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 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 Husted, Bill Hagerty.

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 the nomination of Terrance Cole, of Virginia, to be Administrator of Drug Enforcement, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) would have voted ''yea'', the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted ''yea'', and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 418 Ex.]

YEAS—44

Banks	Grassley	Moreno
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Sheehy
Cramer	Lummis	Sullivan
Crapo	Marshall	Thune
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—13

Budd	Graham	Risch
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Tillis
Coons	Kennedy	Warnock
Cruz	Mullin	
Duckworth	Ossoff	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). On this vote, the yeas are 44, the nays are 43, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO ASPEN MONROE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Aspen for her hard work as an intern in my Sheridan office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Aspen is originally from Cody, WY. Aspen recently graduated from American University in Washington, DC, with a bachelor's degree in justice and law with a concentration in criminology. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Aspen for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.

TRIBUTE TO FAITH RODEN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Faith for her hard work as an intern in my Casper office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Faith was born and raised in Casper, WY. Faith attends Casper College, where she is pursuing a degree in elementary education. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Faith for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I was absent on Thursday, July 17, 2025, for rollcall vote No. 414. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 96, Aaron Lukas, of Arkansas, to be Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence.

Mr. President, I was absent on Thursday, July 17, 2025, for rollcall vote No. 415. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 108, Bradley Hansell, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security.

Mr. President, I was absent on Thursday, July 17, 2025, for rollcall vote No. 416. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 91, Arielle Roth, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 306, motion to discharge S.J. Res. 53, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Qatar of certain defense articles and services.

Mr. President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall vote No. 307 motion to discharge S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

H.R. 1

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, on July 1, 2025, the Senate passed H.R. 1, which is nothing more than one big, beautiful, betrayal for Americans across the country. This bill slashes healthcare for 17 million Americans by gutting Medicaid and dismantling the Affordable Care Act. It shuts down rural hospitals, it takes food away from more than 4 million hungry children, it makes college more expensive

for families, and it ends clean energy investments to fight climate chaos. All to make tax cuts permanent and help billionaires get richer.

And if that isn't bad enough, it destroys the architecture of fiscal discipline put in place 51 years ago and explodes the debt by $3.3 trillion over 10 years and by more than $30 trillion over 30 years—again, all in pursuit of making billionaires richer.

And if those eye-popping debt numbers aren't alarming enough, CBO projects that if interest rates go up by as little as 1 percent, the costs could double. This is the most fiscally irresponsible bill ever to come to the Senate floor and wasn't supposed to be possible after Congress passed the 1974 Budget Control and Impoundment Act.

In 1974, addressing the deficit was such a bipartisan priority that the Budget Act created a special filibuster-free fast-track process, known as reconciliation, for the sole purpose of reducing the deficit. That is right, the original purpose of reconciliation was to reduce the deficit.

The reconciliation process was built on three pillars. First, a reconciliation bill cannot create deficits in the first 10 years. Second, a reconciliation bill can't increase the deficit in any year after the first 10 years. And third, it should be measured using honest numbers from the independent, nonpartisan, scorekeepers.

So how did we go from every Senator voting for a special process for deficit reduction in 1974, to almost every Republican, the party who claims to support fiscal responsibility, supporting a 2025 reconciliation bill that adds tens of trillions to the debt?

It started in 1996, when the Republicans wanted to pass tax giveaways for the wealthy and didn't have the required 60 votes so they turned to the reconciliation process. Except they had one problem, reconciliation wasn't supposed to increase the deficit in the first 10 years. Instead of finding a compromise, the Republicans decided to change the rules and allow a reconciliation bill to increase the deficit in the first 10 years. That was the end of pillar one, and the reconciliation process has been abused in the same way ever since—for the 2001 Bush tax cuts, the 2003 Bust tax cuts, and the 2017 Trump cuts.

But pillar two and pillar three were still standing. That is, until now. In the Republican's never-ending quest to make billionaires richer, they once again changed the rules. This time in order to hide the true cost of this bill. In doing so, pillar two and pillar three collapsed and all remaining remnants of fiscal discipline with it.

During consideration of H.R. 1, Senate Republicans upended decades of law and precedent and allowed the Budget Committee chair to abuse the authority under section 312 of the Budget Act to determine violations of section 313 of the Budget Act, also known as the Byrd Rule.

I recognize that section 312 of the Budget Act gives the Budget chair scorekeeping duties. Read in isolation, or with no understanding of past precedent, section 312 could appear to be unlimited. But it is not. The authority in section 312 must be read in combination with other provisions of the Budget Act, with other budget laws, and with Senate precedent, particularly in relationship to the Byrd Rule as it always has been.

I do not dispute that when bills are considered under regular order, it is the Budget Committee chair's responsibility to determine what numeric budget points of order lie. However, the Budget Committee chair has never determined whether provisions of a reconciliation bill comply with the Byrd Rule, that has always been the responsibility of the Parliamentarian's office.

And why is the Byrd Rule so unique from other budget enforcement tools? It is unique where it applies—just in the Senate, and not the House; it is unique when it applies—only for reconciliation, a fast track process, not regular order; it is unique how it applies and is adjudicated—a formal litigation where the Parliamentarian's office issues guidance based on written and oral arguments and nonpartisan current law scoring estimates.

It is not normal budget enforcement. Why is that? Because reconciliation is a fast track process, and Senators, with eyes wide open, voted to impose these strict guardrails on this process.

The majority's assertion of 312 authority also runs counter to section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, which defines the current law baseline. The section 257 baseline, as it is called, has been the foundation for the nonpartisan cost estimates for the past 40 years, estimates produced by the independent scorekeepers: the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation. The Senate has never, before consideration of H.R. 1, used cost estimates based on something other than the section 257 baseline to assess reconciliation legislation for compliance with the Byrd Rule.

To reiterate: in developing their guidance under the Byrd Rule, the Parliamentarian's office has never—never—used cost estimates other than those based on the section 257 baseline. With the majority's actions on H.R.1, Republicans have dealt the remaining pillars of reconciliation a fatal blow.

While section 312 has never been used in reconciliation, I agree that it has been used in regular order. But I want to make clear that use of section 312 authority, up until now, has only been invoked when the issue at hand was narrow, technical, often bipartisan, involved relatively small amounts of money, and was done in regular order.

For example, during the bipartisan ''side deal'' between Leader SCHUMER and Speaker Johnson for the fiscal year 2024 appropriations process, Democratic Senate Budget Committee Chair WHITEHOUSE and Republican House Budget Committee Chair ARRINGTON included a direction to CBO to use the Office of Management and Budget's estimate of housing receipts, which allowed for an extra $2.8 billion in offsets for that package.

In 2023, when the Agriculture Committee wanted to extend a dairy provision, CBO's initial estimate counted the same spending twice. Again, Democratic Chair WHITEHOUSE and Republican Chair ARRINGTON used the section 312 authority in a bipartisan manner to instruct CBO to conform to the way it originally scored the program.

On a bipartisan basis during the fiscal years 2023–2025 appropriations cycles, Budget chairs have directed CBO to score appropriations language related to the Purchase Power and Wheeling activities of three Federal Power Marketing Administrations consistent with a 2000 bipartisan scorekeeping agreement that CBO had recently deviated from.

By far the most common use of section 312 authority over the past decade relates to directing CBO to follow legislative text commonly included in omnibus legislation to allocate the budgetary effects to the proper committee.

These examples all illustrate how section 312 allows the Budget chair to step in to address scoring issues and resolve ambiguities. In all cases, these efforts have been narrowly applied and concerned discrete polices with limited budgetary impacts.

And again, in none of these examples was the Senate considering a reconciliation bill.

During debate on H.R.1, the majority has also falsely claimed precedent exists for their actions. I will now explain why each instance the Republicans cite is clearly distinguishable from their current abuse of section 312 authority.

Senator GRAHAM, the current chair of the Budget Committee, claimed that former Budget Chair Kent Conrad ''used a new baseline in the budget so he could get the farm bill in the budget.'' This is a mischaracterization. In 2008, during Farm Bill negotiations, Budget Chair Conrad chose not to apply an updated CBO baseline while the bill was in conference committee. Over the course of the prior year, both the House and Senate had passed a Farm Bill and having to change all the numbers during conference negotiations would have undone a year's worth of work. There is also longstanding precedent to not update for new baseline estimates at the last minute when a bill that has been carefully negotiated is nearing completion. Further, Chair Conrad used a current law baseline to measure the farm bill. This was not a scoring manipulation meant to skirt the guardrails of a fast-track process.

Second, the majority has repeatedly referred to the Obama administration's supposed use of a current policy baseline to score a tax bill in 2012 that extended most of the expiring Bush tax

cuts. At the time, the Obama administration's Office of Management and Budget produced a ''current policy'' score that they used when publicly talking about the benefits of the bill. It served a purely messaging purpose. Congress did not—I repeat, did not—use a current policy baseline for official budget enforcement purposes in the Senate. Congress used the current law score from CBO. This bill also passed under regular order, not reconciliation.

Another example cited by the majority party is former Budget Chair BERNIE SANDERS including a scoring rule for childcare and pre-kindergarten legislation in the fiscal year 2022 budget resolution. This scoring rule did not override current law; rather it forced CBO to conform to current law as laid out in section 257. This Head Start scoring rule was isolated to one program that affected $18 billion over 10 years and was never ultimately used.

Before it was further amended on the Senate floor, the Senate reconciliation bill added $3.3 trillion to the deficit over the 10-year budget window. By abusing the authority under section 312, the Republicans claim that H.R. 1 actually saves $500 billion. The Finance Committee title alone adds $3.5 trillion to the deficit over the 10-year budget window. But the Republican's claim, alleging section 312 authority, that the Finance title actually saves $300 billion and thus meets its reconciliation instruction.

The blatant abuse of claiming section 312 authority to determine H.R. 1 complied with section 313 of the Budget Act is unprecedented, overrides current law, and will forever change the Senate. And it was all done to further an agenda of families lose, billionaires win.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF PRATT & WHITNEY

● Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Pratt & Whitney, a pioneer and titan in the field of aviation.

The Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Company was founded in 1925 in Hartford, CT, by Frederick B. Rentschler and colleagues from his previous position at Wright Aeronautical, with funding and facility space from Pratt & Whitney Machine Tool.

Rentschler, along with George J. Mead and other colleagues, were designing and developing a new air-cooled radial engine design that would enable an unprecedented power-to-weight ratio. The company's first engine, the 425-horsepower R–1340 Wasp, was completed by the end of 1925. On its third test run in March 1926, the engine easily passed the U.S. Navy qualification test and proceeded to revolutionize military and commercial aviation through a combination of both performance and reliability.

In order to ramp up production, the company moved to East Hartford, where assembly lines, research and testing, and administrative offices are still located, along with an airfield, known as Rentschler Field.

Notably, the R–1340 powered the aircraft of many high-profile aviators of the day, including Wiley Post and Amelia Earhart. It also gave birth to an entire Wasp series, which are used in agricultural aircraft and other aviation applications around the world to this day.

Engine production soared during World War II, and in 1944, Pratt & Whitney—now independent of Pratt & Whitney Machine Tool and part of the United Aircraft Corporation—began its gas turbine and jet propulsion initiative. The company constructed a wind tunnel, laboratory, and engineering center to support the United States and its allies in World War II. By 1945, wartime production of these engines totaled more than 300,000 and were known by servicemembers to be extremely dependable. Indeed, the ''Dependable Engines'' has been one of the company's slogans—and its overriding goal—for decades.

After World War II, Pratt & Whitney continued designing and innovating aircraft engines that were more powerful, agile, and reliable. Today, they remain a world leader in the commercial and defense aerospace industry, with more than 85,000 engines in service, approximately 17,000 customers worldwide, and plants across the United States.

With roughly 11,000 employees between its headquarters in East Hartford and a facility in Middletown, Pratt & Whitney continues to be one of the greatest, most impactful commercial institutions in Connecticut. I hope my colleagues will join me in honoring the 100th anniversary of Pratt & Whitney and the tremendous legacy it has left—and continues to forge—in the aerospace industry.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Holstead, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF A PROCLAMATION PROVIDING EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN STATIONARY SOURCES FROM COMPLIANCE WITH THE FINAL RULE PUBLISHED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY TITLED ''NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS: TACONITE IRON ORE PROCESSING,'' 89 FR 16408 (TACONITE RULE), WHICH IMPOSES NEW EMISSIONS-CONTROL REQUIREMENTS ON TACONITE IRON ORE PROCESSING FACILITIES—PM 33

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with applicable law, including section 112(i)(4) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7412(i)(4), I hereby report that I have issued a proclamation providing exemption for certain stationary sources from compliance with the final rule published by the Environmental Protection Agency titled *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Taconite Iron Ore Processing*, 89 FR 16408 (Taconite Rule), which imposes new emissions-control requirements on Taconite iron ore processing facilities.

As reflected in the proclamation of July 17, 2025 (Regulatory Relief for Certain Stationary Sources to Promote American Iron Ore Processing Security) (Proclamation), taconite iron ore processing is fundamental to the United States' steel production and manufacturing sectors. The facilities involved in the process supply essential raw materials used to make steel, which is used in national defense systems, critical infrastructure, and a broad range of industrial applications. Preserving and enhancing domestic taconite processing capabilities is vital to reducing reliance on foreign sources and ensuring resilience of American industrial supply chains.

In the Proclamation, I determined that the technology to implement the Taconite Rule is not available. Such technology does not exist in a commercially viable form sufficient to allow implementation of and compliance with the Taconite Rule by the compliance dates set forth in the Taconite Rule. I further determined in the Proclamation that it is in the national security interests of the United States to issue an exemption from the Taconite Rule to certain stationary sources subject to the Taconite Rule, as identified in Annex I of the Proclamation. This exemption applies to all compliance