



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2025

No. 186

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, November 7, 2025, at 2 p.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 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.

Gracious God, our rock of ages, give our lawmakers this day the abiding assurance of Your presence. May this companionship with You inspire them to find the wisdom to open our government. Enable them to experience Your contentment, mercy, and peace, facing life's challenges with quiet hearts and vibrant faith.

Lord, refuse to forsake them, quicken their thinking, and empower them to fulfill Your purposes on Earth. May they not become weary in doing what is right, knowing that You will reward their faithfulness with a sure harvest.

We pray in Your awesome 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. MULLIN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under previous order, the Senate will be in morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Iowa.

VETERANS DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I come to the floor ahead of next Tuesday, which is Veterans Day, to recognize and share my gratitude to those who have all answered the call to serve the United States of America.

November 11 is the Federal holiday that we observe today as Veterans Day. It has not always been referred to as Veterans Day. Its origins come from the term Armistice Day, the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, which marked the end of World War I.

The holiday is often marked by tributes and other ceremonies to show our gratitude to our family, friends, and neighbors who have served.

In honor of Veterans Day, my office typically hosts a Veterans History Project event to collect stories from Iowa veterans and submit those stories to the Library of Congress to honor those individuals and their service for generations to come, also, so that researchers can hear the exact words spoken from the mouths of those veterans of what war is all about.

To date, I have submitted 95 stories from Iowa veterans to the Library of Congress. There are more Iowa veterans who wish to share their story,

and I look forward to continuing my efforts to preserve those stories.

Normally, it would be this weekend at some major city in Iowa. I would ask veterans to gather so we can record their memories. Obviously, with the government shutdown, that is impossible for my staff to do, but we will continue that as long as I serve in the U.S. Senate.

I would also like to recognize that, this year, the day before Veterans Day marks the 250th anniversary of the U.S. Marines. On November 10, 1775, the Second Continental Congress established the Marine Corps. I have been fortunate enough to have a brother who served in the Marines in World War II. I have had a grandson in the Marines in the last 10 years.

For the last 250 years, the Marine Corps has faithfully defended our Nation with a distinct fighting spirit, and I am confident that the Marines will continue to do that.

Thank you to our dedicated marines and thank you to all veterans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S7931

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed

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

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

The senior assistant 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.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are 37 days into an entirely avoidable government shutdown. I say “avoidable” because it was.

Democrats instigated this shutdown by rejecting a clean, nonpartisan funding resolution. Republicans weren’t asking them to swallow a bunch of new conservative policies. There isn’t a single partisan policy in the bill. Yet Democrats couldn’t bring themselves to take yes for an answer. Democrats, of course, have claimed their decision to shut down the government is about healthcare. They want Republicans to bail out their ObamaCare mess. And as I have said probably 1,000 times now, Republicans are 100 percent willing to sit down and talk about the mess that Democrats have created. We are just not going to have that conversation while Democrats are holding the Federal Government hostage. That was our position in September; that was our position in October; and, yes, it is still our position in November. We are just waiting for Democrats to take yes for an answer.

I do know that Democrats have been under a lot of pressure from the far left. The far left pushed them to shut down the government, and the far left has pushed them to keep it shut down.

As one House Democrat told Axios yesterday, “There would be hell to pay if Senate Democrats don’t let events play out.”

“There would be hell to pay if Senate Democrats don’t let events play out”—that quote from a House Democrat just yesterday.

Well, what events need to play out? What more needs to happen for the far left to be satisfied?

The pain this shutdown has caused is only getting worse as 40 million Americans who rely on food assistance programs are now at risk of going hungry without a resolution of the shutdown. I am sure these Americans are doing everything in their power to feed their families, but they can’t do that forever. Federal workers have now gone without pay for more than a month, including the people in this building.

Will the far left not be satisfied until Federal workers and military families are getting their Thanksgiving dinners from a food bank? Because that is where we are headed.

Then there is air travel.

Yesterday, the Transportation Secretary announced that, as a matter of safety, the Department of Transportation is requiring a mandatory reduction in air traffic, starting tomorrow because of shutdown staffing issues. That means widespread flight cancellations, supply chain issues, and hundreds of thousands of passengers dealing with disruptions to travel every day. The impact this will have will be immense—all of it because Democrats cannot bring themselves to accept a clean, nonpartisan funding resolution, which is something that happened 13 times when they had the majority and President Biden was in the White House.

So I ask the question again: What more do Democrats need? They got their cheers at the leftwing No Kings rally. They kept their base satisfied through the fall campaigns and election day. And as of Tuesday, they have the extremely dubious honor of instigating the longest and most severe government shutdown in history. How much more do Americans have to endure before Democrats are satisfied?

The Democrat leader said yesterday that every day gets better for Democrats. The No. 2 Democrat in the House has said that the American people’s suffering takes a backseat to Democrats’ precious leverage. The senior Senator from Vermont—a leading voice on the left—wrote an op-ed over the weekend, calling for Democrats to keep the government shut down forever, as far as I can tell.

I hope that is not where most Democrats are. I hope at least a few Democrats can see that this can’t go on any longer.

People are suffering, and it is getting worse every day. A furloughed Federal employee—a mother of five in Maryland—told the New York Times last week:

I don’t know how to get the mortgage paid.

Federal workers are taking on second jobs to make ends meet; food banks across the country are overwhelmed; and American families are looking to the holiday season with apprehension.

Democrats have a choice to make: Are they going to continue to bow to pressure from the voices on the far left telling them to keep up their opposition or are they going to stop the American people’s suffering and end this shutdown?

I hope enough of them are willing to do the right thing, and I hope they do it soon. The American people can’t wait for events to play out.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

2025 ELECTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Americans, plagued by high costs, fired a political torpedo this week at Donald Trump and Republicans. They spoke loudly and clearly: We are fed up with the high cost of living. We are fed up with the tax on healthcare. We are fed up with your broken promises.

The question now is, Will Donald Trump and Republicans listen to the American people? Will Republicans finally work with Democrats to reopen the Federal Government and negotiate a fix to the ACA premium crisis? Will Donald Trump finally take a break from his lavish ballrooms to help families who can’t afford the rent and can’t afford healthcare?

The American people are waiting. Democrats are ready. We want to have negotiations. It has been long enough.

Look, if Republicans were smart, they would get the message after Tuesday that their do-nothing strategy isn’t working. Even Donald Trump knows Americans hold Republicans responsible for this mess. Here is what he said—he was talking about why they lost the elections. He said:

[T]he shutdown was a big factor, negative for the Republicans.

Again, Donald Trump’s words:

[T]he shutdown was a big factor, negative for the Republicans.

That is what he said about the elections Tuesday.

This is probably the smartest thing President Trump has said in a while. Donald Trump clearly is feeling pressure to bring the shutdown to an end. Well, I have good news for the President: Meet with Democrats, reopen the government, and fix the ACA crisis. That is the best way to put this crisis behind us.

I will say something else about what happened on Tuesday. The single biggest worry Americans feel right now is the cost of living. If you boiled down the theme of Tuesday’s elections, down to one word, it was “affordability.”

Republicans absolutely whiffed on that by focusing on everything but affordability. In fact, Republicans have governed all year like drunken sailors. Instead of lowering costs, they plundered healthcare into oblivion. They have cut taxes for billionaires while kicking millions off healthcare. They have approved luxury jets for Cabinet officials and acted as if there were zero consequences for their actions.

After spending all year intoxicated on rightwing policies that do nothing to lower costs, Republicans shouldn’t be surprised that Tuesday hit them like a bad hangover.

Now that Tuesday is over, we are suddenly reading all these stories about how Donald Trump is finally going to start getting serious about messaging on affordability.

One story says it is going to be the big focus for him next year. Wow. Where has this guy been? What fantasy

is he living in? Are we supposed to applaud Donald Trump now that he is finally going to focus more on affordability and, he says, on messaging. The American people want results, not a message that brings no results and produces no progress.

Apparently, Donald Trump even said on Bret Baier's show that Republicans aren't doing a good job talking about affordability. No kidding. That would be putting it kindly after everything they did this summer to make life affordable for billionaires.

Look, if Donald Trump really wants to get serious about affordability, here is a free tip: He should work with Democrats to actually make healthcare more affordable, not say he wants to do something vacuously.

We should extend the enhanced ACA premium credits, which Senate Republicans voted against three times.

If Donald Trump has any interest in keeping his promise to lower costs, he should maybe focus more on fixing healthcare than sending billions to Argentina and trying to win a Nobel Prize.

The American people have spoken. It is time Republicans finally listen and work with Democrats to bring this shutdown and healthcare crisis to an end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today is day 37 of the Schumer shutdown. Senate Democrats have now broken the record for the longest shutdown in American history.

Democrats have already acknowledged the government must reopen. They have said it. On "Face the Nation" this past Sunday, Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia, referring to the shutdown, said:

I hope it ends this week.

Well, it is already Thursday.

Now there are reports that 10 to 12 Senate Democrats are actually coming forward and saying that they are going to be willing to vote for a clean, bipartisan continuing resolution—something that has been sitting out there for 37 days. Looks like more Democrats are getting ready to finally do the right thing for the American people and reopen the government.

My question to the Democrats is, Why do you continue to prolong the pain? How much longer are you going to force families to stand in line at food banks? How much longer are you going to force workers to miss paychecks?

The Schumer shutdown can end today. Republicans continue to work in good faith to reopen the government. We continue to talk to Senators about ways to get the government open. The only question is, When?

Remember, it is the Democrats who are keeping the government closed.

REMEMBERING DICK CHENEY

Mr. President, on a separate matter, I come to the floor today to remember Vice President Dick Cheney.

Tributes are pouring in from Wyoming, from across the Nation, and from around the world.

Dick Cheney's career was extraordinary. He rose from modest beginnings to serve this Nation in four different Presidential administrations. He was the youngest White House Chief of Staff in American history. He represented Wyoming for 10 years in the House of Representatives. He served as Secretary of State for this Nation at a moment of dramatic global change. He was by any measure one of the most consequential Vice Presidents our Nation ever had. Dick helped guide the course of history in Wyoming, in America, and around the world.

We are always going to remember Dick Cheney as the son of Wyoming. He was a political giant in my home State. He was plainspoken, he was direct, and he was steady in purpose.

Senator Al Simpson once said that Dick was a "big-time, make-things-work [kind of a] guy," and that is exactly right.

Dick grew up in Casper, WY. He was a football star at Natrona County High School. The high school field there still bears his name.

He worked as a power line man in Rock Springs, WY, earning \$3 an hour. He got his start in politics in the 1960s as an intern in the Wyoming State Senate. He went on to Washington. He served Gerald Ford as the White House Chief of Staff—still, as I said, the youngest person in history to hold that position.

When Art Laffer sketched out the legendary Laffer curve on a cocktail napkin, talking about economics, it was on Dick Cheney's napkin.

Dick was at the center of our Nation's history in so many ways. After the Ford administration, Dick came home to Casper. He ran for Congress, and he won that seat six times in a row. In Congress, he fought for lower taxes, for Second Amendment rights, and for preserving our State's natural beauty.

Dick rose to become the whip of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. That made him the second Republican whip in Congress from Wyoming. Senator Al Simpson was chosen to be the Senate Republican whip just a few years earlier.

When George Herbert Walker Bush became President, he chose Congressman Dick Cheney to serve as his Secretary of Defense. The Senate confirmed him unanimously, 92 to 0. We don't see anything like that happening around this place today.

In 4 transformative years, he oversaw a victory in Desert Storm, he guided America through a peaceful end to the Cold War, and he helped shape America's role as the world's only superpower.

A decade later, he became Vice President of the United States. He liked to

joke that he personally delivered Wyoming's three electoral votes. In an election decided by one vote in the electoral college, those three votes from Wyoming mattered.

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Dick's calm, steady leadership reassured Americans in one of our darkest hours.

Dick's values were the values of Wyoming, enshrined in the cowboy code: Live each day with courage, take pride in your work, and do what needs to be done. That was Dick Cheney, and that is how he lived.

Some of our Founders questioned whether America ever needed a Vice President. Benjamin Franklin joked that the title for the Vice President would be "Your Superfluous Excellency." Had Franklin met Dick Cheney, he would have changed his mind. Vice President Cheney was anything but superfluous. He shaped history. He steadied nations. He stood for a stronger, safer America and a freer world.

As Vice President, Dick held the title of President of the Senate. In that capacity, he presided, as the Presiding Officer is presiding today, over our Chamber. His eight tie-breaking votes on the floor of the Senate were cast at decisive moments in our history. In 2001, he cast the tie-breaking vote on the budget resolution that paved the way for generational tax relief for American families.

Dick never treated this office as ceremonial. He was hands-on and deeply engaged in governing.

A bust of Vice President Cheney now rests in the Senate wing of the Capitol. It marks not only the office he held; it memorializes the values that he lived. A son of Wyoming, a defender of freedom, and an American original, we remember Dick Cheney as he lived: steady in purpose, firm in conviction, loyal to his country, and unafraid to do what he believed was right.

My prayers are with Lynne, with Liz and Mary, and with their grandchildren, as they celebrate the life of an incredible man.

May he rest in peace.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, election night, this past Tuesday, should have been a wake-up call for many of my colleagues in the Senate. Americans lined up at the ballot box to demand the Trump administration start addressing America's affordability crisis. These voters want to go to the grocery store or a doctor's office without breaking the bank.

But the President I am not sure is even listening. Despite President Trump's promise to bring prices down on day one of his administration, Americans have been paying more for their groceries, electricity, and rent throughout this first year of his second term. And in 2026, they will be paying far more when it comes to healthcare.

You see, President Trump said on the campaign trail that he had “concepts of a plan”—“concepts of a plan”—to make healthcare affordable. His real plan—and the Republicans’ plan that they have been following for the past year—unfortunately, is going to mean Americans pay dramatically more for their healthcare.

In July, congressional Republicans passed—you remember the name—the Big Beautiful Bill, President Trump’s budget bill. It cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, and it is going to result in more than 10 million people losing their health insurance.

Those cuts were not enough. As they unilaterally wrote and passed the so-called Big Beautiful Bill, congressional Republicans also refused to extend the Affordable Care Act’s enhanced premium tax credits. What is an enhanced tax credit? It means that you receive help from the government to pay your premiums for health insurance. These tax credits help more than 21 million people in America afford healthcare, and President Trump and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are choosing to let these credits expire at the end of this year.

Last week, people in my State of Illinois started receiving letters informing them of what is in store if we don’t do something about this Republican action. They are going to find out through the mail what is going to happen to next year’s health insurance premiums. They won’t like it. And for those in my State who access healthcare through the ACA, these letters inform them their premiums will increase by an average of 80 percent, or an additional \$2,500 per year—2,500 bucks, folks. How is that on the family budget? I know what it is; it is a killer for a lot of people.

For many others, those premium increases will be even higher, doubling and tripling what people are actually paying today. Folks don’t realize this. They will soon, when they receive these letters. That is what they are in for.

What does it mean for many families in my State? Devastation.

I want to read some of the messages I have been receiving from constituents across Illinois, now that they see what happens to their hospitalization premiums because of this Republican action.

Todd is in Petersburg, IL, which is a small town in the middle of the State. He wrote to my office, and he said:

In 2025, I had a good plan, which was around \$560 a month [for health insurance]. Sadly, my option now [has] a monthly premium of almost \$1,400.

That is almost triple what he is paying now.

Scot, from Glen Ellyn, a suburb of Chicago, wrote:

My daughter just received her 2026 premium notice. Without any . . . help, her [costs] will increase from \$232 [a month] to \$788.

That is triple what she is currently paying.

Phyllis, from DuPage County, wrote: I lost my job and have been on ACA [Marketplace] plans. Last year my plan with dental and vision cost me \$162 [a month]. This year, without a subsidy, [prices are] going up to \$1,136.

From \$162 to \$1,136 a month.

[With] a higher deductible, more co-pays, and no vision, nor dental [coverage].

She concluded:

This amount [they are asking for my health insurance] is more than my [monthly] mortgage. It’s not affordable living in this country anymore.

If Republicans don’t come to the negotiating table, Scot’s daughter will see a \$6,600 premium increase, Todd will face a premium increase of \$10,000-plus, and Phyllis will pay \$12,000 more for her healthcare. What family can handle that?

These are real stories from real families, real results of action that has been taken in the Senate. People are going to pay thousands of dollars more for their health insurance, and some will drop it. The director of insurance in Illinois estimates that 30 to 40 percent of the half a million people who are under the Affordable Care Act in Illinois will drop their coverage.

Will they get sick in the future? Sure, they will. Will they show up at the hospital even if they have no insurance? Of course, they will. Will the hospital treat them? Yes. Who will pay for that treatment? All the rest of us, because of this Republican action eliminating this tax credit.

So what has President Trump been doing as my constituents receive these awful notices? In the last month, he launched a \$40 billion bailout for Argentina—\$40 billion. We didn’t vote for \$40 billion; he just announced it.

He started construction on a grand new ballroom for his billionaire buddies at the White House, insisting it won’t cost the taxpayers any money at all. And he bought two new private jets for Kristi Noem, the Secretary at DHS. And last week, he threw himself a lavish “Great Gatsby”-themed Halloween party at Mar-a-Lago.

The voters are fed up, and they showed it last Tuesday. As the President lives like a King, Americans are rejecting Republicans who show more interest in fawning over the President than lowering the cost of living.

There will be more election Tuesdays like this one if President Trump and congressional Republicans continue to refuse to sit down with Democrats and find a way out of this shutdown. We should be meeting today to open this government. We need to address this health insurance problem. It affects every district. In fact, it affects red States, those who President Trump carried, more than blue States. It is a national problem created by the Republicans, and it needs to be fixed by them. They have got to join us in this effort.

There is no reason we can’t find a deal to stop millions of Americans from paying double or triple in health

insurance premiums because the American people deserve so much more than mere concepts of a plan when it comes to healthcare.

I yield the floor.

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, today is day 37 of the longest ever government shutdown, and American families and American workers are paying the price for Democrats to put on a show; from poetry being read at night, to protests, to press conferences, it is a high price to pay.

And that means our troops, Federal law enforcement officers, air traffic controllers, other essential personnel, families in need that go paycheck to paycheck aren’t getting a paycheck.

For 6 weeks, Americans, many of whom our lives depend on, have wondered how they are going to pay their bills or keep food on the table for their families. It is ridiculous that because of this ongoing lapse of funding, heroes who protect and defend us are suffering.

In fact, I found it incredible and embarrassing that the U.S. Army has published guidance on their website directing soldiers in Germany to emergency service benefits, loans, food banks, and food-sharing organizations where volunteers provide leftover food through public fridges.

These are our soldiers, working day in day out, far away from home, away from their loved ones—indeed, the oldest boy in our family serves in the Army. He says he is not worried about himself, but he is worried about his friends that have kids and wonder if they are going to get paid.

We have Federal law enforcement officers working tirelessly to get deadly drugs out of our communities and take down dangerous gangs like Tren de Aragua, doing it for free without being paid, because my colleagues are using the American people as political leverage.

My Democratic colleagues have voted 14 times to keep our government closed, all while collecting their paychecks.

Let me say that again. Our troops, our law enforcement officers, so many essential government employees are still working because the—without pay—because the Democrats will not vote to open this government, and my Democratic colleagues are still getting their paychecks.

It is far past time to end this.

Maybe if my Democratic colleagues weren’t getting paid or maybe if we posted on the Senate website that they could go to food banks and food-sharing organizations and public institutions to get food, they might think twice about voting no on reopening this government; voting no 14 times just to continue the funding that we spent last year.

I have committed to donating my own paycheck during this shutdown to

a crisis center back in Florida, and I am glad to know there are others that have committed to donating their pay during this time to help others.

The American people did not send us here to let the government shut down and stop working, and our colleagues that are forcing this upon the American people and on our workers do so against the will of the people, against those that put them in office, against the wishes of even workers groups that have historically supported Democratic candidates.

We were sent here to do important work and govern in good faith on behalf of the people. Americans should be furious at the display of recklessness with their country. I understand the President's frustration. I understand our leaders' frustration.

I am livid. I have been here 10 months. It is no wonder people across America hate DC.

We have much work to do to make this country stronger and safer. So I urge my colleagues to end this shutdown. Stay here until we get it done. Stay here until we pass the clean continuing resolution so we can continue the people's work.

And while we are at it, let's pass legislation to make sure this cannot happen again. We could start with the No Budget, No Pay Act, meaning none of us here in Congress get paid unless we pass a budget and fund the government. That is common sense. Senators and Representatives shouldn't be paid until Congress does its base level job.

We should also pass legislation to make sure that those in Congress don't leave DC until we deliver, and we keep government functioning. That is why I am cosponsoring the Eliminate Shutdowns Act and other legislation that would make sure this does not happen again and ensures that our government remains open and those heroes that put their lives on the line for us get paid.

We owe it to the American people to ensure the government remains open, and we should not have another shutdown. Period. Thirty-seven days of chaos, uncertainty, and dysfunction is a disservice to the Americans we are here to represent, and this must end.

Government must work for the people. If showboating politicians begin sabotaging the very operation of our government, corrupting rules, warping those rules' intended use to satisfy a subversive agenda, all options need to be on the table. Those options can take many forms, but this cannot continue.

Maybe I should put this in terms that even my Democratic colleagues can understand: Maybe the Senate needs to reimagine the filibuster. Let's make Congress work again, and until we can do that, maybe we need to lock Congress in the Capitol until that happens—no bail, no revolving Capitol door.

Let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today in defense of one of the most sacred pillars of our democracy: the freedom of speech.

Last Saturday, President Donald Trump declared on social media that comedian Seth Meyers' jokes about him were "100% ANTI TRUMP, WHICH IS PROBABLY ILLEGAL!!!"

That is right—"illegal." The President thinks it is probably illegal to make jokes about him on television, that what Seth Meyers was doing is illegal. No more jokes about the President.

Let me be clear. In America, criticizing the President is not a crime. It is a constitutional right. It is a democratic duty. It is essential for a free society.

The Founders enshrined this principle in the very first words of the Bill of Rights. The First Amendment guarantees that Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or the press. That protection is not conditional. It is not conditional upon whether or not Donald Trump likes that constitutional protection or not. It is not limited to Americans who praise those in power. It also extends to those who are critical of those who are in power, including the President and including all of the Members of the U.S. Senate—because we have to accept that as part of our job, that people can criticize us. This right belongs equally to everyone, from your family arguing about politics at Thanksgiving dinner to protesters and late night comics making fun of the President.

Donald Trump seems to have somehow missed this part of the Constitution. He thinks that the First Amendment has a hidden clause that prohibits criticism of him. This Trump exception flips the First Amendment on its head. Rather than protecting the public's right to speak, it protects Trump's right to be free from criticism. That is how Kings think. That is not how elected officials in the United States are allowed to think—that they are infallible, that no one can ever criticize them.

So that might sound crazy. Could Donald Trump really think criticizing the President is illegal? Just look at his record. Law firms, universities, protesters, and journalists all have faced this administration's wrath for their speech.

The message is clear: If you dare to dissent, you have a target on your back.

Consider President Trump's repeated attacks on broadcasters. Over and over again, he has urged the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to revoke broadcasters' licenses for their speech. His allies, including Chairman Brendan Carr, have echoed those threats, even warning ABC and Disney that the FCC could "do this the easy way or the hard way" over the political commentary of late night host Jimmy Kimmel.

Those are not jokes; these are threats. And when government officials use the power of their office to intimidate or silence speech they dislike, they assault the very fabric of our democracy.

The resolution I bring forward today is simple. It is straightforward. It condemns any suggestion by President Trump or his administration that criticism of him is illegal. It reaffirms that the First Amendment protects the right to speak truth to power—including and especially to the most powerful person in our country—and it urges all Trump administration officials to refrain from using the machinery of government to punish or suppress dissent.

This is not about partisanship; it is about principle. Presidents come, Presidents go, but the First Amendment must endure.

If we allow any President to wield government authority as a cudgel against speech, then no citizen's voice is safe in our Nation—not yours, not mine, not the press, not the public's. No one is safe.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in sending a clear and bipartisan message: In the United States of America, it is not illegal to criticize the President of the United States. It is our constitutional right to be able to criticize the President.

We have to give our support to our government, to our Nation, 100 percent of the time, but we only have to support elected officials, led by the President, when they are right. That is what our country is all about. That is why we have a First Amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 486, submitted earlier today; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this is an interesting conversation, but Democrats have had 37 days to stop the most important issue that this Senate should be focused on right now, and that is the shutdown, but they would rather spend their time playing politics and attacking the President instead of doing what is best for the American public.

Democrats have caused the longest government shutdown in our Nation's history for one reason: They hate our President. They hate him. They don't care that their actions are stopping our troops, Capitol Police, Federal law enforcement, and air traffic controllers from getting their paychecks. They don't care that they are causing chaos and delays at our airports or that 42 million people—42 million people—rely on SNAP benefits and can't put food on the table.

Now, I think about growing up. I was blessed. I had a wonderful mom. But we lived in public housing. I didn't know my dad. She really struggled to put food on the table.

In my State of Florida and all across the country, we have people worried about putting food on the table right now. Little kids are worried about getting dinner tonight, and it is because the Democrats have decided to shut down our government.

So I represent the people of Florida and Americans across this country who are sick and tired of these political games. What we ought to be doing is feeding our families, paying the people who are working their tails off, and opening our government. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, it is telling that the Republicans have objected with an unrelated bill. This is a classic Republican move. They are scared of supporting anything critical of Donald Trump, but they don't want to defend his actions at the same time, so they object and pivot to an unrelated issue. But don't be fooled. The Senate Republicans just blocked a resolution stating that it is not illegal to criticize President Trump. I am genuinely shocked that we can't agree that the First Amendment protects our right to criticize the President.

This is unfortunately an era where Donald Trump wants to be King, and too many in the Republican Party are allowing him to believe that is possible in a democracy with a Constitution and a First Amendment that guarantees the right of free speech and the right of freedom of the press.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. And I am shocked that my colleague doesn't want to worry about the 42 million people that are not getting SNAP benefits, the Capitol Police that are protecting us that aren't getting paid. These people have mortgages; they ought to get paid.

So, Mr. President, I rise today with my bipartisan and commonsense No Budget, No Pay Act. It is a simple proposal that says that if Members of Congress can't complete one of our basic jobs of funding the government, we shouldn't get paid. This shouldn't even be necessary. We should just do our jobs. But as we sit here, over a month into the Democrat shutdown, it is clear we need something to hold Congress accountable.

Every year, we are tasked with putting together a budget with the expectation that it is on time and it fits the needs of the American people.

The American people elected us to come together, look at what we are collecting in revenues, and put together and pass 12 appropriations bills and use those dollars effectively.

I was Governor of Florida. Every year, we passed a budget, we balanced a budget, and we did it on time. The last time Congress passed all 12 appropriations bills on time was—what is your guess? Three decades ago. Congress has failed, time and time again, to do its most basic job.

I came to fix this. I ran on a plan to make Washington work better for families, which included my No Budget, No Pay Act, and I have been fighting to get this passed since I got here in 2019 and have been met with resistance from many of my colleagues since I got up here.

But, unfortunately, Democrats have thrived in the dysfunction and have fought endlessly to keep the status quo. They pass massive spending bill after massive spending bill, which has caused massive inflation in this country. They raised taxes and expanded the government. We now have—how much debt do you think we have now? Thirty-eight trillion dollars. We are running a \$2 trillion-a-year deficit.

Now they are using the same dysfunction to shut down our government. They are prioritizing a liberal wish list over the needs of the American people. And they are more than happy, it seems, to deprive Federal workers, TSA, FAA, and law enforcement of their paychecks, while Members of Congress still get their own paychecks.

Democrats are happy to stop 40 million people from getting their SNAP benefits. I just can't imagine little kids worrying about where their meal is going to come from tonight.

These Democrats voting to shut down the government are still getting paid. We should not get paid if we don't do our job.

This is the problem with Washington. Any working American will tell you: If you don't do your job, you don't get paid except here.

Members of Congress consistently fail one of our basic duties of funding the government on time and still get a paycheck even when others don't.

Senate Democrats have now voted against funding the government 14 times in the last 5 weeks. They have voted, time and time again, to continue the longest shutdown in our Nation's history and stop people from getting paid. But they are still getting paid. Democrats shouldn't be shutting down the government, risking others' paychecks without being in the same boat.

I ask every one of my colleagues to support passage of my No Budget, No Pay Act to tell every Member: Do your job. Fund the government or do what other people end up doing—forgo your taxpayer-funded salary.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 88 and Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to recon-

sider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Reserving the right to object, I agree with my colleague, for sure, that during a government shutdown, lawmakers should not be paid. That is why I am having my pay deferred during this period.

But the real answer to this shutdown isn't to withhold pay from lawmakers. It is for Republicans to stop holding the healthcare of Americans hostage for millions of Americans, including 337,000 people in my home State. It is for the House Republicans to return here to Washington. They are in a political witness protection program right now, back in their home States. They should come here and negotiate on these issues.

We are seeing the consequences of this Republican shutdown every day—reduced SNAP benefits, canceled flights, rising healthcare costs.

Enough already. Let's sit down. We can open the government and protect the healthcare of all Americans with one vote on the floor. My Republican colleagues are kind of twisting themselves into knots trying to use the shutdown to block my free speech resolution. That is ridiculous. We should have the vote on free speech.

Because of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I want to commend my colleague for deferring his paycheck. I think it is the right thing to do. If he is willing to defer his paycheck, why wouldn't he allow my bill to pass so all of us should defer our paychecks until the government gets open again?

The right thing to do is open the government and figure out how do we improve our healthcare system. Our healthcare system is out of control. The costs are out of control. ObamaCare has completely failed us.

Remember when ObamaCare was passed? President Obama said: You won't lose your doctor—the biggest lie of the year. Gosh, you are not going to lose your plan. You completely lost your plan. You are going to save \$2,500 a family. No, your costs have skyrocketed. Copayments are up, deductibles are up, and premiums have skyrocketed.

What we have to do is we need to sit down in a bipartisan manner and say: How do we actually fix the cost of healthcare? You don't do it by shutting down the government and making sure our military doesn't get paid, TSA doesn't get paid, FAA doesn't get paid, Capitol Police don't get paid, all our Federal workers don't get paid, and we prevent 42 million people from getting food stamp benefits.

If we want to fix healthcare, which we should do in a bipartisan manner, we should sit down once we open the Federal Government.

So I am disappointed that my colleague—I commend him for deferring his paycheck. That is the right thing to do. But we should do that for every Member of Congress until we open our government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). The Senator from Texas.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, next July, we will celebrate the 250th anniversary of the founding of this great country.

As we approach this monumental commemoration, it is worth reflecting from time to time on the enduring principles that have made our Nation unique in the world. Perhaps the most foundational of these ideas are enshrined in the Declaration of Independence itself, that all of us are created equal and we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights.

The notion that we are all of equal dignity and must be treated equally under the law was somewhat of a revolutionary idea, but it does provide the basic foundation for our constitutional Republic. All other rights and freedoms that we hold dear flow from that idea.

Americans defend the right to free speech because we believe in the equal dignity of every human being and their right to speak as they wish.

So our Constitution prohibits government from infringing upon we the people's ability to speak our mind, and as a country, we welcome open dialogue and debate about even the most controversial issues.

It almost goes without saying, but sometimes I think we need to remind people that free speech is essential to our democratic Republic, to the whole idea of self-government. If people cannot have open conversations and even arguments, then it becomes impossible for us to be informed about the most important issues and to be able to make decisions as we the voters—we the people—decide at our elections or in petitioning our government, another right guaranteed by the Constitution.

But as I indicated earlier, not every country or culture shares these commitments. In fact, many are riddled with ideologies that run directly counter to these ideals that have sustained our democratic Republic for nearly 250 years. In the 20th century, totalitarian ideologies like communism and Nazism began to emerge. These radical schools of thought run counter to American ideals of liberty and equality, placing the state—not the person but the state—at the center of society, while sidelining the individual, the family, and, most especially, religion. Totalitarian belief systems defy American principles of freedom of speech and association, the protection of private property, and the rule of law.

Unfortunately, we have seen a resurgence of another vile ideology in recent times: anti-Semitism, the world's oldest form of hate. A recent report from the FBI showed a nearly 6-percent in-

crease of religiously motivated incidents against Jewish Americans between 2023 and 2024. In 2024, the same report found that 70 percent of religiously motivated hate crimes targeted Jews, who make up only 2 percent of our population. Let me repeat that. This report found that 70 percent of religiously motivated hate crimes were directed at Jews—70 percent—even though Jews only make up 2 percent of our population. And 41 percent of young American Jews between the age of 18 and 29 said they had experienced anti-Semitism at least once in the last year.

As we can all recall with horror, 2 years ago, on October 7, Hamas terrorists conducted the deadliest terrorist attack against Israel in history, the worst cause of death since the Holocaust for Jews, resulting in the murder of 1,200 people, the brutal raping of women and young girls, and hundreds of hostages taken at the same time.

Unimaginably, in the wake of this horrible tragedy and the ensuing war in Gaza, many elite educational institutions in the United States shockingly responded with a flurry of anti-Semitism. We saw faculty at some of the most prestigious universities in America openly celebrating this devastating attack while some students blatantly threatened to slit the throats of Jewish students on campus.

The president of Harvard, we may recall, was forced to resign as a result of her lack of moral clarity on this issue. There should be no confusion between good and evil, and this was clearly motivated by evil and hate. When pressed in committee hearings on anti-Semitism on whether Harvard policies prohibited students from calling for the genocide of Jews, she said, “It can be, depending on the context”—shameful.

Republicans in the House and the Senate rallied to the defense of American Jews facing this rising tide of hatred from the radical fringes of the left, while, unfortunately, too many of our colleagues across the aisle left them out to dry. For example, in 2024, in May, we introduced a resolution led by Senator TIM SCOTT of South Carolina condemning anti-Semitism on American college campuses. Yet this was blocked by Senators on the other side of the aisle for some reason. Some Democratic House Members even visited these protests to show solidarity with the very people spreading hateful rhetoric, such as “Zionists don’t deserve to live.”

Vice President Kamala Harris even chose not to preside over the joint address to Congress of the Prime Minister of Israel, instead preferring to keep a previously scheduled commitment to address a sorority gathering in Indianapolis, in an obvious snub of the Prime Minister and Israel.

There are increasing signs that the Democratic Party has lacked conviction to stand up to the most vile elements of their base. Some have even openly embraced anti-Semitism. The

newly elected mayor of New York City refused to condemn terrorism in an interview on national television, saying he doesn't “really have opinions about the future of Hamas in Israel.”

I find it too curious that, just 2 years ago, he said, “When the boot of the NYPD is on your neck, it has been laced by the IDF,” the Israel Defense Forces. This is the newly elected mayor of New York City. And when asked how he would have handled the protests on Columbia's campus, he said: “I would have not sent the police to Columbia.”

Despite his refusal to use police to quell these campus riots, Mamdani has expressed on multiple occasions a willingness to direct the police to arrest Prime Minister Netanyahu if he were to ever visit New York City.

The left has openly embraced this radical candidate, and now he has been elected as mayor of America's largest city.

But while the Democratic Party has, unfortunately, embraced anti-Semitism in too many instances, Republicans under President Trump have continued to make clear what we stand for and have not shied away from making clear what we stand against. President Trump's leadership in the fight against anti-Semitism has been undeniable. In his first term, he signed a landmark Executive order giving new authorities to the Department of Education to investigate anti-Semitism complaints on college campuses and university campuses. When he was returned to office in 2025, one of his first actions was to sign another Executive order to address anti-Semitism that reaffirmed and built on the successes of his 2019 order.

In February, President Trump's Department of Justice formed a new task force to combat anti-Semitism, particularly at our Nation's schools. So President Trump has made clear that anti-Semitism has simply no place in America—on the right or on the left. Unfortunately, his predecessor wasn't so clear. But President Trump, unlike his predecessor, has had no hesitation directly confronting the anti-Semitism working still in our higher education system.

President Biden has been gone from the Oval Office for months now, but, unfortunately, there are still forces capitulating to the radicals who embrace this vile ideology. I am thankful that, by and large, Republicans have not done the same. Even when storied institutions like the Heritage Foundation have sent mixed messages about their commitment to individual liberty and freedom of speech and opposition to this vile form of hatred directed at Jews, prominent voices in the Republican Party have courageously condemned those who ascribe to anti-Semitism, including some who claim to be conservatives.

Standing up for the truth and condemning evil does not amount to canceling people. Freedom of speech and

freedom of association both allow institutions and individuals to condemn evil when they see it. I believe that all Americans should continue to stand with Jewish Americans against the rising tide of anti-Semitism.

As we approach the 250th anniversary of this great country of ours, I hope all of us will recommit ourselves to upholding the dignity of every individual in this country and around the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from North Carolina.

LUMBEE FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, we had a great hearing in the Indian Affairs Committee yesterday, and I wanted to come to the floor and talk a little bit about it. Before I do, I want to thank Chairman MURKOWSKI, Vice Chair SCHATZ, and especially Senator MARKWAYNE MULLIN, who came to the hearing to hear the 130-year-old saga of what I consider is injustice, racism, and all kinds of bad things that the Lumbee people have experienced.

Back in January, I introduced the Lumbee Fairness Act, which is to right what I consider to be more than a century of wrong. The issue has come before the Senate many times, but every time, it has failed. It is like the Lumbee have been promised so many times by so many politicians and so many election cycles, and yet, at the end of the day, they are left without a resolution to a problem that started over 130 years ago when they were first recognized by the State of North Carolina.

You know, these days, it is rare to see Republicans and Democrats come together in doing anything, but when it comes to Lumbee recognition, the support has become overwhelming, and it is bipartisan. We are talking about support from current President Trump, former President Joe Biden, Vice President JD VANCE, Vice President Harris—former Vice President—Gov. Josh Stein, the North Carolina General Assembly, and nearly every Member of our congressional delegation.

Here in the Senate, nearly two dozen Members from both parties have co-sponsored the Lumbee Fairness Act, including Senator SCHATZ, the vice chair of the committee, and Senator MULLIN, who sit together on the committee.

What is interesting about Senator MULLIN is that MARKWAYNE MULLIN is an enrolled member of the Cherokee Nation. The major opponent to the Lumbee Fairness Act being passed are the Cherokee.

Let that sink in. A policymaker in this room, a Member of the U.S. Senate, is an enrolled member of a Tribe that is opposing Lumbee recognition.

Why are they doing it? Well, over the past, they would say that the Lumbee were fake Indians or that they weren't real; that their story was, you know, fabricated. They have gone to conventions, and they have done all kinds of things to try to mislead people about this issue. But the fact of the matter is, I am not going to let them off the hook this time.

But before I want to talk about the Lumbee, I do want to talk to the Cherokee people.

I moved to North Carolina in 1998. I got involved in politics in 2006. I ran for the legislature, and I became the speaker of the house in 2011—the second Republican speaker since the Civil War.

For years, politicians have been promising the Eastern Band of Cherokee that they would renegotiate their compact and treat them more respectfully, and for years, those promises were not fulfilled.

I became speaker, and the only bill in the 4 years, the two terms that I was speaker of the house that I ever allowed to go to the house floor without a majority of the support of my Republican colleagues was to right the injustice that was done to the Eastern Band of Cherokee by allowing them to modernize and negotiate a new compact, which was transformational for the enrolled members of the Eastern Band of Cherokee.

So to the Eastern Band of Cherokee—not the leaders who are opposing this now, people that I consider to be a part of the casino cartels that are objecting to this because of money—to the Cherokee people, know that I care as much about you today as I did when I took the step to oppose a majority of my Republican colleagues to right that wrong—and we did.

Now I have another Tribe in my State, and I want to right that wrong, and the Cherokee are standing in the way. But it is not just the Cherokee; it is the Choctaw; it is the Chickasaw; it is other Tribes. But, folks, I am not letting off of this.

The Lumbee's history is long and well documented. They were recognized by the State of North Carolina in 1885 and began seeking Federal recognition just 3 years later. That was 137 years ago.

During the 20th century, the Lumbee were among the dozens of victims of the termination era—a very dark period in our Nation's history where, on this floor, racist policies, Jim Crow policies, were acted out every single day, and the Lumbee became a victim.

In 1956, Congress passed the Lumbee Act that acknowledged the Tribe but cruelly denied them the benefits and recognition that every other Tribe receives, putting them in a no-man's land. The Federal Government has since worked to correct the grave injustices of the termination era for nearly every other Tribe except for the Lumbee.

Time and again, the Lumbee have proven their case. Their records are

filled with testimony, studies, and reports that all lead to one conclusion: The Lumbee are a Tribe fully deserving of Federal recognition.

The House has acknowledged that repeatedly, passing the Lumbee recognition bill with broad bipartisan support in every Congress since the 116th. This year, it was unanimously voted and included in the National Defense Authorization Act that we are about to begin conferencing on.

In 2022, I promised to identify and expose the small but persistent opposition to this bill, and I am not going to go into the details here—I did in a speech I did yesterday—but let me just tell you what I found. It is pretty simple. It is a small handful of well-funded Tribes hiring high-priced DC lobbyists to spin half-truths and stir fear, motivated by profit, not principle. At the center of that opposition is the Eastern Band of Cherokee leadership.

Again, let me make the distinction between the elected leaders of the Eastern Band of Cherokee and a Tribe that I am fully dedicated to, and I have demonstrated that through the actions I made when I was the speaker of the house in North Carolina.

But at the center of the opposition is also a lobbyist whose name—I will have you refer to my testimony yesterday. But it is just rooted in financial self-interest, folks. That is their right, but let's not pretend it is anything more. We got them. We have found them passing out leaflets at Native American conventions talking about fake Indians, undermining the case for the Lumbee. It is disgraceful. But we are tracking them, and everywhere we go, almost invariably, I can find somebody that can give me information where they are trying to spread lies and confusion.

The Eastern Band—in reality, it is not just about the Lumbee. The Eastern Band of Cherokee have opposed nearly every recognition effort in their geographic vicinity that might affect their financial interests. They tried to do it with the Catawba, and we succeeded there.

Now they are running the same playbook on the Lumbee. They are spending millions of dollars on lobbyists and pay-for-play reports. They will pay whoever they have to to conjure some sort of report that builds their case. It is like: I have this thesis. Now give me a report to support it because it is going to keep the Lumbee in this limbo they have been in for 137 years.

It is disappointing to see the kind of money wasted on tearing down other Tribes instead of lifting up their people.

To the leadership of the Eastern Band of Cherokee, spend those millions of dollars on education, on improving the situation in the boundary, helping your people like I have.

So yesterday in the hearing, the principal chief of the Eastern Band of Cherokee said: Let it just happen in the Department of the Interior. Let it run its course.

Well, that is political speak for “Let the administration do it, take 10 or 20 years, and then we will have a lawsuit that will take another generation to settle.” We know their playbook. I have studied this. I know what they are doing, and we are going to match them at every step along the way.

Since 1978, they have said: Don’t recognize them by an act of Congress; let it go through the process.

But here is the reality: Congressional recognition has become the norm since 1978. Twice as many Tribes have been recognized by Congress as through the administrative process. Congress has recognized Tribes by legislation many times, including the Little Shell Tribe of the Chippewa Indians in the 2020 NDAA and six Virginia Tribes in the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act. I supported both of those bills because it was the right thing to do.

Mr. President, in closing, I hope that the Eastern Band of Cherokee leadership knows that I care about the people of the Eastern Band of Cherokee as much as I care about the Lumbee. I went to great lengths to have the Eastern Band experience the benefits that came from the work I did as speaker of the house. I will go to great lengths in my remaining time in the Senate to help them in the future as soon as they do the right thing and allow the Lumbee people, after 137 years, to get the Federal recognition they deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of my good friend and the duly elected Member of Congress for Arizona’s Seventh Congressional District, Adelita Grijalva. It has now been 44 days since the people of Southern Arizona voted overwhelmingly to send Adelita to Congress. Yet still, her seat is vacant.

Since the passing of her father in March, the people of Southern Arizona have had no one to speak for them in Washington—not for 44 days. The people of Southern Arizona have been denied representation. For 44 days, the 800,000 residents of Arizona’s Seventh District have been denied representation and forced to go without Federal casework services all because Speaker JOHNSON refuses to do his job and uphold his constitutional duty to swear her in.

It is now the longest period in history that a duly elected representative has gone without being sworn in. And why? Why does Speaker JOHNSON refuse to swear her in? Because he is doing everything he can to prevent accountability for those connected to the Epstein investigation.

He knows that as soon as Adelita is sworn in, she will be the final signature needed on a petition to release the Epstein files. So instead of letting that happen, Speaker JOHNSON has kept the House on an extended vacation, falsely claiming that he can’t swear in Representative Grijalva while the House is out of session.

That is a lie. Just this year, he swore in two Representatives from Florida while the House was out of session. But when it comes to swearing in someone who will vote to expose elite predators, he refuses to act.

He also knows that if Adelita is sworn in, she will be another vote to stop healthcare premiums from skyrocketing for 24 million Americans. He knows that if he brings back the House into session, if his Members are forced to choose between doing nothing or acting to stop yet another cost increase for constituents, they might just do the right thing and act to protect the rise in healthcare premiums.

To put it simply, Speaker JOHNSON is refusing to swear in Adelita Grijalva because he wants to stall oversight and avoid a vote on the Epstein discharge petition, while also allowing healthcare costs to rise for millions of Americans.

It is disgusting. The people of Arizona’s Seventh Congressional District deserve representation and a voice in Congress. They deserve to have their voices honored, and Adelita Grijalva deserves to be able to get to work for her constituents. And I hope that my fellow Senators agree with me on that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I am going to yield to the other Senator from Arizona here briefly and come back to me in a second.

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

Mr. GALLEGOS. Mr. President, in closing, the constituents of Adelita Grijalva have voted. They have voted, and they have spoken in the most democratic way that we have established under our Constitution. An election occurred. It has been certified by the secretary of state. It was an overwhelming victory to the point that there is no real reason—no logical reason—why the 800,000 constituents of the Seventh Congressional District of Arizona are lacking that representation, and that is why I speak today in support of this bill.

And with that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of my resolution at the desk, which calls for the prompt swearing in of Representative-elect Grijalva; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, every American is supposed to have two Senators and a Representative fighting for

them here in Washington. All of us should care about that, whether it is our constituent or someone else’s.

Now it has been 44 days since Southern Arizonans elected Adelita Grijalva in a landslide to represent them in Washington. Yet 800,000 Arizonans, including me and my wife Gabby and my daughter, still do not have a voice in the U.S. House of Representatives because of political games being played by Speaker JOHNSON.

My office has seen an increase in calls and casework from the district because they don’t have a congressional office that they can turn to.

This is unprecedented.

I have heard Speaker JOHNSON’s excuses. None of them make any sense. He has said that he swore in two Republican representatives from Florida because it was a special circumstance, their family was here. Well, Adelita Grijalva can get her family here on a moment’s notice. He also said on another occasion that she deserves the pomp and circumstance of the way they normally swear people in. Well, I have spoken to her about that. She does not care about pomp and circumstance.

The people of Arizona did their part. They voted, and their representative, Adelita Grijalva, has been certified; the election has been certified; and they should not have to wait another day to have someone representing them in the House.

So we have a message for Speaker JOHNSON: Do your job. This isn’t complicated. It is the basic stuff of being the Speaker of the House. It is the basic thing in our democracy, and it should not be impacted by politics. I would like to think that every Senator here, whether a Democrat or a Republican, would agree with that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be speaking here for a few minutes about the upcoming War Powers Resolution vote.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Wall Street Journal editorial about the War Powers Act, if I may.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 4, 2025]

THE WAR POWERS IRRESOLUTION

(By The Editorial Board)

Here we go again. Senators who oppose the American use of military force are trying again to hamstring presidential military action. No matter what you think about President Trump as Commander in Chief, putting Congress in charge of the military is an even worse idea.

That’s essentially what the war powers resolution offered by Sens. Tim Kaine, Adam Schiff and Rand Paul would do. The resolution states that “Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities within or against Venezuela, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force.”

The constitutional problem here is that Congress lacks the power to order a President to terminate military action. The authority as Commander in Chief lies with the President under Article II. Congress has the power to declare war, but the last time it did so was 1942. Presidents have used military force countless times since, including long wars in Korea, Vietnam, and the Middle East.

If Congress opposes a military action, it can use its power of the purse to cut off funding for the conflict. Democrats in Congress reduced aid for South Vietnam in 1975, and the result not long afterward was a North Vietnamese invasion that conquered the South and sent tens of thousands of “boat people” adrift in the ocean. Congress can also impeach a President, but Democrats lack the votes.

That's why the Senators are relying on the 1973 War Powers Act, which says the President must consult with Congress before committing troops to fight, and he must withdraw troops from a conflict after 60 days without authorization from Congress. The law in effect creates 535 Commanders in Chief.

The resolution passed over the veto of Richard Nixon, who thought it was unconstitutional and so have nearly all Presidents since. “We think it's illegal,” said Ronald Reagan when Democrats tried to invoke it to block his deployment of the Navy to escort oil tankers in the Persian Gulf in 1987. Barack Obama claimed to be following the War Powers Act in Libya, though he didn't wait for Congress's permission to intervene in that conflict.

Numerous Presidents have used force without Congressional approval going back to Thomas Jefferson against the Barbary pirates. John F. Kennedy didn't ask Congress before he decided to blockade Cuba, risking nuclear war. Ditto for Reagan's invasion of Grenada. In the nearest analogy to Mr. Trump and Venezuela, George H.W. Bush sent troops in 1989 to depose and arrest the president of Panama, Manuel Noriega.

Mr. Trump is assembling a Navy flotilla in the Caribbean near Venezuela. Its purpose isn't clear, though Mr. Trump said Sunday on CBS's “60 Minutes” that dictator Nicolás Maduro's days in power are numbered. The U.S. has blown up boats and a submarine it says were carrying drugs to the U.S. But it's hard to believe Mr. Trump has assembled a fleet of this size merely to attack drug boats.

Venezuela's democrats won the 2024 election, and helping them oust Mr. Maduro would be a service to the Americas and U.S. security. It would turn a regime allied with Cuba, China, Russia and Iran into an American ally. It would also allow the Venezuelan diaspora that has fled the regime's poverty and cruelty to return home and rebuild. Once a wealthy nation, Venezuela could be again.

If Senators are opposed to the U.S. deposing Mr. Maduro, they ought to say so. But the Senators don't want to do that because it might be unpopular to side with a dictator. It's so much easier, politically, to charge that Mr. Trump is acting unlawfully than address the merits of U.S. policy.

None of this means Mr. Trump shouldn't inform and cooperate with Congress on Venezuela. If he brings Congress with him at the start of hostilities, he will have more allies if events go awry, as they often do in war. Mr. Trump would also be wise to explain to the public what he is doing and why he thinks it's in America's interest to depose Mr. Maduro.

If Mr. Trump does pursue regime change in Venezuela, he will have to stay with it until the end. That means supporting a new democratic government against Maduro diehards allied with Cuban intelligence. Mr. Trump

doesn't want his version of JFK's Bay of Pigs.

The Constitution gives the Commander in Chief enormous power to use the military without Congressional micromanagement, but it also means taking responsibility for failure.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been asked a lot about this. In a prior life, I used to be a Judge Advocate in the Air Force for about 33 years—prosecutor, defense attorney, and a military judge for a very short period of time. I enjoyed it very much, so this part of the law has been part of my life.

The body is going to have a big vote today, and I think it is a consequential vote.

Simply put, here is my understanding of the Constitution and how Congress and the President and the courts interact when it comes to making war.

No President has the ability to put America in a state of war. That is reserved for the Congress. It says in the Constitution only Congress can declare war.

When you look at the history of the country, we have declared war—Congress has—five times in the last 250 years. So declaring war is an unusual thing by the Congress: the War of 1812, the Mexican-American War, Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. So I would suggest that declaring war is something America doesn't do a lot, and there is probably good reason. When you declare war, it affects insurance contracts. It is a legal state that has a lot of consequence to it. We have done that five times as a nation.

I wonder how many times a Commander in Chief has used military force to defend a nation without a declaration of war—hundreds, if not thousands, of times in the last 250 years.

The norm in this country is that military conflicts are not carried on under a declaration of war. Military conflicts, which there have been a lot of—Korea, Vietnam, on, and on, and on—are engaged in by a Commander in Chief who feels a need to use military force depending on what the threat is.

The question before the body is, Can the Congress stop a military conflict declared by the Commander in Chief because we don't agree with their decision, and without our approval it must end? The answer, unequivocally, to me is no.

Under the Constitution, the authority to be Commander in Chief resides exclusively with the President. The power to declare war is exclusive to the Congress.

Now, what could the Congress do constitutionally if they disagree with a military action that is not a declaration of war? We could cut off funding. The Constitution reserves the right of the Congress, beginning in the House, to appropriate money. So if there is a military engagement out there—you just pick the topic—and as a Member of Congress, you think America should not be in this conflict, constitu-

tionally, you could terminate funding. And that would be a constitutional check and balance on the President's ability to use military force.

The second thing you could do, as a Member of Congress, if you thought the President was doing something wrong by using the military, is you could do an Article of Impeachment, somehow create a high crime or misdemeanor; that the use of force in this circumstance is a high crime or misdemeanor and impeach the President.

Those are two things that Congress can do to check and balance a President.

But one thing we can't do, in my opinion, is to substitute our judgment for that of the Commander in Chief about a military operation because if that is the case, then you don't have a single Commander in Chief; you have 535 Commanders in Chief.

There has never been in the history of the country a termination of military activity based on the idea of Congress did not approve. There have been a lot of military operations authorized by Congress. There have been a lot of military operations not authorized by Congress. The question of the War Powers Act is what we are talking about.

In 1973—the frustration with the Vietnam war—Congress passed a statute that required the Commander in Chief to notify Congress about engaging in hostilities within a specific period of time, to make reports to Congress at the end of a defined period. I think it is 60 days. I can't remember. If Congress hasn't approved those hostilities, then they must be terminated.

I think the War Powers Act is an obvious constitutional infringement on the ability of the Commander in Chief to conduct military operations because the War Powers Act, at its heart, takes away the ability of the Commander in Chief to decide military matters, and it resides with us.

If you can terminate a Commander in Chief's decision through the War Powers Act, then that constitutional authority has been taken by us, the Congress. And that would be a disaster for this country.

I would argue that the War Powers Act is, on its face, unconstitutional. Reagan and a bunch of other Presidents have said the same thing.

The day that we terminate a military operation based on the idea that we haven't authorized it, then we become the Commander in Chief, we the Congress. That power has been taken from the designated Commander in Chief and usurped by us. That would be a disaster for our country. It would create paralysis at a time of need.

Presidents have informed us of military actions under the War Powers Act, arguing the act is unconstitutional. I would continue to do that if I were a Commander in Chief. I would inform the Congress. I would brief the Congress about what I am going to do or not do using our military—just, I think it is good public policy.

But the vote we are going to take this afternoon is basically we are going to vote, as the U.S. Senate, to terminate actions taken by President Trump regarding drug cartels. I think the day we do that, then we are saying to the world that, really, the Commander in Chief is the Congress, not the President. And if you don't like what President Trump is doing with drug boats and other activity in the Caribbean or anywhere else, you could pass a law saying no funds can be used for the purposes of these operations.

I have been told by my colleagues: Well, that is hard.

Well, it is meant to be hard. The President can veto any law we pass, and the only way we can override that veto is to get two-thirds of the body. It is meant to be hard. It requires us to find consensus.

To my colleagues, please do not be confused about this. Never in the history of our country has a Congress terminated a military action because they did not give permission to the Commander in Chief. Never in the history of the country has the Supreme Court ruled that the Congress has the power to terminate hostilities simply because they disagree with the President—because the day that becomes the norm, then you have taken the power of the Commander in Chief away from the President, and you have conferred it upon us.

This is a big vote. This is a consequential vote. What I am saying, I think, makes eminent sense. By making the Commander in Chief a single person—the President—sitting atop the military, you create a structure and order. If to get military action up and running and sustained you had to have a vote of 535 people, it would be chaos.

If you don't like what the President is doing, then, again, the remedy is to use your constitutional tools as a Member of Congress, which is funding, not replacing your judgment for that of the Commander in Chief. I have said that about Obama, Clinton, everybody. That is just my view.

In 1989, President Bush, 41, used military force to take down Manuel Noriega, the leader of Panama. And he was indicted and put in an American prison for being a drug lord, a drug kingpin. That was done without authorization of Congress. I think President Bush, 41, was right to take Noriega down. We can't tolerate nation states in our backyard becoming narcoterrorist centers.

That takes us to Venezuela. President Trump has decided that these drug boats being operated by narcoterrorists, emanating from Venezuela, are a national security threat to our Nation. I think he is right in his assessment.

All of these boats coming to our shores, heading for our shores, have drugs, and drugs are killing more Americans than any terrorist group out there.

Fentanyl comes from China through Mexico. But cocaine production was up

85 percent over the last 4 years, and cocaine has destroyed a lot of lives in our country. So these drug boats are being interdicted by the military because President Trump believes that narcoterrorism is a national security threat to our country, and he is using the military in that endeavor, not law enforcement. I think he is right.

Some people say have the Coast Guard stop the boat. Well, the Coast Guard is military, and it is civilian. I like the idea that our Commander in Chief is telling narcoterrorist organizations: You are not only a foreign terrorist organization, but when you engage in threats to our country—a boat headed to America full of drugs—we are going to take you out. That is going to stop the flow of drugs.

We secured the border, but we now need to go to the networks that produce the products and distribute the products that eventually come to our shores and kill Americans.

As to Venezuela, I would argue it is a narcoterrorist state. It is not a sovereign country in the sense of international law; that the leader of Venezuela, Maduro, is an indicted drug dealer with a \$50 million bounty from the United States; that the recent election was stolen by Maduro. He is not a legitimate President under the laws of Venezuela, and he is not recognized as being legitimate by a multitude of international bodies.

I would say that Venezuela, in the hands of Maduro, is an existential threat to the people of the United States; that it is a narcoterrorist state, run by a drug kingpin that is used as the base of operations to send deadly drugs into our country, and it needs to stop. And whatever power that President Trump would like to use to stop that, I think he has the authority under the Constitution. And if we don't like it as a Congress, we can defund the military operations; we can't replace our judgment for his.

Finally, Maduro and Hezbollah have a long connection. The Presiding Officer of the Senate is a great Senator who understands national security. He was Ambassador to Japan and has been a great addition to this body.

Hezbollah connections to Venezuela go way back. Hezbollah is a Mideast terrorist organization, Shiite, connected to Iran, that has a lot of American blood on its hands—241 marines killed at the end of a runway in Beirut in the 1980s by Hezbollah. They are running out of money because President Trump has really isolated Iran as their benefactor. So now they are upping their game by associating with Maduro.

Maduro now has a business relationship with Hezbollah at a level we haven't seen before. Funding this terrorist organization from narcoterrorist activity in Venezuela threatens America's interests in the Middle East. This is not a hypothetical connection; it is a real connection. So I am hoping that the body will understand that what

President Trump is doing is not only lawful but necessary.

We have a drug caliphate in our backyard. We have Mexico; we have Colombia; we have Venezuela; and we have Cuba. These are all nations—some of them allied with us—that have enormous drug problems, and they have lost their sovereignty in Mexico over parts of the country. But I am focused on Venezuela.

Venezuela truly is not a legitimate government under Maduro. He stole the election. He is an indicted drug dealer. It is not legitimate. It is a threat to the United States.

So I am glad to see that President Trump has put narcoterrorist drug organizations and countries that support them on notice that we will fight back to protect our people. As these drug boats flow toward us, I think President Trump sees it as a killing machine. If a boat full of al-Qaida guys were coming to the United States, what is the right answer? Blow them up before they get here. If you have a drug boat full of drugs, run by narcoterrorists associated with Mideast terrorists, blow them up before they get here. But we have to do more than blow up the boat; we have to go to the problem on the land: Who loads the boats? Who makes the money off the boats?

So I don't know where this is going in Venezuela, but I know this: President Trump has said that Maduro's days are numbered. They should be.

What I like a lot about President Trump: He is a man of peace until he is not. He is seeking peace all over the planet. He stopped eight conflicts. He will be the first one to tell you that. I like the idea of a President wanting to make peace, not war, but he is a man not to be trifled with.

I think he decided early on that narcoterrorism emanating from our backyard is not going to be tolerated any longer.

There is a new game in town. You do this at your own risk.

I just want to let him know and the country know that not only do I think he has the legal authority; I think he is doing the right thing.

You are saving a lot of lives by stopping this boat traffic from getting to our shores, and if you need to take down the organization that funds the boats and supplies the boats, that is a direct threat to the United States, associated with Mideast terrorist organizations, tell us what you are up to, but do what you have to to protect America.

So at 5 o'clock, we are going to take a very consequential vote. I would urge my colleagues: Whether you like President Trump or not, whether you agree with him about politics, this is bigger than you, and it is bigger than him.

I did the same thing for Obama. When he went into Pakistan to kill bin Laden, I didn't think for 1 minute Congress had to authorize that action. He was taking out a mastermind of terrorism. That made us safer. It was in a

sovereign country called Pakistan that was no longer reliable when it came to policing bin Laden. I supported that operation because he had the legal authority, and it was the right thing to do. I supported President Bush 41. I supported Reagan when he went into Grenada to take down building Cuban influence, where Cubans were beginning to have a footprint in Grenada that was adverse to our national security interests when Cuba was aligned with Russia and other bad actors. So we have had a policy of policing our backyard.

But on this vote—Senator KAYNE is a good friend—we just see things differently. He is saying that in America, there is really not a single Commander in Chief. He is saying that in America, you can't conduct hostile actions unless the Congress as a body approves it.

What he is saying is what the Constitution rejects. If they wanted us, as the Framers of the Constitution, to give approval to continue hostilities, they would have done so. They resided in us the power to declare war, and that is the power reserved to us, but that doesn't mean the President can't use military force when necessary to protect our Nation without a declaration of war. And the reason I know that is true: We have only declared war five times in 250 years, and we have had hundreds of military operations—some authorized and some not.

So to my colleagues today: Please understand this constitutional check and balance. It has served our country well for 250 years. We live in polarized times. Don't let your emotions drive you into doing something that would weaken our Nation. I can't think of anything more critical to weakening our Nation than to have Congress be the Commander in Chief; us; 535 people who have a hard time deciding when to go to lunch.

So I am hoping that this resolution—well-intended—will be voted down not because I like President Trump but because I believe the constitutional structure that was created a long time ago has served us well as a nation, and if we vote to change that structure, we will do great damage to our Nation and our national security.

So I would urge a “no” vote this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3102

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I rise today to request unanimous consent on my bill to extend the Affordable Care Act's premium tax credits. Those tax credits have made it possible for over 24 million Americans in my State of Vermont and in the Presiding Officer's State of Tennessee and across this entire country to have access to affordable healthcare.

Around 30,000 Vermonters receive these healthcare tax credits that then help them pay, from their own hard-earned money, for private insurance.

But in Vermont, and this is true everywhere—everywhere—annual premiums have doubled and, in some cases, way more.

I heard this directly this weekend from a farmer in the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont, which is right on the border with Canada, an incredibly hard-working, rural part of our State. It is a place, frankly, in Vermont, that is Trump country. His premium rose \$1,600 a month. And what he said to me is this: Peter, if I have to pay that premium, I am going to go without healthcare.

That story is being repeated by citizens that you care about, that the chairman from Idaho cares about, and that I certainly care about.

I heard directly from Alison Mindel in Vermont. She has a 17-year-old son. He spent 174 days in a hospital fighting myeloid leukemia. He is cancer-free. That is really good news, and it is a reflection of the extraordinary care that he got at a local community hospital, where there was a quick diagnosis, and at the University of Vermont Medical Center, where he got expert care.

But that family, who was the beneficiary of having access to affordable healthcare—their premium is going to go up by \$40,000. Mr. President, \$40,000 is what they are going to have to pay, and they don't have that money. And they know how absolutely critical it is that they have insurance because their beloved son is alive and healthy today because they did have access to healthcare.

As you know, open enrollment began on November 1, and what is going to happen is that as folks see this notice of the sky-high premiums, they are going to opt out of insurance altogether. And they are not going to opt out because they don't want to pay it; they are going to opt out because they can't pay it.

And I have in mind a woman who she and her husband have two kids. They have a small business where they make meals, and they are a take-out.

And she said: You know, as a mother, I feel totally irresponsible if I don't have healthcare for my kids. But if I can't pay it, what do I do?

And the point here—I see the chairman of the Finance Committee. It is so good to see you, Senator. You care. I care about folks who need the healthcare that they have now. I think we all share that. But they won't have it unless we do something to extend these tax credits.

You know this is not a red-State, blue-State deal. It is not a Republican or Democratic deal. We have got some examples in other States.

A farmer and his family of four in Tennessee making \$120,000 a year—by the way, that probably includes some off-farm income, with one from the couple working off the farm, as is so often the case. Those premiums will go up \$1,900 a month. That is \$33,000 a year. How does a family with an income of \$120,000 add \$33,000 in expenses?

The small business owner and baker, in Alabama, making \$85,000 a year, will see premiums increase by \$750 a month. That is about \$15,000.

A mechanic, a single person in North Carolina who makes \$65,000, who loses access to the tax credits—actually loses access to the tax credits entirely—and to afford any healthcare, they will have to pay \$14,000 a year.

You know, the majority leader is saying that we can get what we want or we can get to an outcome if we just trust him and vote to negotiate later.

I want to say something directly to you and to all of my colleagues: I trust the majority leader. I trust JOHN THUNE. But here is a fact: It is beyond his control if we don't get an enforceable agreement because we have to get buy-in from the House of Representatives. And to the everlasting disgrace of the House of Representatives, they are not here today, and they haven't been here for over 6 weeks.

Many over there have made it clear that they want nothing to do with extending the tax credits. So, yes, I trust my Republican colleagues; I trust our Senate majority leader. But if we don't have a House that is even here, how are we going to get it?

Mr. WYDEN. Would my colleague yield for a question?

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, what my colleague seems to be stressing—and it is something I share—is that there is an urgency here. In my State, we have a couple with premium hikes of 500 percent. They feel like they are getting hit by a healthcare wrecking ball.

And what I am also deeply concerned about—and we have talked about it in the Finance Committee—is that with all these cuts in public programs, we are going to have a massive shift to those who have employer-sponsored coverage. It is 154 million people. For 60 percent of working age Americans with coverage, it comes from their employers. They are going to have a massive shift onto them.

And what I believe my friend is saying and what he is stressing and seeing in Vermont is the urgency of this. If you could speak to that as we review this first of what I think may be other colleagues coming to speak.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you very much.

One of the questions is, Why don't we just open up and deal with this later? And there is an answer to that. This is not about one party trying to jam the other. It is about, as the ranking member of the Finance Committee said, a deadline. Folks have to make a decision about signing up during open enrollment that began on November 1, and they are looking at these very much higher bills, and they have to figure out whether they can afford to pay them.

For many families, they won't be able to afford it. The decision is made when they get a notice that the premium is going up \$30,000. That will

have spill-on effects. First of all, it will be incredibly insecure. It just will be painful for these families that are thinking they don't have health coverage for their family. And we all relate to that.

But then, they are going to get sick, and they are going to go to a community hospital, and they are going to get coverage. And the hospitals are going to try to figure out how to get paid. And the way they will do that is by seeking rate increases and then having the cost shift further escalate the expense to our employers who really deeply care about providing coverage to the folks that work for them.

I know in Oregon, in Idaho, in Ohio, your employers care about their employees, and they want them to have coverage. But if they can't afford it, you get back to the same old thing: You know what? I will try to deal with the premium increase.

The employer says: But we are not going to be able to give you that raise you need to pay the utility bills.

My heartbreak on this is that I know we all care about the well-being of the families that we represent, and there is an urgency to the moment because the open enrollment now, in November, is here, and families have to make decisions.

This body is literally the only institution in the United States of America that has the ability, that has the authority, that has the power to provide a remedy to the families we all care about.

So that is my plea to my Republican colleagues.

You know, President Trump—I don't want to, in this case, turn this into a political deal—but he is the President, and he has got enormous authority, and he has got enormous influence on the Republicans in the House and in the Senate. It would be so good if he would come and sit down and figure out how to address this problem.

And the simplest way to do it is to extend the tax credits. And then, all of us acknowledge that we have to address the cost of healthcare—we have to.

And I, as a person who is always focused on access, the biggest threat to continued access to care for folks in Vermont is the rise in expense. At a certain point, you just can't afford it.

So you know, I know in talking to many of my Republican colleagues, they are focused on cost—totally fair. But the answer to dealing with the cost of healthcare is not to take away insurance.

People still get sick. So we have got an urgent moment here where people are just getting this horrible feeling when they open up that mail and that family who has had healthcare in 2025—and, oftentimes, it will be a couple, and they are caring about their kids, and they are caring about each other. They want that sense of confidence and purpose that comes from being a parent who loves their kids. It comes from

being an employer who feels good that they are able to meet the healthcare insurance needs of their workers.

They care about it. But they get a bill where they are going to perceive it as a fail if they can't continue to provide that coverage in 2026 that folks had in 2025. Parents are going to feel that.

We can change that. We can change that. And as somebody who is deeply concerned about extending those credits so people can have healthcare—I pledge to you—I am so glad we have got the chair and we have got the ranking member of the Finance Committee. And I can just say, on my behalf, that anything that is reasonable to do to deal with this cost that is so detrimental to the well-being of the country, that healthcare is just too expensive, I will be there.

But I do believe that the one thing we cannot do, in good conscience, is allow these premium tax credits to expire, when what that means is that the folks we care about, who have no control themselves over what the cost of healthcare is, they are just on the receiving end; that we have got to extend those, and that can bring us time to start addressing some of the concerns that my colleagues have about the cost of healthcare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 3102 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the Welch substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, one thing needs to be made really clear. We have all this talk about how we have an urgent crisis, and it can be totally fixed if we just accept the demand of my colleagues on the other side that we extend the temporary COVID tax healthcare premium enhancement that occurred during the COVID crisis.

This is what needs to be made clear: Insurance premiums are skyrocketing, not because of a temporary small COVID premium support passed during the COVID crisis. They are skyrocketing because our healthcare system is broken and needs to be fixed. And we have been asking to negotiate about this for years, and intensely over the last few months.

Let me give it some real specifics. This demand that my colleagues on the Democrat side are making, even if it were true that all of it was an impact—that letting it expire would be an impact on premium increases, which is not accurate—even if all of it were to be impacting premium increases, it is only 4 percent of the premium support. It is only 4 percent of the premium increases that are coming.

So we have the entire U.S. Government shut down because we won't concede to a demand that we spend another \$100 to \$350 billion in premium supports because the premium expansions are coming, resulting from a broken healthcare system that we can get no engagement on in negotiating.

Congress has a timely, bipartisan obligation to reopen the government. The proposal offered by my colleague on the other side of the aisle does not address that. The Senate has now voted 14 times—14 times—to end this shutdown.

My Democrat colleagues claim to be taking a stand to make healthcare more affordable. While we may disagree on the merits of those individual policies, everyone in this Chamber shares that goal. In fact, as a part of the clean CR that we have voted on 14 times to extend critical Medicare and Medicaid programs, we would have increased payments to rural hospitals, we would have provided access to tele-health services for our seniors, and we would have offered our seniors the option to receive hospital-level services in their homes.

But, no, not unless we agreed to spend \$350 billion or \$100 billion—the current request is around \$100 billion—not unless we agree to spend billions of dollars extending what were made temporary by my Democratic colleagues when they controlled the Senate.

They were made temporary because they were intended to get us through the economic difficulties of the COVID crisis. And, again, they relate to only 4 percent of the premium increase that is coming. And yet it is said that we can solve the entire premium increase problem today by just doing this. Not true.

Because Democrats will not join Republicans in reopening the government, these programs that I mentioned, just a moment ago, have lapsed. These programs have lapsed, disrupting care for millions of Americans.

Premiums are going up dramatically for all Americans, and not just those enrolled in Obamacare.

Despite the confusion that has been created here, the original ObamaCare subsidies don't expire. Let's make that very clear. The only thing expiring is temporary COVID-related enhancements that the Democrats themselves made temporary.

The Democrats are the ones who set the expiration date that we are debating today.

Even without extending these COVID enhancements, taxpayers will spend \$1 trillion over the next 10 years subsidizing ObamaCare premiums. So let's not tell the American people that the American Government is going to stop subsidizing the failed ObamaCare premium system. Over \$1 trillion is going to be spent subsidizing it. We need to address that problem. We cannot spend our way out of rising premiums.

If my colleagues want to have a conversation about reforms that truly

lower costs instead of masking the problems with a \$100 to \$350 billion taxpayer-funded patch, then Republicans are willing to have that conversation.

Leader THUNE has made this point clear. In his own words, he said:

I am willing to sit down with the Democrats.

And I join him. I am also willing to sit down with the Democrats to discuss the growing unaffordability and unsustainability of ObamaCare. It is a system they created, but I am happy to hear them out.

I am still quoting Leader THUNE:

Heck, I am even willing to give them a vote, which we have offered and offered and offered. But there is one condition: End the Schumer shutdown.

I will not negotiate under hostage conditions, nor will I pay a ransom. Period.

That is the end of the quote from our leader, Leader THUNE.

For these reasons, I object to my colleague's request.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I want to address some of the points the chair of the Finance Committee made.

First of all, I happen to be in agreement with you that we have a broken healthcare system. No. 2, I am absolutely willing to engage with you and with anyone in this Chamber to address the rising costs, and we have made some bipartisan progress.

I support the international crises mechanism that President Trump is talking about to try to bring down prescription drug costs. We had a PBM and physician payment bill that was in legislation last year that got blown up when Elon Musk intervened.

We should be doing what you are saying, and I can just speak for myself. When it comes to talking about how we bring down the cost of healthcare, I think that is absolutely essential for the well-being of the economy and the well-being of the American people.

Also, I want to acknowledge that on COVID, it was temporary. You are right about that. Of course, that was because we had an emergency where healthcare demand went way up and employment went way down. So it is a fair point, and I owe you an answer on why it is I am standing here today asking to extend something that was temporary.

Here is the reason: We did fail to bring down the cost of healthcare. So what has happened since COVID left is there has been very significant inflation, including really high inflation in healthcare costs, and people in this country are not able to pay their bills, and it is really becoming a problem for the people you and I both represent.

So the cost of healthcare has gone way up. In fact, if we don't extend that premium support—even though, yes, it is temporary—it will expire. It is going to mean that those premium increases I cited where some folks are going to

need to pay \$32,000 more—they have a real problem. They are not going to be able to do it.

So you make a meritorious point, but the point I make is that those individuals and those families who are dealing with the reality that they are getting, say, a \$32,000 increase have no capacity to do the things that only we have the capacity to do. They are on the receiving end. They have no control over it. So it is not like somebody in the family has been irresponsible last year where they are smoking and getting sick. They are just going about their lives, doing their work, and in the mail, they get a notice that they have to pay \$32,000 more.

So, you know, the question for us is, Do we want to give them at least a year where they have some stability and then we take up the challenge? Because I think all of us here know that the cost of healthcare is totally, completely unsustainable. It is brutal.

But the reality is, however we got here, the families in every single State of this Nation are going to be faced with premium increases they can't afford.

So I just want to convey to you, Senator, my respect for your points, but that is my best response to them.

At the end of the day, the casualties of our failures as an institution to deal with healthcare costs can't become an insurmountable burden for the families we represent.

Mr. WYDEN. Would my colleague yield briefly?

Mr. WELCH. Yes. Yes.

Mr. WYDEN. I think the remarks my colleague has made are thoughtful. He knows that since my days as director of the Gray Panthers, I have always wanted to work in a bipartisan fashion. But how do you do it if, in fact, in the Finance Committee, we have not had, by my calculus, a healthcare hearing in 400 days? Isn't that what my colleague is saying, is that we ought to have these hearings and we ought to work in a bipartisan way? That is what we did in the PBM bill, where we got a 26-to-nothing vote.

I see my friend from California, a new Member. You can't get a vote around here 26-to-nothing to order a can of Sprite but it was because colleagues like Senator WELCH wanted to find some common ground and get going.

Isn't that what my colleague is saying, is that we want to work with Republicans in a bipartisan way and we are available 24/7 to do it? Is that correct?

Mr. WELCH. Well, it is.

I want to be fair to my colleague because I think he wants to work with us. We obviously have different points of view, but we have to sit down, and we have to stay at it, and we have to have hearings, and we have to do the work we are blessed to be able to do.

Mr. CRAPO. Senator WELCH, would you yield briefly to me?

Mr. WELCH. I will, yes.

Mr. CRAPO. Senator WELCH, first of all, I appreciate your acknowledging that we do want to work together. I would hope that you would acknowledge that we are working together to try to find solutions.

This notion that the fact that we haven't had a hearing—it is because we haven't gotten to the point where we have legislation before us to have that hearing on.

But I just would like to make two points. No. 1, once again, open the government. No. 2, even if we agreed to your request today, all of those people you talk about who are going to get hit with premium increases are going to get hit with premium increases because this temporary COVID premium enhancement support was never intended to be and never was the foundation of what is driving—or did deal with the foundation of what is driving premium increases.

Everybody in America is going to get hit with a massive premium increase, and it is not going to be changed if we give an extension for that 4 percent that goes to this enhancement. It could be like maybe a tiny bit different in some ways and in some places, but I doubt it would make a dollar's difference in most cases.

Let's get the government open, and let's continue real negotiations to solve this problem. We mutually have talked. We mutually know that there are things we can work on to get this solved.

I am just asking my colleagues on the other side to quit trying to blame Republicans for the premium increases that are coming and say: Let's get the government open, and let's get together working to solve our healthcare crisis.

Mr. WELCH. I thank you. I thank my colleagues.

I would love to get the government open, and I would love to be able to let folks know that the healthcare they had in 2025 they would be able to have in 2026.

I would like the President to do what Presidents do and that is get the parties together in a room and negotiate an outcome that works for all of us.

Whatever we do in this—this is where I want to agree with both my chairman and ranking member—we have real work to do on the cost side of healthcare. We really all have to take that on. But the approach to dealing with the high cost of healthcare can't be taking people's healthcare away; it has to be making the healthcare they have more affordable.

So I thank the gentleman. I thank my colleague Senator WYDEN, our ranking member.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES WITHIN OR AGAINST VENEZUELA THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—Motion to Discharge

Mr. KAYNE. Mr. President, pursuant to section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from the further consideration of S.J. Res. 90, to direct the President to terminate the use of U.S. Armed Forces for hostilities within or against Venezuela, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 90, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Venezuela that have not been authorized by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAYNE. Mr. President, I will begin I think a few hours of floor speeches on S.J. Res. 90, and I appreciate the work of Leader THUNE and Leader SCHUMER in scheduling this matter for a vote today at 5 o'clock. I view it as a very important one.

The act that I just read, the International Security Assistance and Arms Control Export Act, is an act that allows a single Senator to file a privileged motion that can be heard on the floor of the Senate without intervening committee action under a simple majority threshold to address the most serious question that this body ever has to grapple with—the question of war.

The War Powers Act was passed in 1974, and it has a set of provisions in it. Those provisions include Presidential notification of Congress when there are military actions undertaken that meet the definition of “hostilities” within the act. And the President has notified us. President Trump, like other Presidents, has provided notice of military actions.

The particular statute allows this motion to be heard on the floor in a privileged status if two threshold questions are met: first, that there is no congressional authorization covering a proposed military action, and second, that military action is either ongoing or imminent, such that the motion should be heard.

The framers, in 1974, of this act clearly intended that Congress should be able to have a vote and debate on this matter even before the initiation of war so that Congress could be in a position to stop it before it begins.

So what I am offering, together with my cosponsors Senators SCHIFF and PAUL, is this resolution to try to make plain what the Constitution makes plain, and that is, no war without Con-

gress. We should not be in a war without Congress.

I have had the opportunity, as have some of my colleagues, to go into the classified facility here in the Senate and review the legal authorization document that the Trump administration has presented recently to the Senate concerning the military strikes against boats in the Caribbean and Pacific.

Now, I reviewed that in the SCIF, so I can't talk about the content of it. I would encourage all of my colleagues to go review it, because I basically believe there are three critical errors in that: one, a mistaken philosophy of Executive war powers that derives from a misquotation of constitutional-era documents that the Framers were using as they grappled with war powers questions; two, a domestic legal rationale for when the President can unilaterally wage war that is completely contrary to the Constitution; and three, an international legal rationale that I think most of the Members of this body would find to be quite a stretch if they review it.

But the one thing I can say is something that isn't in the document, and so I am not in any danger of revealing classified information. What is not in the document that is available for Senators to review is any—any—legal rationale that would suggest that U.S. military action against the sovereign nation of Venezuela or any sovereign nation is covered by the legal rationale in that document.

Just this morning, there has been public press suggesting that even the President recognizes that there is no legal rationale for such military action, again, absent congressional authorization.

Why are we bringing this to the floor? We are bringing it to the floor because of a set of actions. We have already discussed, in a resolution that was filed by my colleague Senator SCHIFF, a couple of weeks back, where we had a vote, the increased pace of military operations in the Caribbean and the Pacific, near Venezuela, and the justification that the White House has used for those often references to Venezuela.

So there is an ongoing and increasing pace of strikes against boats that are killing dozens of individuals. But with respect to additional actions that are specifically focused on Venezuela that enable this resolution to meet the imminence test under the War Powers Resolution, on October 15, 2025, President Trump confirms that he has authorized the CIA to conduct covert action in Venezuela.

Now, it is highly unusual for a President to publicly announce that he has authorized covert action. It almost immediately makes it noncovert once the President has announced it. But that has been widely, publicly disseminated, that the President has authorized covert action in Venezuela.

The next day, October 16, the President says, “We are certainly looking at

land now,” signifying the land invasion of Venezuela.

On October 24, there were multiple public reports—and this is underway—that the Pentagon has sent the *Gerald R. Ford* carrier strike group to U.S. SOUTHCOM to be positioned in and around Venezuela. You don't need a Ford-class carrier to interdict small drug boats. That is not what you use a carrier for. That direction of the *Ford*, which includes many Virginians who are positioned on the *Ford*, to SOUTHCOM is specifically to have it there, arrayed nearby Venezuela, in the event the President decides to start a war there.

Finally, on October 31, public reporting shows that many Trump administration officials have told the press that a secret list of targets in Venezuela has been drawn up. All of this, together with the increased pace of strikes in the Caribbean and Pacific, suggests that we are on the verge of something that should not happen without a debate and vote in Congress before the American people.

This is an indication of the current assets that are massed around Venezuela, the U.S. ships and aircraft massing off Venezuela. And this comes from a Washington Post report of November 1, 2025. The *Gerald R. Ford*, the largest and most modern aircraft carrier in the world, built at the Newport News shipyard in Virginia, is the lead. But the mass of other ships and submarines and special operations vehicles and unmanned, is significant.

Currently, about 10 percent of the U.S. Navy is arrayed around Venezuela. They have been pulled from every other theater in the world to array around Venezuela. This poses some significant risks to U.S. sailors.

Venezuela has very high-end weaponry that they have acquired from U.S. adversaries, primarily Russia and Iran, that could do significant damage to these U.S. assets and to our sailors and troops that are on these assets, particularly if Venezuela were to misread the impressions or the strategy of the United States or were there to be some kind of miscommunication. It would not at all be outside of historical precedent for Venezuela to use its own weapons if it believed it was subject to imminent attack, and that would pose the U.S. troops connected to these multiple platforms to significant danger. And that is what we should avoid.

Mr. President, here is my belief. There may be Members in this body who believe that we should be at war with Venezuela, just as there may be Members in this body who believe we should be at war with narcotraffickers in the Caribbean and the Pacific. And there is a simple solution for that which is consistent with the Constitution, and that solution is for U.S. Senators to draft up an authorization for use of military force and have the backbone to put their own names on it, if they believe a war is a good idea.

But the Framers of the Constitution firmly believed that we should not be at war—we should not be risking our troops who are on all these platforms right now, their life and their health—we should not be risking them without a debate and a vote in Congress. The Framers took this position in such an unusual way in 1787.

In all the other countries around the world, the ones they were familiar with, the initiation of war was a matter for the Executive. But the Framers of the Constitution—as I said before, even with George Washington as the President, a great military leader whom they revered—they said a decision about war is too important to put in the hands of one person. Thus, the initiation of war should be for the article I legislative branch, not the article II executive branch. That has been consistent constitutional language that is very unique.

Most nations still put the decisions about war in the hands of the Executive, not the legislative branch. I have been a stickler about this, whether the President has been a Democrat or Republican.

Interestingly enough, this issue came up yesterday, right across the street, in the Supreme Court, as the Court was hearing oral arguments on the case of *Learning Resources, Inc. v. Trump*, a case dealing with the question of whether tariffs could be imposed under the IEEPA statute that we spent some time discussing on the floor. The Solicitor General of the United States, Attorney Sauer, is not only the Nation's chief advocate before the Supreme Court; he was Donald Trump's personal lawyer. This is an individual who is very close to the President, both personally and now in a professional capacity. And he was making the argument that Congress had delegated a clear congressional power—the power to post tariffs, the power to tax—to the Executive.

One of the Justices, Donald Trump's appointee, Justice Gorsuch, was pressing on the question of whether Congress really can delegate specific congressional powers to the Executive or not. On page 68 of the transcript of the oral argument in the case, Justice Gorsuch was pressing this Solicitor General, Donald Trump's personal attorney:

What's the reason to accept the notion that Congress can hand off the power to declare war to the President?

The Solicitor General said:

Well, we don't contend that. Again, that would be . . . an abdication, not a delegation.

I stand here to urge my colleagues—and I have done this often during by 12½ years in the Senate—not to abdicate. Don't abdicate the power to declare war. Of all the powers given to the article I branch, this is the one that should be most jealously guarded.

The reason the Framers put this decision in the hands of Congress was because of a belief that we should not

risk the lives of our servicemembers unless there is a clear political consensus, as expressed by a vote in Congress, that the mission is worth it. If Congress is not willing to have a debate and say that the mission is worth it, then it is the height of—I would sort of call it—public immorality to nevertheless require people who are serving to risk their lives and their health.

The people who volunteer for the military volunteer knowing that it is going to be dangerous. They do sign up for that. But they ought to know, if they are ordered into a mission that involves military action, that there is a political consensus by the elected leadership of the country that that mission is worth it. And absent a debate and vote in Congress, we are ordering people to potentially risk their lives without having the courage ourselves to sign our name to that mission.

So I stand here with my cosponsors, Senator SCHIFF and Senator PAUL, to say we shouldn't be at war without Congress. Even President Trump, by public reporting today, suggests that he may not yet think he has a legal rationale for a war against Venezuela.

Let's not abdicate. Let's not abdicate the most important power we have. I would hope that all my colleagues—whatever they think about the virtues or vices of a war against Venezuela—would at least stand strong for the proposition that Congress should have the power and, indeed, the responsibility to have a debate and have a vote on it before we ordered our troops to risk their lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I am proud to join my colleagues Senator Kaine and Senator PAUL in introducing this War Powers Resolution that provides that we have not authorized the use of force against Venezuela.

We meet at a precarious moment, when we might be on the precipice of war with that country. Today, in the Caribbean or on its way to the region, are the following military assets: Three Arleigh Burke-class destroyers, the USS *Gravely*, *Jason Dunham*, and *Sampson*; the USS *Lake Erie*, a Ticonderoga-class guided missile cruiser; the USS *Newport News*, a nuclear attack submarine with torpedoes and Tomahawks; the USS *Iwo Jima*, an amphibious assault ship equipped with a flight deck for F-35s, Ospreys, and attack helicopters; the MV *Ocean Trader*, a floating base designed for special operations; reaper drones, Harriet jets, and fifth generation fighters—incredibly lethal aircraft.

But this is not all. The largest aircraft carrier ever built, the USS *Gerald R. Ford* is on its way right now from the Mediterranean. This means we will see upward of an additional two dozen Super Hornets and two dozen additional F-35s. This warship will be accompanied by three additional destroyers, bringing at least 10 of America's

best naval warships within striking distance of Caracas.

All told, there will be more than 400 missiles and vertical launch systems on Nicolas Maduro's doorstep—115 Tomahawks alone, with an additional 70 coming with the *Ford*.

Are we supposed to believe that this is only about striking speed boats? If so, why would there be 10,000 American servicemembers in the vicinity? Why fly three B-52s from the United States to the region? Why have B-1 supersonic bombers flown off the coast of Venezuela in just the last few weeks for a so-called “bomber attack demonstration”?

That is not my definition of the mission. That is what the Pentagon called it. Bomber attack demonstrations for what—to blow up fishing vessels?

We all need to see that this has quickly become so much bigger and so much more dangerous. And maybe that was the point, to focus the narrative on drug trafficking so we don't recoil from what may be right around the corner with Venezuela, and that is the use of force to achieve the goal of regime change.

I understand the President, this weekend, said he was not “inclined” along those lines. But I urge my colleagues to look at the administration's actions and not merely its words, because if it walks like a military buildup and talks like a military buildup, it might just very well be a military buildup.

Two weeks ago, the President said:

We are certainly looking at land now, because we've got the sea very well under control.

And now we have the buildup I just described.

People may be putting a lot of stock into the President's most recent words saying he would not strike Venezuela when he was on “60 Minutes,” on Sunday. When asked if the leader of Venezuela's days were numbered, he also answered: Yes, “I think so.”

That is what our Commander in Chief said, with the largest warship the U.S. has sailing close to Venezuela. If any other world leader moved this kind of firepower to another country's doorstep, we know what we would believe was taking place.

The bottom line is this: Americans do not want another war. They don't want American servicemembers put into harm's way, either flying missions or with boots on the ground, for a war not authorized by Congress. Mothers and fathers of American sailors, marines, soldiers, and pilots do not want to lie awake at night wondering if their kids will be the ones who have to be deployed to yet another armed conflict, this time in South America.

Last month, we came to this body with a resolution to end the unlawful strikes that this administration had been taking against boats in international waters. We came up a few votes short. But while we remain concerned about those ongoing strikes,

this debate is about a different resolution. This resolution is tailor-written to stop one thing: a war with the nation of Venezuela. The Trump administration has not asked Congress to authorize such a war, but the administration appears to be laying the groundwork for one anyway. If they believe a war is necessary, let them come to Congress to make the case for one.

Maduro is a murderous dictator. He is an illegitimate leader in having overturned the last election by the use of military force. He is a bad actor. But I do not believe the American people want to go to war to topple this regime in the hopes that something better might follow.

If the administration feels differently, let them come to the Congress and make the case. Let them come before the American people and make the case. Let them seek an authorization to use force to get rid of Maduro. But let us not abdicate our responsibility. Let us vote to say no to war without our approval. We don't have to wait, nor should we wait for that war to begin before we vote. The War Powers Resolution very clearly and intentionally gives Congress the ability to prevent a President from going to war in the first place. The legislative history of the War Powers Act makes that abundantly clear.

My colleagues might object: Well, these aren't yet hostilities.

Yet people are already dying.

They might object: Well, this is not yet imminent.

Yet with the kind of military force being brought to the region, there is a danger to our sailors, our marines, and our soldiers, as Senator Kaine outlined, because if Venezuela believes we are on the precipice of war, they have the capability to take action against our ships. That clearly meets the definition of "imminent."

Our predecessors in Congress designed this law precisely to respond to the very type of military buildup that we see here and act in advance of the U.S. being dragged into another war without Congress's authorization.

We in this body serve our constituents, who have told us for years—now for decades—no more war, no more use of military force for regime change.

We must reassert our constitutional power, our duty to have the sole decision when American lives could be on the line, when war is on the line.

I share my colleague Senator Kaine's concerns in having read the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel. Regardless of what people view of the merits of that opinion, what we are talking about here is a wholly other matter. What we are talking about here is potential war with Venezuela. What we are talking about here is a massive military and naval buildup in the region, where hostilities may be imminent under circumstances clearly contemplated by Congress when it passed the War Powers Resolution.

I have debated Senator Kaine whether this is our most important power—

that is, the power to declare war or to refuse to declare war—or whether it is the power of the purse. It may indeed be a bit of both in the sense that one way of cutting off a military campaign is by cutting off support for that military campaign.

We have already abdicated our power of the purse in this institution. Should we also abdicate our responsibility to declare war and allow the administration or any administration or any President to usurp that authority? It would be antithetical to what the Founders intended and what they wrote.

As the Founders wrote, the power was given to the legislative branch to declare war because the power to make war was something that an Executive might grow too fond of. So the power was given to Congress, to this legislative body. Let's use that power. Let's reassert our authority. Let's say through this resolution that if the President or the administration wants to go to war for the purpose of regime change or any other purpose, that it must come to Congress and make the case to us and to the American people.

I urge an "aye" vote on the resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

TRIBUTE TO MANUEL HEART

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, today, I want to recognize the leadership of Manuel Heart, who retires tomorrow after 15 years as chairman of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe and 27 years on Tribal Council.

For time immemorial, the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe has called the vast landscape of the Southwest home—the mountains, canyons, and rivers that have sustained the Weenuche people for countless generations.

Chairman Heart carried this legacy of stewardship throughout his career. As a young council member, he began a lifetime of service rooted in a deep love for his people and a reverence for their ancestral homeland. Over the decades, he grew into a statesman whose leadership reached far beyond Towaoc, inspiring both Tribal and non-Tribal leaders alike all across this Nation.

As chairman, he helped establish Bears Ears and Camp Hale National Monuments, elevated Tribal voices in the Colorado River Basin, and advocated for the protection of the Dolores River.

After generations of the unjust loss of their ancestral homelands, Chairman Heart led the efforts to secure full Federal trust status for the Tribe's Pinecrest Ranch, reclaiming a piece—a piece—of what was taken.

It has been a privilege to work alongside him, meeting in Towaoc and across the ancestral homeland of the Ute people, rafting the Colorado River to discuss water and climate policy, visiting cultural sites in the Dolores River Basin, and gathering along the Continental Divide to discuss how Camp Hale should tell the Ute story.

He regularly visited my office in Washington, DC. In 2021, I was proud to stand together at the White House to celebrate the restoration of the Bears Ears National Monument. When we introduced the Tribal Access to Clean Water Act, the chairman testified before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs to remind Congress of the Federal Government's responsibility to ensure all of Indian Country has access to clean, reliable drinking water.

Chairman Heart also understood that the strength of a sovereign Tribal nation lies in the preservation and vitality of culture and language for future generations. He led the effort to create the Kwiyatog Community Academy, dedicated to teaching Ute history, language, and culture. Visiting the school with him was a profound reminder of his vision and dedication to his people and their cultural heritage.

Chairman Heart never let the United States forget its promises to Tribal nations and made sure that my office always included the voices of sovereign Tribes when we made decisions. He taught me what true government-to-government respect means. I remain deeply grateful for his friendship, his wisdom, and his example—for his brotherhood. His legacy reminds us that true leadership is measured not only in achievements but in the strength and hope it instills in generations to come.

Colorado and the United States owe Chairman Heart a profound gratitude for his decades of service. We also thank Marie, his wife, and their entire family.

Working with him has been one of the greatest honors of my life and of my time in the Senate, and I wish him well in his retirement as he enjoys well-deserved time with his loved ones.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

S.J. RES. 90

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I rise today because since early September, Donald Trump has ordered our military to engage in 16 strikes in the Caribbean and in the eastern Pacific Ocean. Those strikes have killed more than 65 people. Each one of those strikes—each person killed—was done without the necessary legal basis or proper justification to this Congress and the American people. Now, amid a buildup of forces in the Caribbean, the administration is even reportedly considering action against Venezuela itself.

We are not powerless against this lawlessness. That is why I rise today in support of this resolution.

I rise because no President can unilaterally decide to use our military to target or kill anyone that they simply claim to be a threat.

I rise because if we do not hold this President accountable, we abdicate our responsibility to be a voice for the American people and instead embolden Trump to intensify this conflict.

I rise because these actions can quickly escalate into a conflict that

could destabilize the Western Hemisphere and would put the lives of American troops on the line.

I rise because as we see this President abuse the fundamental trust and purpose of our powerful military both abroad and here at home in our own cities, it is imperative that we push back against his relentless lawlessness.

I have seen this from my own perspective. Whether that was working as a State Department officer embedded with the military out in Afghanistan or in my work at the Pentagon or in my work at the National Security Council working to try to counter the terrorist group ISIS, I saw the importance of our being able to do that but doing it in a way that is in accordance with our own laws, to be able to both ensure unity as a government but also to ensure that our servicemembers who are fighting have the protections that they need, that they know that the entirety of our government leadership is behind them and that our country is with them. But that is not what we have right now.

The first step in fighting back against the lawlessness is understanding the importance of the War Powers Resolution.

In this very Chamber 53 years ago, Senator Javits, in debating the overturning of President Nixon's veto of the War Powers Resolution, called the power to bring America into war the "most awesome power in the possession of any sovereignty." This resolution, he said, is about ensuring the "broad representation of the people in the Congress a voice" in exercising that power.

Senator Javits reminded this Chamber in the wake of the Vietnam war that "wars cannot be successfully fought except with the consent of the people and with their support."

What we have seen is a President in Donald Trump who thinks he can use that awesome power against anyone he wants, anytime he wants. That is not what the law says, and it is not what our Founders intended. Our Founders intended for the people to have a say in when we commit our sons and daughters to harm's way.

Even in an emergency, the law requires the President to seek Congress's approval within a 60-day window to continue action. In this circumstance, that window closed on Monday with zero indication that this White House will stop taking military action even without having a clear, legal basis to continue.

They first recognized the legal parameters of the War Powers Resolution back in September, but now the administration is arguing that they are not bound by this law. They have changed their tune and are contradicting their own arguments in order to get around the law.

Of course, that won't stop them from pretending they have legal grounds and fabricating justification where none exists. You will hear them reference a

list that designates certain cartels as "terrorist groups," but the authority to pursue groups on this list provides absolutely no basis for the use of deadly force. Even worse, they still have provided zero proof of how they know the individuals they have targeted are linked to these cartels.

Trump is simply giving himself the power to designate and then to kill enemies without there being a proper legal review or transparency for the American people. That is not a power any President should have alone, and we cannot allow this to proceed under our watch. After all, it will not be Donald Trump who feels the consequences of further conflict; it will be military families and the American people. That is why decisions of war require deliberation, careful consideration, and a clear legal basis. That is why they require congressional authorization.

Through this resolution, we can uphold our responsibility to give voice to Americans on the safety of our troops and the security of our great Nation. We need to give that voice in this moment because this is a crisis that can spiral into a conflict and from a conflict into an all-out war.

While Trump tries to claim their targets are boats from Venezuela, in reality, reports show strikes have hit boats from Colombia and apparently those carrying citizens from other neighboring countries.

The administration has even admitted they don't know each individual identity of those targeted. To still execute legal strikes is a reckless and dangerous use of our powerful military.

As Trump considers expanding strikes to include land targets within Venezuela—that is what we are talking about, within Venezuela—we move further toward a war that would destabilize the entire region.

The American people don't want us to start a war within Venezuela, and their voices should be heard, not ignored by this President.

There is a final reason why I rise in support of this resolution because letting Donald Trump ignore the law abroad makes him think he has a free pass to do it right here at home.

Donald Trump thinks if he can do this in the Caribbean, he can do it on the streets of Chicago. He could use the military for his own political retribution and consolidation of power in and outside our borders.

After all, he said in his own words:

We're under invasion from within, no different than a foreign enemy but more difficult in many ways because they don't wear uniforms.

That is what the President said.

We cannot be complacent as he sends troops into our cities as a tool of intimidation against his political enemies.

As I close here, I just want to say that we know the American people are not blind to what Trump is doing. They know we are not powerless to stop it. It is time to step up and show them we

believe in the law; that we believe in the voices of the American people; that we believe in protecting our servicemembers; and that we won't stand idly by in the face of lawlessness.

I hope all of my colleagues join me in passing this resolution. It is our power. It is our duty. It is our responsibility. I yield the floor.

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, next week marks the anniversary of my Alive Day. That is the anniversary of the last day I ever woke up, laced up my boots, and climbed into my Black Hawk helicopter; the day when an RPG shot my helicopter out of the Iraqi sky; the day that I could have died; the day that I probably should have died but didn't, thanks to the courage of my buddies who risked their lives to save my own.

So I come here this afternoon, battle wounds and all, not because I am scared of war—I am not; been there, done that; got the t-shirt. Titanium legs don't buckle, by the way. What I am scared of, however, is that the United States is stumbling into an armed conflict because of a five-time draft dodger who is using our military to pretend to be a tough guy on the world stage.

What I am troubled by is that a man who was never brave enough to serve in uniform himself seems to care more about thumping his chest than keeping our troops out of danger. What I am worried about is that Donald Trump's obsession with making America great again is making Americans less safe again.

Two months ago, without even seeking congressional approval, the Trump administration began carrying out airstrikes against boats in international waters near Venezuela, claiming he was targeting fentanyl traffickers and drug cartels. Since then, without due process, dozens of people have been killed in these strikes.

What he is doing is un-American, unconstitutional, and downright dangerous—dangerous for our servicemembers whom he is placing at greater risk of retaliation, dangerous for Americans who should be afraid that Trump is using military might to kill people without due process or proper evidence, and dangerous for our democracy if we keep speeding down this path.

Bringing the force of the U.S. military down on drug traffickers is both ineffective and unwise, as drug trafficking is fundamentally a law enforcement matter, not a military one.

This is yet another instance of Donald Trump wildly abusing our military, trying to blur the lines between our servicemembers and law enforcement. We saw it when he sent the National Guard to intimidate peaceful protesters in Los Angeles or when he similarly threatened Chicago and Portland before he was stopped by the courts. We have even seen it in this Capital City, where I am speaking today, when

he forced troops to carry rifles around the quiet streets of our Nation's Capital.

Now we are witnessing it stretch from DC to the Caribbean Sea as Trump is, once again, unilaterally—and unconstitutionally—using our troops however he sees fit, rule of law be damned.

To put what he has done another way, the President has ordered repeated military strikes against civilians without congressional oversight, and he has claimed that such military action is justified because he himself, in his ultimate wisdom, has deemed these civilians to be criminals, which leaves us to ask: What is to stop him from arguing that anyone he dislikes deserves the same treatment? What is to stop him from naming any of his enemies as a terrorist, then unilaterally deciding to use the military to hunt them down without congressional consent?

To be clear, I will never ever support trafficking illegal drugs into this country. I believe we should use the might of law enforcement to track down drug traffickers, but that is not why we are here today.

Why I am here is to sound the alarm on the incredibly slippery slope that Donald Trump has set us careening down. Even if the administration can actually give us proof that those killed on board were all criminals, well, then they should have been apprehended by law enforcement and tried in the judicial system. That is how “law and order” works.

But Trump doesn't seem to care. In his world, he is a judge, jury, and executioner. In his mind, the justice system can be discarded at will. The military is his plaything, with fewer and fewer guardrails to keep the rest of us safe. He believes there are no checks on his power—no checks at all—other than the ones going into his own pockets, signed by his rich friends.

The United States exists today because a few brave patriots saw a tyrant who cared more about the gold in his coffers than the people in his colonies, and then our Founders decided to form a more perfect Union where enforceable guardrails would check executive greed. They pushed those chests of tea into Boston Harbor; they fought a revolution; they did the hard, messy work of forging a democracy because they knew that a man who believes he wields all the power but fears no consequences is a danger to those who fall under his rule.

While Donald Trump may be a wannabe King rather than a Monarch by blood or title, what was true then is true now: He doesn't seem to care that his strikes are clearly escalatory actions that will only harden our enemies, put our troops in greater danger, and our families at greater risk of retaliation.

He does not care that this campaign is draining military resources, hurting its readiness, and wasting untold sums of taxpayer money.

He probably isn't aware of the second- and third-order security consequences of his decisions. He probably doesn't even know that already, because of his decisions, a Marine Expeditionary Unit has been forced to relocate to SOUTHCOM, leaving our troops in Europe and the Middle East without the emergency support they rely on in worst case scenario moments, leaving our troops there hanging.

He just wants to look strong, and he doesn't care that, in the process, he is making our Nation weaker.

Look, I first ran for Congress so that when the drums of war started beating, I would be in a position to make sure that our Nation's leaders fully consider the true cost of war, not just in dollars and cents but in the sacrifices of our heroes and their families. Now, with those drums beginning to echo once more, I am here today to, once again, keep my promise because, sadly, worryingly, infuriatingly, Trump has already started a conflict and now seems intent on expanding it.

He has already threatened land strikes against Venezuela, with seemingly no concern over the fact that only Congress—this body, not the President—has the authority to declare war.

We are the ones tasked with deciding when and how we send our troops into combat. We are the ones the Constitution charged with that most solemn duty. And, today, we are the ones who must be the adults in the room because Trump is, yet again, acting like a toddler throwing a tantrum on a playground, acting as if obeying the law is optional, acting as if the Constitution is nothing more than a yellowing piece of paper that he can rip up at will.

Those are just some of the many, many reasons why, today, I am voting yes on the resolution to block the administration from continuing to illegally use military force within or against Venezuela.

This should not be a partisan issue. No matter if you are a factory worker pulling double shifts or the President of the United States, no one is above the law. No matter if you are struggling to pay rent or your name is plastered in fake gold on the front of a building on Fifth Avenue, no one can overrule the Constitution.

Listen, if the Trump administration actually believes there is an ongoing credible threat of armed conflict, then they must bring their case to Congress and give the American people a say through their elected representatives. They must respect our servicemembers enough to prove why war is worth turning more moms and dads into Gold Star parents. And they must testify about what the end state of these military operations would actually look like.

Then, when their case has been made, when Congress's debate is done, we should vote. After all, it is our duty. It is the least we owe to the warriors who deserve to know why we are putting them in harm's way.

On Veterans Day, I am sure we will see Donald Trump wrap himself in the flag in the morning, but you can be sure that he will have found a way to abandon our troops again by the afternoon because Trump has made a habit of giving our troops the middle finger.

Well, I am sure as hell not going to let him get away with that. So as many times as is necessary, I am going to keep coming back to this Chamber. I am going to keep raising my voice and keep demanding what is actually in our Nation's best interest because I don't make decisions of war and peace based on how tough I want to look on Truth Social.

As I celebrate my Alive Day next week, I am going to do my damnedest to make sure other troops get to come home to their families too. It is just one small way I can honor those buddies who saved my life, every other veteran, and all those still in the uniform of our great Nation today.

If only this five-time draft dodger hadn't cried “bone spurs” when his Nation needed him the most, then maybe he would understand the first thing about what it means to actually honor those who serve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I strongly support this resolution.

I do want to say thank you to Senator Kaine.

Senator Kaine, I think I speak for you and I think I speak for every Member of the Senate: Senator from Illinois, you are wonderful.

It is so amazing what she did.

As an enlisted person in combat, the injuries you suffered, the devotion that you have to your fellow servicemembers, the indomitable spirit you have of solidarity with them, and then the credibility you bring to this discussion about the importance of the role of the legislature to make the decisions about whether you and your fellow citizens, the folks who made the decision to step forward and serve our country—whether we, as elected representatives, have the responsibility to make the decision whether they have to go into harm's way—you have inspired us every day.

If you are ordered to go, you go; you report for duty. The Commander in Chief makes the decision. But if it is about a decision to go to war, we, the U.S. Congress, have the obligation to make that decision. And nobody has more credibility in making that case than you do.

And both of you have already stated the factual predicate here that we are engaged in hostilities. We have 10 percent of our Navy out there. The President is saying that he is going to do land strikes and then changing his mind on it. But, you know what, he is also asserting what there is—that we all share as a real concern—and that is, any kind of drugs coming into this country, we are all appalled by it and want to do everything that we can to stop it.

But what is at stake here is the Constitution and the constitutional provision that the people who are elected and directly accountable—the House of Representatives and the Members of the U.S. Senate—who have to make that decision where we know, when it is made to go to war, there will be people like Senator DUCKWORTH, who say: I am ready. I am ready.

We have that responsibility. It can't be the arbitrary action of any single individual, including the President of the United States. So what is at stake here is preserving the accountability that has so weakened as the Congress itself has delegated so many of our responsibilities to the Chief Executive. It is a terrible development in our democracy where the checks and balances that were essential to the well-being of our country, with the tug-of-war that goes on in every generation about what is the right policy; the tug-of-war that goes on in every generation with competing efforts to get more power in either the judiciary, the executive, or the Congress; the checks and balances system that we have where a check we have, as U.S. Senators, is the right to make that decision whether the citizens of this country—the citizens that we serve—are going to be put in harm's way.

So we couldn't have a better advocate than a person who herself made that decision to stand up for America, to defend our country, put herself in harm's way, who inspires us every day with her incredibly positive attitude despite these incredible injuries that none of us—none of us can imagine what it is like.

You are so special.

It is amazing to be her colleague, isn't it? It really is.

But what you are speaking about is so profoundly moving to me because you understand better than any of us ever can how significant a decision it is to go to war. You experienced it. You have seen, as you call them, your "buddies" who have experienced it. You have paid a price yourself. You have seen the price that others have paid. You have seen the nobility and the patriotism of those folks who do serve us in the services, and you take really seriously the obligation that we have to make that profound decision on—yes or no—should we go into war.

So I want to thank you, and Senator Kaine, I want to thank you, because there is no more important thing for this Congress to do than to reassert its responsibility—to accept our responsibility for the powers that were delegated to the U.S. Congress, particularly about whether we do or don't go to war.

I so appreciate this resolution. I believe it is one of the most important acts that we can assert: to reestablish that we will defend the constitutional obligation—obligation—to bear the burden of making these very, very difficult decisions about whether this country goes to war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, over the past 2 months, President Trump has ordered 16 airstrikes in the Caribbean and eastern Pacific, killing more than 65 people. His administration boasts that they are targeting drug-trafficking organizations. Yet Congress and the American people have received minimal information about the intelligence supporting these strikes, the legal framework governing these strikes, or the strategic objective they are meant to accomplish.

I want to be clear about something at the outset: I have spent years advocating for stronger action against drug cartels that poison our communities. I have consistently voted to provide law enforcement with the resources they need to dismantle these criminal networks. I have supported international cooperation to target these organizations at their source. And like everyone here, I recognize the cartels are a scourge and they must be confronted aggressively and dismantled thoroughly.

But that is not what is happening here. Let me begin with the most fundamental question: What is the operation actually meant to accomplish?

The administration has emphasized fentanyl as the primary justification for these strikes. Yet their own officials have acknowledged that cocaine is the predominant drug trafficked through these Caribbean routes. The fentanyl that is devastating American communities flows overwhelmingly through different routes. So what problem are we actually trying to solve?

And I think it should be obvious you cannot bomb your way out of a drug crisis. The demand that motivates drug trafficking is not found in the Caribbean. It is located in communities across America where people are suffering from addiction, where economic opportunity has dried up, where the social fabric has frayed. Military strikes do nothing to address those root causes.

Indeed, the significant budgetary attacks on Medicaid and other programs—health programs—will further undermine our attempts to control demand and to solve our drug problem. We have been down this road many times before in many parts of the world. We have seen what happens when military force is employed without clear objectives, without defined endpoints, without an honest assessment of what military power can and cannot achieve. The so-called "war on drugs" has been waged for decades. It has cost billions of dollars and countless lives, and it has not solved the problem.

As we expand this military operation in South and Central America, we have to ask: What does victory look like? How do we know when this mission is complete?

I know when many of us considered the Iraq war, I think many failed to

ask the fundamental question: What happens when we win? Because we won quickly and then found ourselves in a 20-year struggle throughout the region to maintain stability.

As I indicated before, more than 65 people have been killed across 16 strikes. Boats have been blown out of the water in videos released by the administration. But has the flow of fentanyl into America decreased? Has a single trafficking network been dismantled? The administration hasn't provided any evidence that these strikes are achieving anything beyond the destruction they document on camera.

This is not a strategy. This is violence without a strategic objective. The administration's legal justification shifts every week. First, they simply cited the President's article II authority and claimed that these cartels were terrorist organizations.

Then the President decided that America is in a "non-international armed conflict," which is a dubious claim. Now, Secretary Hegseth has begun calling these cartels "the Al Qaeda of the Western Hemisphere," and declared open season on them.

But he seems to have forgotten an important fact: After 9/11, Congress passed an authorization for the use of military force, or AUMF, to provide the legal basis for using military force against al-Qaida. By Secretary Hegseth's own logic, this current operation requires congressional authorization.

But there is a deeper problem with the administration's analogy to terrorism. Terrorists pursue political objectives. Cartels pursue profit and power. They are criminals, not ideological combatants waging war against the United States. If the White House truly believed that these are terrorist organizations and the Defense Secretary truly thinks Tren de Aragua compares to al-Qaida, the administration should come to Congress and request a AUMF. The fact that they haven't is revealing.

When the legal justification keeps changing, it means that there is no clear mission to begin with. And here is what troubles me the most: the administration's refusal to explain itself, both to Congress and the American people. It suggests that they know this operation does not hold up to scrutiny.

Chairman WICKER and I have sent multiple requests to Secretary Hegseth to submit the basic information Congress is legally entitled to: execute orders, legal justifications, and intelligence underpinning individual strikes.

The Pentagon has taken more than 2 months to provide only some of this information and has refused to answer simple questions regarding the very limited information that has been provided to date.

And this is not a partisan complaint. These are statutory requirements that are being ignored and noticed by both sides of the aisle.

The United Nations has stated that these strikes “violate international human rights law” and find “no justification in international law.” Legal experts across the political spectrum have been nearly unanimous in denouncing these operations as unlawful. Yet the administration’s response has been to withhold information rather than provide justification.

If this operation serves vital American interests, if it can achieve its stated objectives, and if it is legal under domestic and international law, then why won’t the administration defend it before Congress and the American people? The obfuscation suggests they don’t have genuine answers. The secrecy suggests they know this doesn’t make sense.

Now the situation grows more dangerous. The USS Gerald R. Ford, our largest and newest aircraft carrier, is headed to the Caribbean, bringing additional warships and thousands of sailors and marines. This is not a limited operation; this is a major military buildup. To what end? The administration will not say. Against what enemy? They won’t specify. For how long? They refuse to answer.

These operations risk destabilizing the region and provoking direct confrontation with Venezuela. We could be stumbling into another open-ended conflict without purpose or plan.

If the administration intends to escalate toward conflict with Venezuela, Congress has a constitutional duty to declare and authorize such action. We cannot sleepwalk into another war through incremental escalation while being kept in the dark.

To my Republican colleagues, I know many of you share concerns about endless American wars. I know many of you have questioned open-ended military commitments that lack clear strategic objectives. You have consistently opposed Executive overreach by previous Presidents in the manner of war.

These SOUTHCOM operations look like the beginning of exactly that kind of entanglement, and we are being asked to accept it on faith—without information, without debate, without authorization.

Which brings me to the matter of constitutional authority. The Constitution is unambiguous. Article I, section 8 vests the power to declare war in Congress, not in the executive branch. This was not an oversight by the Founders; it was a deliberate choice borne from hard experience with monarchs who could commit their nations to war by decree.

The War Powers Resolution exists to give meaning to that constitutional principle. It requires the President to consult with Congress before introducing forces into hostilities and to obtain authorization within 60 days.

The Trump administration delivered its war powers notification to Congress on September 4. The 60-day window to receive congressional authorization closed on Monday without approval

being rendered. A law-abiding administration would cease its operation, but the Trump administration continues on.

Incredibly, according to public reporting, the White House is apparently now arguing that these strikes don’t constitute “hostilities” under the War Powers Act because American servicemembers aren’t directly in harm’s way while operating standoff weapons and drones. This is ridiculous. Most importantly, it is an insult to the men and women who are risking their lives flying aircraft, operating ships and submarines, and conducting reconnaissance in the region. They are very much in harm’s way, and to say that this operation is so safe that it doesn’t qualify as “hostilities” is embarrassing. Also, it suggests, perhaps, the logic that these really aren’t military operations or hostilities; they are pre-meditated attacks to produce lethal effects on people who may or may not be drug dealers.

This new interpretation creates a dangerous precedent. If standoff weapons exempt military operations from congressional oversight, we have effectively granted the executive branch unlimited authority to wage war anywhere in the world so long as American forces can strike from a distance.

Does this mean that we can fire a long-range missile into another country because we are not in hostilities since there are no servicemembers directly in danger as we launch the missile from our territory? That logic does not hold up. That represents, indeed, a fundamental rewriting of our Constitution—not through amendment or legislation but through one man’s decision.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I ask you to consider what authority you would be comfortable granting to any President—not just this one but the next one and the one after that. The powers we recognize today will be exercised by future administrations. Constitutional principles should not bend with political convenience.

I believe that this is not a political debate; this is about the institution of Congress and the congressional and constitutional limits on Executive power. It is about insisting that before we commit American military forces to combat operations, before we take lives in America’s name, we must have clear legal authority, credible justification, and strategic coherence.

If this operation makes strategic sense, let the administration make that case to Congress and the American people. Let them provide the legal justification that they have withheld. Let them explain the endgame. What happens when we win? What does winning mean? What are the limits of this operation?

Let them show us how blowing up boats in the Caribbean solves what the President has repeatedly said—the fentanyl crisis in each and every one of our States. They have not done so, and

until they do, this operation does not deserve our support.

I urge my colleagues to hold the Trump administration accountable. The Constitution requires it. The American people deserve it. And we all have taken an oath to the Constitution, not the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to start where Senator REED, the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee left off, and that is with the U.S. Constitution, which should be the North Star for every Senator in this body, regardless of party, and that is why I rise in support of this bipartisan resolution, barring U.S. military action within or against Venezuela without congressional authorization.

I think it is always helpful just to read the words of some of these resolutions, and the one we are debating right now is S.J. Res. 90, a joint resolution to direct the removal of U.S. Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Venezuela that have not been authorized by Congress.

Pretty straightforward statement of what the Constitution requires because article I of the Constitution vests the responsibility to go to war explicitly and exclusively in Congress, not in one person in the Oval Office.

James Madison put it best in 1793 when he wrote:

In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature, and not to the executive. . . . The trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man.

We are seeing Donald Trump succumb to the temptation in real time as he wantonly strikes boats in the Caribbean and Pacific: 16 strikes to date, 67 people killed, extrajudicial killings, no evidence to support their claims, and even if they were to provide evidence, still not a justification to engage the Armed Forces of the United States.

And now—and now—the Trump administration is threatening lethal operations against Maduro and the Maduro regime in Venezuela itself.

We all understand that the President has the authority to defend the United States from imminent attacks. That is an authority that this resolution clearly recognizes. But it is also crystal clear that there is no imminent attack or danger from Venezuela—zero.

Now, after illegally striking boats and killing people in international waters, President Trump is now threatening to start a war against a sovereign nation in our own hemisphere.

As my colleague and friend Senator Kaine pointed out earlier, the President has been taking this series of actions that are displayed on this chart.

On October 15, Trump confirmed that he authorized the CIA to conduct covert action in Venezuela.

October 16, Trump says:

We are certainly looking at land now.

Meaning not only using the Armed Forces of the United States to strike in the waters but on land in Venezuela.

October 24, Pentagon announces that the Gerald R. Ford carrier strike group has been directed to U.S. SOUTHCOTM.

October 31, several Trump administration officials tell the press that a secret list of targets in Venezuela has been drawn up.

Headline in the New York Times: “Trump Weighs Options, and Risks, for Attacks on Venezuela.”

Washington Post: “Trump beats the drums of war for direct action in Venezuela.”

That is what people are discussing and contemplating, as we speak, within this administration, and it is not just this series of actions and comments that have surfaced, but the President of the United States has deployed lots of U.S. military assets to the region.

I am not going to go through all of these, but this is a massive deployment of U.S. naval power off the coast of Venezuela. In other words, President Trump is openly threatening a regime change war that could cost American and Venezuelan lives.

You know, I think we all agree. I think we all agree in this body that Maduro is a terrible dictator. He is a plague on his own people. But we have learned from history that bombs don't turn dictatorships into democracies. The American people, particularly our veterans who sacrificed so much in Afghanistan and Iraq, understand that lesson very clearly, as do the American people, because recent polling found that a majority of Americans would oppose a U.S. military invasion of Venezuela.

And the U.S. Navy deployment near Venezuela has become even less popular over the last month as the Trump administration's boat strikes and saber-rattling against Venezuela has intensified.

I want to take a moment to contrast this resolution regarding Venezuela with the one we considered recently in the Senate regarding applying the War Powers Resolution to the President's action, blowing up boats and people in international waters.

And I see my colleague Senator KAINE on the floor, and I want to thank him for bringing both these resolutions before the body.

But I wanted to mention the earlier resolution because, just earlier today, I read the Trump administration's so-called justification for the actions that they are taking in international waters to strike these boats that have killed 67 people. I have followed the War Powers debate for a very long time, as have many of my colleagues. What I read was 35 pages of pure gobbledegook, pure mumbo jumbo.

Clearly, a lawyer had to work really hard to justify a decision that had already been made. That is what that 35-plus-whatever-page report was, as my colleague Senator REED talked about,

to justify the actions that the President has been taking about going after boats in international waters. It requires such a strained reading of the war powers set out in the Constitution, and subsequently, that it would blow up a hole so big that it would essentially absorb the article I requirement that Congress be the one that declares war.

Based on my reading of that statement, there is zero justification for what the President is doing with respect to strikes in the Caribbean.

I do want to point out, as have my colleagues, if you are actually serious about preventing drugs from coming to the United States, as we all should be, the way you do it is you interdict those boats. You go up the chain to find the kingpins, and you go after them.

I will tell you what you don't do. You don't submit a budget to the U.S. Congress that cuts the funding for the Drug Enforcement Agency and cuts funding for the task forces we developed to go after major organized crime syndicates involved in the drug business.

I happen to be the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee that oversees the Justice Department. And all my colleagues have to do is take a look at the request from the President of the United States when it comes to resources for fighting drugs coming to the United States. They cut them. They cut those resources.

So that is not what this is about. What this is about is a violation of the Constitution. It was just a few months ago that President Trump was asked whether he needs to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I don't know if my colleagues remember what his answer was, but it is right there on the record for all of you to read it. The President said: “I don't know”—“I don't know.”

Our job here is to make it clear to the President and to everybody else that all of us have to adhere to the Constitution of the United States, and that is what this War Powers Resolution does. We don't want to surrender those constitutional responsibilities to the President of the United States. We need to vote for this resolution, which, as I read at the very beginning of my remarks, is very clear. It simply says the President cannot go to war against Venezuela without congressional authorization.

Let me just end this with, we are here in the middle of a government shutdown. I have now voted seven times to reopen the government without giving President Trump a blank check and dealing with the healthcare crisis that is in front of us. President Trump has not engaged in any way in that discussion. He has been traveling around the world. He wanted to meet with Kim Jong Un, the North Korean leader, who apparently said no. He is using at least \$20 billion of U.S. taxpayer money to bail out his buddy in Argentina.

Meanwhile, here at home, prices are going up and up and up. The President promised he was going to bring them down on day one.

Right now before us, we have a ticking time bomb that is going to explode healthcare costs in America, especially when it comes to the Affordable Care Act. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle passed what they called the Big Beautiful Bill—“beautiful” if you are a billionaire, because they extended the tax cuts for billionaires permanently. The one tax relief provision that they let lapse was that which helps middle-class Americans better afford their healthcare.

So the message all of us should send to the President of the United States is: Quit engaging in illegal actions in the Caribbean and international waters, blowing up boats and people in an extrajudicial fashion. And when it comes to Venezuela, stop making these threats and amassing military assets off the shore and claiming you somehow have the authority to do that.

The Constitution invests the authority to go to war with the U.S. Congress. That is what this resolution is all about. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this weekend, I watched, probably like you, a number of folks go on television and confidently predict that we were going to be out of the shutdown. Some said as early as Wednesday. One confidently predicted Thursday. A couple more said Friday. So when I came back on Monday, I was pretty sanguine about things.

It gives me no joy to say this, but I was wrong. I don't know. As bad as this multiple-vehicle pileup looks from the outside, you ought to see it from the inside. I know you know what I am talking about, Mr. President. The Republicans have voted 14 times to come out of the shutdown. My Democrat friends have voted 14 times to stay shut down. I think it is going to be like that for a while.

I used to have a beagle. I loved him to death. His name was Roger. He was a rascal. Roger would run off. He was a rabbit dog that we picked up as a stray. Roger would run off for 3 days and scare me to death. I was afraid he was going to die. After 3 days, he would come staggering back home, and he always had roadkill in his mouth. He would hide that roadkill under my back porch. Where we are now, in negotiating out of the shutdown, looks like something Roger used to hide under my back porch.

We are supposed to have a vote tomorrow. We don't know what we are voting on, but we have been promised we are going to have a vote. I hope we do. And I hope we are wrong, and I hope we come out of this shutdown very soon. But I am not going to lie to the

American people. I think we are going to be in it for a while.

Now, as everyone knows, folks aren't being paid while we are in a shutdown. Our air traffic controllers are not being paid. In fact, starting tomorrow, the airlines are going to be canceling flights. Our staffs are not being paid. Federal employees are not being paid. These young men and women here, our pages, are not being paid. Our military is only being partially paid.

I am confused about SNAP payments. Some say the payments are being made; some say they aren't. I don't know who is telling the truth. But I do know this: I don't think anybody wants to see anybody hungry in America.

The only people that I can ascertain who are being paid are Members of Congress. I am not being paid. I said I wasn't going to take a salary during the shutdown. Some of my colleagues are, and I am not judging anybody. My purpose is not to judge anybody. I am just saying that it is time that Congress set an example.

I have two bills I am going to offer up today. The first one is called the No Shutdown Paychecks to Politicians Act. This just says that while we are in a shutdown, Members of Congress don't get paid and they don't get backpay.

The second bill is entitled Withhold Member Pay During Shutdowns Act. That bill says that while we are in a shutdown, Members of Congress don't get paid, but they will get paid. They will get their money in arrears after we open the government back up.

I am rather fond of the Constitution, as most people are. I am well aware of the 27th amendment which says:

No law, varying the compensation for the service of the Senators and Representatives, shall take effect, until an election of Representatives shall have intervened.

What that means, of course, is you can't change the pay for a Congressman until after you have had an election.

I think my bills are constitutional for two reasons. No. 1, we are not changing the rate of compensation. We are just saying: You are in a shutdown; you are not going to get your money.

No. 2, there is precedent for this. Back in 2013, President Obama had Congress pass the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013. President Obama's bill said: Look, Congress is about to go into a shutdown. Fine, have at it. Knock yourselves out. Go into a shutdown. But if you don't come out of that shutdown by this particular date, you are not going to get paid.

And do you know what? Members of Congress had an epiphany. They had a Damascene moment. They were born again. They got out of the shutdown in time to be paid.

I am not trying to put down anybody. I am not trying to condemn folks who have been taking their salary. I am not saying they don't earn every bit of it. But I am saying what is good for the goose is good for the gander.

I want to offer up these two bills for the Members' consideration, starting

with my first bill, which would say Members of Congress can't be paid and don't get backpay even after we end the shutdown. That is called the No Shutdown Paychecks to Politicians Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill, that bill which I just described, which is at the desk. I further ask 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is time that instead of closing the government down further, we begin to open up government.

What I will offer is legislation that instead of closing government down further, begins to pay those who are working. It pays our soldiers, pays our air traffic controllers, pays everyone who is showing up for work. I think this should become a permanent feature of our government.

I think it is disruptive, I think it is unfair, and I think it is wrong that we don't pay the workers that show up. A better way than isolating different groups and punishing different groups is actually to pay those who are working. I think, if we do this, pass this legislation, this would never be a problem again.

We are going to run into disagreements in the future. We are going to have times when the government shuts down. There is no reason we shouldn't be paying our government workers.

I ask the Senator to modify his request, so, instead, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 191, S. 3012; 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. Will the Senator modify his request?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will not, Mr. President.

I would like to explain why.

I understand Senator PAUL is making a good point. What he is saying is, rather than saying, as I am, that nobody else is being paid so Members of Congress shouldn't be paid—I think what Senator PAUL is saying is let's pay everybody. That is what I understand him to be saying. He wants me to agree to that instead of my bill.

What Senator PAUL is proposing is Senator RON JOHNSON's "no shutdown" act that we voted on several times. I am for it. I voted for it several times.

Here is the problem I have with Senator PAUL's proposal, pulling down my bill and going with Senator JOHNSON's bill—several reasons. No. 1, I am interested in passing something. I am not interested in just putting on a show. My bill will pass the House of Representatives, and my bill will be signed by the President.

Senator PAUL's bill, I can assure you, will not pass the House of Representatives, and President Trump will not sign it. I am not saying someone is right or somebody is wrong. President Trump does not consider Senator PAUL to be part of his MAGA agenda, and he will veto it. Then we are right back to square one.

So, for that reason, I can't substitute his for mine because his is going to be as dead as fried chicken here in a few days, and mine has a chance to pass.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Now, Mr. President, I need some clarification, a parliamentary inquiry, if you will: Do I understand that Senator PAUL has objected to my bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has asked if you would modify your request.

Mr. KENNEDY. And his modification, if I might ask, is to substitute his bill for mine?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. OK. I have said I will not substitute his bill for mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I think it is actually not clear at all that the President wouldn't sign a bill to continue paying Federal workers. I think it is actually a universal sentiment among both parties and among the American people, particularly among the soldiers, that we ought to continue to pay the soldiers and continue to pay the workers.

I am, perhaps, the most conservative Member of the Senate. I vote to cut spending on everything—I think we spend way too much—but I am not for cutting the salaries of people who have a contract and who are doing their work. Now, I probably would not hire new people, and I would probably let the Federal Government shrink gradually through attrition because I think we need to be smaller, but if you work for the government and you are doing your job and you have a contract, I think you ought to be paid.

So I don't think it is clear that the President wouldn't support this. I think it is actually quite confusing that this is being objected to by the Democrats, and I think, actually, it would be nice to let the Democrats, you know, have a round at this and explain to us why they don't want to pay the air traffic controllers.

Look, we can have a dispute over spending. I think the Republican proposal spends too much, and I think the Democrat proposal spends too much, but I think we ought to pay the workers while we are working out the debate over what the spending level ought to be.

I think it is actually an untenable position of Democrats to come before

this body and say: Oh, we want to give subsidies to people who make \$225,000 a year. That is what they are arguing for. The ObamaCare subsidies are not the basic subsidies. These are add-on subsidies that started 2 years ago. If you make \$100,000 a year, the Democrats want to give you \$13,000. Meanwhile, people who make \$20,000 and are on food stamps are not going to get food stamps, but somebody making \$100,000 is going to get \$13,000. That doesn't sound like the Democrats are for the working class or for the poor. It sounds like the Democrats are for the people making \$200,000 a year to get a subsidy.

But in the midst of all this, with pressure, I think the Democrats could be made to understand and support paying the government workers. I mean, I just think it is something eminently reasonable, and I think it is something very passable. I don't see the President objecting to this. I think the President would sign this in a heartbeat.

So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may I ask for a clarification?

I have offered a bill to say that Congress does not get paid like everybody else who is not being paid during a shutdown. There has been a little bit of a back-and-forth.

As I understand it, Senator PAUL has objected to that bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky objected to your unanimous consent request.

Mr. KENNEDY. To my bill to say Congress isn't paid during a shutdown; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the bill you asked unanimous consent to pass. He objected to the unanimous consent.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to bring up my second bill. It is called the Withhold Member Pay During Shutdowns Act.

Remember, my first bill that Senator PAUL objected to would have said Members of Congress don't get paid, just like our staffs don't get paid, just like air traffic controllers don't get paid, just like the military doesn't get paid. We don't get paid until the shutdown is lifted, and we don't get our money in arrears. In other words, we don't recoup our money once the shutdown is lifted. Perhaps Senator PAUL will find my second bill to be more palatable to him and his pocketbook.

The Withhold Member Pay During Shutdowns Act would say, while we are in a shutdown and everyone else is not being paid, Congress would not be paid but that Members of Congress—including Senator PAUL, including me, including all Members of Congress—would have the right to get the money back, to be paid, after they are out of the shutdown. In other words, the money would be escrowed, and they

would get it once we were to come out of the shutdown.

Again, there is precedent for that, and I talked about what President Obama did back in 2013. For that reason, I am going to ask unanimous consent on that one.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3057 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask 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. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I think the answer is to pay more people and not fewer people and to try to get through shutdowns without having people go without pay who are doing their jobs.

Now, the proposal was made, and I just simply made a proposal that would pay everybody. So the Senator from Louisiana has objected to paying everyone, and I don't quite understand this. We could pay everyone. We could have paid everyone had he agreed to my motion. My motion was to pay everyone—to pay the soldiers; to pay the air traffic controllers; to pay the staff; to pay everybody who is working. Yet there was an objection. So I don't understand what is going on here.

Should the emphasis be to pay fewer people or more people? Why would we try to punish certain groups of people instead of paying all of the people who are working? Why would we not do that?

So I don't understand the process we have gone through here. We just had a chance to pay all of the people. We had a chance to pay the air traffic controllers; we had a chance to pay the soldiers; we had a chance to pay all of the government workers—and then there was an objection. So I don't understand what we are going through here.

I, for one, believe that the workers should be paid. I, for one, believe that we should fix this permanently. The bill that I have presented is not just to pay them one time; it is to pay all workers all the time who are under contract and who show up for work whether there is a shutdown or not. It is a permanent payday for those who do their jobs. That was the fix. It is not a niche bill. It is not to punish one group or the other group. It is to say, if you are working and there is a disagreement on the spending levels, that all workers are paid. I don't understand the objection, and I will continue to support paying all the workers all the time they are at work whether there is a shutdown or not.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a point of clarification: Has Senator

PAUL objected to my bill or does he want me to modify it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He objected to your bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am not done yet. Maybe I wasn't clear. I apologize if I wasn't clear.

I support RAND's bill. It is actually RON JOHNSON's bill, but I support his idea.

What I am saying is, if everybody over here isn't being paid, Members of Congress shouldn't be paid, OK? What RAND is saying—what Senator PAUL is saying—is let's pay everybody, and he is absolutely right. I support that, but I am going to pass on it.

I am going to pass on it, Senator DURBIN. We live in the real world, and my bill is more likely to be signed by the President than Senator PAUL's bill. I wish that weren't the case, but it is. I don't think that the House is going to pass Senator PAUL's bill. I don't think it is any secret. I am not saying he is right or wrong, but President Trump does not consider Senator PAUL to be part of the MAGA agenda. He said that. He has tweeted it about a skillion times.

Am I wrong, Senator DURBIN?

I mean, he has tweeted it about a skillion times, and he is going to veto Senator PAUL's bill because his name is on it. He is going to knock it to Uranus. He is going to knock it into a new ZIP Code.

Then what have RAND and I done? We have put on a pretty performance. I want to pass something. Now, I have tried to pass my bill preventing Members of Congress from being paid, and you can pretty it up all you want to, but RAND objected. And I am not judging him. I am not judging anybody who is taking their salary. I am not taking mine, but I am not judging anybody. But what is good for the goose is good for the gander, and you either think Members of Congress ought to be treated like everybody else or you don't. You either think that we are more important and smarter and more virtuous than the American people or you don't, and I think we ought to be treated the same.

Now, having said that, I said I agreed with what Senator PAUL said. I am just worried his name on the bill is going to get knocked out of the park, so I am going to put it in my name. It is not Senator PAUL's bill; it is Senator RON JOHNSON's bill, and what RON JOHN's—we call him RON JOHN. I am sorry. He is Senator RON JOHNSON from the wonderful State of Wisconsin.

What Senator JOHNSON has proposed—and I voted for it repeatedly—says: Look, if you are deemed an essential employee right now, if you are working but you are not being paid, Senator JOHNSON's bill says we are going to pay you. I voted for that. It also says, if you are furloughed, if you are deemed to be nonessential, then you are not working, but you will get paid once we come out of this shutdown.

Does that make sense? That is what Senator RON JOHNSON has proposed.

As I told my good friend Senator PAUL, I agree with it. Senator PAUL's name is on that bill, and it is going to be vetoed six ways to Sunday. I am going to try to put my name on the bill. Maybe it will get passed, and maybe it won't, but I think I have a better chance than Senator PAUL. That is just my personal opinion. It is not meant to be personal.

For that reason, Mr. President, I will try it a third way. It is not my preferred way, but we have got to get out of this mess.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 191, S. 3012. As I have indicated, I think we have got a chance to pass it in the House, and I really don't think President Trump will veto it if I explain to him it is Senator RON JOHNSON's bill. I further ask 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. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, let me just say this: We should make sure that every Federal worker gets the paycheck that they are owed, and the right way to do that is for Republicans to finally join us and get serious about passing a bipartisan CR so we do reopen the government and prevent healthcare costs from exploding.

Instead, the bill that the Senator from Louisiana is asking unanimous consent for actually lets Donald Trump and Russ Vought decide whom they want to pay during a shutdown, and that will allow them to stiff everyone else. President Trump has said he will only pay the people he wants to.

He literally said:

[W]e're going to take care of our people. There are some people who really don't deserve to be taken care of, and we'll take care of them in a different way.

This bill would actually let Trump do exactly that.

We should make sure all of our workers get paid, not just the workers Trump likes. So the best way to do that is, of course, for Republicans to sit down with us, as Democrats, and work out a solution to reopen the government. If, instead, you do as the Senator from Louisiana suggests here, then, at a minimum, it should cover all employees, and that proposal is out on the table with Senator VAN HOLLEN and Senator PETERS.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, look, I get it. You know, this is why we are in a shutdown.

I just proposed a bill—this was my third choice, but it was better than nothing—to say everybody gets paid,

and my good friend from Washington State objected.

I don't know what else to do. I voted 14 times to open up the government.

I can't change the election. President Trump was duly elected President of the United States—he was—in a free election, and the American people spoke. Some of my colleagues are upset about that. In fact, they hate the President so much, they have shut down government. They hate him so much that, if President Trump came out in favor of breathing to live, they would hold their breath. It is not rational.

I just don't know what else to do. All I can tell my Democratic friends is: Look, reasonable people disagree, and I get it. But you are just being too emotional. You need to go drink a big ole, cold, tall glass of "get over it" and realize that President Trump is the President of the United States. Don't shut the government down because of it.

Mr. President, you have been really patient. Even though the Parliamentarian tried to get you to dodge my questions, you answered them straight up, and I really appreciate it.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

S.J. RES. 90

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, for decades, the globalists in Washington have led our country into one disastrous foreign war after another. Whether in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, and now potentially Venezuela, the formula is always the same: Proclaim that the regime of the targeted country poses such a threat to the American way of life that the only thing we can do is go to war. Tell them that our intervention is a noble effort, one that would bring security at home and liberty to foreign lands. Topple the government and declare a new age of freedom. The warmongers have recycled these experiments in regime change again and again. And what has it brought? Instability, chaos, suffering, and resentment.

It is the height of arrogance to think we can forcibly remove the dictatorship in Venezuela and expect a different result. We should learn from history. Liberty cannot be imposed at the point of a foreign bad act. The United States maintains the most formidable military in human history. Of course, we have the capability of overthrowing the Maduro regime, just like we had the power to overthrow Saddam Hussein and Muammar Qadhafi.

But what comes next? Is anyone thinking about the potential blowback that such a campaign could entail? Overthrowing the Maduro regime risks

creating more regional instability, not less. The breakdown of state authority may create a power vacuum that the very drug cartels the administration is ostensibly trying to destroy could exploit.

Just as our misguided interventions in the Middle East led to the proliferation of terrorist organizations, this could happen in Venezuela, but this time with the proliferation of organized crime. We could swell the ranks of the cartels with new recruits. Remember what happened in Iraq, the de-Baathification of Iraq. Removing all of the previous government soldiers, they had no place to go. They were used to being paid, they wanted money, and they went and worked and became terrorists.

Where do you think the tens of thousands of Venezuelan soldiers and desperate civilians will turn when their livelihood suddenly disappears? It may be the drug cartels. In its hubris, Washington may very well empower the cartels and make the drug problem in our hemisphere worse. Certainly, any war will exacerbate the already precarious humanitarian crisis in Venezuela and lead to mass migration into neighboring countries already struggling under the strain of millions of refugees. And rest assured, many of those who flee the disaster of the war that will come will make their way to the United States.

Most consequentially, any military operation comes with the risk that American servicemembers will be killed or wounded. We owe it to our servicemembers to only send them into harm's way when vital American interests are at stake. Who is in charge of Venezuela does not constitute such an interest.

We have seen chaos emerge from our misguided wars before. We overthrew Saddam Hussein thinking Iraq will be transformed into this great Jeffersonian democracy. Instead, what occurred was an insurgency that led to some of the most brutal sectarian violence in living memory. Washington's foolish invasion empowered radical jihadists and ultimately led to the rise of ISIS, which posed a much greater threat to Americans than Saddam Hussein ever did.

A similar story unfolded in Libya. In 2011, our forces aided the rebels to oust Muammar Qadhafi. The result was a brutal 6-year war that saw the proliferation of jihadist groups and widespread human rights violations, including the resurgence of slavery. Weapons were spread throughout Africa. Our intervention helped spur mass migration into Europe and contributed to widespread instability across Africa as weapons flowed from Libya into the Sahel and Sub-Saharan, where they continued to fuel conflicts and terrorism to this day.

Libya is still highly unstable, and the conflict constantly threatens to reignite. Like Saddam and Qadhafi, Maduro is unmistakably a dictator. He

is a bad guy. He suppresses freedom of speech. He controls his people. There is no free voting. He treats people poorly, and that is an understatement.

But there are a lot of bad guys in the world. There are a lot of dictators. There is a lot of socialism leading to starvation. It doesn't mean that the United States should carelessly risk its blood and treasure to go and topple every one of them. As we have seen all too well in recent decades, foreign military interventions often end up making things worse. The road to hell is paved with good intentions.

Imagine the anarchy that followed our wars in the Middle East. Do we really want to risk creating similar conditions in our own backyard? With over 10,000 U.S. troops, 8 warships, a Virginia-class submarine, and dozens of F-35s already in the Caribbean, the USS *Gerald Ford* strike group surging toward the region, the stage for folly is set. We are told that only drug dealers are the target of U.S. operations, but the consolidation of the largest U.S. force in the Caribbean in 35 years suggests that regime change may very well be the intended goal.

The use of lethal force and our massive military buildup is an invitation to retaliation. Attacked countries often attack back. It is our soldiers in the field of battle—not the Senators on this floor—who will bear the brunt of the retaliation. By then, the time for debate will have passed. The Senate will have once again excused itself from the responsibility of governing, and the United States will once again be at war.

Those who argue that small boats in the Caribbean are so dangerous that they warrant being blown out of the water must explain why, when some of the individuals happen to survive, they are not detained. The drugs are not scooped up and tested. The survivors are simply sent back to their country of origin. Wouldn't we ask whom they work for? Wouldn't we detain them? Wouldn't we present evidence to a court and say what should be done with these survivors? We summarily shoot them when we don't know who they are. But once we pick them up, we don't summarily kill them. We don't even try them.

The United States has now repatriated two survivors to Colombia and Ecuador. If, as we are told, these groups constitute a threat to our security equal to al-Qaida, that they are somehow narcoterrorists, then why are we allowing these individuals to go home? The truth is that these arguments are nonsensical. Drug traffickers aren't equivalent to al-Qaida, and the executive branch does not have the authority to kill at will anyone, anywhere, at any time, for any reason.

Repatriating survivors of the strikes suggest that the administration's lawyers are not so confident that their arguments about article II authority will survive legal scrutiny—or perhaps they are not confident that they could even bring drug convictions in a court.

In addition to the strategic malpractice of pursuing regime change in Venezuela, there is also the inconvenient fact that the President simply does not have the authority to unilaterally launch wars. The Founders had the foresight to recognize that the executive branch is the branch most prone to war, and they therefore made it clear in the Constitution that Congress maintains the exclusive power to declare war.

Part of President Trump's broad appeal was his strong contempt for the neocons on the right and the liberal internationalists on the left who never met a war they didn't want someone else's children to fight. He rightfully criticized those in Washington who supported nation-building fantasies throughout the Middle East; yet now certain individuals within the administration seek to lead the President astray.

I would advise President Trump to remember the wise words of his inaugural address, when President Trump said:

[W]e will measure our success by the wars we never get into.

President Trump, do not allow the warmongers in Washington to drag you into an unnecessary war of choice. Washington has spent decades, trillions of dollars, and thousands of lives trying to remake other countries in our image. The American people are sick and tired of their elected representatives in Congress standing idly by saying: Nothing to see here; the President can do whatever he wants, while their sons and daughters are sent to fight wars in distant lands.

As the administration authorizes covert CIA action in Venezuela and surges U.S. forces to the region, including our most advanced aircraft carrier, the risk of imminent involvement in hostilities is evident.

It is time that the first branch of government puts America first. The majority party of this institution should stand by the principles of restraint as espoused by President Trump's promise to the American people. Honor and statesmanship should prevent the Senate from sitting idly by while elements within his administration blunder America into another foreign war. The American soldiers, their families, and the American people deserve a debate and a vote before we send our Armed Forces into war.

If you agree that our soldiers and their families deserve at least this much, vote yes on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR TO S.J. RES. 90

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator Kaine for S.J. Res. 90, and I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor.

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

S.J. RES. 90

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are here debating a central Constitution

precept, and I am glad. Throughout my career in the House and Senate, I have tried to be consistent on this issue and respect the Constitution and its wisdom.

I am going to say six words I very rarely, if ever, have said in my entire career in Congress: I agree with Senator RAND PAUL. I believe what he has said on the floor today is in fact the way I feel about what this section of the Constitution means.

In one of the previous debates with the War Powers Resolution, War Powers Act being debated on the floor, Senator Kaine reminded us of that historic moment when the Founding Fathers decided to write this Constitution, which we have all sworn to uphold and defend. And leading that Constitutional Convention, of course, was the greatest general then and still in the history of the United States: George Washington.

Despite the fact that he was in the room and leading the conversation about what Constitution would govern this country, article I, section 8 put in a provision that basically said, when it comes to a future war, even if you are President, General Washington, that Congress would have the power to decide whether we go to war. Senator Kaine made that point in an earlier debate, and I thought it was well worth repeating.

Let me say a word about Venezuela. In 2018, I had the opportunity to visit Venezuela—a once prosperous, albeit imperfect democracy, suffering terrible economic and political decline under the disgraceful and failed leadership of Nicolas Maduro.

I told then-President Maduro that if he rigged any upcoming elections, Venezuelans would be even more isolated and endure further unnecessary suffering. He went ahead with a sham election anyway, leading to even more cruelty and the exodus of literally millions of Venezuelans, some to the United States.

Last July, Venezuela held another Presidential election, during which the regime, the Maduro regime, arbitrarily blocked opposition candidates from the ballot and tried to undermine the preelectoral process. Nonetheless, more than 10 million Venezuelans showed up to vote, and results meticulously documented by credible election monitors showed a sweeping victory for opposition candidate Edmundo Gonzalez. Maduro and his criminal enablers again refused to respect the rules and shamelessly refused to swear in legitimately chosen President Gonzalez.

So let me make it clear: Nicolas Maduro is an illegitimate leader guilty of turning Venezuela into a failed state, one that has caused terrible suffering and misery for the people who live there. This is not the question at hand. As I have long said, it is long overdue that the result of last year's elections be respected in Venezuela.

But let me be clear on a position I have also held for a long time regardless of who has been in the White

House. Only Congress, under the Constitution, has the power to declare war. Article I, section 8 is clear on this issue—and for good reason. Only the people's elected representatives should have the awesome power to send our sons and daughters into armed conflict.

I remember thinking about this in personal terms during the era of the Vietnam war when I was a college student, thinking about the fact that there had not been any formal declaration of war in Vietnam, and yet over 40,000 of my brothers and sisters gave their lives in that conflict.

Our Founding Fathers were wise in this regard and well aware of human history in which Kings and unelected leaders sent their people into war for personal gain without any public consent.

Congress overwhelmingly reaffirmed this key constitutional provision when it passed the War Powers Act in 1973 over the veto of then-President Richard Nixon.

Under the law, the President has the authority to approve military attacks as a response to an imminent threat or with the expressed authorization of Congress. I do not believe these conditions have been met in this situation.

We in Congress have already ceded too much of our constitutional authority on appropriations and other key items to the President. This body must not do so regarding matters of war.

I think about the idea of a war breaking out between the United States and Venezuela. Certainly picking off unarmed boats in the ocean is an easy task for our great military. But let's keep in mind that we live in a world where there is asymmetric power. What am I talking about? Take a look at what the drones—many of them pretty cheap pieces of equipment—have wrought in countries like Ukraine in the midst of their war. What would turn out to be a mass of force by the United States sent down in the Caribbean—there is sure to be a show of force, maybe subject to attack even by Venezuela, poorly armed country that it is.

So I would say that if we are thinking clearly about this, we would think long and hard before we engaged in any conflict with Venezuela. That is what article I, section 8 is about. The American people, before being asked to give any sons and daughters and risk their lives in a war, have to have a voice in the process, and they do that through Members of Congress and through our Constitution. That is what Senator Kaine of Virginia reminds us of today. That is why I will support S.J. Res. 90.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I rise today to respond to Senator Kaine's S.J. Res. 90, and I would like to state clearly that the administration is very much opposed to this resolution, and they have put out a policy statement as of today stating that they strongly oppose S.J. Res. 90.

Without going into all the details, they say that S.J. Res. 90 fails to account for the extraordinary national security threat posed by transnational violent drug-trafficking cartels and narcoterrorists operating in and around the Caribbean Sea. That really says it all, and not much more needs to be said, but I do have a few comments on this.

President Trump has taken decisive action to protect thousands of Americans from lethal narcotics. He has kept drugs off the streets, kept children alive, and eliminated narcoterrorists who have been profiting off of the deaths of members of our communities.

These people have been transmitting drugs into the United States via a lot of different ways. One of them was by vessels, shipping vessels, in the Caribbean and the eastern Pacific Ocean.

But some Democrat Members and members of the media have claimed that President Trump does not have the authority to conduct these strikes. I will tell you right now, that is plain wrong. I myself and many of my colleagues have sat recently through hours of briefings and analysis by government legal departments and attorneys who have studied this issue. Unanimously, they have concluded that the action taken by President Trump is absolutely lawful.

As Commander in Chief, if the President sees a group of terrorists planning to harm America or our allies, he has the right—not only the right but the duty—to do something about it. He has taken an oath to protect this country, and I and the majority of my colleagues are glad the President took this action.

Now, for some reason which I don't understand, the people who oppose the President's actions somehow make a differentiation between drugs and explosives. If these were explosives that were on ships being brought to the United States by terrorist organizations to be distributed through the United States and kill and maim Americans, people would say nothing about it. These drugs are no different than that. They do the exact same thing: They kill people by the thousands in the United States.

President Trump is doing what needs to be done to protect the American people, just as he has done before. Take for example the recent defensive strikes against the Houthis in the Red Sea. This went on for some time. When the Houthis threatened the U.S. ships in the Red Sea, citing article II of the Constitution, the President took action to eliminate the terrorists threatening our troops and U.S. commercial shipping in the Red Sea.

These strikes are fully compliant with the War Powers Resolution and fully compliant with the President's article II constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

Prior Presidents did not need nor did they seek congressional authorization

to defend America in this Western Hemisphere. Panama and Grenada are two examples where Republican Presidents also took action in our own backyard to go after threats to the American people.

These strikes have been discrete; they have been intermittent, with little risk, if any, to U.S. servicemen. No 60-day clock has been triggered, as many Democrats have tried to argue today.

I wish my colleagues would join me here today in congratulating the President for what he has done and thanking the President for what he has done on behalf of the many parents who will not have to bury their children early and will never know that they were saved from this.

But there is no doubt—none whatsoever—that every time we take a strike and we send tons of these poisonous drugs to the bottom of the ocean, thousands of American lives have been saved.

Mr. President, thank you for what you are doing on behalf of all those Americans who will be saved from these poisonous drugs. Thank you, and continue to do what you are doing.

Mr. President, I object to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAIN. Mr. President, I rise for the closing comments about S.J. Res. 90. My colleague and friend from Idaho talked about strikes on boats. That is not what this is about. This is about the prospect, openly discussed by the President, for a land invasion of the sovereign nation of Venezuela. The President has not asserted a legal rationale for it. The documents that we read in the classified facility talk about a legal rationale for strikes in international waters but, specifically, do not contain a legal rationale for striking a sovereign nation.

This is not about President Trump. It is about the Constitution, and it is about Congress. Do we take seriously the most important responsibility in article I, that wars should not be declared without Congress?

Venezuela is a nation of 30 million people. They have a very capable military because they purchased weapons from our adversaries, like Russia and Iran. The massing of U.S. forces around Venezuela poses series risk of a miscommunication or a use of those weapons against Americans.

I might remind my colleagues that the United States attacked Grenada in 1983. Grenada was an island with a population of less than 100,000. Nineteen American soldiers died in that attack. One hundred fifty-two American soldiers were wounded in that attack. Twenty-four civilians who were at a mental hospital that was bombed by accident were killed in that attack.

An attack against a population poorly armed, without weapons, of 113,000 people caused 19 soldiers to lose their lives and 152 to be injured.

A Venezuela of 30 million people is a completely different kind of military operation, and we would not expect it to go perfectly because none ever go perfectly.

How will you respond to an American family who loses the life of a child or whose child is injured in the event of a war against Venezuela, when they ask you: Why did you not even think it was important enough to have a debate and vote in the U.S. Senate? Why did you let this President—why would you let any President—make that decision on his or her own without you even weighing in?

I will close with this. I have stood on this floor and made this same argument when the President is a Democrat. It happened often during President Obama's term, and I made the same argument against unilateral Executive war when the President was a Democrat, as I am now making when the President is a Republican.

I believe, as I stand here today, if these same facts were applying strikes on boats, massing of warships, the President saying he has authorized covert action, the President saying he has looked at land targets, and that President was Joe Biden or Barack Obama—I believe I would have many Republicans voting with me on this resolution, not because they don't like President Biden or President Obama but because they would take this responsibility, no war without Congress, that we pledge an oath to because it is in the Constitution we pledge an oath to—they would take it seriously.

I urge you to take this as seriously as you would take it if the President were a Democrat. It shouldn't matter. We should not be going to war without a vote of Congress. The lives of our troops are at stake. Respect them and their families, and please vote yes on the resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first let me thank our great Senator from Virginia Senator Kaine. He has been the most vigilant watchdog against over-encroachment of the military. He has been the most rigorous watchdog in making sure Congress's power to make war and engage in acts of war are upheld.

There are many Presidents, as Senator Kaine pointed out, who try to push the boundaries, but no President has pushed the boundaries more than President Trump.

Americans need Kaine here to do just what he is doing.

Thank you, Senator Kaine.

I also want to thank Senator Paul and Senator Schiff for championing this resolution today because the Senate will vote to discharge a resolution that says two—two—simple things.

First, it affirms that the United States will always support our troops when they act to protect the American people and themselves from foreign attack.

But it also says that if Donald Trump wants to engage in military hostilities against Venezuela, he must seek authorization from Congress first.

As we speak, America's largest aircraft carrier, the *Gerald Ford*, is on its way to the Caribbean. It is part of the largest military buildup in our hemisphere that we have seen in decades.

According to press reports, Donald Trump is considering military action on Venezuelan territory. But it also sounds like nobody really knows what the plan is because, like so many other things with Donald Trump, he keeps changing his mind. Who knows what he will do tomorrow.

To date, we have heard no clear goals, no clear timetable, no clear explanation for what Donald Trump's objective is in Venezuela. This is unacceptable, and it is dangerous.

Even in our briefing with Secretary Rubio, yesterday, we walked out of the room with more questions than answers. We need a clear explanation.

I am demanding a full Senators' briefing on this issue of Venezuela and the intervention there, at once.

In the meantime, the Senate must act today to discharge this resolution because Donald Trump seems ready to lead our troops over the Rubicon with a blindfold over his eyes, and that is a recipe for catastrophe.

Congress must assert its authority on matters of war and peace, and time is of the essence. Multiple warships have been moved from other ports of the world to be just off the coast of Venezuela. By some estimates, 10 percent of the Navy's deployed assets are now in the Southern Command area of responsibility.

These actions certainly do not sound like mere drug enforcement against organized criminals—not even close. These are actions you take before you consider launching a major military operation against another country, and that authority—the Constitution is clear—must come from Congress.

Nobody here denies the Maduro regime is horrific and undemocratic, and we also agree drug traffickers and organized criminals who poison Americans ought to be tracked down and dismantled. That was why, when I was majority leader, Congress provided billions for counternarcotics operations and granted sweeping authorities to combat the flow of narcotics and opioids like fentanyl.

If we must do more, we should. We should help law enforcement, intelligence operators, and Federal agents to dismantle criminal networks and drug smugglers. But saber-rattling and military escalations are a poor substitute—a poor substitute—for a real counternarcotics strategy.

I ask my colleagues: Remember what Colin Powell used to say about military force? You break it; you own it.

It is the old Pottery Barn rule.

This is the danger of unilateral attacks against Venezuela. If we break it, we are going to own it. The mere

thought of another endless war ought to make the American people sick to their stomachs.

So, today, the Senate must act to uphold the Constitution, uphold our national security, and reaffirm the authority of Congress to have its proper say on matters in war and peace.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

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

Mr. BARRASSO. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 608 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—51

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BARRASSO. 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.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale

may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

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

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 25-1L. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 24-26 of March 12, 2024.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosure.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 25-1L. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 24-26 of March 12, 2024.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosure.

DEFENSE SECURITY,
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BRIAN MAST,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 25-1L. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 24-26 of March 12, 2024.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-1L

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

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Poland.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 24-26.

Date: March 12, 2024.
Implementing Agency: Navy.

(iii) Description: On March 12, 2024, Congress was notified by congressional certification transmittal number 24-26 of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of two hundred thirty-two (232) AIM-9X Sidewinder Block II Tactical Missiles; and sixteen (16) AIM-9X Sidewinder Block II Tactical Missile Guidance Units. Also included were missile containers; training aids; active optical target detectors; spares; support equipment; missile support; U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost was \$219.1 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted \$181.3 million.

This transmittal notifies the inclusion of the following additional MDE items: one hundred and twenty (120) AIM-9X Sidewinder Block II tactical missiles. The following non-MDE items will also be included: missile containers; training aids; active optical target detectors; spares; support equipment; missile support; U.S. Government and contractor technical assistance; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost of the new items is \$100.1 million. The estimated MDE value will increase by \$80.1 million to a revised \$261.4 million. The estimated non-MDE value will increase by \$20 million to a revised \$57.8 million. The estimated total case value increases by \$100.1 million to a revised \$319.2 million.

(iv) Significance: This notification is provided as the additional MDE items were not enumerated in the original notification. The inclusion of these items represents an increase in capability over what was previously notified. The proposed sale will support Poland's capability to meet current and future threats by providing more flexibility and maintaining Poland's capability to counter regional threats.

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

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology:

The Sensitivity of Technology Statement contained in the original notification applies to items reported here.

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

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: November 4, 2025.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

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

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 25-49, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Singapore for defense services estimated to cost \$353 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

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

Enclosures.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 25-49, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Singapore for defense services estimated to cost \$353 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

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

Enclosures.

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HON. BRIAN MAST,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 25-49, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Singapore for defense services estimated to cost \$353 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

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

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-49

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

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Singapore.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$0.

Other \$353 million.

Total \$353 million.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case SN-D-GFU was below congressional notification threshold at \$27 million (\$0 in MDE) and included U.S. government

and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The Government of Singapore has requested the case be amended to include construction services at Ebbing Air National Guard Base and other related elements of logistics and program support. This amendment will cause the case to exceed the notification threshold, and thus notification of the entire program is required. The above notification requirements are combined as follows:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

None.

Non-Major Defense Equipment:

Construction services at Ebbing Air National Guard Base, including studies and surveys; transportation support; U.S. government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (SN-D-GFU).

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

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

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 31, 2025.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Singapore—Ebbing Air National Guard Base Construction Services

The Government of Singapore has requested to buy construction services at Ebbing Air National Guard Base and other related elements of logistics and program support that will be added to a previously implemented case whose value was under the congressional notification threshold. The original Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case, valued at \$27 million (\$0 in MDE), included U.S. government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$353 million.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a strategic partner that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in Asia.

The proposed sale will improve Singapore's capability to maintain operational readiness and interoperability with U.S. and coalition forces. Singapore will have no difficulty absorbing these articles and services into its armed forces.

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

There are no principal contractors associated with this potential sale. At this time, the U.S. government is not aware of any offset agreement proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

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

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

HONORING CAPTAIN WILLIBALD BIANCHI

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to posthumously honor U.S.

Army Captain Willibald Charles Bianchi of New Ulm, MN, a true American patriot who courageously served our country and made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

On August 11, 2025, Captain Bianchi's remains were identified—more than 80 years after he died in service to our country.

Since the founding of our democracy, each person who has worn the uniform has left their mark on our Nation as they defended our freedom.

Captain Willibald Bianchi was no different. Born in New Ulm, MN, and raised on a poultry farm, Captain Bianchi, like many Minnesotans before him, initially aspired to follow in his father's footsteps and become a farmer. Instead, he went on to serve in World War II with the greatest generation.

In 1940, Captain Bianchi commissioned as an Army second lieutenant and was deployed to the Philippines, joining the conflict in the Pacific theater. In 1942, during his deployment, Captain Bianchi volunteered to help clear a series of Japanese machinegun nests and continued leading the attack even when wounded multiple times, his heroism earning him the Medal of Honor. While he was later captured and died aboard a Japanese prisoner of war ship, his recovery reflects our Nation's commitment to bringing our missing heroes home—no matter how much time has passed.

We can never serve any veteran in quite the same way they served us. Whether they served many decades ago or in our more recent conflicts, our obligation is to ensure they have the support and care they earned.

So today, I rise today to honor Captain Willibald Bianchi, an American hero.

RECOGNIZING THE VISIT OF ECUMENICAL PATRIARCH BARTHOLOMEW

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize and welcome the Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew to Washington, DC.

Born Demetrios Arhondonis in 1940 on the island of Imvros, now known as Gökreda, Türkiye, Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew was elected in October 1991 as the 270th Archbishop of the 2,000-year-old Orthodox Church. As Ecumenical Patriarch, he is the spiritual leader of Orthodox Christianity worldwide, with over 300 million adherents and a history tracing back to the early Christian communities of Roman antiquity.

Patriarch Bartholomew has been a strong advocate for religious freedom, interfaith dialogue, and environmental stewardship. He has been received by multiple Presidents of the United States and Secretaries of State, and in 1997, Congress awarded him the Congressional Gold Medal, one of our Nation's highest honors.

Last September, Patriarch Bartholomew returned to Washington to

receive the very prestigious Templeton Prize, awarded in New York City, joining the company of past recipients such as Mother Teresa, Archbishop Desmond Tutu, and the Dalai Lama. The Templeton Prize recognizes his outstanding leadership in promoting human dignity and fostering dialogue between faith and science.

The people of Delaware, including our incredibly vibrant Greek Orthodox community, are honored to welcome the Patriarch Bartholomew to the U.S. Capitol. I invite my colleagues to join me in welcoming Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA'S INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES GULF COAST RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CENTER

• Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Florida Gulf Coast Research and Education Center, an institution at the forefront of agricultural innovation and scientific research located in Wimauma, FL.

The Gulf Coast Research and Education Center was started in 1925 as a laboratory focused on solutions for Florida's threatened tomato production. Throughout its 100-year history, the center adapted, grew, and became a leader in advancement for farmers in the Sunshine State.

Research efforts at the center have spanned a wide range of cutting-edge agricultural initiatives. Importantly, the center's efforts have not been a mere academic exercise. Scientists at the center have improved the quality and yield of the crops Florida's farmers grow and sell around the world.

At 100 years old, the center is breaking ground on its next big venture: the Center for Applied Artificial Intelligence in Agriculture. This new chapter in the center's story will revolutionize the way the men and women who get up before the sun provide the food we eat.

Long before the tourist attractions and bustling neighborhoods, there was the Florida farmer, raising cattle and growing winter vegetables. With 100 more years of the Gulf Coast Research and Education Center, the Florida farmer will still be there. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring their century-long track record of excellence. •

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mrs. Stringer, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-2097. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report to advise that he is exercising his authority to terminate the Inspectors General for the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Federal Housing Finance Agency; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2098. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registry of Nonbank Covered Persons Subject to Certain Agency and Court Orders; Rescission" (RIN3170-AB32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2099. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fair Credit Reporting Act; Preemption of State Laws" (12 CFR Part 1022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2100. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to all complaints received by air carriers alleging discrimination on the basis of disability; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2101. A communication from the Chief Regulatory Officer, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of the Automatic Extension of Employment Authorization Documents" (RIN1615-AD05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2102. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Priestia megaterium strain SYM36613; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 12859-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2103. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cyclobutifluram; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 12872-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2104. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management

Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Attainment by the Attainment Date; California; Mariposa County; 2015 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 12611-02-R9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2105. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "ASFBIOF01-02 Polypeptide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 13031-01-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2106. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances (24-4.5e)" (RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 12563-02-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 5, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2107. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-164, "Special Education for Young Adults in the Custody of the Department of Corrections Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2025"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2108. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-175, "Volunteer Services Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2025"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2109. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the threat from securities investments that finance certain companies of the People's Republic of China (PRC) that was declared in Executive Order 13959 of November 12, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2110. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2111. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2112. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to nominations, vacancies, designations of service in acting roles, discontinuations of service in acting roles and actions on nominations for positions covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2113. A communication from the Supervisory Program Analyst, Office of Managing

Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Review of Submarine Cable Landing License Rules and Procedures to Assess Evolving National Security, Law Enforcement, Foreign Policy, and Trade Policy Risks; Amendment of the Schedule of Application Fees Set Forth in Sections 1.1109 of the Commission's Rules" (FCC 25-49) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on November 6, 2025; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Thomas Ferguson III, of North Carolina, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina for the term of four years.

(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. CASSIDY (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 3114. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to require labor organizations to make certain disclosures to its members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3115. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to enhance the stability of orders of the National Labor Relations Board by limiting nonacquiescence of the Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3116. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to restrict charges of unfair labor practices that are not filed in good faith or are frivolous, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3117. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act regarding labor organization elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. 3118. A bill to require reporting on compliance with requirements to update leadership boards across the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 3119. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make temporary lodging facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs available for members of the Armed Forces, other individuals on active duty, and family members of such individuals on a space-available basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 3120. A bill to limit engagement with the Government of Mexico unless Mexico provides water to the United States pursuant to its obligations under the Treaty relating to the Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE:

S. 3121. A bill to require English proficiency as a prerequisite for eligibility for ride share contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3122. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require notifications to the Food and Drug Administration regarding food substances generally recognized as safe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3123. A bill to require the use of the voice and vote of the United States in international financial institutions to advance the cause of transitioning the global economy to a clean energy economy and to prohibit United States Government assistance to countries or entities to support fossil fuel activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 3124. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employees from harassment and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3125. A bill to require the Director of the United States Secret Service to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3126. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to reform farm loans, to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to reform the National Appeals Division process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

S. 3127. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3128. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect worker privacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 3129. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to further restrict contributions of foreign nationals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. McCORMICK (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3130. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a program to award grants to eligible entities to develop, implement, and evaluate approaches and methodologies for prospective randomized control trials for neurorehabilitation treatments for the treatment of chronic mild

traumatic brain injury in veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 3131. A bill to provide for the inclusion on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall of the names of the lost crew members of the USS *Frank E. Evans* killed on June 3, 1969; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 3132. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to exempt discounting food from the equal treatment requirement during a government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. SHEEHY):

S. 3133. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to update the juvenile transfer for criminal prosecution process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. RICKETTS):

S. 3134. A bill to amend the Fentanyl Sanctions Act to address trafficking of copy-cat and counterfeit drugs and active pharmaceutical ingredients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 3135. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to authorize manufacturers of certain vehicles to suspend engine derate or shutdown functions in prolonged cold weather conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3136. A bill to waive the guarantee fee for certain business loans made to veterans and spouses of veterans; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. KING, Mr. KAINA, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3137. A bill to establish a rental assistance program for low-income veteran families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 3138. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include adaptive prostheses and terminal devices for sports and other recreational activities in the medical services furnished to eligible veterans by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. McCORMICK):

S. 3139. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish the Zero Suicide Initiative pilot program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Ms. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3140. A bill to modify Department of Agriculture programs to improve flood protection and infrastructure resiliency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINA, Ms. ALSO BROOKS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KIM, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3141. A bill to prohibit Executive agencies from carrying out a reduction in force,

or any similar effort, during any period during which there is a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KIM):

S. 3142. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify each alien who is serving, or has served, in the Armed Forces of the United States on the application of any such alien for an immigration benefit or the placement of any such alien in an immigration enforcement proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KIM):

S. 3143. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow certain alien veterans to be paroled into the United States to receive health care furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. KIM):

S. 3144. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a veterans visa program to permit veterans who have been removed from the United States to return as immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WELCH):

S. 3145. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test a comprehensive alternative response for emergencies model under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ALSO BROOKS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KIM, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3146. A bill to restore limited, free telephone service for detainees to facilitate consultations with legal counsel and to maintain ties with their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KIM, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINA, Ms. ALSO BROOKS, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3147. A bill to provide for continuing appropriations for Head Start programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

S. 3148. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to destroy adulterated, misbranded, or counterfeit tobacco products offered for import; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 3149. A bill to provide for cost-share waivers for projects carried out in response

to wildland fires caused by certain Government actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. McCORMICK, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3150. A bill to require entities seeking a license to export advanced artificial intelligence chips to countries of concern to certify that United States persons have priority in acquiring those chips; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 3151. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide for the automatic contingent extension of the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3152. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to give preference to local contractors in awarding contracts to carry out certain hazardous fuel reduction projects on Federal land; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 486. A resolution condemning the suggestion by President Donald J. Trump that criticism of him is “illegal,” reaffirming the fundamental importance of free speech, and declaring that criticism of the President is not only lawful but essential to democracy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 487. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week beginning on November 3, 2025, as “National School Psychology Week”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. Kaine, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. Res. 488. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the European Union’s actions to diversify from Russian energy sources; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 489. A resolution commanding Delta State University in Cleveland, Mississippi, for 100 years of service to the State of Mississippi and the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. McCORMICK, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 490. A resolution affirming the critical importance of preserving the United States’ advantage in artificial intelligence and ensuring that the United States achieves and maintains artificial intelligence dominance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER:

S. Con. Res. 23. A concurrent resolution recognizing the difficult challenges Black veterans faced when returning home after serving in the Armed Forces, their heroic military sacrifices, and their patriotism in

fighting for equal rights and for the dignity of a people and a Nation; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 137

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. McCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 137, a bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to prohibit the Federal Government from entering into contracts with an entity that discriminates against firearm or ammunition industries, and for other purposes.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. MULLIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 932, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to molecularly targeted pediatric cancer investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 952

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide a uniform 8-digit subheading number for all whiskeys.

S. 1220

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1220, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a Savings Opportunity and Affordable Repayment plan as an income contingent repayment plan.

S. 1410

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1410, a bill to provide for health coverage with no cost-sharing for additional breast screenings for certain individuals at greater risk for breast cancer.

S. 1677

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1677, a bill to provide health insurance benefits for outpatient and inpatient items and services related to the diagnosis and treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 1806

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

S. 1884

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 1884, a bill to clarify the Holocaust Expropriated Art Recovery Act of 2016, to appropriately limit the application of defenses based on the passage of time and other non-merits defenses to claims under that Act.

S. 2252

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2252, a bill to require United States foreign assistance commodities to be made available for their intended purposes before they expire.

S. 2983

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2983, a bill to reauthorize the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.

S. 2991

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2991, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to the requirement to test drivers of commercial motor vehicles for English proficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 3072

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3072, a bill to prohibit the imposition of additional tariffs on coffee imported from countries to which the United States has extended normal trade relations, and for other purposes.

S. 3090

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSO BROOKS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3090, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for an explosive nuclear weapons test.

S. 3106

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3106, a bill to require the approval of Congress before explosive nuclear testing may be resumed.

S.J. RES. 90

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 90, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Venezuela that have not been authorized by Congress.

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 90, supra.

S. RES. 236

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr.

S. RES. 486

CORNYN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSO BROOKS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 236, a resolution calling for the return of abducted Ukrainian children before finalizing any peace agreement to end the war against Ukraine.

S. RES. 463

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 463, a resolution expressing condemnation of the Chinese Communist Party's persecution of religious minority groups, including Christians, Muslims, and Buddhists and the detention of Pastor "Ezra" Jin Mingri and leaders of the Zion Church, and reaffirming the United States' global commitment to promote religious freedom and tolerance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WELCH):

S. 3145. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test a comprehensive alternative response for emergencies model under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Vermont, Senator WELCH, to introduce the Comprehensive Alternative Response to Emergencies Act, or the CARE Act. Our bipartisan legislation would require the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to test a 5 year treatment-in-place model for Medicare. This model, also known as TIP, is the practice of treating patients in their homes or where a medical emergency occurs. The pilot program in our bill would reimburse EMS for the care they administer to seniors in emergencies outside of the hospital, such as for minor medical incidents. This program would expand access to health services for seniors, especially in rural communities, while reducing unnecessary emergency room visits and expenses.

Emergency room doctors throughout Maine often tell me about the frequent backlogs and long wait times that patients experience in waiting rooms. One way to address this problem is to reduce the number of nonessential emergency room visits. By creating a pathway to reimburse EMS for treating certain patients at home, the CARE Act will help decrease the number of emergency room visits and lengthy wait times.

When EMS arrives after a 9-1-1 call, they usually transport patients to the emergency department immediately. Many patients, however, may not need emergency services from a hospital and could be better served by receiving treatment "in place." EMS is capable of providing a host of interventions,

such as treating hypoglycemia for a patient with a diabetic emergency or responding to routine, chronic seizures.

Most insurance plans, including Medicare, do not reimburse emergency medical services unless the patient is transported to the hospital. The current payment model can thus incentivize transportation to the hospital even when a less expensive level of care is appropriate.

The CARE Act will also help support EMS providers' long-term financial viability. According to the Maine Ambulance Association, approximately 35 percent of EMS calls conclude without transport. Without reimbursement, EMS providers must absorb the costs of these calls, further challenging the sustainability of their operations. The treatment-in-place pilot program proposed by our legislation offers a solution to this financial burden by reimbursing EMS for this kind of care.

This model also saves Medicare money. When CMS implemented a trial version of TIP during the COVID-19 pandemic, the program demonstrated more than \$500 net savings to Medicare per patient encounter.

This commonsense bill builds on the past success of TIP. TIP increases communities at a time when EMS is facing historic staffing and financial challenges, by removing the need for time-consuming transport. The reimbursement of a TIP encounter is only a fraction of the cost of ambulance transport and a hospital emergency department visit.

Reducing unnecessary emergency room visits, lowering costs, and easing the strain on our hospital and EMS workforce will help improve care overall. The CARE Act presents an opportunity to further test the TIP model and improve patient care, while supporting the brave first responders who save countless lives in our communities. Our bill is supported by the

American Ambulance Association, the Maine Ambulance Association, the National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians, the National Rural Healthcare Association, the National EMS Quality Alliance, and many other local EMS organizations around the country. I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 486—CONDAMNING THE SUGGESTION BY PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP THAT CRITICISM OF HIM IS "ILLEGAL," REAFFIRMING THE FUNDAMENTAL IMPORTANCE OF FREE SPEECH, AND DECLARING THAT CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT IS NOT ONLY LAWFUL BUT ESSENTIAL TO DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.";

Whereas robust public debate and criticism of those who hold public office lie at the core of democratic governance, which includes the proposition that the right to speak, publish, and dissent is fundamental to a self-governing people;

Whereas the institution of the presidency, like all offices of government in the United States, is subject to public scrutiny, criticism, and accountability;

Whereas, on November 1, 2025, President Donald J. Trump posted on social media that commentary by comedian Seth Meyers was "100% ANTI TRUMP" and therefore "PROBABLY ILLEGAL";

Whereas President Trump has previously attacked late-night comedians and urged the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to punish broadcasters that air the comedians' political commentary by revoking their broadcast licenses;

Whereas Federal Communications Commission Chairman Brendan Carr has demonstrated a willingness to weaponize the Commission's authority over broadcasters for political purposes, including, in September 2025, in response to a monologue delivered by comedian Jimmy Kimmel, by publicly threatening ABC and its parent company Disney, stating that "we can do this the easy way or the hard way," in clear reference to the Commission's regulatory power;

Whereas President Trump's social media post and the repeated actions of the Trump administration suggest that they view criticism of President Trump as illegal and subject to regulatory punishment;

Whereas such episodes serve as a reminder that when government officials treat criticism—especially of themselves—as unlawful, they undermine the basic premise of free and open political discourse; and

Whereas the right to criticize the president is not only lawfully protected but politically essential, and the ability of citizens, the press, and elected representatives to question, challenge, and hold the executive branch to account is foundational to the health of democracy in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns any suggestion by President Donald J. Trump or his administration that criticism of President Trump is illegal or that governmental power may lawfully be used to punish, censor, or intimidate dissenting views;

(2) affirms that the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protects the right to criticize public officials, including the President of the United States, and to engage in vigorous public debate without fear of governmental retaliation; and

(3) urges all officials of the Trump administration to refrain from using regulatory, licensing, investigative, or enforcement authorities to penalize or suppress speech that criticizes President Trump or the policies of his administration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 487—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK BEGINNING ON NOVEMBER 3, 2025, AS "NATIONAL SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY WEEK"

Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred

to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 487

Whereas all children and youth learn best when they are healthy, supported, and receive an education that meets their individual needs;

Whereas schools can more effectively ensure that all students are ready and able to learn if schools meet all the needs of each student;

Whereas learning and development are directly linked to the mental health of children, and a supportive learning environment is an optimal place to promote mental health;

Whereas sound psychological principles are critical to proper instruction and learning, social and emotional development, prevention and early intervention, and support for a culturally diverse student population;

Whereas school psychologists are specially trained to deliver academic support and mental health services that lower barriers to learning and allow teachers to teach more effectively;

Whereas school psychologists facilitate collaboration that helps parents and educators to identify and reduce risk factors, promote protective factors, create safe schools, and access community resources;

Whereas school psychologists are trained to assess barriers to learning, utilize data-based decisionmaking, implement research-driven prevention and intervention strategies, evaluate outcomes, and improve accountability;

Whereas State educational agencies and other State entities credential more than 44,000 school psychologists who practice in schools in the United States as key professionals that promote the learning and mental health of all children;

Whereas professional organizations, such as the National Association of School Psychologists and the American Psychological Association, help establish standards for the training and practice of school psychologists;

Whereas the people of the United States should recognize the vital role school psychologists play in the personal and academic development of children in the United States; and

Whereas the week beginning on November 3, 2025, would be an appropriate week to designate as “National School Psychology Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week beginning on November 3, 2025, as “National School Psychology Week”;

(2) honors and recognizes the contributions of school psychologists to the success of students in schools across the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the vital role school psychologists play in schools, in the community, and in helping students develop into successful and productive members of society.

CURTIS, Mr. CORNYN, and Ms. ROSEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 488

Whereas the Russian Federation’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 has demonstrated the strategic risks of Europe’s dependence on the Russian Federation for energy, specifically oil and gas;

Whereas, following Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, the United States, the European Union, and their partners imposed a broad, punitive sanctions on Russia that limited Russia’s income sources from energy;

Whereas, in May 2022, the European Commission launched the REPowerEU initiative to phase out dependence on Russian energy sources before 2028, with milestones to stop existing spot contracts of Russian gas by the end of 2025 and to stop all imports of Russian liquefied natural gas by the end of 2027;

Whereas, since February 2022, the European Union has subsequently reduced its dependence on Russian fossil fuels by approximately 90 percent by cutting oil imports by more than 90 percent and reducing pipeline gas deliveries by roughly 80 percent;

Whereas most countries have undertaken significant measures to reduce their Russian energy imports in accordance with the REPowerEU initiative, Hungary and Slovakia have requested exemptions to the timeline and Hungary has actually increased its dependence on Russian energy by an estimated 30 percent since February 2022, by providing approximately \$6,700,000,000 of substantial revenues to Russia between February 24, 2022 and December 31, 2024 for crude oil alone;

Whereas, on September 23, 2025, President Donald Trump said European member states had “to immediately cease all energy purchases from Russia”;

Whereas, on October 23, 2025, the Council of the European Union adopted the 19th package of restrictive measures against the Russian Federation, including—

(1) a ban on imports of Russian liquefied natural gas into the European Union;

(2) a full transaction ban on Rosneft and Gazprom Neft;

(3) measures against third country operators (which enable Russia’s revenue streams), 2 Chinese refineries, and a Chinese oil trader; and

(4) strengthened enforcement against maritime circumvention and the “shadow fleet”;

Whereas, on October 22, 2025, the United States imposed secondary sanctions on Lukoil and Rosneft; and

Whereas European Union member states Bulgaria and Hungary purchase Russian fossil fuels through Lukoil: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes the European Union’s commitment and actions—

(A) to end its dependence on Russian fossil fuels; and

(B) to deny Vladimir Putin a critical source of revenue to continue funding Russia’s war campaign in Ukraine;

(2) welcomes the Trump Administration’s recent decision to sanction Rosneft and Lukoil and calls on United States allies and partners to terminate all contracts associated with both companies to avoid potential exposure to secondary sanctions;

(3) encourages continued coordinated action among the United States and the Group of Seven countries, in addition to concerted action with the European Union and the United Kingdom to apply additional sanctions on Russian energy sources;

(4) expresses concern that Hungary has shown no sign of reducing its dependence on Russian fossil fuels;

(5) calls on Hungary and remaining consumers of Russian energy to fully adhere to the timeline agreed to in the REPowerEU initiative; and

(6) underscores continued bipartisan opposition to the Nord Stream I and II pipeline projects and any effort to revive them, regardless of the home country of individuals or entities involved.

SENATE RESOLUTION 489—COMMENDING DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY IN CLEVELAND, MISSISSIPPI, FOR 100 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI AND THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 489

Whereas, on February 19, 1924, Mississippi State Senator W.B. Roberts and Mississippi State Senator Arthur L. Marshall introduced Mississippi Senate Bill 263, and on April 9, 1924, Mississippi Governor Henry L. Whitfield signed Mississippi Senate Bill 263 into law, creating Delta State Teachers College;

Whereas Delta State Teachers College opened its doors officially on September 15, 1925, to 97 students and 11 faculty;

Whereas the first graduation at Delta State was held in June 1928, with 13 students receiving Bachelor of Science degrees;

Whereas the Delta Council was organized at Delta State on March 5, 1935, and Delta State President William M. Kethley served as its first president;

Whereas the Marshall Plan was first announced at Delta State by Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson on May 8, 1947;

Whereas Delta State Teachers College officially became Delta State College on February 16, 1955;

Whereas, in the summer of 1965, Delta State added a graduate program, which was a great step forward in providing additional training for the excellent teachers it had been educating since its establishment;

Whereas, on March 15, 1974, Delta State College became Delta State University;

Whereas Delta State University worked to create the Mississippi Delta National Heritage Area, which was officially designated by Congress in 2009 and is 1 of 55 National Heritage Areas in the United States designated by Congress to tell nationally important stories, celebrating the diverse heritage of the United States through community-based partnerships and local collaboration;

Whereas Delta State University partnered with the local community to attract to Cleveland, Mississippi, the Grammy Museum Mississippi, which opened on March 5, 2016, to honor Mississippi’s profound influence on music in the United States and inspire the next generation of creators;

Whereas the Delta State University Statesmen and Lady Statesmen are composed of the 15 intercollegiate varsity sports that represent Delta State University in the Gulf South Conference;

Whereas the Delta State University Statesmen and Lady Statesmen have a strong tradition of excellence in athletics, serving as charter members of the Gulf South Conference and boasting 14 national championships, including 6 in women’s basketball, 1 in baseball, 1 in football, and 6 in swimming and diving;

SENATE RESOLUTION 488—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE EUROPEAN UNION’S ACTIONS TO DIVERSIFY FROM RUSSIAN ENERGY SOURCES

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. Kaine, Mr.

Whereas Delta State University is a 4-year public institution whose nearly 2,700 students come from most States of the United States and more than 35 countries;

Whereas, acknowledging its beginning as a teachers college, Delta State University sustains excellence in teacher education while continuing to expand offerings in traditional, as well as unique, fields of study;

Whereas programs such as those available through the Delta Music Institute, the Commercial Aviation Department, and the Center for Interdisciplinary Geospatial Information highlight Delta State University's commitment to meeting the evolving needs of the students it serves with world-leading, industry-acclaimed programs; and

Whereas, situated in the heart of the Mississippi Delta, Delta State University offers top-notch academic programs in business, arts, sciences, nursing, education, and more; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends Delta State University for 100 years of service to the State of Mississippi and the United States;

(2) recognizes Delta State University for its academic, cultural, and athletic excellence; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the President of Delta State University, Dr. Daniel J. Ennis;

(B) the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Leslie Griffin; and

(C) the Director of Athletics, Mr. Mike Kinnison.

SENATE RESOLUTION 490—AFFIRMING THE CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF PRESERVING THE UNITED STATES' ADVANTAGE IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ENSURING THAT THE UNITED STATES ACHIEVES AND MAINTAINS ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DOMINANCE

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. McCORMICK, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 490

Whereas artificial intelligence (AI) will be one of the defining technologies of the 21st century;

Whereas preserving American dominance in AI will allow the United States to hold an advantage in military capabilities, economic might, scientific achievement, and geopolitical influence, all of which will enable the United States to shape the world's future on a foundation of democratic values;

Whereas AI will unlock untold opportunities in nearly every sector in the global economy, from healthcare to manufacturing, defense, energy, and finance;

Whereas AI is also a national security imperative, with the potential to reshape military strategies, cybersecurity, and intelligence operations, requiring both the United States Government and the private sector to collaborate in preserving the technological superiority of the United States;

Whereas the United States has historically led the world in AI research and development, fostering a dynamic ecosystem of cutting-edge technologies driven by the collaboration between government, academia, and the private sector;

Whereas the global competition for AI supremacy is intensifying, with the Government of the People's Republic of China mak-

ing substantial investments in AI research, development, and deployment with the stated goal of becoming the world leader in AI by 2030 and leveraging state-backed policies to accelerate AI adoption across various domains;

Whereas the White House AI Action Plan notes that “just like we won the space race, it is imperative that the United States win this race” and “achieve and maintain unquestioned and unchallenged global technological dominance”;

Whereas AI dominance will be decided by relative strength across multiple pillars, including talent, energy, and compute, with the United States maintaining a clear lead in compute while China's investments have yielded advantages in energy and talent;

Whereas United States chipmakers, working with manufacturers in Taiwan, produce millions of United States-designed AI chips per year, while Chinese chipmakers are projected to produce no more than 200,000 advanced chips this year, according to Secretary of Commerce Howard Lutinick, each of which is far less powerful than AI chips designed in the United States;

Whereas United States companies produce 43 to 120 times more computing power than their Chinese equivalent, taking into account both the number and quality of United States-made chips, and United States chips are in effect the only true option for training advanced AI systems such that even leading Chinese firms use United States-produced chips;

Whereas China—despite more than a decade of major Chinese indigenization efforts and more than \$200,000,000,000 in investments since 2014—has struggled to produce advanced AI chips and therefore has to rely on smuggling or legal exports of advanced chips from the United States;

Whereas export controls on advanced chips, chip design software, tools, and manufacturing equipment have denied the Government of the People's Republic of China the opportunity to develop domestic chipmaking capabilities and capture significant market share of global AI infrastructure;

Whereas it is essential that the United States remain the world's hub for AI development, training, inference, and innovation; and

Whereas preserving the United States lead in AI will require ensuring United States AI companies can access the energy, compute, and talent they require; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the preservation of the United States' primacy in artificial intelligence is a national imperative that is critical to maintaining our global leadership, economic prosperity, and national security;

(2) commends the White House AI Action Plan, including its recognition that “advanced AI compute is essential to the AI era, enabling both economic dynamism and novel military capabilities” and that “denying our foreign adversaries access to this resource, then, is a matter of both geostrategic competition and national security”;

(3) applauds United States Government efforts to deny the Government of the People's Republic of China access to advanced chips and chipmaking equipment, and affirms the importance of continuing these efforts;

(4) recognizes that efforts of the Government of the People's Republic China to close the AI gap and leap ahead of the United States in developing frontier AI models, and deploy Chinese AI models for the world to use and build on, present a clear and imminent threat to the United States, and that China's self-acknowledged inability to make and access computing power is the main impediment to its progress;

(5) emphasizes that the world's most powerful supercomputers and next generation of AI models must be built in the United States and by United States companies;

(6) calls on the United States Government to ensure that United States companies maintain priority access to the cutting-edge AI chips they require to build frontier AI models and are not deprioritized in favor of buyers in China or other arms-embargoed countries;

(7) emphasizes the importance of exporting the full United States AI stack—which includes United States AI chips, cloud infrastructure, and models—to allies and partners, while restricting access to the most sophisticated chips and models that United States adversaries may seek to use against the United States, whether by enforcing export controls and countering illegal chip diversion or by strategically limiting legal exports of advanced chips to adversary countries; and

(8) asserts the need to prioritize investments in the energy, telecommunications, and physical infrastructure necessary to enable widespread adoption of AI technology.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23—RECOGNIZING THE DIFFICULT CHALLENGES BLACK VETERANS FACED WHEN RETURNING HOME AFTER SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES, THEIR HEROIC MILITARY SACRIFICES, AND THEIR PATRIOTISM IN FIGHTING FOR EQUAL RIGHTS AND FOR THE DIGNITY OF A PEOPLE AND A NATION

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 23

Whereas there has been no war fought by or within the United States in which Blacks did not participate, including the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the War of 1812, the Spanish American War, World Wars I and II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas Frederick Douglass voiced his opinion on the civic value of military service in one of his autobiographies, “Life and Times of Frederick Douglass,” writing, “I . . . urged every man who could, to enlist; to get an eagle on his button, a musket on his shoulder, the star-spangled banner over his head,” and later remarking that “there is no power on Earth which can deny that he has earned the right to citizenship in the United States”;

Whereas, during the Civil War, Black soldiers, commonly referred to as the United States Colored Troops, fought with honor and distinction despite being treated as second-class citizens;

Whereas the health care and hospitals available to Black soldiers during the Civil War were substandard, and Black soldiers often died from the withholding of services that were supposed to be administered by medical personnel;

Whereas Dr. W.E.B. DuBois and William Monroe Trotter, members of the “first generation of freedom's children,” founded the Niagara Movement in 1905 and fought for desegregation in the Armed Forces in World War I;

Whereas, in his book, “Black Reconstruction in America,” published in 1935, DuBois recognized the importance of equity in military service writing that “Nothing else made

Negro citizenship conceivable, but the record of the Negro soldier as a fighter.”;

Whereas the 369th Infantry, known as the Harlem Hell-fighters, continued the history of distinguished military service despite treatment as second-class citizens, fighting the Germans during World War I as part of the French Army and serving the longest stretch in combat, 191 days without replacement and without losing a foot of ground or a man as prisoner;

Whereas, at the end of the service of the 369th Infantry, the entire regiment received the Croix de Guerre, which was France's highest military honor, from a grateful French nation;

Whereas, in 1917, Charles Hamilton Houston encountered racism after entering World War I as a commissioned first lieutenant in the segregated 17th Provisional Training Regiment, later writing that “I made up my mind that if I got through this war I would study law and use my time fighting for men who could not strike back.”;

Whereas Alain Locke, the first Black Rhodes Scholar, wrote in 1925 about a “New Negro” who had returned from battle with a bold new spirit that helped spark a new mood in the Black community;

Whereas, at the start of the United States' involvement in World War II, Dorie Miller, a messman attendant in the Navy, was catapulted to national hero status and an icon to generations, after displaying heroism on board the USS *West Virginia* during the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941;

Whereas the famed Tuskegee Airmen, a group of Black pilots, flew with distinction during World War II under the command of Captain Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., the highly decorated officer who served for more than 35 years and became the first Black general in the Air Force;

Whereas, during World War II, the 6888 (known as the “Six Triple Eights”), the first postal battalion comprised exclusively of Black women, who served in England and then France, was given the daunting task of clearing out a 2-year backlog of more than 90,000 pieces of mail, completed the mission in 3 months, and went on to make a positive impact on racial integration in the Armed Forces;

Whereas, before becoming a famous baseball player, Jackie Robinson was court-martialed in the Army in 1944 for refusing to sit in the back of the bus, and when he was later acquitted, he wrote that “[i]t was a small victory, for I had learned that I was in two wars, one against the foreign enemy, the other against prejudice at home”;

Whereas, during World War II, the Army's 92nd Infantry Division, better known as the “Buffalo Soldiers,” which traces its direct lineage back to the 9th and 10th Cavalry units from 1866 to the early 1890s, was the only Black segregated unit to experience combat during the Italian campaigns of 1944 and 1945, with several members of the unit later earning Medals of Honor for bravery;

Whereas Reverend Benjamin Hooks, who served in the 92nd Infantry Division, found himself in the humiliating position of guarding Italian prisoners of war who were allowed to eat in restaurants that were off-limits to him;

Whereas, even after President Truman issued Executive Order 9981, desegregating the military on July 26, 1948, discrimination continued;

Whereas Oliver L. Brown, a World War II Army veteran from Kansas, and Harry Briggs, a World War II sailor from South

Carolina, were the fathers of 2 of the 5 named plaintiffs in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1952) and *Briggs v. Elliott*, 342 U.S. 350 (1952), the historic school-desegregation cases of 1952;

Whereas the Black heroes and heroines of World War II and the Korean War, and their offspring such as Private Sarah Keys and Women's Army Corps officer Dovey Roundtree, won significant victories against discrimination in interstate transportation in landmark civil rights cases, including *Keys v. Carolina Coach Company*, 64 MCC 769 (1955), which was decided 6 days before Rosa Parks' historic protest of Alabama's Jim Crow laws in Montgomery;

Whereas, after serving overseas in the Army, Charles and Medgar Evers returned home to Mississippi, where in 1946, they tried to register to vote but were turned away at the polling stations;

Whereas, in 1952, Charles and Medgar Evers began to organize voter registration drives for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP);

Whereas, in his address at Riverside Church on April 4, 1967, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., commented on the irony of Blacks fighting in Vietnam to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia while not enjoying the same rights at home;

Whereas Black veterans who were in the forefront of the leadership of the civil rights movement, with their strong resolve to address the paradox of military service abroad and the denial of basic rights at home, brought deeper meaning to the word “democracy,” and through their example, transformed the face of the United States;

Whereas Black veterans of the Nation's wars sowed the seeds for today's bountiful harvest that includes the Niagara Movement, the NAACP, and the modern-day civil rights movement, all of which share a common ancestry in the Civil War, without which there would be no civil rights movement and no equal rights for all Americans; and

Whereas Black veterans suffer at a disproportionate rate from chronic illnesses and homelessness and are plagued by health disparities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress recognizes—

(1) the difficult challenges Black veterans faced when returning home after serving in the Armed Forces, their heroic military sacrifices, and their patriotism in fighting for equal rights and for the dignity of a people and a Nation; and

(2) the need for the Department of Veterans Affairs to continue to work to eliminate any health and benefit disparities for minority veterans in the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Thursday, November 6, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, November 6, 2025, at 10 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, November 6, 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, November 6, 2025, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, November 6, 2025, at 1 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2025

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Friday, November 7; 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.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 5:57 p.m., adjourned until Friday, November 7, 2025, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

JARED ISAACMAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, VICE BILL NELSON, RESIGNED.