

votes. That is on Republicans. If you don't get any input from Democrats, it is a Republican vote. A shutdown is on Republicans.

The American people rightly understand that Republicans have pushed this country towards a shutdown. They do understand that Donald Trump has created a massive economic uncertainty and is putting us on track for a Republican recession with his indiscriminate layoffs, his illegal funding freeze, his incoherent trade war, and now by threatening a Republican shutdown.

Democrats did not write this bill. We did not have any input, but if we had, we sure wouldn't have handed over more of our power to two billionaires. You can bet we would not have cut our domestic investments by billions. Democrats did not write this bill, but if we did, we would have protected our public schools. Democrats did not write this bill, but if we did, we would have put our veterans first, and you can bet we would not have prevented the District of Columbia from spending its own taxpayer dollars and be forced to lay off police and teachers. Democrats did not have any say on this bill, but if we did, we would have protected our public lands and your healthcare and lifesaving cancer research.

So I hope my Democratic and, yes, my Republican colleagues as well will join me in voting no on this bill and swiftly passing a 4-week extension so we can hammer out a better bipartisan solution.

I am voting no because my constituents should have a say in how their tax dollars are spent. I am voting no because Congress—Congress, each one of us, not Elon Musk—should decide which schools or which hospitals get funding. I am voting no, and I hope my colleagues will join me.

Before I close, I want to say to my constituents who are frightened and scared: I understand your fears. Some days, I share them. But your voice matters. Speaking out matters. You elected me to be your voice, and you better believe I will keep fighting for you. So shoulders up. Keep the faith. We stand strong, but we do not stand down. We are going to keep fighting for the America we love.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall votes.

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

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I have the greatest respect for the previous speaker and also for the distinguished chair of the Appropriations Committee.

If she gets her way this afternoon or later tonight, the government will shut down. We would have to call the House back in. It will be a long period of uncertainty in a shutdown. That is the choice we are faced with.

The Speaker of the House has been faced with a very, very slim margin in the House of Representatives. He has had to do a deal that none of us likes, but he has decided that we have a responsibility to govern, and the better choice is to keep the government open.

The previous speaker has had 6 months to try to negotiate the deal which she says we can do now in 30 days. It is not going to happen.

We are here to make tough choices. Today, Senator COLLINS and I and others will make tough choices. We don't like the choices before us, but that is the way you have to govern.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN FEINBERG

Mr. WICKER. Let me talk about an easy choice that the Senate will soon have to make, and that is the nomination of Mr. Stephen Feinberg, President Trump's choice to serve as Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Here is the reason it is going to be an easy choice for us in just a few moments. He was reported from the Armed Services Committee by an 18-to-9 vote—a bipartisan overwhelming vote—and he will do a good job.

The Secretary of Defense focuses on policy, on the overall policy. The Deputy Secretary of Defense—the position that Mr. Feinberg will hold if he is confirmed, as I am sure he will be—this person oversees the day-to-day operations of the vast Pentagon by leading its budget process, managing its people, and driving crucial internal reforms. Steve Feinberg is the exact person for this.

Now, under normal circumstances, the Deputy Secretary of Defense requires exemplary skills in management, budgeting, and problem-solving, but today's extraordinary environment requires even more than that—a manager of the highest caliber in that role. So let's look at just two or three items from Steve Feinberg's resume.

He has been founder and cochief executive officer and chief investment officer of Cerberus. He founded and cofounded other Cerberus affiliates and Cerberus funds. He managed separate pools of capital for Gruntal & Company, and he also had high responsibilities in Drexel Burnham Lambert. He knows how to manage huge, billion-dollar operations and to manage people.

He is also a perfect person for this role. He is well-spoken. He is calm. He is understated. He will be largely invisible. But he is the man to help us rebuild the military, reform the way the Pentagon does business, and turn this unaudited Pentagon bureaucracy around.

He will get a resounding bipartisan vote on the floor, I predict, as he did in the committee.

I congratulate the President on this nomination and on the bipartisan vote that we will soon get on a vote that is relatively easy compared to some of the harder votes later on today.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON FEINBERG NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—59

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

NAYS—40

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

NOT VOTING—1

Booker

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and resume consideration of S. 331, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 331) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the scheduling of fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Thune (for Grassley) amendment No. 1237, of a perfecting nature.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Halt All Lethal Trafficking of Fentanyl Act” or the “HALT Fentanyl Act”.

SEC. 2. CLASS SCHEDULING OF FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCES.

Section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)) is amended by adding at the end of schedule I the following:

“(e)(1) Unless specifically exempted or unless listed in another schedule, any material, compound, mixture, or preparation which contains any quantity of a fentanyl-related substance, or which contains the salts, isomers, and salts of isomers of a fentanyl-related substance whenever the existence of such salts, isomers, and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation.

“(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), except as provided in paragraph (3), the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ means any substance that is structurally related to fentanyl by 1 or more of the following modifications:

“(A) By replacement of the phenyl portion of the phenethyl group by any monocycle, whether or not further substituted in or on the monocycle.

“(B) By substitution in or on the phenethyl group with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxy, hydroxyl, halo, haloalkyl, amino, or nitro groups.

“(C) By substitution in or on the piperidine ring with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxy, ester, ether, hydroxyl, halo, haloalkyl, amino, or nitro groups.

“(D) By replacement of the aniline ring with any aromatic monocycle whether or not further substituted in or on the aromatic monocycle.

“(E) By replacement of the *N*-propionyl group with another acyl group.

“(3) A substance that satisfies the definition of the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ in paragraph (2) shall nonetheless not be treated as a fentanyl-related substance subject to this schedule if the substance—

“(A) is controlled by action of the Attorney General under section 201; or

“(B) is otherwise expressly listed in a schedule other than this schedule.

“(4)(A) The Attorney General may by order publish in the Federal Register a list of substances that satisfy the definition of the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ in paragraph (2).

“(B) The absence of a substance from a list published under subparagraph (A) does not negate the control status of the substance under this schedule if the substance satisfies the definition of the term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ in paragraph (2).”.

SEC. 3. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO RESEARCH.

(a) **ALTERNATIVE REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR SCHEDULE I RESEARCH.**—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (1) (relating to required training for prescribers) as subsection (m); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(n) **SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS CONDUCTING CERTAIN RESEARCH WITH SCHEDULE I CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding subsection (g), a practitioner may conduct research described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with 1 or more schedule I substances in accordance with subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) of this subsection.

“(2) **RESEARCH SUBJECT TO EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.**—Research described in this paragraph is research that—

“(A) is with respect to a drug that is the subject of an investigational use exemption under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)); or

“(B) is—

“(i) conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, or the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

“(ii) funded partly or entirely by a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction from the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

“(3) **EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.**—

“(A) **RESEARCHER WITH A CURRENT SCHEDULE I OR II RESEARCH REGISTRATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If a practitioner is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I or II, the practitioner may conduct research under this subsection on and after the date that is 30 days after the date on which the practitioner sends a notice to the Attorney General containing the following information, with respect to each substance with which the practitioner will conduct the research:

“(I) The chemical name of the substance.

“(II) The quantity of the substance to be used in the research.

“(III) Demonstration that the research is in the category described in paragraph (2), which demonstration may be satisfied—

“(aa) in the case of a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction, or intramural research project, by identifying the sponsoring agency and supplying the number of the grant, contract, cooperative agreement, other transaction, or project; or

“(bb) in the case of an application under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)), by supplying the application number and the sponsor of record on the application.

“(IV) Demonstration that the researcher is authorized to conduct research with respect to the substance under the laws of the State in which the research will take place.

“(ii) **VERIFICATION OF INFORMATION BY HHS OR VA.**—Upon request from the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Department of Defense, or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, as appropriate, shall verify information submitted by an applicant under clause (i)(III).

“(B) **RESEARCHER WITHOUT A CURRENT SCHEDULE I OR II RESEARCH REGISTRATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If a practitioner is not registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I or II, the practitioner may send a notice to the Attorney General containing the information listed in subparagraph (A)(i), with respect to each substance with which the practitioner will conduct the research.

“(ii) **ATTORNEY GENERAL ACTION.**—The Attorney General shall—

“(I) treat notice received under clause (i) as a sufficient application for a research registration; and

“(II) not later than 45 days of receiving such a notice that contains all information required under subparagraph (A)(i)—

“(aa) register the applicant; or

“(bb) serve an order to show cause upon the applicant in accordance with section 304(c).

“(4) **ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS.**—The Attorney General shall provide a means to permit a practitioner to submit a notification under paragraph (3) electronically.

“(5) **LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS.**—A practitioner conducting research with a schedule I substance under this subsection may only possess the amounts of schedule I substance identified in—

“(A) the notification to the Attorney General under paragraph (3); or

“(B) a supplemental notification that the practitioner may send if the practitioner needs additional amounts for the research, which supplemental notification shall include—

“(i) the name of the practitioner;

“(ii) the additional quantity needed of the substance; and

“(iii) an attestation that the research to be conducted with the substance is consistent with the scope of the research that was the subject of the notification under paragraph (3).

“(6) **IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION REQUIREMENTS NOT AFFECTED.**—Nothing in this subsection alters the requirements of part A of title III, regarding the importation and exportation of controlled substances.

“(7) **INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Halt All Lethal Trafficking of Fentanyl Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall complete a study, and submit to Congress a report thereon, about research described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with fentanyl.”.

(b) **SEPARATE REGISTRATIONS NOT REQUIRED FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCHER IN SAME INSTITUTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 302(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) An agent or employee of a research institution that is conducting research with a controlled substance if—

“(A) the agent or employee is acting within the scope of the professional practice of the agent or employee;

“(B) another agent or employee of the institution is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in the same schedule;

“(C) the researcher who is so registered—

“(i) informs the Attorney General of the name, position title, and employing institution of the agent or employee who is not separately registered;

“(ii) authorizes that agent or employee to perform research under the registration of the registered researcher; and

“(iii) affirms that any act taken by that agent or employee involving a controlled substance shall be attributable to the registered researcher, as if the researcher had directly committed the act, for purposes of any proceeding under section 304(a) to suspend or revoke the registration of the registered researcher; and

“(D) the Attorney General does not, within 30 days of receiving the information, authorization, and affirmation described in subparagraph (C), refuse, for a reason listed in section 304(a), to allow the agent or employee to possess the substance without a separate registration.”.

(2) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Section 302(c)(3) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(c)(3)) is amended by striking “(25)” and inserting “(27)”.

(c) **SINGLE REGISTRATION FOR RELATED RESEARCH SITES.**—Section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4)(A) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a person registered to conduct research with a controlled substance under section 303(g) may conduct the research under a single registration if—

“(i) the research occurs exclusively on sites all of which are—

“(I) within the same city or county; and

“(II) under the control of the same institution, organization, or agency; and

“(ii) before commencing the research, the researcher notifies the Attorney General of each site where—

“(I) the research will be conducted; or

“(II) the controlled substance will be stored or administered.

“(B) A site described in subparagraph (A) shall be included in a registration described in that subparagraph only if the researcher has notified the Attorney General of the site—

“(i) in the application for the registration; or

“(ii) before the research is conducted, or before the controlled substance is stored or administered, at the site.

“(C) The Attorney General may, in consultation with the Secretary, issue regulations addressing, with respect to research sites described in subparagraph (A)—

“(i) the manner in which controlled substances may be delivered to the research sites;

“(ii) the storage and security of controlled substances at the research sites;

“(iii) the maintenance of records for the research sites; and

“(iv) any other matters necessary to ensure effective controls against diversion at the research sites.”

(d) **NEW INSPECTION NOT REQUIRED IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.**—Section 302(f) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(f) The” and inserting “(f)(1) The”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) If a person is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance and applies for a registration, or for a modification of a registration, to conduct research with a second controlled substance that is in the same schedule as the first controlled substance, or is in a schedule with a higher numerical designation than the schedule of the first controlled substance, a new inspection by the Attorney General of the registered location is not required.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall prohibit the Attorney General from conducting an inspection that the Attorney General determines necessary to ensure that a registrant maintains effective controls against diversion.”

(e) **CONTINUATION OF RESEARCH ON SUBSTANCES NEWLY ADDED TO SCHEDULE I.**—Section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **CONTINUATION OF RESEARCH ON SUBSTANCES NEWLY ADDED TO SCHEDULE I.**—If a person is conducting research on a substance when the substance is added to schedule I, and the person is already registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I—

“(1) not later than 90 days after the scheduling of the newly scheduled substance, the person shall submit a completed application for registration or modification of existing registration, to conduct research on the substance, in accordance with regulations issued by the Attorney General for purposes of this paragraph;

“(2) the person may, notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), continue to conduct the research on the substance until—

“(A) the person withdraws the application described in paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

“(B) the Attorney General serves on the person an order to show cause proposing the denial of the application under section 304(c);

“(3) if the Attorney General serves an order to show cause as described in paragraph (2)(B) and the person requests a hearing, the hearing shall be held on an expedited basis and not later than 45 days after the request is made, except that the hearing may be held at a later time if so requested by the person; and

“(4) if the person sends a copy of the application described in paragraph (1) to a manufacturer or distributor of the substance, receipt of the copy by the manufacturer or distributor shall constitute sufficient evidence that the person is authorized to receive the substance.”

(f) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURING ACTIVITIES AS COINCIDENT TO RESEARCH.**—Section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822), as amended by subsection (e), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURING ACTIVITIES AS COINCIDENT TO RESEARCH.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a person who is registered to perform research on a controlled substance may perform manufacturing activities with small quantities of that substance, including activities described in paragraph (2), without being required to obtain a manufacturing registration, if—

“(A) the activities are performed for the purpose of the research; and

“(B) the activities and the quantities of the substance involved in the activities are stated in—

“(i) a notification submitted to the Attorney General under section 303(n);

“(ii) a research protocol filed with an application for registration approval under section 303(g); or

“(iii) a notification to the Attorney General that includes—

“(I) the name of the registrant; and

“(II) an attestation that the research to be conducted with the small quantities of manufactured substance is consistent with the scope of the research that is the basis for the registration.

“(2) **ACTIVITIES INCLUDED.**—Activities permitted under paragraph (1) include—

“(A) processing the substance to create extracts, tinctures, oils, solutions, derivatives, or other forms of the substance consistent with—

“(i) the information provided as part of a notification submitted to the Attorney General under section 303(n); or

“(ii) a research protocol filed with an application for registration approval under section 303(g); and

“(B) dosage form development studies performed for the purpose of requesting an investigational new drug exemption under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)).

“(3) **EXCEPTION REGARDING MARIHUANA.**—The authority under paragraph (1) to manufacture substances does not include the authority to grow marihuana.”

(g) **TRANSPARENCY REGARDING SPECIAL PROCEDURES.**—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) **TRANSPARENCY REGARDING SPECIAL PROCEDURES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Attorney General determines, with respect to a controlled substance, that an application by a practitioner to conduct research with the substance should be considered under a process, or subject to criteria, different from the process or criteria applicable to applications to conduct research with other controlled substances in the same schedule, the Attorney General shall make public, including by posting on the website of the Drug Enforcement Administration—

“(A) the identities of all substances for which such determinations have been made;

“(B) the process and criteria that shall be applied to applications to conduct research with those substances; and

“(C) how the process and criteria described in subparagraph (B) differ from the process and criteria applicable to applications to conduct research with other controlled substances in the same schedule.

“(2) **TIMING OF POSTING.**—The Attorney General shall make information described in paragraph (1) public upon making a determination described in that paragraph, regardless of whether a practitioner has submitted such an application at that time.”

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTION ON CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES DISPENSING.

Effective as if included in the enactment of Public Law 117–328—

(1) section 1252(a) of division FF of Public Law 117–328 (136 Stat. 5681) is amended, in the matter being inserted into section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act, by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

(2) section 1262 of division FF of Public Law 117–328 (136 Stat. 5681) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

(ii) in the matter being stricken by subsection (a)(2), by striking “(g)(1)” and inserting “(h)(1)”; and

(iii) in the matter being inserted by subsection (a)(2), by striking “(g) Practitioners” and inserting “(h) Practitioners”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (1), by striking “303(g)(1)” and inserting “303(h)(1)”;

(ii) in the matter being inserted by paragraph (1), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

(iii) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (2)(A), by striking “303(g)(2)” and inserting “303(h)(2)”;

(iv) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (3), by striking “303(g)(2)(B)” and inserting “303(h)(2)(B)”;

(v) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (5), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

and

(vi) in the matter being stricken by paragraph (6), by striking “303(g)” and inserting “303(h)”;

(3) section 1263(b) of division FF of Public Law 117–328 (136 Stat. 5685) is amended—

(A) by striking “303(g)(2)” and inserting “303(h)(2)”; and

(B) by striking “(21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2))” and inserting “(21 U.S.C. 823(h)(2))”.

SEC. 5. RULEMAKING.

(a) **INTERIM FINAL RULES.**—The Attorney General—

(1) shall, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, issue rules to implement this Act and the amendments made by this Act; and

(2) may issue the rules under paragraph (1) as interim final rules.

(b) **PROCEDURE FOR FINAL RULE.**—

(1) **EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERIM FINAL RULES.**—A rule issued by the Attorney General as an interim final rule under subsection (a) shall become immediately effective as an interim final rule without requiring the Attorney General to demonstrate good cause therefor, notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of the undesignated matter following paragraph (4) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT AND HEARING.**—An interim final rule issued under subsection (a) shall give interested persons the opportunity to comment and to request a hearing.

(3) **FINAL RULE.**—After the conclusion of such proceedings, the Attorney General shall issue a final rule to implement this Act and the amendments made by this Act in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 6. PENALTIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 401(b)(1) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(vi), by inserting “or a fentanyl-related substance” after “any analogue of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl] propanamide”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(vi), by inserting “or a fentanyl-related substance” after “any analogue of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl] propanamide”.

(b) **IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION.**—Section 1010(b) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(F), by inserting “or a fentanyl-related substance” after “any analogue of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl] propanamide”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(F), by inserting “or a fentanyl-related substance” after “any analogue of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl] propanamide”.

(c) **DEFINITION OF FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCE.**—Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(60) The term ‘fentanyl-related substance’ has the meaning given the term in subsection (e)(2) of schedule I of section 202(c).”

SEC. 7. APPLICABILITY; OTHER MATTERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Irrespective of the date on which the rules required by section 5 are finalized, the amendments made by this Act apply

beginning as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendments made by this Act may be construed as evidence that, in applying sections 401(b)(1) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 841(b)(1)) and 1010(b) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 960(b)) with respect to conduct occurring before the date of the enactment of this Act, a fentanyl-related substance (as defined by such amendments) is not an analogue of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl] propanamide.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress agrees with the interpretation of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) in United States v. McCray, 346 F. Supp. 3d 363 (W.D.N.Y. 2018).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the order of yesterday be amended so that the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 331 be agreed to with all other remaining provisions in effect.

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

Under the previous order, all postclosure time on the bill is expired; amendment No. 1237 is withdrawn; the committee-reported substitute is agreed to; and the clerk will read the bill by title for the third time.

The amendment (No. 1237) was withdrawn.

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON S. 331

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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Baldwin	Graham	Mullin
Banks	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murray
Bennet	Hassan	Ossoff
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Peters
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Reed
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Capito	Johnson	Rounds
Cassidy	Justice	Schatz
Collins	Kaine	Schmitt
Coons	Kelly	Schumer
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cortez Masto	Kim	Scott (SC)
Cotton	King	Shaheen
Cramer	Klobuchar	Sheehy
Crapo	Lankford	Slotkin
Cruz	Lee	Smith
Curtis	Lujan	Sullivan
Daines	Lummis	Thune
Durbin	Marshall	Tillis
Ernst	McConnell	Tuberville
Fetterman	McCormick	Warner
Fischer	Moody	Whitehouse
Gallego	Moran	Wicker
Gillibrand	Moreno	Young

NAYS—16

Alsobrooks	Merkley	Warnock
Blunt Rochester	Murphy	Warren
Booker	Padilla	Welch
Duckworth	Sanders	Wyden
Hirono	Schiff	
Markey	Van Hollen	

The bill (S. 331), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCORMICK). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be up to 20 minutes of debate under the control of Senator PAUL for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time?

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

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

The Senator from Kentucky.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, President Trump has pledged to balance the budget. I want to help him. I want to help him with this task. But to balance the budget requires much less spending than this current bill entails.

Our national debt now exceeds \$36 trillion. That is 124 percent of the size of our economy. That should not be a surprise. We are adding \$2 trillion every year to the debt, this year included.

Critics of excessive Federal spending have rightly argued that we should return spending to prepandemic levels. This is something I could support. The spending bill before us, though, spends \$400 billion more than we were spending before the pandemic. Spending went through the roof during the pandemic, and it never came back down, and the deficits are out of control. In order for this bill to get back to prepandemic levels, it would have to be \$400 billion less. That is something I could support.

Three months ago, when the current continuing resolution was passed at the end of last year, we were told that we just needed to clear the decks. President Trump was going to come in, the Republicans would be in charge, and then everything would be OK. Just wait. Pass it. Pass it along in September. Come March, Republicans will be in charge, and something will happen.

Yet the bill before us doesn't change anything. The bill before us keeps the same Biden spending levels.

We were told with relentless fury that we would fight for the taxpayers come spring, and we were given a bill

that doesn't change. It doesn't change the course of accumulating \$2 trillion in debt every year.

The powers that be, I believe, waved the white flag of surrender when they presented the American people with this bill that fails to make the cuts that are necessary to slow down the accumulation of our debt.

The malpractice is made even worse this time around. Presidents of both parties pay lipservice to the idea that the national debt must be addressed. Despite tough talk, deficits and the debt inevitably keep rising. We now have over \$36 trillion in debt.

Unlike past Presidents, though, President Trump created the Department of Government Efficiency—affectionately known as DOGE—to identify wasteful programs and eliminate them. Despite DOGE working around the clock identifying appalling waste of taxpayers' dollars, this bill continues to fund the same programs that are funding the waste and fraud that have been located.

How can that be? If we have located the waste and fraud, why are we not telling them to reduce foreign aid? If the foreign aid budget is full of all kinds of crazy, leftwing advocacy and nonsense, reduce the amount of money you give them.

This bill will give them the same amount of money they got last year. This bill allows foreign aid to continue. It doesn't incorporate any of the DOGE cuts. It doesn't cut waste. This bill embraces the waste. It allows the waste to continue. This bill doesn't respect the taxpayer. It continues to throw their money away.

This bill continues the Biden levels of spending that caused historic inflation, that caused prices to rise, that caused people to be outraged, to vote for a new President. Why in the world would we continue the same spending levels that led to the debt that led to the inflation that is plaguing us?

This malpractice is compounded by the fact that President Trump and DOGE made it easy for Congress to fix. They actually told us where the waste was and where the waste and abuse was and told us how to root it out, how to remove it.

The waste found by DOGE truly shocks the conscience. Taxpayers paid \$25,000 for an LGBT trans opera in Colombia. They spent \$2 million on sex changes in Guatemala. They spent \$1.5 million advancing DEI initiatives in Serbia. They spent \$6 million on tourism in Egypt. They spent \$32,000 for a transgender comic book in Peru.

Some of the USAID's programs have actually gone beyond woke absurdity into pouring money and support to people who are the enemies of the United States. The Agency provided millions of dollars to EcoHealth, which funded the dangerous research in Wuhan which, in all likelihood, created and caused the pandemic.

From this account, also, millions of dollars went to support agriculture in

Afghanistan, including fertilizer for the poppy fields grown by the Taliban.

And yet, even after all that DOGE has uncovered—and I commend them—Congress is still on the verge of passing a bill that fully funds foreign aid. Many in this Chamber think it is wasteful to do all these things, and they say: Well, why should we keep spending money on foreign aid that is paying for sex changes in Guatemala? And yet the funding levels in this bill stay the same. These are the same funding levels for the foreign aid that were occurring under the Biden administration.

Let me say that again and clearly: This bill fully funds the outrageous foreign aid programs that Elon Musk and DOGE have exposed. Something doesn't make sense here.

While Congress seems slow to open its eyes to waste and abuse, Secretary Rubio has acted. He recently said that the United States is canceling 83 percent of the foreign aid contracts. I am for that. In fact, that is what my amendment will do. My amendment will take the contracts—the dollar amount of the contracts—that President Trump and Secretary Rubio have canceled and put them into language so they don't get funded. Why in the world would we not be for getting rid of the funding for the crazy programs we are trying to get rid of? Something doesn't make sense here.

President Trump and his team identified the cuts that need to be made, but it is ultimately Congress, not the Executive, that has the power of the purse. Congress has to act to make the cuts identified by the administration a reality. And on that score, the bill under consideration today is a disappointment. The bill is a disappointment to those who believe that congressional leadership should have used the 3 months since they came into office, since DOGE and Elon Musk have identified this waste—they should have used that waste and incorporated it into the spending bill.

None of the DOGE cuts, none of Elon Musk's suggestions, have been incorporated into the spending bill. The spending bill continues spending at the Biden levels. When everybody wakes up and scratches their head and says, "What happened here?" the spending will lead to \$2 trillion in debt. People will wake up and say: Well, what about all those cuts? What happened? I thought we were cutting out waste and fraud. And come September, the deficit for the year will be \$2 trillion. Because we are not actually cutting the spending. Congress has to do the heavy lifting.

We owe the American people an answer to this question: Exactly how many Republican seats are required in Congress to achieve a majority that will actually fight to lower government spending?

I don't think the taxpayers need to wait for that fight any longer. I am not willing to say: Oh, just wait, young

man. Wait for another day. We will be fixing this 6 months from now.

It never comes. This is the story of this place: Wait until another day. Wait until the sun shines; we will finally cut some spending.

It never comes. Someone must make a stand and fight. To that end, I offer a DOGE cuts 1.0 amendment that would codify the cuts in foreign aid, reducing USAID's budget by 83 percent and aligning with Secretary Rubio's recent decision to eliminate thousands of these programs.

So what I am doing is not inconsistent with the Trump administration; what I am doing is in support of the Trump administration. What I am doing is taking the preliminary cuts that Secretary Rubio has given to foreign aid and making them law.

Why? Because the whole judiciary is opposing the President. They are telling him he can't fire people, that he can't cut spending. He needs Congress to step up and do their job. The people who support the President need to be supporting the President's cuts. They need to be supporting an amendment—DOGE 1.0—that puts those cuts into law.

I am not even talking about codifying all of the cuts. I am only taking a small sliver of them in foreign aid. This is the low-hanging fruit. This is the worst of the worst. This is \$3 million for girl-centric climate change in Brazil. This is \$4.8 million for social media influencers in Ukraine. This is hundreds of thousands of dollars spent sending Ukrainian fashion designers to the Paris fashion show. This is waste—utter and simple waste—and it ought to be cut.

Why would people tell you publicly they are for it and then vote against it? It doesn't seem to make any sense. What my amendment does is put DOGE's findings into action, eliminating much of the funding for an Agency that spent tax dollars on woke entertainment and advocacy. It sets in law the reductions that the Trump administration has made known to be necessary.

I applaud DOGE's work to uncover these many instances of abuse of taxpayer dollars, and it is now Congress's turn to make the cuts stick. If we do not adopt my amendment, then taxpayers will simply continue spending substantial amounts of money to defund components of the government rather than using savings to pay down our mounting debt. In other words, you might cut it and think it is cut one day; but what if the courts say you have to spend it somewhere else? It never comes back. The cuts are never real. The only way the cuts the administration is making will ever be real, will ever be counted, will ever lessen the debt in the country is to vote in Congress. That is what this is about.

It would be the height of hypocrisy for Congress to pay lip service to DOGE's exceptional work, support it on the superficial, and then vote

against it when you have a chance to vote on it.

Continuing to spend at this bill's level will add \$2 trillion in debt. That is a fact. All the newspapers reporting yesterday—it was all over the news: record-setting accumulation of debt.

We have accumulated over a trillion, and we are not halfway through the year. It is a record accumulation of debt. It only stops when people stand up and say: Enough is enough.

The least we can do is make sure that it doesn't include the egregious spending that has come from the foreign aid, the craziness, the sex change operations in Guatemala, trans operas, trans comic books. All of these ludicrous things that no American supports will only go away and will only go away with permanence if we vote for it.

Before us is a chance to enact about \$16 billion worth of DOGE's cuts in foreign aid. These cuts are only real in the long term if they are reflected in congressional action. If we continue to fund the Federal Government at the Biden administration levels, which is what this bill does, then the money from DOGE's hard-found savings will just be spent somewhere else.

I urge all of my colleagues who have praised DOGE's work to match their actions to their words and vote yes on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WYDEN, Senator SANDERS, and Senator SCOTT be recognized for up to 25 minutes, and that following their remarks, the majority leader be recognized.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 891

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor with my colleague from Vermont Senator SANDERS to pass a set of critical improvements to America's healthcare system. This legislation is overwhelmingly bipartisan, fully paid for, and targeted at two objectives every Senator ought to support: improving healthcare for Americans and cracking down on the middlemen who take advantage of the system.

Mr. President, 597 days ago, the Senate Finance Committee passed the most comprehensive legislation in history to address the pharmacy benefit managers' predatory business practices, and it was passed by a vote of 26 to 1. And 493 days ago, the Senate Finance Committee passed another piece of healthcare legislation that improves

mental healthcare for Americans with Medicaid, expands and strengthens telehealth, and more PBM policies, by a vote, again, of 26 to 0. Since that time, negotiations about how to sign these policies into law have been fatally intertwined with the dysfunctional debate over congressional appropriations, as the public can see on full display this week.

These policies are too important to leave behind due to an unrelated disagreement. Community pharmacists are counting on this legislation. Doctors who don't want to see a pay cut are counting on this legislation. Seniors and working families who want better care at a lower cost are counting on this legislation. So the time to act is now.

In December, Democrats and Republicans struck a deal on this bill. I have the press release on my website to prove it. It was introduced in the House and set for passage. But along came Elon Musk and his now familiar wrecking ball. With one tweet, he killed the entire package for reasons that had nothing to do with the bill before the Senate today.

Musk even had the gall to tweet, "What is a 'pharmacy benefit manager'?" less than 2 weeks after he single-handedly killed the bill.

While this unelected billionaire rifles through Americans' private information and earned benefits, claiming to be looking for waste, fraud, and abuse, he doesn't even know about the middlemen who skim billions off the Federal Government.

Since Musk's tweeting adventure, 237 independent pharmacies have closed their doors. That is nearly three small businesses closing every day. Our bill includes critical protections that stop the giant PBMs from bullying even more local pharmacies into the abyss. Every day matters. That is why it is critical to act now.

Now, I would like to yield to the ranking member of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Senator SANDERS, so he can explain the important pieces of this bill that are in his committee's jurisdiction that also need to pass as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank Senator WYDEN for his outstanding work as the former chairman of the Finance Committee and now as the ranking member.

I get around Vermont a bit. I get around the country a bit. And, generally speaking, when I talk to a group of people, I ask them a simple question.

I say: What do you think about the healthcare system? Is it working well or is it broken? Is it dysfunctional?

And, overwhelmingly, the hands go up that the American healthcare system today is broken, it is dysfunctional, and it is cruel. And what people understand is the function of the American healthcare system, today, is

not to provide quality healthcare to all of our people, which, in fact, goes on in every other major country on Earth. It is to make huge profits for the drug companies and the insurance companies.

The current healthcare system is a system in which we spend twice as much per capita on healthcare as do the people of any other nation—an astronomical sum of money. And yet despite all that money, 85 million Americans are uninsured or underinsured, and the cost of healthcare keeps going up every single year. One out of four Americans cannot afford the costs of the drugs that their doctors prescribe. And, unbelievably, it is a system in which 60,000 Americans die each year because they can't get to a doctor on time.

It is a system in which we don't have enough doctors, we don't have enough nurses, we don't have enough dentists, and we don't have enough pharmacists. But the good news is the insurance companies and the drug companies are making huge profits.

The current healthcare system is a system in which our life expectancy is lower than in any other major country, and if you are working class in America, you are going to live 7 years of shorter life than if you are wealthy.

It is a system in which some 500,000 people go bankrupt each year because of medically related debt. It is a system where, in large parts of our country, rural hospitals are being shut down and where people even with decent insurance have to travel hours in order to find a doctor.

As Senator WYDEN indicated, in December, after months and months of difficult negotiations—and I want to congratulate Senator WYDEN, Senator CRAPO, and all of the people involved in those negotiations—we made some progress on this healthcare crisis by coming together on a bipartisan and bicameral agreement on a healthcare package.

That legislation, while more modest than I would have wanted, would have provided \$4.5 billion for community health centers this year and \$4.6 billion next year, up 15 percent from a few years ago.

Community health centers provide primary healthcare to 32 million Americans—working-class, lower income people. They do a phenomenal job, but they are under financial stress.

That legislation would have provided \$350 million a year, over 2 years, for the National Health Service Corps, so we can attract young people to go out and work—young doctors to work in underserved areas. And it would have provided \$300 million a year for teaching health centers.

It would have also lowered the outrageous price of prescription drugs by taking on the greed of pharmacy benefit managers.

It was a bipartisan bill. And just before that bill was going to be passed, Elon Musk, the wealthiest man in the

world, who does not have to worry about whether he and his friends can afford healthcare, he sent out a series of tweets—some of them outrageously dishonest—to kill this legislation, and he succeeded in doing so.

So, today, it is important that we take a step forward and undo the damage that Mr. Musk caused, and the legislation that we are proposing today would, in fact, begin to take us back where we were. It would increase funding for community health centers and do all of the other important work that Senator WYDEN wanted.

We have a healthcare crisis in America today. The CR that we are going to be voting on in a little while will make a bad situation worse. This is an opportunity to tell the American people that we are aware of the healthcare crisis; we are at least trying to do something.

And I would yield back to Senator WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, very briefly, I want to thank my colleague. We have been working, as we have indicated, for months and months, because Americans, with respect to healthcare, feel like they are getting hit by a wrecking ball here in terms of the costs and inability to get quality care.

So with that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 891 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the Wyden 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 Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. SANDERS. That is it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. We have a healthcare crisis—85 million uninsured or underinsured, people dying because they can't afford healthcare. We pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. We have reached a bipartisan conclusion to go forward in a modest way, but it would have some impact in approving healthcare in America, and my Republican colleague objects. That is about it.

Well, I hope the American people are watching.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 1968 be withdrawn and that the motion to proceed to H.R. 1968 be agreed to; further, if cloture is filed on H.R. 1968, the Senate immediately vote on the motion to invoke cloture, and if cloture is invoked, the only amendments in order to H.R. 1968 be the following: Merkley No. 1273, Duckworth No. 1274, Van Hollen No. 1272, and Paul No. 1266; that the Senate vote on adoption of the amendments in the order listed, with 60-affirmative votes required for adoption with the exception of the Paul amendment; that there be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided, prior to each vote; further, that upon disposition of the Paul amendment, all postcloture time be expired, the bill be considered read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill as amended, if amended, all without further intervening action or debate; further, that following disposition of H.R. 1968, the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of S. 1077; that there be up to 10 minutes for debate on the bill, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage, with no amendments or motions in order to the bill, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; finally, following disposition of S. 1077, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate resume executive session and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Phelan nomination; and if cloture is invoked on the Phelan nomination, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate immediately vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Landau nomination; and if cloture is invoked on the Landau nomination, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader no earlier than Monday, March 24.

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

FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2025

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1968) making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before we finish today, I would like to say that soon, the Senate will vote on a bipartisan piece of legislation that will make an important DC funding fix.

This legislation will make sure that we take care of the residents of the District; that we will support law enforcement and firefighters and teachers and city services. The legislation is very good news for the residents of the District of Columbia. I am happy we are passing the bill today.

I thank my colleagues for working quickly to bring this bill to the floor. Once the Senate acts, we urge the House to act quickly.

Government funding expires at midnight tonight, and the vote before us is a Hobson's choice. The CR bill is a bad bill, but as bad as the CR is, I believe that allowing Donald Trump to take even more power via a government shutdown is a far worse option.

A shutdown would allow DOGE to shift into overdrive. It would give Donald Trump and DOGE the keys to the city, the State, and country, and that is a far worse alternative.

I want to remind everyone that it was Republicans who pushed this false shutdown choice. Their inability to govern has led us to this precipice. Our caucus Members have two bad choices. Different Senators will come down on different sides of the question, but that does not mean that any Senate Democrat supports a shutdown.

Whatever the outcome, our caucus will be united in our determination to continue the long-term fight to stop Donald Trump's dangerous war on our democracy and on America's working families.

Now, I want to be clear about what this bill does and does not do. The full-year CR is a law that sets funding levels for the full year. The President and executive branch have a legal and constitutional duty to faithfully execute the CR. The CR does not change the underlying law making the Trump administration's impoundments and mass firings illegal. This is true as a matter of law.

Nothing in the CR changes the Impoundment Control Act, the foundation of Congress's appropriations authority, and the authorization laws that require USAID and other Agencies to exist and to operate the programs as Congress has assigned to them. Nothing changes title 5, governing the civil service, the Administrative Procedure Act, and so on.

One of the reasons I am voting for cloture is for the very reason that these actions are illegal and no new law is needed to declare that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 26, H.R. 1968, a bill making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Markwayne Mullin, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Pete Ricketts, Shelley Moore Capito, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, Katie Britt, John Kennedy, Todd Young, Tim Sheehy, Kevin Cramer, Jon A. Husted, John Barrasso, Bernie Moreno.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, for information of all Senators, there will be up to nine rollcall votes. I will ask unanimous consent that all votes following the first vote be 10 minutes in length, and that if Senators will stay in their seats, we should be able to get them done even more quickly than that. Everybody be here after this first vote. These are going to be 10-minute votes.

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

The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 26, H.R. 1968, a bill making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Markwayne Mullin, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Pete Ricketts, Shelley Moore Capito, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, Katie Britt, John Kennedy, Todd Young, Tim Sheehy, Kevin Cramer, Jon A. Husted, John Barrasso, Bernie Moreno.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 1968, a bill making further continuing appropriations and other extensions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Banks	Britt	Collins
Barrasso	Budd	Cornyn
Blackburn	Capito	Cortez Masto
Boozman	Cassidy	Cotton