

from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1267 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1968, a bill making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 1015. A bill to extend the National Flood Insurance Program through December 31, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, this is a theme I have been speaking of which affects States across the Nation, which is the National Flood Insurance Program and the threat that it might lapse and the inability of families to be able to afford.

Why are flood insurance premiums so high, you might ask? Flood insurance premiums have skyrocketed across the country due to FEMA's new risk assessment system, Risk Rating 2.0. At the heart of the problem of Risk Rating 2.0 is that with much higher premiums, people will quickly be unable to afford coverage and just drop their policies.

It is well-known in the insurance actuarial world that when you increase a policy by a certain percent, there is going to be another percent of people who just drop their coverage. That means that the pool of policyholders shrinks, and the program enters into what is called an actuarial death spiral, which is to say the risk, instead of being spread out over many, is concentrated in increasingly fewer people, driving up their premiums even that much more; therefore, more people drop.

If we do nothing, the National Flood Insurance Program will collapse. This is important. The National Flood Insurance Program covers 4.7 million American homes across the country. Now, clearly, I am concerned about Louisiana, as that is my State, but it is not just Louisiana or even just a coastal issue. Look at a map of those affected. The States in dark yellow have been hit the hardest by flooding. They have all had at least \$1 billion in claims from the National Flood Insurance Program. Missouri—inland—has had over \$1 billion in claims from the National Flood Insurance Program, as has my home State of Louisiana. But just go around, and you can see California and Hawaii—all with this issue. Now, 44 States have had at least \$50 million worth of claims, and those would be in the kind of mustard color.

So here you see again inland States—not coastal but inland—having problems with flooding. When we say a “problem with flooding,” we mean there is a family that has lost their possessions. They have lost their home, and now, they don't know where to go. That is what we mean by a “problem with flooding.”

My message to my colleagues representing States that rely on the National Flood Insurance Program is, let's find a way forward. One day, the National Flood Insurance Program will lapse if we fail to act.

Now, we are going to, with this CR, do a temporary—temporary—extension. I would ask that we actually have a reauthorization and a reform of the National Flood Insurance Program before it is too late.

By the way, a short-term extension is better than nothing. I thank Speaker JOHNSON in the House for including a short-term extension. If that is the only option, let's take that option. However, I am working on a longer reauthorization so that the National Flood Insurance Program is not thrown into a legal purgatory every year or even sometimes multiple times a year.

Today, I have introduced a bill to fully reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program for this year and for next year. There are 4.7 million homeowners across the country who deserve that little bit of certainty, and it does not seem like it is asking too much.

Imagine if your homeowners or life insurance was subject to lapsing every year if Congress couldn't get their act together. Well, for families living in communities with the NFIP as the only option for flood insurance, this would be unsettling.

In the past 10 years, Congress has passed 32 short-term National Flood Insurance Program extensions. The vote we are taking tomorrow will be the 33rd short-term extension—American families holding their breath 33 times. Families need stability. Businesses need stability. This is the absence of stability. This is a yin and a yang. Congress needs to reauthorize this for an extended period of time.

Let's make flood insurance affordable again. I will keep working to do that. I am pleased that the Flood Insurance Program will survive the weekend, but we need to make it survive long term.

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

S. 1042. A bill to require the Agricultural Research Service to conduct research relating to wildfire smoke exposure on wine grapes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Smoke Exposure Research Act of 2025. This legislation will bolster research at land-grant universities to better understand the impacts of wildfire smoke on wine grapes.

Increasingly frequent and catastrophic wildfires are threatening the longterm sustainability of important winegrowing regions in California, Washington, and Oregon. Vineyards, winery operations, and the communities they support are routinely facing the threat of wildfires that can not only destroy vineyards, but even those

vineyards that escape direct wildfire damage can still suffer from prolonged smoke exposure, which can be absorbed into grapes and create an ashy taste known as smoke taint.

The impact has been particularly acute for California's 4,800 wineries and 5,900 winegrape growers, who have seen significant property loss, loss of tourism, and loss of production due to smoke-exposed grapes. The 2020 wildfires alone are estimated to have cost wineries and winegrape growers \$3.7 billion both from immediate fire-caused losses as well as losses in future sales due to unharvested grapes exposed to wildfire smoke.

Yet, there is a limited understanding of how to measure and identify compounds that cause smoke taint and even less understanding of the mitigation and risk management measures necessary to reduce these impacts.

Recognizing the dearth of information and how much is at stake for the wine industry, Congress provided \$5 million to the USDA to identify the compounds responsible for smoke taint and to develop mitigation methods to reduce or eliminate smoke taint.

This was a great first step, but we need more. That is what my bill would do.

The Smoke Exposure Research Act of 2025 would provide \$32.5 million over years to ensure the sustainability of the wine industry in the face of climate crisis.

Specifically, this bill would direct the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, in coordination with land-grant universities and researchers with viticulture and enology expertise, to identify the compounds responsible for smoke taint; establish standard sampling, testing, and screening tools for use in vineyards and wineries; and develop new risk assessment tools, mitigation measures, and management strategies for growers.

As researchers from the University of California Davis, Washington State University, and Oregon State University explain in recent research, the impact of smoke taint is not predictable.

We cannot currently predict which grapes may have suffered damage based on anything intuitive, such as sight, smell, or even the flavor of fresh grapes. Freshness of wildfire smoke, length of exposure, variety of grape—the list goes on. There is so much we don't know.

That is why we need to pass the Smoke Exposure Research Act, to ensure we have strong science-based data for actual risk management and mitigation tools to protect the U.S. wine industry.

I would like to thank my colleagues Senator Jeff Merkley and Representatives Mike Thompson and Doug LaMalfa for their leadership in bolstering west coast winegrowing communities and for their partnership on this legislation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the Smoke Exposure Research Act as quickly as possible.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. KIM, Mr. RICKETTS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 1053. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by imposing sanctions with respect to certain persons of the People's Republic of China and prohibiting and requiring notifications with respect to certain investments by United States persons in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, a lot has changed in Washington, DC, in the last 6 weeks. That is an understatement, perhaps. But one of the things that President Trump has done is shifted the Overton window when it comes to the People's Republic of China.

Years ago, when the Clinton administration invited China to join the World Trade Organization, the idea behind that was that somehow communist China would change with being part of the rules-based international order. Well, of course, we know China doesn't follow the rules and has taken advantage of the United States for decades. But under President Trump, that will no longer be the case. For example, last month, the White House announced its America-first investment policy, which will be critical for holding China to account.

One of the avenues that China has exploited to gain the upper economic hand is through both inbound and outbound flows of capital. By investing in U.S. companies, the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party can obtain access to intellectual property and know-how. And, of course, they have no shame. Again, they don't play by our rules. They are not afraid to cheat or steal our technology if it is possible.

On the other side of the coin, U.S. investments from the United States are flowing into China and have for a long time. A 2021 estimate was that the market value of U.S. investments in China was valued at more than \$1 trillion.

Now, the reason why that is important is that China has used that investment to build their economy and their military. It has allowed them to advance technologies that one day might be used against the United States.

So I am very glad that President Trump, by his Executive order, has brought this issue from the back burner to the front.

It is no secret to any of my colleagues that I have been working on this issue for a while now. I was proud to partner with President Trump during his first administration to update CFIUS, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. This

interagency committee reviews foreign investments and real estate transactions to determine whether they pose any security risks for the United States.

Through the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act, or what was known as FIRRMMA, we strengthened and modernized CFIUS to rise to the occasion of new threats coming from the People's Republic of China. The President's America-first investment policy builds on this by directing CFIUS to restrict PRC investments in U.S. tech, agriculture, energy, raw materials, and more.

But as Chinese companies get richer and richer from American investment, it is clear that restricting inbound investment is not enough. We need to prevent the People's Republic of China from using capital investments by the United States to gain access to and copy our technological advances—most importantly, in certain critical sectors.

As of 2023, U.S. investors were investing close to \$2 billion in Chinese critical technology sectors, including semiconductors, quantum computing, and artificial intelligence. A report from the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission noted: "The United States is the most important foreign source of investment to semiconductors, quantum computing, and AI in China."

Let me say that again. "The United States is the most important foreign source of investment to semiconductors, quantum computing, and AI in China."

So it is these investments, which are largely opaque to us, as policymakers, that are helping China basically compete with us. We know, of course, it is not just about economic competition. We know that China has a strategy of military-civil fusion, which means that these investments are not simply benefiting China's economy and consumer tech sector; they are directly helping build China's military strength.

It is not too dramatic to say that as I stand here, U.S. dollars are funding the development of technologies that could one day be used against Americans, potentially even to kill Americans or American troops.

Inbound and outbound investments are simply two sides of the same coin. We can't be giving away all of our intellectual property and our incredible innovation for Chinese companies to copy at will, and we can't be giving them the capital to recreate our ideas or reverse-engineer and then use them against us.

How can we expect to outcompete our most significant competitor on the world stage if we are sending billions of dollars directly into their arsenal?

President Trump has been a great partner with Congress on ending this exploitative relationship with China. Again, this is not dealing with another country on the basis of good faith and a knowledge that everybody is operating from the same set of rules and

norms. China does not, and we have recognized that more recently, but it is important to reemphasize because some people, I think, still naively assume China operates by the same rules the United States does.

So I am glad the President is as excited as I am to finish the job we started with CFIUS reform.

Today, I am proud to announce that I am introducing legislation to finally tackle this issue called the Foreign Investment Guardrails to Help Thwart China Act. The acronym is FIGHT China. Two years ago, I sponsored an amendment to the NDAA requiring transparency for these outbound investments. It passed the Senate overwhelmingly with a final bipartisan vote of 91 to 6. We don't see many votes here in the Senate these days where there is such strong bipartisan support, so I am grateful for that.

Regrettably, even in the face of such overwhelming consensus, this amendment did not make its way into the final version of the bill for reasons I won't dwell on now. But, as my colleagues can attest, I am not one to give up easily, and this issue is simply too important to American national security to take no for an answer, so I have continued to work with great partners in the House, in the Senate, and in the Trump administration to continue to make progress on this and bring us to where we are today.

The legislation we are introducing today has been the culmination of years of work, and I believe it is stronger as a result of the input and the collaboration that have occurred.

The FIGHT China Act will establish a program at the Department of Treasury to prohibit U.S. investments in certain sensitive technologies in the PRC.

Now, some people may say: Well, if you stop all U.S.-based investment in China, that is a big problem. But we are not talking about that. I could care less how many Starbucks or Burger Kings are built in China. It only addresses certain of the most sensitive technologies. These include advanced semiconductors, artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and hypersonics. Of course, all of these have a military application.

So this is not just an economic question; this is a national security issue. We know that all of these critical industries directly support the Chinese military, and this is the military that has been instructed by President Xi to be ready to invade Taiwan or to absorb Taiwan one way or another, either by force or by coercion, by 2027. It is simply foolish to continue to send money to fuel these technologies that could be used perhaps in the next few years against the United States and our allies.

This legislation would create a notification regime to create more transparency around investments that are not prohibited. You know, as long as we are blind to how much money is

being invested in China and in what technology and in what sectors it is being invested in, we as policymakers can't do our job and the administration can't do its job, which is primarily to keep our country safe and the American people safe.

This legislation will authorize the President to impose sanctions against any PRC entity that engages in PRC military or intelligence sectors.

I want to express my gratitude to our colleagues, people like Senators CORTEZ MASTO, WARREN, BANKS, SLOTKIN, RICKETTS, BENNET, HAGERTY, KIM, MCCORMICK, SCHUMER, SULLIVAN, FETTERMAN, and others for their partnership on this legislation.

I especially want to recognize the chairman of the Banking Committee, which has principal jurisdiction over this subject matter, Senator TIM SCOTT, and thank him for working with me and cosponsoring this legislation.

Last but not least, President Trump has been a great partner to see this project to the finish line. Everything we are doing here is working hand in glove with the administration to ensure that the People's Republic of China is not allowed to meddle with the United States under the guise of simply doing business.

But time is running short. We know that China, as I said, has an interest in reincorporating Taiwan as early as 2027, not 2 years from now. Now is not the time to continue to allow them access to copy all of our work, in particularly the most sensitive areas. Nor is it the time to allow them to continue to benefit from U.S. investment dollars now that they are no longer a developing country, but they are one of the most advanced economies in the world and certainly a rising military power.

We know that China, Iran, and Russia have conducted joint naval drills in the Middle East, called the Maritime Security Belt 2025. These exercises took place in the Gulf of Oman near the strategic Strait of Hormuz, the narrow mouth of the Persian Gulf through which nearly a fifth of all crude oil traded in the world passes. This is an ominous sign. We know they are strengthening their cooperation together in a way to undermine and challenge the West, including the United States. The last thing the United States should do is to join this cooperation by investing in the Chinese military, and that includes not just the Government of the United States but all Americans and American businesses and investors.

So the President has been right to highlight this growing threat, and I look forward to continuing to work with President Trump and Secretary Bessent to ensure that U.S. dollars no longer are able to help build the Chinese military and line the pockets of the country that is working to undermine the international rules-based order and the United States first and foremost.

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

S. 1062. A bill to authorize a pilot program to expand and intensify surveillance of self-harm in partnership with State and local public health departments, to establish a grant program to provide self-harm and suicide prevention services in hospital emergency departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as we all know too well, rates of suicide have risen to epidemic levels in the United States, with suicide now the 10th leading cause of death in the country. On average, there are 135 suicides every day, roughly one every 11 minutes. These are staggering statistics behind which there are tragic stories of loss. That is why I am introducing the Suicide Prevention Act with my colleague Senator MORAN.

Our bipartisan bill would provide new resources to help turn the tide on this disturbing trend. It would authorize new funding for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, to partner with State and local health departments to improve surveillance of suicide attempts and other incidences of self-harm. Data collection efforts regarding suicide often occur years after the fact, which limits the ability of State and local health departments, as well as community organizations, to recognize trends early and intervene. CDC has already begun some of this work, but the Suicide Prevention Act would expand these efforts and enhance data collection so we can respond to new trends quickly and save lives.

We know that emergency healthcare providers are often at the frontlines of responding to suicide attempts. Approximately 37 percent of individuals without a previous history of mental health or substance abuse who die by suicide make an emergency department visit within the year before their death. According to the Suicide Prevention Resource Center, the risk of suicide is greatest within a month of discharge from the hospital. To help ensure our emergency healthcare professionals have the tools to respond, the bill would also authorize funding for a grant program within the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, SAMHSA, to help better train emergency department staff to implement suicide prevention strategies, screen at-risk patients, and refer patients to appropriate followup care. The legislation would also require SAMHSA to develop best practices for such programs so that healthcare providers are able to provide their patients with the best possible care and advice.

Nationwide, suicide rates have skyrocketed over the last decade. In 2022, over 49,000 Americans lost their lives to suicide. That same year, there were 1.6 million suicide attempts. We must renew our efforts on suicide prevention and take a holistic approach. We must also continue to invest in 9-8-8, the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline.

Senator MORAN and I passed legislation in 2022 that increased funding for the lifeline and made key improvements, such as enhance texting capability, but we must do more.

Today, I am pleased to have the opportunity to partner with Senator MORAN once again by introducing the Suicide Prevention Act. This bill is one more step Congress can take to combat the the mental health and suicide crisis in our country. I look forward to working with Senator MORAN and advocates in Rhode Island and across the country to make a difference in addressing this epidemic.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1268. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1968, making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1269. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1968, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1270. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1968, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1271. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1968, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1272. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1968, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1268. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1968, making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AUTOMATIC CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1311. Automatic continuing appropriations

“(a)(1)(A) On and after the first day of each fiscal year, if an appropriation Act for such fiscal year with respect to the account for a program, project, or activity has not been enacted and continuing appropriations are not in effect with respect to the program, project, or activity, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary to continue, at the rate for operations specified in subparagraph (C), the program, project, or activity if funds were provided for the program, project, or activity during the preceding fiscal year.

“(B)(i) Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted under subparagraph (A) shall be available for a period of 14 days.

“(ii) If, at the end of the first 14-day period during which appropriations and funds are