

of those and made sure those were not affected.

Polio eradication efforts around the world, especially for children, is protected. We didn't make any change to that. All of that foreign aid is still going out.

Again, I have folks at home who say that is somebody else's problem, but the vast majority of Americans and Oklahomans say: Hey, we need to make sure that we are engaging in humanitarian needs in the places where we can as we are also fighting our debt and deficit.

But what are some of the areas we actually did cut? Because we actually did eliminate \$8 billion. Let me give you a couple of examples of that.

We actually did a 25-percent reduction in the resettlement fund that is run through the State Department. Now, why would we cut 25 percent of the resettlement fund? Well, 18 months ago, the United States was facing 2.5 million people a year illegally crossing our border, and there was work across all of government that the Biden administration was doing to try to manage these people in very mass numbers. Well, guess what. We have fewer than 200 now a day even attempting to cross our southern border. So there is not a need for this massive resettlement fund anymore because the borders are under control, so this fund was cut 25 percent.

Now, we are still involved in some resettlement efforts in other places for refugees around the world, and we are still involved in disaster aid, but we don't need near as large a fund for this because there is not near the problem that there used to be because our border is more secure.

The Office of Management and Budget literally went through the State Department, line by line, and identified all of these different line items and said: What did we spend our money on in this account last year? This went to humanitarian aid.

But then they also identified different areas that the State Department took for some of these funds and said they spent it on these areas. For instance, the State Department spent \$2.5 million to teach children how to make environmentally friendly reproductive health decisions. Well, we cut that, and I think most Americans would say: What in the world are we doing with that?

They spent \$3 million creating an Iraqi version of "Sesame Street" to be able to use in Iraq.

They spent \$4.5 million on the Melanesian Youth Climate Corps.

They spent a ton of money on a pride parade, with the U.S. taxpayer sponsoring a pride parade in Southern Africa.

There was money that was spent to promote vegan food in Zambia.

There was money spent for social media mentorships in Serbia and Belarus.

There was \$18 million spent to improve gender diversity in the Mexican

street lighting industry. Do you know what? We cut that. What we saved was aid for polio, for AIDS, for food. What we cut was money for gender diversity improvements for the Mexican street lighting industry.

So, yes, we did cut some funds back, but it was very intentional to go back and identify the areas that most folks at home would scratch their heads and say: Tell me again why we spent our tax dollars on that. Tell me again why I worked overtime to pay for my family to be able to make more money and pay more taxes so that my money would go to be able to teach children how to make environmentally friendly reproductive health decisions overseas.

That is what we went after, and I am grateful that we actually didn't just talk about doing something; we did it.

Not only did we do that on the State Department's side, but we engaged in something that a lot of people have talked about for a long time: NPR and PBS. Now, I have got nothing against "Sesame Street." I have got nothing against the "Antiques Roadshow." I have got nothing against NPR programs. If people want to be able to listen to that, well, that is fine. They are in America, and they can have the opportunity to be able to listen to it. This has been interesting just to be able to hear their conversation about it because the conversation has been that we shut the whole program down, that NPR is closing down tomorrow. Well, that is just not true. Let me tell you what we actually did with this rescission.

We gave about a year and a half of time to NPR and to PBS to find some additional funding because, with NPR, 90 percent of their funding right now—90 percent of their funding—comes from private sources. The Federal taxpayer just pays 10 percent of it. That 10 percent for PBS and for NPR equals \$1 billion. It is a big number, but it is just 10 percent of the funding. They provide sponsorships.

I asked the question: How does every other television station and every other radio station seem to operate and find enough sponsors to be able to cover them but that somehow, magically, NPR will not be able to cover the last 10 percent of their costs? That is absurd. Of course, they will be able to do that.

I have smiled and jokingly said to folks: If MSNBC can find enough sponsors to cover it, NPR can as well.

Listen, they will be able to find enough sponsors, and they have got time to be able to actually do that. We didn't cut them off tomorrow. We gave them about 18 months of time and said: You need to start finding some other sponsorships to be able to get ready for that because some people really like PBS. That is great. They will still be out there.

I grew up in a time period like some folks in this room grew up in. I was the remote control when I was growing up, OK? We would sit on the couch, and

Mom would say to me: Go up to the TV and turn the dial, because I was the remote control in our family because we had four stations. We had ABC, NBC, CBS, and PBS. Those are the four stations that we had. We established that as a nation we need to be able to get emergency information out because that was the best way to communicate because we had four stations in America. That was it.

Well, that is not true anymore. There are thousands of stations that are available over the air for free, and there are streaming platforms galore if you want to be able to spend a hundred bucks a month for each of them. We have got lots of things on our cell phones and have access to it. There are lots of different options now that are very different. I think some people don't realize that, in 1983, Ronald Reagan proposed taking the funds away from PBS and from NPR, saying it was not needed—in 1983—because we had enough options, much less now, when thinking about all of the options we have.

It has been fascinating for people to be able to say: If we don't have PBS, people will not know how to respond in an emergency. They desperately need that for an emergency.

I have to tell you, I live in a rural State, the great State of Oklahoma. We have, occasionally, a few storms that roll through Oklahoma. I actually don't know a person who says: Oh, my gosh. It looks stormy. I think I will turn on NPR.

I actually don't know that person. They pull out their cell phones, and they look and see what is going on, on the radar or they track through unlimited numbers of great options for meteorologists in our State, and that is true all over the country.

Again, I don't belittle what they are doing—people can choose to be able to listen—but to say the only way a television station or a radio station is going to function in America is if taxpayers pay for it means you ignore the thousands of other options that are out there.

So, no, we are not cutting them off except for the funding and saying: Hey, decades ago, this might have been an appropriate use of funds, but when we have \$2 trillion in overspending, maybe we should start looking for billions of dollars to be able to reduce our spending. We are not just talking about it; we actually did it and said: OK. Let's start finding strategic ways to be able to do this. So, in the last 24 hours, the House and the Senate agreed, and we are reducing our total spending by \$9 billion in very strategic ways. Now, that is the rescission package. That is one vote-arama for our long night last night.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Mr. President, if we go back a couple of weeks ago, we were on a reconciliation bill—another vote-arama with unlimited amendments, that we had literally more than 24 hours of amendments on. As we walked through that

experience, that was all about: What are we going to do on tax policy, and what are we going to do about the One Big Beautiful Bill?

I have to tell you, I have friends at home who catch me and say: I have heard the term over and over again. I really don't know what is in the "One Big Beautiful Bill." I have just heard people say it.

I even have a friend of mine who owns a restaurant, and he actually has on his menu now the "One Big Beautiful Burger" because it has just become a catchphrase.

Well, let me tell you a little bit about it because I want people to know a little bit more about what is actually in there. This was passed by the House and the Senate, and the President of the United States signed it into law on the Fourth of July, and that bill will have dramatic effects in so many areas.

It is half of the farm bill that needs to be done that, quite frankly, we couldn't get done in the last Congress because our Democratic colleagues would not agree with us on what we were doing on some of the farm programs. Well, guess what. We just got those done. Every farmer and rancher in my State is ecstatic that more than half of the farm bill has now already been done. We are not talking about it. We actually did that. Now, we have got more to go in other policy areas, but reference prices and so many other things that needed to be updated just got updated.

It was able to prevent a tax increase for every single American—every single American, not just the wealthy. For every single American who pays taxes, their tax rate was scheduled to go up on January 1 of next year until now. We passed the One Big Beautiful Bill, and it did the first big thing it needed to do: prevent a tax increase. It kept the rates the same so that Americans would not have a huge tax increase.

It also added a new border wall structure. It added new border agents. It added ICE agents. It added detention facilities so that we don't have a couple of months of a secure border, but we have structures that are going into place to be able to make sure, long term, we have a secure border. Now, there is more to do in law in other areas, but the financial part of it we put in place. It isn't for a single year. We have actually put that in place for 4 years to be able to make sure that the funding would be there to be able to have the structures in place to be able to do that.

There was significant funding that was put in to be able to modernize our military, especially our Navy. We are very, very behind in that area so there are strategic investments in that.

There are strategic investments in the Coast Guard, which is decades behind. If you go to a Coast Guard station right now, you will find older ships, older ports, out-of-date cameras, out-of-date radar. They desperately

need to be updated. So, for all of our coastal communities, they know how dependent they are on the Coast Guard. This One Big Beautiful Bill finally puts an investment into our Coast Guard to be able to increase safety.

While I am talking about safety, we all know we desperately need to be able to modernize our air traffic control. This bill provides \$12.5 billion to finally bring our air traffic control up to a modern system. If you walk into an air traffic control tower, it looks like you just walked into the 1960s, but it won't in the days ahead because the investment has been made to be able to modernize the air traffic control based on what is in this bill. It is one of the most significant investments that we have had in a very, very long time in strategic areas that desperately needed help.

Now, I have heard from a lot of folks on this; that this is a giant deficit bill. I get that. I have seen all of those things on social media. But if you went to the Congressional Budget Office—and everybody is welcome to look at that online. If you went to the Congressional Budget Office and looked for their final, final score—this is after all the amendments, all the text changes, after everything has been done—the final score from the Congressional Budget Office was \$400 billion in savings, not in deficit; \$400 billion in savings was the final score when they came out, once everything was all said and done. I understand, on social media, there are lots of other things flying around there. I urge you to go check the last score to make sure it had all the information and that everything was up-to-date on this.

There are a couple of things I had the privilege of being able to work on for a long time on this bill. Many of them took years. There is kind of a running joke in the Senate that nothing moves fast in the Senate until it does. Many of these issues I have literally worked on for years to be able to make sure that they are ready for this moment. I want to talk through just a couple of them to make sure everybody knows what is really going on.

One of them is called full expensing. If you own a business, you know what that is. If you don't own a business, you have no idea. But if you are a small business or a manufacturer, if you buy a truck or a piece of heavy equipment or manufacturing equipment, you have to expense that out as your business expense over several years. That is really hard to do. Typically, in the first year you buy it, you have to take out a loan to pay your taxes because you had a big capital expense and you don't have enough money to be able to float to be able to cover your taxes as well. We shifted the policy permanently in this bill, where every business that buys a big piece of capital or equipment, they can expense it out in that year that they bought it.

It doesn't make any difference on the amount of revenue coming into the

Treasury, but it makes a huge difference to that individual businessowner and incentivizes them to be able to buy another big piece of equipment the next year.

Do you know what that does? That encourages more manufacturing in the country because when they buy that truck, when they buy that tractor, when they buy that piece of equipment for their manufacturing, they get more efficient. And the business that made that truck, that makes that piece of equipment, they get more business, and it churns the economy.

Every single economist, right or left, says if you do full expensing, it helps your economy. That was in this One Big Beautiful Bill. That allows now—until Congress changes this, which I hope they never do—no expiration. Full expensing now is a part of our Tax Code because I think that is essential to be able to be there.

There is another piece that I worked on, and it is connected to this full expensing. In 2021, my Democratic colleagues did a bill they called the Inflation Reduction Act. They changed the energy tax policy in that. And in that, they created a new tax just on oil and gas companies to say they can't write off their expenses like every other company can. There was like a special punishment just put in, a special new tax piece put in just for oil and gas companies. It is called intangible drilling costs—IDC, as you will hear the term used.

We were able to say if we are going to treat all manufacturing the same, if they get a chance to expense out, that should also be true for oil and gas companies. They shouldn't be punished. They should be treated—watch this—the same as everyone else. It is not a special perk for them. They would be treated equally as every other manufacturer across the country. That provision is in here.

What does that do? That increases domestic production of domestic energy, and it encourages a lot of companies that are out there that have a lot of jobs that are based here in America to be able to continue to invest in their workers and bring in more energy to the United States.

It was a very significant provision that I actually had the opportunity to be able to work on for years to be able to get that done.

Another change that I disagreed with in our 2017 bill—shocking that we don't all agree on everything, on every aspect. But in 2017, we changed who could actually take a deduction for donating to a nonprofit. In 2017, it became only those in the upper brackets could, those who are called itemizers, the top 9 percent of Americans. They could actually donate to a nonprofit and then deduct that from their taxes. That has bothered me ever since.

The result of that is billions of dollars less that has been donated to nonprofits. After years of working on this and talking to my colleagues, we all

agree, we have got to be able to fix that.

In this bill, we changed it. As of next year, every American who pays taxes, if you donate to a nonprofit—and you pick who it is; it doesn't matter—if you donate to a nonprofit, you can write off up to \$2,000 of your donations to a nonprofit on your taxes.

Why did we do that? We did that because we strongly believe that government is not the only safety net in America. There are three safety nets in America. The family is the first safety net. The second safety net are nonprofits and houses of worship all over the country. The third is government.

Government can never meet all the needs. Government may be able to send you a check, but if you are going to get a mentor, if you are going to get somebody to walk alongside you, that is often a nonprofit.

Nonprofits are the ones who take care of the hungry and the homeless and the hurting face-to-face in every single community—tiny little nonprofits, houses of worship all over the country that volunteer their time.

This will encourage more investment in those nonprofits to strengthen our safety net. For those who are hurting the most in our country, they would be able to get help directly where they are.

Quite frankly, if we want to incentivize great help toward the people who are right there in their community, then let's have stronger nonprofits. We did that in this bill. We are not talking about it; we did it.

President Biden put in a rule last year that many of us were shocked by, quite frankly, on both sides of the aisle. He put in a rule saying, for nursing homes all across the country, skilled nursing facilities, whoever it may be, they have got to have a certain new level of staffing. That sounds like a nice idea to say you have got to have more nurses there all the time. That seems nice if you are in Washington, DC, but if you are in rural America, guess what. There just aren't enough nurses to do that.

So in many of these nursing facilities, they have a nurse who is nearby, and when there is a crisis, they are not call all the time, but they are not physically there. But they are putting in a new requirement that they have to physically be there. Do you know what that means? That means rural nursing homes could not operate because they physically don't have enough nurses in the area to do that.

That meant many rural nursing homes in my State were already looking at closing and just moving operations into the suburbs and into the cities where they can get enough nurses. That makes people in my State have to drive farther to see their loved one. That is wrong. That is just wrong.

We changed that in this bill, and we said, no, we are not going to have that.

It sounds like a nice idea. In reality, it shuts down access in rural America

to family members who are at one of the most vulnerable moments they have ever had in their life. We want to make sure families can surround people in those really tough days that happen for many people in nursing and skilled nursing facilities.

Just three quick stories. I know I have talked for a long time. But when I say it is a big beautiful bill, it is big. There is a lot that is in it that I think a lot of people have missed. But if I can just give you three quick stories.

Let me talk about a senior adult in Bethany, OK. Her name is Marilyn. She just found out about the new standard deduction that is in the One Big Beautiful Bill for senior adults that are working senior adults. She just found out about it.

She told us: Our Social Security benefits that we've paid into for all these years are key, but they're buying less and less these days. So we're really excited about maybe having some improvement on that.

She said: You just never know what life's going to bring. And so the benefit of not being taxed now on my Social Security benefits and being able to keep more of my Social Security that I paid into is essential for me, as she said, because many of us that are using that for our living expenses and with the intention of not drawing down our reserves, our savings so we can make sure that it is still there for the future.

She is pretty excited about this change in the law where working seniors will not have to pay as much taxes and won't pay taxes on their Social Security benefits.

Todd Gibson, he is the police chief in Moore, OK. We talked to him about the no tax on overtime. This was his statement: Police Officers do a lot of work on overtime.

There are a lot of Capitol Police who walk around here. In the last couple of weeks, they have done a lot of overtime.

Todd said this: Any bit of money that a police officer can pour back into their family and back into their home is a positive thing. In the rural and smaller organizations, this is really going to make an impact to retain quality people in the community that provide public safety.

He is pretty excited about the no tax on overtime.

Finally, last story, there is a waitress in Yukon, OK. Her name is Rheanna. She is really excited about the no tax on tips.

She told us this: Tips play a huge role in my take-home pay. Being able to take home more of my hard-earned tips means I will be able to support my family a lot better. Not only does every hard-earned dollar that I make go towards things like my car note, a mortgage, and childcare, being able to keep more of it and to put it toward the things that I love and people that I love, that will go a long ways. It's coming at a great time.

She said: The interest rates and the groceries are going up. That gives me

an upper hand to be able to have extra cash in my pocket.

So we were thinking about people all over our States as we worked on the One Big Beautiful Bill.

And I understand the dissension and the divisions. We don't all agree on things. But as we worked on this bill, we are trying to figure out what is the best tax policy for every American. What are the areas where we are the most vulnerable, and what do we need to solve? That is what we worked on in the One Big Beautiful Bill.

Mr. President, you know full well because you know this bill well. I didn't even have time to cover all of it. That is hitting the high points of it. There is a lot more there, and I think in the days ahead, as people get the facts and the information about what really happened, they are going to be grateful to have a little bit of breathing room to be able to support their family just a little bit more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 171.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Terrance Cole, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 171, Terrance Cole, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement.

John Thune, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, Pete Ricketts, Steve Daines, Bernie Moreno, Mike Rounds, Rick Scott of Florida, Eric Schmitt, Tommy Tuberville, Jim Banks, Thom Tillis, David McCormick, James Lankford, Jon A. Husted, Bill Hagerty.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.