ''biological product'' has the meaning given such term in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)).

(3) CYBERSECURITY THREAT.—The term ''cybersecurity threat'' has the meaning given such term in section 2200 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 650).

(4) DRUG.—The term ''drug'' has the meaning given such term in section 201(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(g)).

(5) RELEVANT COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''relevant committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'', except as otherwise specified, means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(e) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) CONFIDENTIAL COMMERCIAL INFORMATION.—The exchange of information among the Secretary and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies for purposes of carrying out subsection (b) shall not be a violation of section 1905 of title 18, United States Code. This section shall not be construed to affect the status, if any, of such information as trade secret or confidential commercial information for purposes of section 301(j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331(j)), section 552 of title 5, United States Code, or section 1905 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) CYBERSECURITY MEASURES.—The Secretary shall ensure that robust cybersecurity measures are in place to prevent inappropriate access to, or unauthorized disclosure of, the information identified, exchanged, or disclosed under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 3826

(Purpose: To modify and reauthorize the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 8, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3728

(Purpose: To require the executive branch to develop a whole-of-government strategy to disrupt growing cooperation among the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which are the foremost adversaries of the United States, and mitigate the risks posed to the United States.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of September 2, 2025, under ''Text of Amendments.'')

AMENDMENT NO. 3928

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program for deploying microreactors)

At the end of section 922, add the following:

(h) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program for deploying microreactors at United States military installations to strengthen energy resilience and reduce reliance on vulnerable civilian grids.

VOTE ON AMENDMENTS EN BLOC

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, on the en bloc, I suggest a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on adoption of the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 3340, 2928, 3355, 2952, 3376, 2971, 3405, 3039, 3435, 3136, 3439, 3156, 3489, 3351, 3703, 3530, 3732, 3557, 3788, 3570, 3799, 3601, 3810, 3712, 3811, 3724, 3813, 3751, 3823, 3818, 3702, 3825, 3842, 3834, 3890, 2979, 3272, 3742, 3901, 3819, 3899, 3888, 3880, 3015, 3753, 3826, 3728, 3928) were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Thune amendments and motions are withdrawn; amendment No. 3427 is agreed to, and the substitute amendment No. 3748, as modified, and as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3427) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3748), in the nature of a substitute, as modified, and as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, we are considering the National Defense Authorization Act at a time when our democracy and our Constitution are under attack from a lawless President. We are also in the middle of a 9-day-long government shutdown, and we should be working to get the government open. Instead, Senate Republicans are seeking to conduct business-as-usual instead of addressing the impending spike in healthcare costs for American families and responsibly funding the government.

The NDAA includes critical investments in our national defense. Maryland has a key role to play in developing the technologies of the future that will keep our Nation at the cutting-edge and is the proud home of tens of thousands of military personnel and civilians working in the defense sector, as well as critical military installations. I have continually pressed for resources for our servicemembers and veterans and their families and investments in the military installations in our State that conduct groundbreaking research and support our defense.

But these are not normal times. We are witnessing an authoritarian power-grab by President Trump, and Congress has a responsibility to stand up as a co-equal, not subservient, branch of this government. We need to call it what it is: President Trump is using the power of the government, including the U.S. military, to coerce and silence voices he disagrees with. This is a playbook that dictators have used around the world, and now, it is the Trump playbook.

To date, Trump has deployed the National Guard to the District of Columbia, Los Angeles, Memphis, and Chicago. He has also ordered the deployment of National Guard troops to Portland, which has been temporarily blocked by the courts, and earlier today, a judge issued a temporary restraining order blocking the deployment of National Guard troops in Chicago as well. He is manufacturing claims of emergency and chaos to send the Guard to engage in domestic law enforcement rather than using Federal resources to work with local partners to keep communities safe and pulling members of the military away from other critical missions. The National Guard has also been supporting ICE as agents arrest and disappear people without due process. And as State and local leaders and courts of law stand in the way of these deployments, Trump has threatened to invoke the Insurrection Act to bypass them and the restrictions of the Posse Comitatus Act.

Trump's deployment of the military to assist in domestic law enforcement is a clear violation of U.S. law, including the Posse Comitatus Act. And a Federal judge agrees. On September 2, a Federal judge in the Northern District of California found that the Trump administration ''willfully'' violated the Posse Comitatus Act in its deployment of National Guard troops to Los Angeles and stated that the Trump administration clearly intends to ''[create] a national police force with the President as its chief.'' Trump clearly telegraphed this intention in his speech to top military brass at Quantico, when he called for using American cities as ''training grounds for our military'' and asserted that ''we're under invasion from within. No different than a foreign enemy but more difficult in many ways because they don't wear uniforms.''

The deployment in Los Angeles marked the first time since 1965 that the National Guard has been activated without the State Governor's consent. And it has not stopped. Trump's power grab in DC and other cities is part of his accelerating effort to militarize the streets of our country. That is why I offered an amendment to block the President from deploying the National Guard to a State, or the District of Columbia, if that State's Governor, or the DC Mayor, objects. Sen. Duckworth also put forward an amendment that would require the President to provide notification to Congress before dedicating any military or defense equipment for local law enforcement purposes. Unfortunately, both efforts failed.

At its heart, Trump's politicization of the National Guard is sowing fear and distrust and is a danger to our democracy. Enabling the military to patrol American streets chills lawful protest, blurs the line between military and civilian authority, and erodes public trust in nonpartisan service.

Trump's illegal use of U.S. Armed Forces also includes his recent missile strikes against boats in international waters, which have been flagrant violations of both U.S. and international law and can only be seen as extrajudicial killings. There is simply no evidence that these vessels posed an imminent threat, nor is there an active armed conflict between the United States and any cartel or South American country. Trump has pursued these actions in gross violation of international law and without congressional authorization.

Back in March, Trump also dredged up an old war-time law, the Alien Enemies Act, to target immigrants and deport them without due process. The administration also reached deep into the dustbin of Cold War paranoia and pulled out the McCarran-Walter Act—a relic of the McCarthy era—to brand student protestors as threats to the foreign policy of the great United States of America, used a transnational crime unit to secretly target campus protesters, and then disappeared them into ICE detention facilities with the ultimate goal of deporting them. Peaceful protest is a cornerstone of our democracy, but like the

McCarthy witch hunts of the 1950s, this campaign of fear and repression is eroding the foundational values of our democracy. A Federal district court judge found that the administration had targeted noncitizen students and scholars ''for speaking out'' and ''the facts prove that the President himself approves [of this] truly scandalous and unconstitutional suppression of free speech.''

Taken together, these abuses of power show an increasingly brazen and lawless administration that is misusing defense spending. These concerns only further my existing reservations around the continued uncontrolled growth in defense spending, especially when the Pentagon continues to fail independent audits, most recently in November 2024. In that audit, only 11 DOD components achieved clean audit opinions, but 13, including the Army, Navy, and Air Force did not. On top of that, from FY 2021 to FY 2025, authorization levels for defense spending have gone up from $740 billion to $895 billion, a 21 percent increase over the 5-year period. If this bill is enacted, we will be authorizing $924 billion, almost a trillion dollars in spending. This does not include the recent partisan budget reconciliation bill that passed into law in July 2025, which included over $150 billion in mandatory defense spending. I concur with the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, that we need to put our defense dollars to better strategic use and make the hard choices necessary to right-size our overall defense spending. If we truly care about government efficiency, we must apply the same standard to the Department of Defense, which represents over half of total Federal discretionary spending.

This is the first time during my service in the Senate that I am voting against the NDAA. I do not make this decision lightly. Ensuring that our men and women in uniform have the tools they need to defend the United States is critical, and I will never waver in protecting our servicemembers. But what we are seeing in America today and over the last few months should be a wakeup call for everyone in this Chamber. We cannot and should not authorize almost a trillion dollars in defense spending for an administration that is currently using the military to conduct local law enforcement operations and to rip communities apart. That is using the power of the Executive to silence the media, undermine the judicial system, and chill speech.

We deploy a strong military to protect our democracy and freedom from foreign threats and adversaries. Sadly, today, the threats to liberties and the rule of law are coming from our own Commander in Chief, and I will not vote to give him a blank check.

VOTE ON S. 2296

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 570 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Alsobrooks	Grassley	Moreno
Banks	Hagerty	Mullin
Barrasso	Hassan	Murkowski
Bennet	Hawley	Ossoff
Blackburn	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Ricketts
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Britt	Husted	Rosen
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Schumer
Collins	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Coons	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cotton	King	Sheehy
Cramer	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Curtis	Lee	Thune
Daines	Luján	Tuberville
Ernst	Lummis	Warner
Fetterman	Marshall	Warnock
Fischer	McConnell	Whitehouse
Gallego	McCormick	Wicker
Gillibrand	Moody	Young
Graham	Moran	

NAYS—20

Baldwin	Merkley	Schiff
Booker	Murphy	Smith
Cantwell	Murray	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Padilla	Warren
Durbin	Paul	Welch
Kim	Sanders	Wyden
Markey	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—3

Cortez Masto	Cruz	Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCORMICK). On this vote, the yeas are 77, and the nays are 20.

The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill is passed.

The bill (S. 2296) was passed.

(The bill, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The majority leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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, Eric Schmitt, Jim Justice, James E. Risch, Tom Cotton, Steve Daines, Ted Budd, John R. Curtis, John Boozman, Mike Rounds, Kevin Cramer, Bernie Moreno, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Markwayne Mullin, James Lankford, Tim Sheehy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I am delighted that this body has passed the 2026 National Defense Authorization Act with such an overwhelming vote.

At the outset, let me thank the dozens of staff members who have made this possible—and I know that my friend and colleague the ranking member will also express his appreciation to a very hard-working and capable and intelligent list.

But let me name my staff, specifically, and it is going to take a while to thank them all: Adam Barker, Kristina Belcourt, Levi Brunt, Cody Emerson, ''Marty'' Fromuth, Megan Galindo, Isaac Jalkanen, Lauren Johnson, Katie Karam, Greg Lilly, Eric Lofgren, Katie Magnus, Jonathan Moore, Katie Romaine, Mike Tokar, Eric Trager, Adam Trull, Mike Urena, Dave Vasquez, Terry Miller, Emily Yetter, Dan Hillenbrand, Beth Spivey, Ryan Bates, Jonathan Bowen, Leah Brewer, Luke Chaney, Mike Gerhart, Anna Given, Meredith Gravatte, Madeline Guenther, Brad Patout, Rick Berger, Brendan Gavin, and John Keast.

And it is possible that I have left some out, but I really do owe a debt of gratitude—and so does my friend Senator REED—to both staffs on both sides of the aisle for all of the technical work and advice in making this work.

I would remind those listening that this bill passed a committee 26 to 1. That was an overwhelming positive and speedy passage. It is designed to send a clear message.

We agree that we are not where we need to be, and this bill helps us close the gap, and it does so by focusing on two themes: rebuilding but also reforming. And we really need the ''reform'' part. This bill includes $924.7 billion as a top line. This is an increase, and it is needed. It recognizes the urgent need to rebuild our military systems, technologies, and hardware.

We also adopted the most significant acquisition reform proposal in decades. And let me give Members one example

of this. In just a single provision of the bill that we have now passed, we repeal 86 outdated or unnecessary acquisition policies.

American innovators are developing the technologies that can dominate the battlefields of the 21st century. The FoRGED proposal in this National Defense Authorization Act taps into that talent.

This bill was Member-driven, both in the committee and on the floor. Our committee approved 985 items that were led by individual Senators in this body.

Our September substitute amendment contained 49 amendments—20 from Republicans, 20 from Democrats, and 9 that were bipartisan. The second managers' package was included today, including another 47 amendments—again, bipartisan.

And today we took 14 rollcall votes, and because we are so united and joined together to make a strong voice for national defense, we took 9 voice votes. I don't know when we have done that, but I think it sends a strong message, and I hope it does. Altogether, 1,098 Member items.

This is what collaborative, bipartisan legislation looks like. And in highly charged partisan times, this ought to be refreshing news to the American people.

My friend JACK REED is a veteran of military service, and he is a veteran of this Congress and is a capable partner who works shoulder to shoulder with me on the Armed Services Committee. I want to thank him from the bottom of my heart for his cooperation and diligence in actually getting this bill brought to the floor.

The fact that we were able to finish about 9 o'clock tonight is a testament to that because earlier today, we really did not know around noon if we would be able to come to a consensus. So much negotiation and so much give-and-take has taken place so that we could get on the floor and make a strong statement and send a strong message.

It amplifies the voices of Senators in this body as we begin to conference with our House colleagues.

We are not where we need to be. This doesn't get us everywhere we need to be, but it moves us along the way toward reform and an increase in a realization that we live in the most dangerous world that we have seen in decades.

So I yield the floor with gratitude and thanks to my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first, I would like to commend Chairman WICKER whose leadership was absolutely essential to reaching this moment. He, too, is a veteran. He, too, understands the needs of our men and women in uniform, and he also recognizes and has contributed significantly with his floor staff, which has set a new standard for acquisitions.

We have to get it through the conference, but I am sure we will.

The hallmark of the Senate Armed Services Committee has long been bipartisanship, and I am glad we have continued this tradition for the 65th consecutive year.

I would also like to thank my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee. We were able to adopt, as the chairman indicated, hundreds of amendments during the committee markup, and I am glad that with bipartisan cooperation this evening, we adopted dozens more.

This is strong, forward-looking legislation that we can all be very proud of.

I am confident we will provide the Department of Defense and our military men and women with the resources they need to meet and overcome the national security threats that we face in a very, very challenging world.

I, too, would like to take this opportunity to recognize the phenomenal staff that made this bill possible. I want to specifically recognize the director of the Democratic staff Elizabeth King and the director of the Republican staff John Keast. They have led their staffs, and they have worked together with the utmost professionalism.

And I would also like to take the time to thank the staffers on the Democratic side, since the chairman has rightfully identified his staff members: Jody Bennett, Carolyn Chuhta, Jon Clark, Jenny Davis, Jonathan Epstein, Jorie Feldman, Kevin Gates, Creighton Greene, Gary Leeling, Maggie McNamara Cooper, Mike Noblet, Chad Johnson, John Quirk, Andy Scott, Cole Stevens, Meredith Werner, Isabelle Picciotti, Brittany Amador, Sofia Kamali, and Noah Sisk.

Also let me thank the floor staff and leadership staff. You have been a part of this process the last several weeks, and you have done a remarkable job. We thank you for that very, very much.

Mr. President, this is a good moment. Now on to the next moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

H.J. RES. 106

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to overturn the Biden administration's restrictive Central Yukon land management scheme, which threatens Alaska's self-determination and resource development. I ask my colleagues to support our resolution of disapproval, H.J. Res. 106, to protect Alaska's rights and future.

The implementation of the Biden administration's Record of Decision and Approved Central Yukon Resource Management Plan, RMP, prohibits the development of natural resources and essential infrastructure in a broad and sweeping manner—completely undermining multiple-use management while ignoring the needs and input of local residents. We need to ensure that our conservation policies consider and allow for adequate economic opportunities for the communities and people impacted by those policies.

Alaskans are some of the foremost conservationists in the world, with a long-standing record of balancing conservation with responsible resource and infrastructure development. On top of the jobs provided to Alaskan residents, responsible resource development funds various initiatives across the State, including education, infrastructure, and community services. It feeds our families, sustains our communities, and provides livelihoods for the thousands of Alaskans who work to responsibly develop the vast timber, mineral, material, and oil and gas resources that Alaska is blessed with.

In the heart of my State is the Central Yukon planning area, which comprises 56 million acres in central and northern Alaska, an area roughly equivalent to the entirety of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania combined. The Bureau of Land Management—BLM—manages nearly a quarter—13.3 million acres of that area. The other major landholders within the area include the State of Alaska with 25.4 million acres, approximately 45 percent of the planning area, and Doyon, Limited, one of the 12 land-owning Alaska Native regional corporations established under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act—ANCSA—with an ownership interest in 4.65 million acres. Approximately 3,000 miles of Doyon's land borders BLM land. Many of those millions of acres were selected by Doyon for their economic development potential, consistent with the intent of ANCSA. The northernmost part of the planning area covers the traditional lands of the Inupiat people in the Arctic Slope Region.

This vast area includes enormous critical mineral potential of national and strategic importance. As our geostrategic adversaries continue to place tighter controls on minerals essential for defense, advanced technology, and manufacturing, America needs these resources responsibly developed in places like Alaska. Additionally, the area includes incredible oil and gas resources that help to contribute to America's energy dominance. Further, this region contains abundant timberlands and substantial sand and gravel material resources that are essential for roads, airstrips, and other infrastructure. Local access to these materials allows rural villages

in this region to avoid costly imports that contribute to the high cost of living in these communities.

Importantly, the area also contains the Dalton Highway and the right-of-way for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, Alaska's most essential piece of infrastructure and a nationally strategic asset for the United States. This system transports crude oil 800 miles from the North Slope oil fields to marine terminals in Valdez and provides the vital access necessary to develop the resources in the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska, the ANWR Coastal Plain, and construct the Alaska LNG pipeline.

In 1971, the Department of the Interior issued Public Land Order—PLO—5150 withdrawing from selection a 5.3 million acre stretch of Federal land to reserve it as a utility and transportation corridor to facilitate monetizing the oil reserves on the North Slope. These lands covered the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System right-of-way and the North Slope Haul Road, which was later named the Dalton Highway. The significance of these lands to Alaska cannot be understated; they represent the State of Alaska's highest priority land selections, and the State has top-filed for these lands pursuant to Section 906(e) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA.

After more than 60 years following the passage of the Alaska Statehood Act by Congress in 1958, Alaska has yet to receive its full land entitlement. To this day, over 60 percent of the land in Alaska is managed by the Federal Government. Key to the State's ability to finalize its land selections is the lifting of PLO 5150, which will enable the State to satisfy a large portion of its outstanding statehood land entitlement and unencumber other lands that have been selected to fulfill the entitlements of Alaska Native Corporations, the University of Alaska, and Alaska Native Vietnam Veteran land allotments.

In 2006, as directed by the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act, sponsored by my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI, BLM released a report finding that withdrawals on 152.18 million out of 158.96 million acres—95 percent—''have outlived their original purpose'' and ''could be lifted consistent with the protection of the public's interest.'' BLM recommended that PLOs be lifted on 50.1 million acres of land it manages in Alaska. In 2012, then Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar wrote Alaska Governor Sean Parnell that ''BLM is committed to working with the State to consider further modifications of PLO 5150'' and indicated that the BLM Alaska State Office would initiate the planning process for the Central Yukon planning area to evaluate the public lands within the utility corridor located north of the Yukon River and said, ''I consider fulfillment of the State of Alaska's land entitlement a top priority.''

Beginning in 2013, BLM began the formal public scoping process for the resource management plan, kicking off a multi-year-long planning process with dozens of public meetings and thousands of hours of hard work by BLM as part of the process of drafting an Environmental Impact Statement—EIS—to satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act. In December 2020, BLM released its Draft Resource Management Plan/EIS and identified Alternative C2 as the preferred alternative, blending resource protection and resource development, closing some 1 million acres to mineral material sales, but leaving 13.1 million acres open to locatable mineral entry. Importantly, Alternative C2 recommended full revocation of PLO 5150, enabling the State of Alaska's top-filed lands to become valid selections. It also recommended revocation of approximately 5.2 million acres of ANCSA 17(d)(1) withdraws opening land for selection by Alaska Native Vietnam-Era Veterans who qualify for a land allotment under the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act, P.L. 116–9.

While not perfect, Alternative C2 served as an important discussion point and something the largest land stakeholders in the area—the State of Alaska and Doyon—could work with toward a balanced final Record of Decision. However, following the election of President Biden, he announced plans to review the Central Yukon RMP EIS, one of 70 Executive actions the Biden administration took targeting Alaska. In April 2024, BLM issued its Proposed RMP/Final EIS, identifying a new Alternative E that was not previously made available for public review and comment and contained sweeping restrictions on land use. The Proposed RMP/Final EIS had protests filed from Doyon Limited, the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, the Alaska Miners Association, and the State of Alaska—all denied, ignoring Alaska Native voices and the people who live in and responsibly develop Alaska every day. This new Alternative E became the Central Yukon Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan in November 2024, which the passage of this joint resolution of disapproval would invalidate.

While the approved Central Yukon RMP applies only to the BLM-managed areas within the planning area, it affected access for other landholders in the region, principally Doyon and the State of Alaska. The Central Yukon RMP designated 21 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern spanning 3.6 million acres and reclassified Visual Resource Management areas in ways that hinder infrastructure development.

Section 1326 of ANILCA provides clear and unambiguous restrictions on executive branch actions with respect to future withdrawals and further studies or reviews without congressional approval. Under ANILCA's ''no more clause,'' BLM may not withdraw more than 5,000 acres, in the aggregate, without congressional authorization. Designation of ACECs that remove lands from operation of the public land laws is a de facto withdrawal and an insult to Congress's express intent in ANILCA, locking up critical resources that our Nation needs to counter our dependency on hostile foreign powers.

Doyon, the largest Alaska Native Corporation stakeholder in the Central Yukon Planning Area, notes these restrictive land designations complicate access to their lands and prevent it from realizing the economic and other benefits that Congress intended it would enjoy as a result of ANCSA's settlement of Alaska Native land claims. Doyon's letter of support for the disapproval resolution called the Central Yukon RMP ''misguided and harmful'' and cites the profound implications on the ability to place communication, electric transmission, and other infrastructure these land restrictions create, adding further obstacles to the extraordinary challenges faced by rural communities in Alaska, many of which are disconnected from the road system.

Furthermore, the approved Central Yukon RMP did not recommend revoking PLO 5150—which has long outlived its original purpose—or ANCSA 17(d)(1) withdrawals, with limited exceptions, frustrating the State's ability to fulfill its statehood land entitlement and perpetuating unnecessary encumbrances on public lands in contradiction to BLM's own findings in the Alaska Land Transfer Acceleration Act Report to Congress.

Fortunately, elections have consequences, and on his first day in office of his second term, President Trump signed Executive Order 14153, ''Unleashing Alaska's Extraordinary Resource Potential,'' which called for the rescission of the 2024 Record of Decision and a reimplementation of the draft RMP and EIS issued in December 2020. The Executive order further directed the Secretary of the Interior to evaluate the potential rescission of PLO 5150, and Secretary Burgum has admirably taken concrete steps toward delivering on that commitment. This disapproval resolution would effectuate the President's directive in Executive Order 14153, immediately rescinding the Record of Decision and would advance the ongoing work to revoke PLO 5150 and review outdated ANCSA 17(d)(1) withdrawals predicated on the underlying EIS, which would not be invalidated by H.J. Res. 106.

The House has already passed this joint resolution, recognizing the impact that this highly restrictive plan would have on our national security, the massive Federal overreach stifling economic development opportunities, and the disregard for Alaska Native voices. I spoke of Doyon, Limited's letter of support earlier, but this resolution is also supported by the North Slope Regional Trilateral which is made up of the elected leaders of the

North Slope Borough, the Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, which is the regional Tribe, and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, the Alaska Native Regional Corporation for the Inupiat people living on the North Slope of Alaska. It is supported by the Alaska Miners Association, Americans for Prosperity, the American Energy Alliance, the National Federation of Independent Businesses, the American Exploration and Mining Association, Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions, the Resource Development Council for Alaska, as well as the Trump administration.

I urge my colleagues to reject unlawful regulatory overreach, reinforce American mineral and energy security, and uphold Federal law and Alaska Native land rights by supporting the Alaska delegation and voting for this joint resolution of disapproval and rescinding this Record of Decision.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, had Kaine amendment No. 3337 to Calendar No. 115, S. 2296, FY2026 National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA, been a recorded rollcall vote, I would have voted no.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, had Kaine amendment No. 3337 to Calendar No. 115, S. 2296, FY2026 National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA, been a recorded rollcall vote, I would have voted no.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, had Kaine amendment No. 3337 to Calendar No. 115, S. 2296, FY2026 National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA, been a recorded rollcall vote, I would have voted no.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING SUE HECHT

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator ALSOBROOKS, 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 nonprofit 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. During her time in the statehouse, she served on numerous committees, including appropriations. In her second and third terms, she was appointed as deputy majority whip—a testament to her skill and initiative. She fought fiercely on behalf of her constituents, but always with grace and humility. Sue was well known in Annapolis and back home in Frederick for her leadership, compassion, and steadfast support of her colleagues and her community.

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.

Throughout her life, Sue served in numerous positions with a variety of organizations, including the Frederick County Commission for Women, the Frederick County Affordable Housing Commission, the Maryland 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 children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, brothers, and numerous nieces and nephews. Her daughter Shannon Aleshire followed in her footsteps of public service, serving 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 an impactful legislator, a courageous leader, and a neighbor whose legacy will endure in Frederick, across Maryland, and beyond. We ask our colleagues to join us in extending condolences to Sue's family and in honoring the indelible impact she made in Frederick County and across Maryland.●

REMEMBERING PETER SIMONE

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of my friend Peter Simone, a longtime North Providence Councilman. One of the best things about politics is the people you get to meet, and one of the best people I got to meet was my friend Peter Simone. Peter passed away this week and is survived by his dear wife Irene, his two daughters Helene and Annmarie, his beloved grandson Matthew, and many wonderful friends.

Peter was born in Providence and was a proud graduate of LaSalle Academy, where he met Irene at a LaSalle dance. He moved to North Providence and took a job at the Monet Jewelry factory, where he worked as an industrial engineer until his retirement. In 1976, Peter threw his hat into the ring in politics and won a seat on the North Providence Democratic Town Committee, before running successfully for the North Providence Town Council in 1982. He served as a councilman from District 1 for 22 years, distinguishing himself as a tireless advocate for his community. In a town known for lively rough-and-tumble politics, Peter was a true gentleman who served in public office for all the right reasons.

Peter stepped back from the council in 2004 to spend more time with his beloved family before taking on a new role overseeing the student page program for the Rhode Island Senate, where he mentored the next generation of Rhode Island's leaders, including his grandson Matthew.

Peter was one of the very first people who supported my political career, taking me in when I was just finding my way. You always remember the people willing to take a risk and lend you their credibility, early on, when the outcome is not a sure bet, and I will always remember him. Peter Simone was a sweet and fine man, a political veteran of the old school, and a foxhole friend, and I will miss him dearly.●

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–2002. A communication from the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services—2025 Update'' (Docket No. EP 542) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2003. A communication from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Media Bureau, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Adamsville, Texas and Richland Springs, Texas)'' ((DA 25–867) (MB Docket No. 25–156)) received during the adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2004. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section

73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Adamsville, Texas and Richland Springs, Texas)'' ((DA 25–867) (MB Docket No. 25–156)) received during the adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2005. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modernization of Special Airworthiness Certification; Correction'' ((RIN2120–AL50) (Docket No. FAA–2023–1377)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2006. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Falsification, Reproduction, Alteration, Omission, or Incorrect Statements; Miscellaneous Amendments'' ((RIN2120–AL84) (Docket No. FAA–2024–0021)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2007. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.A. Helicopters; Amendment 39–23128'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2271)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2008. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2276)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2009. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Jet Route J–534 and Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Federal Airway V–349, Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V–23 and V–165, and Establishment of Canadian Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–645 in Northwestern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0371)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2010. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes Q–64, T–414, and T–705, and Establishment of United States RNAV Routes T–461 and T–463; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0295)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2011. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4182'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31623)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2012. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Alaskan Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range Federal Airway V–350 in Alaska'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2024–2361)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2013. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4181'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31622)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2014. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Restricted Areas R–3004A, R–3004B, and R–4004C; Fort Gordon, Georgia'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2023–0504)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2015. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 587'' ((RIN2120–AA63) (Docket No. 31624)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2016. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, LLC; Amendment 39–23121'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2024–2009)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2017. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Engines; Amendment 39–23126'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2024–2423)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2018. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V–55, V–100, and V–277 in the Vicinity of Keeler, Michigan'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0141)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2019. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Jet Routes and Domestic Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Federal Airways and Revocation of VOR Federal Airway; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2023–2269)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2020. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Jet Route J–96 in the Vicinity of Cimarron, New Mexico'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0174)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2021. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23127'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2268)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2022. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23124'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0752)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2023. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E4 Airspace Over Elmira, New York'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1671)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2024. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference; Amendment No. 71–57'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1763)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2025. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Costruzioni Aeronautiche Tecnam S.p.A. Airplanes; Amendment 39–23123'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2266)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 25, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2026. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23130'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1104)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2027. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–23141'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0344)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2028. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23140'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1108)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2029. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23134'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0472)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2030. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23133'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0742)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2031. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–23132'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2024–2662)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2032. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters; Amendment 39–23131'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0630)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2033. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o (Type Certificate Previously Held by Walter Engines a.s., Walter a.s., and MOTORLET a.s.) Engines; Amendment 39–23135'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0627)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2034. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–23142'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2278)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2035. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–23129'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2023–2398)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2036. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–23136'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0914)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2037. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Designations; Incorporation by Reference Amendments; Amendment No. 71–57'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1763)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2038. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4183'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31625)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2039. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4184'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31626)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2040. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E4 Airspace Over Elmira, New York'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. 25–AEA–11)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2041. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters; Amendment 39–23139'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0750)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2042. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG Engines; Amendment 39–23153'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–0926)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2043. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.A Helicopters; Amendment 39–23150'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–2550)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2044. A communication from the Manager of Legal Litigation and Support, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Polskie Zaklady Lotnicze Sp. z o.o. Airplanes; Amendment 39–23138'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2025–1113)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2045. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Recurring Marine Events; Sector St. Petersburg'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2025–0528)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2046. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Regulations; Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, California'' ((RIN1625–AA01) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0868)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2047. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations; Galveston Channel, Galveston, Texas'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2025–0586)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2048. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone, Black River Bay, Sackets Harbor, New York'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2025–0800)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2049. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Okeechobee Waterway, Stuart, Florida'' ((RIN1625–AA09) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0222)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2050. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Naval Salvage Operation, Apra Harbor, Guam'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2025–0850)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2051. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Illinois River, Naplate, Illinois'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2025–0320)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2052. A communication from the Administrative Assistant, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Wrightsville Beach, North Carolina'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2025–0776)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Platte Moring, of South Carolina, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense.

*Kirsten Davies, of Tennessee, to be Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

*Derrick Anderson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*James Mazol, of Virginia, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

By Mr. CASSIDY for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Anthony D'Esposito, of New York, to be Inspector General, Department of Labor.

*Crystal Carey, of New Jersey, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board for term of four years.

*Rosario Palmieri, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

*James Murphy, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of five years expiring December 16, 2027.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Rebecca L. Taibleson, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

David A. Bragdon, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina.

Lindsey Ann Freeman, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina.

Matthew E. Orso, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

Susan Courtwright Rodriguez, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

Sara Bailey, of Texas, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

Braden Boucek, of Tennessee, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Tennessee for the term of four years.

Dominick Gerace II, of Ohio, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Ohio for the term of four years.

Jerome Francis Gorgon, Jr., of Michigan, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan for the term of four years.

Bryan Stirling, of South Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Carolina for the term of four years.

Thomas Wheeler II, of Indiana, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 2993. A bill to establish appropriate rules for prosecutors and Federal judges to carry a concealed firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KING, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KIM, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

S. 2994. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to clarify that a State may not use an individual's failure to vote as the basis for initiating the procedures provided under such Act for the removal of the individual from the official list of registered voters in the State on the grounds that the individual has changed residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2995. A bill to require the Federal financial regulators to issue guidance encouraging financial institutions to work with consumers and businesses affected by a Federal Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SHEEHY (for himself and Ms. SLOTKIN):

S. 2996. A bill to clarify that a State or local jurisdiction may give preference to individuals who are veterans or individuals with a disability with respect to hiring election workers to administer an election in the State or local jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 2997. A bill to protect the independent judgment of health care professionals acting in the scope of their practice in overriding AI/CDSS outputs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MORENO, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 2998. A bill to designate the area of H Street Northwest between Connecticut Avenue Northwest and Vermont Avenue Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as ''Charlie Kirk Patriot Way''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself and Ms. ALSOBROOKS):

S. 2999. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide deposit insurance for noninterest-bearing transaction accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 3000. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify and report instances of disability benefit questionnaire fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3001. A bill to appropriate funds for pay and allowances of excepted Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. HUSTED, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. LEE, Mrs. MOODY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3002. A bill making continuing appropriations for military pay in the event of a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. Res. 444. A resolution condemning the dictator of the People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping, for deceit, undermining prospects for peace and security, and orchestrating crimes against humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MORENO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 445. A resolution congratulating President Donald J. Trump for achieving peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BUDD, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SHEEHY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 446. A resolution recognizing the 250th birthday of the United States Navy; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. HYDE–SMITH (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 447. A resolution designating September 25, 2025, as ''National Ataxia Awareness Day'', and raising awareness of ataxia, ataxia research, and the search for a cure; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. Res. 448. A resolution designating October 1, 2025, as ''Energy Efficiency Day'' in celebration of the economic and environmental benefits that have been driven by private sector innovation and Federal energy efficiency policies; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 449. A resolution designating the week beginning on October 12, 2025, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 522

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 691

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 691, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to improve the administration of antidumping and countervailing duty laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1144, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 1151

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to expand the use of E–

Verify to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 1335

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude debt held by certain insurance companies from capital assets and to extend capital loss carryovers for such companies from 5 years to 10 years.

S. 1404

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1404, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods and cargo for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 1748

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1748, a bill to protect the safety of children on the internet.

S. 1821

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1821, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax on income from litigation which is received by third-party entities that provided financing for such litigation.

S. 2282

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2282, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to reauthorize the Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network, and for other purposes.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out a grant program to support the recruitment and retention of paraprofessionals in public elementary schools, secondary schools, and preschool programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2451

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2451, a bill to ensure that paraprofessionals and education support staff are paid a living wage.

S. 2960

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2960, a bill to develop economic tools to deter aggression by the People's Republic of China against Taiwan.

S. 2967

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2967, a bill to address the management by certain Federal land management agencies over Federal land along the southern border and northern border, and for other purposes.

S. 2985

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2985, a bill to secure the dignity and safety of incarcerated women.

S. 2988

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2988, a bill to bolster upgrades and infastructure for lasting development at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 69

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 69, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to ''Record of Decision for the Barred Owl Management Strategy; Washington, Oregon, and California''.

S.J. RES. 84

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 84, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Market Integrity and Affordability''.

S. RES. 158

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 158, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that paraprofessionals and education support staff should have fair compensation, benefits, and working conditions.

S. RES. 442

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 442, a resolution condemning Russian incursions into NATO territory and reaffirming Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

S. RES. 443

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 443, a resolution expressing concern about the growing problem of book banning, and the proliferation of threats to freedom of expression in the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 3927

At the request of Mr. SCHIFF, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3927 proposed to S. 2296, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 444—CONDEMNING THE DICTATOR OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, XI JINPING, FOR DECEIT, UNDERMINING PROSPECTS FOR PEACE AND SECURITY, AND ORCHESTRATING CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 444

Whereas Xi Jinping is the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, a criminal organization posing a grave threat to global stability and peace;

Whereas, under the control of General Secretary Xi Jinping, the Chinese Communist Party has engaged in systemic deception, warmongering, and crimes against humanity, the likes of which have few historical parallels;

Whereas, under the leadership of Xi Jinping, the Chinese Communist Party routinely lied about the origins of the SARs–CoV–2 virus, using international organizations like the World Health Organization to peddle falsehoods regarding the supposed limited transmissibility of the virus;

Whereas the number of individuals from the United States who have died from the coronavirus exceeds 1,000,000, representing the many lives needlessly lost as a result of the lies and deceit of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas General Secretary Xi Jinping pledged to engage more fully in fentanyl cooperation with the United States in 2019 and again in 2023, only to see more than 70,000 individuals from the United States die from fentanyl overdoses in recent years, with the 2025 National Drug Threat Assessment stating that ''fentanyl and other synthetic drugs . . . are the primary drivers of fatal drug overdose deaths nationwide'';

Whereas, from sewage garlic to broken magnetic chess pieces, the Chinese Communist Party maintains an appalling record on consumer product safety;

Whereas a 2015 study by the National Institutes of Health determined that human waste is used as an agricultural fertilizer in the People's Republic of China;

Whereas Xi Jinping has doubled down on Communist China's proud tradition of cheating in trade and purposefully ignoring World Trade Organization obligations;

Whereas the People's Republic of China was granted entry into the World Trade Organization in December 2001, and pledged to transition to a more market-oriented economy by reducing state control over trade and investment, removing price controls, protecting intellectual property, and making numerous other promises;

Whereas, as of the date of the introduction of this resolution, the Chinese Communist Party continues to lie and fails to uphold many of their obligations on which their admission to the World Trade Organization was based;

Whereas, under the rule of Xi Jinping, Communist China has become the largest official debt collector in the world, with 80 percent of the overseas lending portfolio of the People's Republic of China going to countries in financial distress;

Whereas the Belt and Road Initiative, developed by Xi Jinping, promises only the loss of sovereignty and long-term economic and environmental devastation;

Whereas the Sino Metals disaster, a story that the Government of the People's Republic of China has worked to suppress in the international press, is yet another example of predatory lending practices by the People's Republic of China;

Whereas, on February 18, 2025, a tailings dam failure at a major Chinese-owned copper mine in northern Zambia released more than 50,000,000 liters of toxic waste into the Kafue River, Zambia's lifeline, devastating the ecosystem, destroying crops, and threatening the health and livelihoods of more than 60 percent of the Zambian population living within the river basin, many of whom depend on the river for drinking water, agriculture, and fishing;

Whereas the pH level, a quantitative measure of the acidity or basicity of aqueous or other liquid solutions, of the Kafue River was at least as low as 1.8 following the spill, transforming the substance of the river from water to something closer to stomach acid, which has a pH level of 1;

Whereas, in June 2025, Chinese nationals were charged in a criminal complaint with conspiracy, smuggling a dangerous biological pathogen into the United States, false statements, and visa fraud;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party, under the rule of Xi Jinping, has accelerated espionage efforts, including through the 2017 cyberattack of the credit reporting agency Equifax, stealing the addresses, birth dates, Social Security numbers, and other data of 145,000,000 individuals from the United States;

Whereas, from February 2021 to December 2024, more than 60 Chinese Communist Party-related espionage cases have been documented across 20 States, including the opening and operations of clandestine ''police stations'' on United States soil;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party, led by Xi Jinping, has increasingly compromised regional and international stability through its commitment to taking Taiwan by force, violating territorial integrity and Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ) of Taiwan, supporting state sponsors of terrorism, and aligning itself with the Russian Federation in the unjustified assault by the Russian Federation against Ukraine;

Whereas, according to data from the Ministry of National Defense of Taiwan, aircraft from the People's Liberation Army conducted more than 3,600 flights into the ADIZ in 2024, setting a new record;

Whereas, in spite of any claim to Taiwan, the Chinese Communist Party, which has not ever ruled Taiwan, continues to cause enormous harm to the well-being of neighboring countries and allies of the United States;

Whereas, under the rule of Xi Jinping, Communist China has engaged in a pattern of harassment and intimidation against Philippine vessels in the West Philippine Sea, endangering Filipino maritime personnel, threatening freedom of navigation, and destabilizing regional peace and stability;

Whereas the People's Republic of China accounts for an estimated 90 percent or more of the total trade of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and purchases up to 90 percent of the oil exports of the Islamic Republic of Iran;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party, under the rule of Xi Jinping, is pledging the expansion of the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor to Taliban-controlled Afghanistan;

Whereas, under the rule of Xi Jinping, the Chinese Communist Party is guilty of orchestrating a horrific, modern-day genocide of the Uyghur people and other Muslim populations in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, also known as East Turkistan;

Whereas, under the rule of Xi Jinping, the Chinese Communist Party holds upwards of 1,000,000 Muslim Uyghurs in prison and labor camps, and forces female spouses of Uyghur men in prison camps to share beds with Han Chinese males assigned by the state;

Whereas the designation of genocide against the Uyghur people was made by President Trump in 2021 and confirmed by the Biden Administration;

Whereas, during the tenure of Xi Jinping as General Secretary, Communist China has harvested the organs of political dissidents, most notably Falun Gong practitioners;

Whereas the Tiananmen Square Massacre of June 3 and June 4, 1989, even 36 years later, continues to serve as a stark reminder of the sheer evil and cowardice of the Chinese Communist Party and the inability of the Chinese Communist Party to squash the aspirations of the Chinese people;

Whereas, in 2020, the Chinese Communist Party significantly expanded mass forced labor in Tibet, and continues to engage in enforced disappearance, torture, cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment of Tibetans, denying them of their unique cultural identity;

Whereas, in 2020, Communist China enacted a national security law, compromising the basic freedoms of Hong Kongers and unjustly imprisoning political prisoners of conscience, including Apple Daily founder Jimmy Lai;

Whereas, under the rule of Xi Jinping, Communist China has continued to send defectors from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea back to that country, despite an elevated risk of execution and torture for defectors; and

Whereas Christians of all backgrounds are persecuted in the People's Republic of China, especially Christians not adhering to the Catholic or Protestant state-sanctioned ''patriotic religious associations'', which serve as propaganda arms for the Chinese Communist Party and Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the dictator of the People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping, for engaging in a pattern of deceit, undermining prospects for peace and security, and orchestrating crimes against humanity;

(2) stands in solidarity with the people of the People's Republic of China, and all people around the world who have endured the consequences of rule by the Chinese Communist Party; and

(3) encourages the application of all applicable sanctions authorities against officials of the Chinese Communist Party, including sanctions authorized by the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.).

SENATE RESOLUTION 445—CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP FOR ACHIEVING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. MORENO (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 445

Whereas Palestinian terrorists have attacked the State of Israel for more than 75 years;

Whereas Hamas launched a bombardment of more than 4,000 rockets into Israel from the Gaza Strip on October 7, 2023;

Whereas Hamas killed approximately 1,200 civilians and kidnapped 251 individuals during the October 7 attack;

Whereas the rockets launched by Hamas were intended to massacre and strike fear into the hearts of innocent civilians in Israel;

Whereas, during the ensuing attack, 6,000 Gazans, including 3,800 Hamas terrorists, breached the border into Israel;

Whereas President Donald J. Trump continues to show the world what peace through strength means through his historic and bold actions;

Whereas President Trump led a coalition of nations and leaders throughout the Middle East and across the world to achieve a ceasefire between Israel and Hamas;

Whereas neither President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., nor his autopen were capable of bringing about a resolution to the conflict between Israel and Hamas;

Whereas, mere days before thousands of innocent civilians were murdered, kidnapped, or raped on October 7, 2023, Jake Sullivan, President Biden's National Security Advisor, publicly bragged that ''the Middle East region is quieter today than it has been in two decades'';

Whereas no other United States president has been able to achieve the seismic accomplishment of bringing stability and security to the Middle East;

Whereas President Trump's Abraham Accords laid the groundwork for this historic peace;

Whereas President Trump worked tirelessly to rescue United States nationals and other individuals who were barbarically kidnapped on October 7, 2023, and held in captivity in the tunnels of Gaza;

Whereas President Trump's peace plan includes a political and economic roadmap for resolving the long-standing Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

Whereas President Trump's plan includes large scale investments and incentives to unleash prosperity throughout the region;

Whereas achieving peace in the Middle East and a truce between Israel and the Palestinians has eluded leaders for decades; and

Whereas the peace plan will bring tranquility and harmony to a region wrecked with turmoil: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates President Donald J. Trump for the momentous achievement of reaching a cease-fire between Israel and Hamas;

(2) calls on all peace-loving individuals and nations to embrace President Trump's peace plan; and

(3) celebrates the coming peace and prosperity that will benefit millions of individuals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 446—RECOGNIZING THE 250TH BIRTHDAY OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BUDD, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SHEEHY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 446

Whereas, on October 13, 1775, the Continental Congress, representing the citizens of the 13 American colonies, passed a resolution establishing a Continental Navy to protect North American trade from British blockades and predation and to intercept British ships carrying supplies for British forces in North America;

Whereas the founders recognized the essential nature of a Navy to the strength and longevity of the country by providing authority to Congress ''To provide and maintain a Navy'' in article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the Continental Navy began a proud tradition, carried out for the last 250 years by the United States Navy, to protect the interests of the United States on, under, and above the seas, projecting American values and maintaining the freedom of navigation across the globe;

Whereas, as of the date of this resolution, the United States Navy is a global force of more than 290 ships, 3,700 aircraft, and 590,000 active duty, reserve, and civilian personnel;

Whereas the Navy's Sailors, past and present, have demonstrated unmatched courage, skill, and dedication during every major conflict in the history of the United States;

Whereas the Navy has played a vital role in humanitarian missions, disaster relief, deterrence, and diplomacy, fostering peace and stability in regions far beyond the shores of the United States;

Whereas the Navy remains at the forefront of technological innovation, all-domain warfare, and strategic deterrence in the 21st century;

Whereas the Navy's core values of ''Honor, Courage, and Commitment'' have guided generations of Sailors and reflect the enduring spirit of service to the country;

Whereas the Navy's 250th birthday provides an opportunity to recognize the sacrifices of Navy families, veterans, and civilians who have supported the fleet and fought for the maritime superiority of the United States;

Whereas communities across the United States continue to provide critical industrial and workforce support to sustain fleet readiness and national defense; and

Whereas, whether in peace or at war, the people of the United States can rest assured that their Navy is on watch, ever vigilant, and ready to respond when and where it is needed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic significance of the 250th birthday of the United States Navy;

(2) expresses the appreciation of the people of the United States to the men and women of the Navy, past and present, for their 250 years of dedicated service and defense of the United States; and

(3) reaffirms the Senate's commitment to supporting the United States Navy as a vital instrument of national power and global stability.

SENATE RESOLUTION 447—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 25, 2025, AS ''NATIONAL ATAXIA AWARENESS DAY'', AND RAISING AWARENESS OF ATAXIA, ATAXIA RESEARCH, AND THE SEARCH FOR A CURE

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. MURPHY, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 447

Whereas ataxia is a clinical manifestation indicating degeneration or dysfunction of the brain that negatively affects the coordination, precision, and accurate timing of physical movements;

Whereas ataxia can strike individuals of all ages, including children;

Whereas the term ''ataxia'' is used to classify a group of rare, inherited neurodegenerative diseases including—

(1) ataxia telangiectasia;

(2) episodic ataxia;

(3) Friedreich's ataxia; and

(4) spinocerebellar ataxia;

Whereas there are many known types of genetic ataxia, but the genetic basis for ataxia in some patients is still unknown;

Whereas all inherited ataxias affect fewer than 200,000 individuals in the United States, and therefore, are recognized as rare diseases under the Orphan Drug Act (Public Law 97–414; 96 Stat. 2049);

Whereas some genetic ataxias are inherited in an autosomal dominant manner while others are inherited in an autosomal recessive manner;

Whereas ataxia symptoms can also be caused by noninherited health conditions and other factors, including stroke, tumor, cerebral palsy, head trauma, multiple sclerosis, alcohol addiction or misuse, and certain medications;

Whereas ataxia can present physical, psychological, and financial challenges for patients and their families;

Whereas symptoms and outcomes of ataxia progress at different rates and can include—

(1) lack of coordination;

(2) slurred speech;

(3) cardiomyopathy;

(4) scoliosis;

(5) eye movement abnormalities;

(6) difficulty walking;

(7) tremors;

(8) trouble eating and swallowing;

(9) difficulties with other activities that require fine motor skills; and

(10) death;

Whereas many patients with ataxia require the use of assistive devices, such as wheelchairs and walkers, to aid in their mobility, and many individuals with ataxia may need physical and occupational therapy;

Whereas few treatments and no cures have been approved for ataxia; and

Whereas clinical research to develop safe and effective treatments for ataxia is ongoing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the need for greater public awareness of ataxia;

(2) designates September 25, 2025, as ''National Ataxia Awareness Day'';

(3) supports the goals of National Ataxia Awareness Day, which are to—

(A) raise awareness of the causes and symptoms of ataxia among the general public and health care professionals;

(B) improve diagnosis of ataxia and access to care for patients affected by ataxia; and

(C) accelerate ataxia research, including on safe and effective treatment options and, ultimately, a cure;

(4) recognizes the individuals in the United States who face challenges due to having ataxia, and the families of those individuals; and

(5) encourages States, territories, and localities to support the goals of National Ataxia Awareness Day.

SENATE RESOLUTION 448—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 1, 2025, AS ''ENERGY EFFICIENCY DAY'' IN CELEBRATION OF THE ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS THAT HAVE BEEN DRIVEN BY PRIVATE SECTOR INNOVATION AND FEDERAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY POLICIES

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 448

Whereas October has been designated as ''National Energy Awareness Month'';

Whereas improvements in energy efficiency technologies and practices, along with policies of the United States enacted since the 1970s, have resulted in energy savings of more than 80,000,000,000,000,000 British thermal units and energy cost avoidance of more than $1,000,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas energy efficiency has enjoyed bipartisan support in Congress and in administrations of both parties for more than 50 years;

Whereas bipartisan legislation enacted since the 1970s to advance Federal energy efficiency policies includes—

(1) the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.);

(2) the National Appliance Energy Conservation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–12; 101 Stat. 103);

(3) the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 et seq.);

(4) the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801 et seq.);

(5) the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17001 et seq.);

(6) the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–11; 129 Stat. 182);

(7) the Energy Act of 2020 (Public Law 116–260; 134 Stat. 2418); and

(8) the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117–58; 135 Stat. 429);

Whereas energy efficiency has long been supported by a diverse coalition of businesses (including manufacturers, utilities, energy service companies, and technology firms), public interest organizations, environmental and conservation groups, and State and local governments;

Whereas, since 1980, the United States has more than doubled its energy productivity, realizing twice the economic output per unit of energy consumed;

Whereas more than 2,300,000 individuals in the United States are currently employed across the energy efficiency sector, as the United States has doubled its energy productivity, and business and industry have become more innovative and competitive in global markets;

Whereas the Department of Energy is the principal Federal agency responsible for renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency efforts;

Whereas cutting energy waste saves the consumers of the United States billions of dollars on utility bills annually; and

Whereas energy efficiency policies, financing innovations, and public-private partnerships have contributed to a reduction in energy intensity in Federal facilities by nearly 50 percent since the mid-1970s, which results in direct savings to United States taxpayers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 1, 2025, as ''Energy Efficiency Day''; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe Energy Efficiency Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 449—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 12, 2025, AS ''NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE WEEK''

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 449

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service administers the National Wildlife Refuge System to conserve, manage, and, where appropriate, restore fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of current and future generations;

Whereas, in 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge on Pelican Island in Florida;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System is administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and has grown to include 573 national wildlife refuges, 38 wetland management districts, and 5 marine national monuments with units located in every State and territory of the United States;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System encompasses more than 850,000,000 acres of unique habitats and ecosystems, including tropical and boreal forests, wetlands, deserts, grasslands, arctic tundras, remote islands, and marine areas, and spans 12 time zones from the United States Virgin Islands to Guam;

Whereas national wildlife refuges support approximately 800 species of birds, 220 species of mammals, 250 species of reptiles and amphibians, and 1,100 species of fish;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide protection to more than 380 threatened species and endangered species;

Whereas more than 65 national wildlife refuges were established to conserve species considered to be threatened or endangered under Federal standards, including the American crocodile, California condor, Devil's Hole pupfish, and Antioch Dunes evening primrose;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are the primary Federal lands that support waterfowl habitat;

Whereas, since 1934, the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund has generated more than $2,200,000,000 and enabled the conservation of approximately 6,400,000 acres of habitat for waterfowl and numerous other species in the National Wildlife Refuge System;

Whereas national wildlife refuges protect and conserve climate-resilient habitats that support biodiversity and provide nature-based solutions;

Whereas more than 180 national wildlife refuges conserve marine, coastal, and Great Lakes habitats, helping to protect communities by reducing the risk of storm-surge flooding, especially in low-lying floodplain and coastal areas;

Whereas many national wildlife refuges are managed to reduce wildfire risk by thinning overgrown forests and removing invasive species;

Whereas meaningful engagement and proactive collaboration with Tribes, Alaska Native Corporations, Alaska Native organizations, and the Native Hawaiian community is an integral aspect of the co-stewardship of our shared natural resources, including National Wildlife Refuge System lands and waters;

Whereas important cultural and historic resources are protected on national wildlife refuges, including—

(1) archaeological sites detailing the lives of Native Americans and early colonists at Rappahannock River Valley National Wildlife Refuge in Virginia;

(2) World War II sites in the Pacific, from Attu in Alaska to Midway Atoll in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands; and

(3) the remains of the home of the father of Harriet Tubman at Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge in Maryland;

Whereas Tribal consultation is a cornerstone of historic preservation on national wildlife refuges where cultural resources and traditional sacred spaces are important to Native American Tribes, including Pahranagat National Wildlife Refuge in Nevada, where the Nuwuvi people finalized a plan with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to respect and showcase ancient petroglyphs;

Whereas national wildlife refuges use a range of management tools, including fire management, invasive species control, water management, wildlife health assessments, inventory and monitoring species, facility condition assessments, 5-year infrastructure project plans, and other tools to conserve habitat and ensure opportunities for public access and recreation;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important recreational and tourism destinations in communities across the United States, and offer a variety of recreational opportunities, including sustainable hunting and fishing, wildlife observation, photography, environmental education, and interpretation;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System receives nearly 71,000,000 annual visits which—

(1) generate more than $3,200,000,000 for local economies; and

(2) support 41,000 jobs;

Whereas the National Wildlife Refuge System hosts nearly 44,000,000 annual birding and wildlife observation visits;

Whereas national wildlife refuges are important to local businesses and gateway communities;

Whereas, for every dollar appropriated to the National Wildlife Refuge System, an average of approximately 5 dollars is returned to local economies;

Whereas more than 430 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System have hunting programs and more than 375 units have fishing programs which support, respectively, more than 2,700,000 hunting visits and more than 8,400,000 fishing visits annually;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide an important opportunity for children to discover and gain a greater appreciation for the natural world;

Whereas, in fiscal year 2025, nearly 24,000 volunteers contributed approximately 886,000 volunteer hours in national wildlife refuges, which is equal to the number of hours worked by 425 full-time employees;

Whereas approximately 180 national wildlife refuge ''Friends'' organizations provide additional volunteer labor and serve as an important link between national wildlife refuges and local communities;

Whereas 101 units of the National Wildlife Refuge System are within 25 miles of population centers of 250,000 people or more;

Whereas, through the Urban Wildlife Conservation Program, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service works to dismantle barriers that have blocked underserved communities from full and equal participation in outdoor recreation and wildlife conservation;

Whereas the Urban Wildlife Conservation Program fosters strong new conservation coalitions, educates and employs youth, engages communities, builds trust in government, and connects individuals with nature;

Whereas national wildlife refuges provide opportunities for people from all backgrounds to explore, connect with, and preserve the natural heritage of the United States;

Whereas, since 1995, national wildlife refuges across the United States have held festivals, educational programs, guided tours, and other events to celebrate National Wildlife Refuge Week during the second full week of October;

Whereas the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has designated the week beginning on October 12, 2025, as National Wildlife Refuge Week; and

Whereas the designation of National Wildlife Refuge Week by the Senate would recognize more than a century of conservation in the United States, raise awareness about the importance of wildlife and the National Wildlife Refuge System, and celebrate the myriad recreational opportunities available for the enjoyment of this network of protected lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning on October 12, 2025, as ''National Wildlife Refuge Week'';

(2) encourages the observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities;

(3) recognizes the importance of national wildlife refuges to wildlife conservation, the protection of imperiled species and ecosystems, and wildlife-dependent recreational uses;

(4) acknowledges the importance of national wildlife refuges for their recreational opportunities and contribution to local economies across the United States;

(5) identifies the significance of national wildlife refuges in advancing the traditions of wildlife observation, photography, and interpretation, as well as environmental education;

(6) finds that national wildlife refuges play a vital role in securing the hunting and fishing heritage of the United States for future generations;

(7) recognizes the important work of urban national wildlife refuges in welcoming racially and ethnically diverse urban communities that were long excluded, including work—

(A) to foster strong new conservation coalitions;

(B) to provide education and employment opportunities to youth;

(C) to improve communities;

(D) to build trust in government; and

(E) to connect individuals with nature;

(8) recognizes the commitment of the National Wildlife Refuge System to engagement, relationships, knowledge-sharing, and co-stewardship of National Wildlife Refuge System lands and waters with Tribes, Alaska Native Corporations, Alaska Native organizations, and the Native Hawaiian community;

(9) acknowledges the role of national wildlife refuges in conserving waterfowl and waterfowl habitat under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(10) reaffirms the support of the Senate for wildlife conservation and the National Wildlife Refuge System; and

(11) expresses the intent of the Senate—

(A) to continue working to conserve wildlife; and

(B) to support the management by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the National Wildlife Refuge System for current and future generations.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3929. Mr. KELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3930. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 875, to curtail the political weaponization of Federal banking agencies by eliminating reputational risk as a component of the supervision of depository institutions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3931. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 875, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3929. Mr. KELLY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3748 proposed by Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. REED) to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 718. NOTIFICATION TO TRICARE BENEFICIARIES OF COVERAGE TRANSITION REQUIREMENTS.

Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1097d the following new section:

''§ 1097e. TRICARE program: notice of coverage transition requirements

''(a) PROVISION OF NOTICE.—(1) The Secretary shall provide each covered beneficiary with notices of a TRICARE coverage transition requirement that affects the individual.

''(2) The Secretary shall provide notice under paragraph (1) through electronic means.

''(b) TIMING OF NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide notices to a covered beneficiary under subsection (a)(1) as follows:

''(1) On the date that is one year before the covered beneficiary will experience a TRICARE coverage transition requirement.

''(2) On the date that is 180 days before the covered beneficiary will experience a TRICARE coverage transition requirement.

''(3) On the date that is 30 days before the covered beneficiary will experience a TRICARE coverage transition requirement.

''(c) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall conduct an outreach and public awareness campaign to inform covered beneficiaries of TRICARE coverage transition requirements, including through the internet website of the TRICARE program, social media, and family readiness groups.

''(d) REPORTS.—Not less frequently than annually, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of this section, including metrics relating to the outreach and public awareness campaign conducted under subsection (c) and any recommendations to improve making covered beneficiaries aware of TRICARE coverage transition requirements.

''(e) TRICARE COVERAGE TRANSITION REQUIREMENT DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'TRICARE coverage transition requirement' means a requirement under this chapter for a covered beneficiary to make a different election under the TRICARE program to continue enrollment in the TRICARE program, including by reason of attaining a certain age as described in section 1086(d) or 1110b of this title.''.

SA 3930. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 875, to curtail the political weaponization of Federal banking agencies by eliminating reputational risk as a component of the supervision of depository institutions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 10, line 5, strike ''No'' and inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by subsection (b), no''.

On page 11, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to a depository institution if a Federal banking agency has reasonable cause to believe that the depository institution or an institution-affiliated party (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)) of that depository institution has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage in any activity involving—

(1) Hamas, Hizbollah, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, the Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade, or Ansarallah;

(2) Tren de Aragua, Mara Salvatrucha (MS–13), Cártel de Sinaloa, Cártel de Jalisco Nueva Generación, Cártel del Noreste (formerly Los Zetas), La Nueva Familia Michoacana, Cártel de Golfo (Gulf Cartel), or Cárteles Unidos;

(3) any other organization designated as—

(A) a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189); or

(B) a specially designated global terrorist organization pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism), as amended before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(4) the government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, the Russian Federation, or any other country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism (commonly referred to as a ''state sponsor of terrorism''), for purposes of—

(A) section 1754(c)(1)(A)(i) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4813(c)(1)(A)(i));

(B) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

(C) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

(D) any other provision of law;

(5) any person that is an agent for, or does business with, any entity described in paragraph (2), (3), or (4);

(6) any person who may be involved in soliciting sex from minors or in sex trafficking;

(7) any other illicit conduct involving a transnational criminal organization, drug trafficking organization, or money laundering organization; or

(8) any other illicit finance, criminal activity, or a threat to the national security of the United States.

SA 3931. Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 875, to curtail the political weaponization of Federal banking agencies by eliminating reputational risk as a component of the supervision of depository institutions; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) appropriate Federal banking agencies have a duty to ensure that the depository institutions supervised by those agencies—

(A) are operating in a safe and sound manner; and

(B) have processes and procedures in place to identify fraudulent or illegal activity, whether activity occurs at a depository institution or through vendors or customers with which a depository institution has a relationship;

(2) the duty described in paragraph (1) rests on laws and regulations, not on personal beliefs or political motivations;

(3) undue pressure and coercion designed to restrict access to financial services for lawful businesses have no place at any appropriate Federal banking agency;

(4) depository institutions should provide banking services in the communities in which those institutions serve while carrying out customer identification, risk-based customer diligence, and suspicious activity monitoring and reporting obligations under subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code (referred to in this section as the ''Bank Secrecy Act''), with respect to the customers of those institutions;

(5) despite the fact that individual customers of depository institutions within broader customer categories present varying degrees of risk, all depository institutions should take a risk-based approach in assessing individual customer relationships rather

than decline to provide banking services to categories of customers without regard to the risks presented by an individual customer or the ability of the depository institution to manage the risk;

(6) depository institutions that properly manage customer relationships and risks are neither prohibited nor discouraged from providing services to customers that are operating in compliance with applicable Federal and State law; and

(7) each depository institution is responsible for determining whether providing services to any particular customer is consistent with the business plan, risk profile, and management capabilities of the depository institution.

(b) CONDITIONS FOR TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not request or require a depository institution to terminate a specific deposit account or group of deposit accounts , unless—

(A) there is a valid reason for that request or requirement, as described in paragraph (2); and

(B) reputational risk is not the dispositive factor for that request or requirement.

(2) VALID REASONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To establish a valid reason for a request or requirement under paragraph (1), the appropriate Federal banking agency shall document that valid reason, which may include that the agency has reasonable cause to believe that the applicable depository institution or any institution-affiliated party has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage in—

(i) an unsafe or unsound practice in conducting business;

(ii) a violation of an applicable law, rule, regulation, order, condition imposed in writing, formal or informal enforcement action, or written agency guidance, which shall include the priorities for anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism policy established by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 5318(h)(4) of title 31, United States Code, or otherwise operating in a manner that is inconsistent with requirements of the Bank Secrecy Act; or

(iii) any activity, conduct, or condition that could lead to, or has led to, the issuance of a matter requiring attention, a matter requiring immediate attention, a matter requiring board attention, a document of resolution, or a supervisory recommendation.

(B) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND ILLICIT FINANCE THREATS.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency has reasonable cause to believe that a specific customer or group of customers is, or is acting for or on behalf of, an entity that—

(i) poses a threat to national security;

(ii) is involved in terrorist or other illicit financing;

(iii) is an agent of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, or any country listed on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list;

(iv) is in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country listed on the State Sponsors of Terrorism list;

(v) does business with any entity described in clause (iii) or (iv), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer or group of customers has conducted due diligence to avoid doing business with any entity described in clause (iii) or (iv); or

(vi) is engaged in—

(I) any other illicit conduct directly or indirectly supporting a transnational criminal organization, drug trafficking organization, or money laundering organization; or

(II) any other criminal activity,

such belief shall satisfy the conditions permitting action by the appropriate Federal banking agency under paragraph (1).

(c) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or requires a depository institution to terminate a specific deposit account or a group of deposit accounts under subsection (b), the agency shall—

(1) provide such request or requirement to the institution in writing; and

(2) accompany such request or requirement with the valid reason for the request or requirement, as described in subsection (b)(2).

(d) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), or as otherwise prohibited from disclosure by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or requires a depository institution to terminate a deposit account under subsection (b), the depository institution shall notify in writing the specific customer or group of customers, the deposit account of which is being terminated, of the valid reason for that termination, as determined under subsection (b)(2).

(2) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(A) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT INVESTIGATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Neither a depository institution nor an appropriate Federal banking agency may provide the applicable customer or group of customers with the notice required under paragraph (1) if—

(I) a Federal law enforcement agency or an element of the intelligence community advises the depository institution or the appropriate Federal banking agency that the notice—

(aa) may interfere with a matter of national security;

(bb) involves a matter described in subsection (b)(2)(B); or

(cc) may interfere with a law enforcement investigation, criminal prosecution, or civil action brought by a government agency; or

(II) the depository institution or appropriate Federal banking agency knows or should know that, with respect to that customer or group of customers, a criminal prosecution or a law enforcement investigation is pending.

(ii) CONSULTATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—An appropriate Federal banking agency and depository institution shall consult with, and follow the recommendations of, a Federal law enforcement agency or element of the intelligence community, as applicable, regarding whether the notice described in paragraph (1) is required under that paragraph or prohibited under clause (i) of this subparagraph.

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or requires a depository institution to terminate a specific deposit account or a group of deposit accounts under subsection (b), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may notify the customer or group of customers of the justification for that action, if—

(i) that notice may—

(I) disclose the existence of a report on suspicious transactions filed under section 5318(g) of title 31, United States Code; or

(II) reveal confidential supervisory information or a concern of an appropriate Federal banking agency relating to an internal control of a depository institution; or

(ii) the appropriate Federal banking agency has reasonable cause to believe that the depository institution or any institution-affiliated party has engaged, is engaged, or is about to engage in—

(I) a violation of an applicable law, rule, regulation, order, enforcement action, condition imposed in writing, or formal or informal written agency guidance; or

(II) an unsafe or unsound banking practice relating to that customer or group of customers.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall—

(1) submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives an annual report stating—

(A) the aggregate number of specific deposit accounts that the agency requested that a depository institution terminate, or required a depository institution to terminate, during the previous year; and

(B) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making each request and requirement under subparagraph (A) and the frequency on which the agency relied on each such authority; and

(2) before submitting each report required under paragraph (1), provide the Inspector General of the agency with an opportunity to conduct an evaluation or review of the activity described in that report, which the Inspector General shall submit to the committees described in paragraph (1) concurrently with the submission of the report under paragraph (1).

(f) BIENNIAL FDIC AND NCUA SURVEY ON ACCESS TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS BY SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the National Credit Union Administration shall conduct a biennial survey on the efforts of depository institutions to provide greater access to deposit accounts to small and medium-sized businesses that may have encountered difficulties in accessing or maintaining deposit accounts.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In conducting each survey required under paragraph (1), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the National Credit Union Administration shall consider what issues and barriers most frequently prevent small and medium-sized businesses from accessing or maintaining deposit accounts that are necessary to operate those businesses.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit or restrict the authority of an appropriate Federal banking agency to—

(1) identify or discuss potential supervisory findings with the staff or management of a depository institution, including findings involving financial condition, governance, consumer protection, internal controls, or unsafe or unsound conditions; or

(2) identify or discuss deficiencies in compliance or risks associated with the Bank Secrecy Act, including anti-money laundering or countering the financing of terrorism practices.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency'' means—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union, as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ''depository institution'' means—

(A) a depository institution, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) an insured credit union, as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(3) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning

given the term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have four requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 2025, at 9:50 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, October 9, 2025, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to my congressional fellows and interns for the remainder of this Congress. They are Mary Horton, Kathleen Song, Valerie Hines, and Michael Notti.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Terry Miller, a defense fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges until October 10, 2025.

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

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 446, 250th Navy Birthday; S. Res. 447, Ataxia Awareness Day; S. Res. 448, Energy Efficiency Day:

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RECOGNIZING THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POSTAL SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to S. Res. 337.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 337) recognizing the 250th anniversary of the postal service of the United States.

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

Mr. HOEVEN. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 337) was agreed to.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 24, 2025, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

OSCAR J. UPHAM POST OFFICE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2283 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2283) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Oklahoma Avenue in Guthrie, Oklahoma, as the ''Oscar J. Upham Post Office''.

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

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

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

The bill (S. 2283) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 2283

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

SECTION 1. OSCAR J. UPHAM POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Oklahoma Avenue in Guthrie, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the ''Oscar J. Upham Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Oscar J. Upham Post Office''.

UNIFORMED SERVICES LEAVE PARITY ACT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 151, S. 1440.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1440) to amend title II of the Public Health Service Act to include as an additional right or privilege of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service (and their beneficiaries) certain leave provided under title 10, United States Code to commissioned officers of the Army (or their beneficiaries).

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

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

The bill (S. 1440) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1440

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Uniformed Services Leave Parity Act''.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF LEAVE PROVISIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 221(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 213a(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(22) Chapter 40, Leave.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 219 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 210–1) is repealed.

EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP REPRESENTATION ACT OF 2025

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 157, S. 1728.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1728) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to expand the membership of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans to include representatives of employee ownership organizations.

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

S. 1728

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Employee Ownership Representation Act of 2025''.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF THE ERISA ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 512(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1142(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''fifteen members'' and inserting ''17 members''; and

(B) by striking ''eight members'' and inserting ''10 members''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''two shall be representatives of employee ownership organizations;'' after ''pension plan;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall nominate the first 2 representatives of employee ownership organizations authorized to serve as members of the Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans under section 512(a) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1142(a)), as amended by subsection (a).

SEC. 3. OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish the Office of Employee Ownership in the Department of Labor, outside of the Employee Benefits Security Administration.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The Secretary of Labor shall appoint the Director of the Office of Employee Ownership to serve as the head of the Office at the pleasure of the Secretary of Labor.

(3) STAFF.—The Director of the Office of Employee Ownership may select, appoint, and employ such employees as are necessary to carry out the functions of the Office.

(b) FUNCTIONS.—The Director of the Office of Employee Ownership shall be responsible for carrying out the Employee Ownership Initiative established under section 346 of the SECURE 2.0 Act of 2022 (29 U.S.C. 3228).

SEC. 4. ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established an Advisory Council on Employee Ownership (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ''Council'') consisting of 7 members appointed by the Secretary of Labor.

(2) MEMBERSHIP.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Of the 7 members of the Council—

(i) 4 shall be appointed to represent employees;

(ii) 1 shall be appointed to represent companies that have established an employee stock ownership plan or eligible worker-owned cooperative;

(iii) 1 shall be appointed to represent employee stock ownership plan providers; and

(iv) 1 shall be appointed to represent associations or other membership organizations for employee stock ownership plans or eligible worker-owned cooperatives.

(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 members of the Council shall be members of the same political party.

(3) TERMS.—Members of the Council shall serve for terms of 2 years.

(4) APPOINTMENT; REAPPOINTMENT.—A member of the Council may be reappointed to serve additional terms.

(5) VACANCIES.—A member of the Council appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(6) QUORUM.—A majority of members of the Council shall constitute a quorum and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present and voting.

(b) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Council to advise the Secretary of Labor with respect to the carrying out of the functions of the Secretary of Labor under this Act and to submit to the Secretary of Labor recommendations with respect to carrying out such duties.

(2) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet at least 4 times each year and at such other times as the Secretary of Labor requests.

(3) REPORT.—The Council shall annually submit a report to the Secretary of Labor on the recommendations described in paragraph (1).

(c) EXECUTIVE SECRETARY; SECRETARIAL AND CLERICAL SERVICES.—The Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the Council an Executive Secretary and such secretarial, clerical, and other services as are determined necessary to conduct the business of the Council. The Secretary of Labor may call upon other agencies of the Federal Government for statistical data, reports, and other information which will assist the Council in the performance of its duties.

(d) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Council shall each be entitled to receive the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Council.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Council, members of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) TERMINATION.—Section 1013 of title 5, United States Code, relating to termination, shall not apply to the Council.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ELIGIBLE WORKER-OWNED COOPERATIVE.—The term ''eligible worker-owned cooperative'' has the meaning given the term in section 1042(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLAN.—The term ''employee stock ownership plan'' has the meaning given the term in section 4975(e)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ADVOCATE FOR EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title III of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 3005. ADVOCATE FOR EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor shall appoint an Advocate for Employee Ownership within the Employee Ownership Initiative established under section 346(b)(1) of the SECURE 2.0 Act of 2022 (division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (Public Law 117–328)). The appointment shall be made without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to appointments in the competitive service or Senior Executive Service.

''(b) DUTIES.—The Advocate for Employee Ownership shall—

''(1) consult with the head of the Employee Ownership Initiative established under section 346(b)(1) of the SECURE 2.0 Act of 2022 (division T of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (Public Law 117–328));

''(2) act as a liaison between the Department of Labor, employee ownership advocates, employers considering employee ownership, workers interested in employee ownership, and other stakeholders, including employee stock ownership plan sponsors and participants;

''(3) provide public education and assistance related to the expansion of employee ownership through the establishment and maintenance of practices that promote employee ownership, including the use of employee stock ownership plans;

''(4) provide assistance for purposes of resolving a dispute between the Department of Labor and any employee stock ownership plan sponsor, fiduciary, or participant and help facilitate communication between such entities and the Department of Labor for such purposes;

''(5) identify and recommend potential legislative and administrative changes, including related to access to capital issues, to increase practices that promote employee ownership plans, including the use of employee stock ownership plans; and

''(6) coordinate with other Federal agencies, including the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Commerce, and State and local governments on outreach and education to inform employees and employers about the possibilities and benefits of employee ownership as a business ownership succession planning option.

''(c) CONSULTATION AND INPUT.—The Secretary of Labor shall solicit advice and input from the Advocate for Employee Ownership in developing regulations or interpretations of this Act that relate to employee stock ownership plans.

''(d) COMPENSATION.—The Advocate for Employee Ownership shall be entitled to compensation at the same rate as the rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 31 of each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, the Advocate for Employee Ownership shall submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Workforce of the House of Representatives on the activities of the Office of the Advocate for Employee Ownership during the fiscal year ending during such calendar year, including the contents described in paragraph (2).

''(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall—

''(A) summarize the assistance requests received by the Advocate for Employee Ownership during the fiscal year ending during the calendar year of such report;

''(B) describe the activities, including the activities described under paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b), and evaluate the effectiveness of the Advocate for Employee Ownership during such fiscal year;

''(C) describe any significant problems the Advocate for Employee Ownership has identified during such fiscal year and ways to mitigate such problems;

''(D) contain recommendations for any administrative or legislative action that may be appropriate to resolve barriers to, and to incentivize, practices that promote employee ownership, including the use of employee stock ownership plans; and

''(E) describe progress related to employee ownership in businesses in the United States.

''(3) CONCURRENT SUBMISSION.—The Advocate for Employee Ownership shall submit a copy of each report submitted under paragraph (1) to the Secretary of Labor, and any other appropriate official, at the same time such report is submitted under paragraph (1).

''(4) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Advocate for Employee Ownership shall make a copy of each report submitted under paragraph (1) available to the public.

''(5) DEFINITION OF EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLAN.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employee stock ownership plan' has the meaning given the term in section 4975(e)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

''(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out subsection (d).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3004 the following new item:

''Sec. 3005. Advocate for employee ownership.''.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1728), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RETIRE THROUGH OWNERSHIP ACT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 158, S. 2403.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2403) to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide a clear definition of adequate consideration for certain closely held stock, and for other purposes.

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Retire through Ownership Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDING ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION DEFINITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(18) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(18)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''The term''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) For purposes of clause (ii), a fiduciary of an employee stock ownership plan as defined in section 407(d)(6) may make a good faith reliance on the principles and methodologies set forth in Internal Revenue Service Revenue Ruling 59–60 (as in effect on the date of enactment of the ERISA Adequate Consideration Act of 2025) in determining the fair market value of an asset described in such clause.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to determinations described in section 3(18)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(18)(B)) (as added by such subsection) that are made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Retire through Ownership Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDING ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION DEFINITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(18) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(18)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subclauses (I) and (II), respectively;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(3) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''The term''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) For purposes of clause (ii) of subparagraph (A), a fiduciary of an employee stock ownership plan (as defined in section 407(d)(6)) may make a good faith reliance on a valuation provided by an independent valuation expert or business appraiser that has relied upon the principles and methodologies set forth in Internal Revenue Service Revenue Ruling 59–60 (as amplified and modified by the Internal Revenue Service from time to time) in determining the fair market value of an asset described in such clause.

''(ii) Clause (i) shall not be interpreted to—

''(I) preclude the Secretary from promulgating, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, any regulation interpreting such clause;

''(II) expand the regulatory authority of the Secretary with respect to the term 'adequate consideration' beyond such authority available to the Secretary on the day before the date of enactment of the Retire through Ownership Act; or

''(III) modify a fiduciary's obligations under section 404.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to determinations described in section 3(18)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(18)(B)) (as added by such subsection) that are made on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2403), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2025, THROUGH TUESDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2025

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, on Friday, October 10, at 11:30 a.m.; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, October 10, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Tuesday, October 14; 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, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; finally, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 5371 ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:37 p.m., adjourned until Friday, October 10, 2025, at 11:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 9, 2025:

THE JUDICIARY

JENNIFER LEE MASCOTT, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT.