

Risch	Scott (SC)	Tuberville
Rounds	Sheehy	Wicker
Schmitt	Thune	Young
Scott (FL)	Tillis	

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Moran	Sullivan
--------	-------	----------

The motion was agreed to.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2026 THROUGH 2034

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2025 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2026 through 2034.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is my colleague from my office Mr. John Lowery, and I appreciate his help.

Last week, I spoke a few minutes about the Corporation for Public Broadcasting—we called it the CPB—and the Public Broadcasting Service—most people know what that is, PBS—and the National Public Radio, which most people know is NPR.

And I am not going to repeat everything I said last week, but I do want to revise and extend my remarks.

The U.S. Congress created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting back in the sixties, 1967, I think. Those were very different times. There was no internet. There was no Facebook. There was no Twitter. There was no cable TV. There were no podcasts. There were basically a handful, maybe a few more, of radio stations throughout America. And the television was still pretty new. There were three main television stations with local affiliates.

And many Americans, particularly in rural areas, didn't have access to radio and television for their news because that is all there was. I remember those days.

And so Congress decided to start providing money for what it called, at that time, public broadcasting, to make sure that everybody had access to news, radio, and television, even if they didn't live near a big city.

And Congress intended that that news be news, factually based. Now, those were the days in America of true journalism. I remember them, perhaps the Presiding Officer does too.

Those were not the days that we experience today, opinion journalism, where young journalists are taught to report on who, what, when, where, how, and their opinion. Those were days when the news was really the news, and it was fair and balanced.

So the U.S. Congress created the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. CPB still exists, and here is its relationship—CPB's relationship—to NPR and PBS. We give CPB, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, about half a billion dollars a year, a lot of money.

And the Corporation for Public Broadcasting turns around and picks certain local television and radio stations and gives most of that money to them.

And then those local television and radio stations, the chosen few that get money from the American taxpayer through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, buy programming and content from two other organizations. If they are a radio station, they buy that from NPR, and if they are a television station, they buy that content from PBS.

So up here you have got Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The American taxpayer, through Congress, gives them a half a billion dollars a year. That money flows down to certain select local television and radio stations, and those local television and radio stations then buy content from NPR, if they are a radio station, or PBS, if they are a TV station, which were loosely affiliated with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Since this scheme was established, the American taxpayer has given all of these entities about—oh, I don't know—\$14.5 billion, \$14.5 billion. That would be enough to build 2,700 miles of paved roads throughout America. And I based that on—the roads I am talking about are not gavel roads—regular paved roads, 10 feet each lane, actually 12 feet each lane, with a 3-foot shoulder on each side.

But instead of building 2,700 miles of roads in our rural areas and in urban areas that need infrastructure, we have decided to give this money to CPB, which gives it to the local stations, which gives it to PBS and NPR.

I mentioned the local stations. Only a select few local stations get this taxpayer money. And in my State, we have over 500 radio stations. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, in its unfettered discretion, only picks seven to give the money to. The other 493 get nothing.

We have over 150 TV stations in Louisiana. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting only gives the taxpayer money for 3 of them, so 147 get nothing.

Now, I probably wouldn't object to this if the Corporation for Public

Broadcasting and NPR—National Public Radio is what I am referring to, of course—and PBS had been consistent with its original mission, which is to report factually the news to the American people.

The government doesn't need to subsidize the media anymore because the world has changed. Ninety-seven percent of the people in America have the internet, but I still probably wouldn't object that much if the reporting by these entities were fair and balanced. But it is not.

No fairminded person in America can look at this programming and believe that it is unbiased. It is decidedly prejudiced in favor of one point of view. That is not just my opinion. I think most Americans would agree with that because most Americans see the headlines that are produced by these three entities.

I talked about some last week. This is what Americans' taxpayer money is going to, to provide.

Here are just some headlines from NPR. I mentioned these last week. I won't belabor them.

"Michael Avenatti: A Profile Of The Media-Savvy Attorney."

This is NPR. They love Michael Avenatti, who of course is in jail today. He is a crook. But NPR loved him because he was anti-Republican, and he was anti-President Trump.

NPR published another article: "How racism became a marketing tool for country music."

Now, you don't have to be Euclid to see the implication here that country music is racist, according to NPR. I don't think any fairminded person would call that factual or fair and balanced.

Here is another headline from NPR: "Donald Trump's Long Embrace of Vladimir Putin."

I also talked last week about a few other headlines from NPR.

Here is one: "Monuments And Teams Have Changed Names As America Reckons With Racism. Birds Are Next."

That is what your tax dollars paid for.

"Eating less beef is a climate solution. Here's why that's hard for some American men."

"How the Taliban adds to Afghanistan's woes when it comes to climate-fueled disasters."

No fairminded person with an IQ above a single-cell organism would conclude that this is anything but biased to certain points of view.

And there are more. I could do this all night, but I am not.

Here are some more headlines from NPR:

"'There is no neutral': 'Nice White People' Can Still Be Complicit In A Racist Society."

That is what your tax dollars paid for.

Another one: "Ibram X. Kendi Says No One is 'Not Racist'. So What Should We Do?'"

Another one:

"How [artificial intelligence] could perpetuate racism, sexism, and other biases in society."

Another:

"Scientists Debunk Lab Accident Theory of Pandemic Emergence."

Here is another one:

"As Trump Pushes Theory of Virus Origins, Some See Parallels In Lead-Up to Iraq War."

Your tax dollars at work.

"As U.S. Confronts Russia, Trump's Admiration Of Putin Is Consistent."

Another headline from NPR:

"The History of Policing And Race In The U.S. Are Deeply Intertwined."

Another:

"After Biden's debate performance, the presidential race is unchanged."

This was the debate performance that President Biden gave after which he got out of the race.

If you believe that headline, you believe in the tooth fairy and the Easter Bunny and that Jimmy Hoffa died of natural causes, but that is what NPR reported with your tax dollars.

Here is more:

"Democracy on Trial, Part One: A Blueprint For the Case Against Trump."

Is that fair and balanced? That is from PBS.

"Racism in the Era of Trump: An Oral History."

Another headline, January 13, 2020.

Another, this one is really special:

"'A Serial Liar': How Sarah Palin Ushered in the 'Post-Truth' Political Era in Which Trump Has Thrived."

Now, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and NPR and PBS have the right, whether I like it or not or whether you like it or not or whether Americans like it or not to publish these articles and to broadcast this news. That is the First Amendment, but they don't have the right to do it with taxpayer money.

At least half of America would look at these headlines and be offended. They would be offended, first, because they would—really for three reasons: No. 1, they disagree with opinion journalism; No. 2, they would disagree with the headline; and, No. 3, they would disagree with the fact that these headlines are not fair. They are not objective. They are obviously slanted to one point of view, and they are using taxpayer money.

If someone introduced a bill tomorrow—I will just pick a publication—to prohibit the New York Times, I would vote against that bill and argue against it. If someone introduced a bill to get rid of FOX News, I would have the same position. If someone introduced a bill to get rid of the Washington Post, that would be my position as well. Whether I agree with those media outlets or not, we have a First Amendment that we cherish, and I am rather fond of the Constitution.

But if somebody introduced a bill to give money to CNN, taxpayer money to CNN or to the New York Times or to FOX News, I would oppose that as well.

This is simply wrong, and we are spending half a billion dollars a year, \$14.5 billion over time, to give to people at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and NPR and NPS to participate in opinion journalism, which they are entitled to do. But they can't do it on the taxpayer dime. They are doing it on the taxpayer dime, but they shouldn't be able to.

I would also point out that the folks at PBS and NPR and PBS are doing pretty well for themselves. NPR just bought a \$201 million office space just up the road from the Capitol—\$200 million. It came from the American taxpayers so they could publish this stuff.

NPR pays its hosts as much as \$532,000 a year, taxpayer money. It pays its chief diversity officer about \$320,000 a year.

And you know what? Despite all this money that the American taxpayers are giving to these left-of-center entities, their viewership has declined because people don't need them anymore. So why are we giving them money?

I have introduced legislation, not to eliminate the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, not to eliminate the Public Broadcasting Service, and not to eliminate the National Public Radio—they can go exist on their own if they want to, but I do want to defund them.

We are running \$36 trillion in debt. This is disgraceful in 2025. It is disgraceful whether it is left-of-center opinion journalism or right-of-center opinion journalism. It is disgraceful to the American people to have to fund this rot. It doesn't mean the rot doesn't have a right to exist, but they don't have a right to taxpayer money.

It is late. So I am not going to go to my second topic.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. Res. 10

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, but no later than Friday, February 28, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 10, and the Senate proceed to its consideration; further, that there be 6 hours for debate only, with the time equally divided between the leaders or their designees on the joint resolution; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the joint resolution be read a third time, and the Senate vote on the joint resolution with no further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF RIVA RIDGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a momentous occasion for the U.S. Army and for the North Country. Today, February 18, 2025, marks the 80th anniversary of the Battle of Riva Ridge during World War II.

During this battle, on the slopes of the northern Apennine Mountains in Italy, the 10th Mountain Division first "Climbed to Glory" and delivered one of the most amazing and decisive victories in U.S. military history.

In the face of grave danger and extreme adversity, the 10th Mountain Division broke through German positions and paved the way for Italy's liberation. Each soldier of the 10th Mountain Division demonstrated extraordinary courage, resilience, and tactical brilliance, forcing the German Army to retreat and providing a major boost to Allied efforts in Europe.

This anniversary comes only days after the 40th anniversary of the reactivation of the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum on February 13, 1985.

Since 1943, the 10th Mountain Division has stood as a pillar of strength, resilience, and readiness, answering the call to serve in nearly every major conflict our Nation has faced.

From the battlefields of World War II to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and now in support of Operation Atlantic Resolve and our NATO allies, the soldiers of the 10th Mountain Division have been at the forefront of protecting our national security.

For more than two decades, they have been the most deployed unit in the U.S. Army, demonstrating unparalleled commitment and courage in defending our country and supporting our partners abroad.

But their contributions go beyond their battlefield successes. The 10th Mountain Division is shaping the future of our military—pioneering advancements in mobility, rapid deployment, counter-UAS, and the integration of cross-domain capabilities into training for large-scale combat operations to build the Army of the future and will strengthen our armed forces for years to come. With the activation of elements of the 2nd Multi-Domain Task Force at Fort Drum this summer, the installation's role in our national defense will continue to grow.

Fort Drum is more than a military base; it is a cornerstone of our national security, and I am proud to have fought for the funding and resources necessary to ensure its continued success. As we mark this anniversary, let us reaffirm our commitment to the brave men and women who serve at Fort Drum, ensuring they have the tools, training, and support they need to defend our Nation.

"Climb to Glory!"