

**SEC. 104. FUNDING.**

The Commission shall use amounts in the Fund to pay for all administrative expenses of the Commission, not to exceed 3 percent of the amounts made available for projects for a qualified climate change adaptation purpose from the Fund during the applicable calendar year.

**SEC. 105. TERMINATION.**

The Commission shall terminate on the date that is 20 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

**TITLE II—CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCY FUND****SEC. 201. CLIMATE CHANGE RESILIENCY FUND.****(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States the “Climate Change Resiliency Fund”.

**(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—**

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use not less than 40 percent of the amounts in the Fund to fund projects that benefit communities that experience disproportionate impacts from climate change and climate change-causing pollution, including environmental justice communities, frontline communities, and low-income communities.

(B) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—All amounts deposited in the Fund in accordance with section 301(a) shall only be used—

(i) to fund new projects in accordance with this section; and

(ii) for administrative expenses of the Commission authorized under section 104.

(3) RESPONSIBILITY OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall take such action as the Secretary determines necessary to assist in implementing the Fund in accordance with this section, which shall include consulting with relevant Federal agencies.

(b) CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION PROJECTS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Commission, shall carry out a program to provide funds to eligible entities to carry out projects for a qualified climate change adaptation purpose.

**(c) APPLICATIONS.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity desiring funds under subsection (b) shall, with respect to a project, submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(2) CONTENTS.—An application submitted by an eligible entity under this subsection shall include data relating to any benefits the eligible entity expects the project to provide to the community in which the applicable project is performed, such as—

(A) an economic impact;

(B) improvements to public health; or

(C) permanent environmental preservation or restoration.

(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall offer technical assistance to eligible entities preparing applications under this subsection.

**(d) SELECTION.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall select eligible entities to receive funds to carry out projects under this section based on criteria and guidelines determined and published by the Commission under section 102.

(2) PRIORITY.—In selecting eligible entities under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall give priority to eligible entities planning to perform projects that will serve areas with the greatest need.

**(e) NON-FEDERAL FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), in order to receive funds under this section, an eligible entity shall provide funds for a project in an amount that is equal to not less than 25 percent of the amount of funds provided under this section.

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive all or part of the matching requirement under

paragraph (1) for an eligible entity, especially an eligible entity performing a project benefitting a low-income community, frontline community, or an environmental justice community, if the Secretary determines that—

(A) there are no reasonable means available through which the eligible entity can meet the matching requirement; or

(B) the probable benefit of the project outweighs the public interest of the matching requirement.

**(3) NO-MATCH PROJECTS.—**

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award not less than 10 percent and not more than 40 percent of the total funds awarded under this section to eligible entities to which the matching requirement under paragraph (1) shall not apply.

(B) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall give priority for funding under subparagraph (A) to an eligible entity performing a project in a community experiencing a disproportionate impact of climate change, including—

(i) an environmental justice community;

(ii) a low-income community;

(iii) a community of color; or

(iv) a frontline community.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL LAW.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to waive the requirements of any Federal law or regulation that would otherwise apply to a project that receives funds under this section.

**SEC. 202. COMPLIANCE WITH DAVIS-BACON ACT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on projects funded directly by, or assisted in whole or in part by and through, the Fund shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on projects of a character similar in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of part A of title 40, United States Code.

(b) LABOR STANDARDS.—With respect to the labor standards described in this section, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. App.) and section 3145 of title 40, United States Code.

**SEC. 203. FUNDING.**

To carry out the program under section 201(b), the Secretary, in addition to amounts in the Fund, may use amounts that have been made available to the Secretary and are not otherwise obligated.

**TITLE III—REVENUE****SEC. 301. CLIMATE CHANGE OBLIGATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate (referred to in this title as the “Secretary”) shall issue obligations under chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code (referred to in this title as “climate change obligations”), the proceeds from which shall be deposited in the Fund.

(b) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—Payment of interest and principal with respect to any climate change obligation issued under this section shall be made from the general fund of the Treasury of the United States and shall be backed by the full faith and credit of the United States.

(c) EXEMPTION FROM LOCAL TAXATION.—All climate change obligations issued by the Secretary, and the interest on or credits with respect to such obligations, shall not be subject to taxation by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

(d) AMOUNT OF CLIMATE CHANGE OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the aggregate face amount of

the climate change obligations issued annually under this section shall be \$200,000,000.

(2) ADDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—For any calendar year in which all of the obligations issued pursuant to paragraph (1) have been purchased, the Secretary may issue additional climate change obligations during such calendar year, provided that the aggregate face amount of such additional obligations does not exceed \$800,000,000.

(e) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall use funds made available to the Secretary and not otherwise obligated to carry out the purposes of this section.

**SEC. 302. PROMOTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall promote the purchase of climate change obligations through such means as are determined appropriate by the Secretary, with the amount expended for such promotion not to exceed \$10,000,000 for any fiscal year during the period of fiscal years 2026 through 2030.

(b) DONATED ADVERTISING.—In addition to any advertising paid for with funds made available under subsection (c), the Secretary shall solicit and may accept the donation of advertising relating to the sale of climate change obligations.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For each fiscal year during the period of fiscal years 2026 through 2030, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

**SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS****SENATE RESOLUTION 331—CALLING UPON THE SENATE TO GIVE ITS ADVICE AND CONSENT TO THE RATIFICATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA**

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Young, and Mr. King) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 331

Whereas the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) was adopted by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in December 1982 and entered into force in November 1994 to establish a treaty regime to govern activities on, over, and under the world's oceans;

Whereas the UNCLOS builds on four 1958 Law of the Sea conventions to which the United States is a party, namely the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, the Convention on the High Seas, the Convention on the Continental Shelf, and the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, all done at Geneva April 29, 1958;

Whereas the UNCLOS and an associated 1994 agreement relating to implementation of the treaty were transmitted to the Senate on October 6, 1994, and, in the absence of Senate advice and consent to ratification, the United States is not a party to the treaty or the associated 1994 agreement;

Whereas, as of January 2025, 170 parties have ratified UNCLOS, including 166 United Nations member states, but not the United States;

Whereas the United States, like most other countries, maintains that coastal States under the UNCLOS have the right to regulate economic activities in their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), but do not have the right to regulate foreign military activities in their EEZs;

Whereas the treaty's provisions relating to navigational rights, including navigational rights in EEZs, reflect the diplomatic position of the United States on the issue dating back to the adoption of the UNCLOS in 1982;

Whereas becoming a party to the treaty would codify the United States' current position of recognizing the provisions within the UNCLOS as customary international law;

Whereas becoming a party to the treaty would give the United States standing to participate in discussions relating to the treaty and thereby improve the ability of the United States to intervene as a full party to disputes relating to navigational rights and to defend United States interpretations of the treaty's provisions, including those relating to whether coastal states have a right under the UNCLOS to regulate foreign military activities in their EEZs;

Whereas becoming a party to the treaty would allow the United States to be a member of the International Seabed Authority and thereby participate directly in setting and voting on the policies organizing and controlling mineral-related activities in the international seabed area as global demand for critical minerals increases;

Whereas more than 97 percent of the global internet traffic relies on infrastructure located on the seabed of the world's oceans compared to space-based infrastructure;

Whereas lack of full-party membership to UNCLOS limits the access and influence of the United States to critical territorial dispute management, including matters involving pursuit and competition of extended outer continental shelf submissions, facilitated primarily by Article 76, which represents the main tool assisting sovereign authority delimitation agreements;

Whereas relying on customary international norms to defend United States interests in those issues is not sufficient, because customary international law is not universally accepted and is subject to change over time based on state practice;

Whereas relying on other countries to assert claims on behalf of the United States at the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague is woefully insufficient to defend and uphold United States sovereign rights and interests;

Whereas the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in the July 12, 2016, ruling on the case *In the Matter of the South China Sea Arbitration*, stated that "the Tribunal communicated to the Parties and the U.S. Embassy that it had decided that 'only interested States parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea will be admitted as observers' and thus could not accede to the U.S. request" to "send a representative to observe the hearing";

Whereas, on November 25, 2018, the Russian Federation violated international norms and binding agreements, including the UNCLOS, in firing upon, ramming, and seizing Ukrainian vessels and crews attempting to pass through the Kerch Strait;

Whereas, on May 25, 2019, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea ruled in a vote of 19 to 1 that "[t]he Russian Federation shall immediately release the Ukrainian naval vessels *Berdyansk*, *Nikopol* and *Yani Kapu*, and return them to the custody of Ukraine" and that "[t]he Russian Federation shall immediately release the 24 detained Ukrainian servicemen and allow them to return to Ukraine", demonstrating the Tribunal's rejection of the Russian Federation's arguments in that matter in relation to the Law of the Sea;

Whereas, despite the Tribunal's ruling aligning with the position of the United States Government on the November 25, 2018, incident, the continued nonparticipation of the United States in the UNCLOS limits the

ability of the United States to effectively respond to the Russian Federation's actions and to any potential future violations by the Russian Federation and any other signatory of UNCLOS;

Whereas the past Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Lloyd Austin, stated that "the United States has long treated the UNCLOS's provisions related to navigation and overflight as reflective of longstanding and customary international law. Our military already acts in a manner consistent with these rights and freedoms, so accession to the Convention will not impact the manner in which we conduct our operations," in response to a question for the record from Senator Mazie Hirono on January 21, 2021;

Whereas the past Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Lisa Franchetti, stated that "the United States played a major role in drafting the Convention, and it is favorable to U.S. interests on all significant issues as a result. Further, our Navy already acts in a manner consistent with the Convention's navigational and overflight provisions. Accession would not impose any additional constraints on the Navy's ability to fly, sail, and operate wherever international law allows", in response to advance policy questions on September 14, 2023, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Lisa Franchetti, further stated that "the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea would give our objections to excessive maritime claims a stronger legal foundation that does not rely exclusively on customary international law. When protesting excessive maritime claims asserted by the People's Republic of China in the South China Sea, the Russian Federation in the Arctic region, and others, the United States would come from a position of increased authority and influence," in response to advance policy questions on September 14, 2023, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command and United States Northern Command, General Gregory M. Guillot, stated, "I support U.S. accession to the Law of the Sea Convention (UNCLOS). UNCLOS provides a comprehensive regime for the governance of the world's oceans, including the Arctic, and U.S. accession would further demonstrate our commitment to an international rules-based order. Acceding to the treaty would enable U.S. representation during critical international negotiations that impact the maritime domain, provide an additional mechanism to counter countries like Russia and China that continue to exploit our absence from key ocean governance diplomatic forums, and ultimately help protect our nation's rights and interests in this critical sphere of operations," in response to advance policy questions on July 23, 2023, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command and United States Northern Command, General Gregory M. Guillot, further stated in regard to United States ratification of the UNCLOS, "I believe accession to the Law of the Sea Convention (UNCLOS) would help the U.S. protect its interests in the Arctic: Accession would demonstrate our commitment to a rules-based order, ensure our best interests are represented during international negotiations regarding territorial disputes and challenges to longstanding maritime customs and practices, and improve our ability to advocate for our ocean governance interests around the globe, including in the Arctic. Engagement through UNCLOS is particularly critical today as multiple nations vie for access and control in the Arctic and

seek to modify international norms to accommodate expansionist ambitions around the globe in general, and in the Arctic in particular. Finally, accession would preclude Russia and China from exploiting U.S. absence in forums," in response to advance policy questions on July 23, 2023, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Secretary of the Navy, Honorable Carlos Del Toro, stated that "accession would 'lock in' the customary rights and freedoms reflected in the UNCLOS, and would give the U.S. a seat at the table to set the course for future law of the sea discussions on a coequal level with member states like China and Russia. China continues a more aggressive posture in the South China Sea. As widely reported, Chinese warships, law enforcement vessels, and other PRC-flagged vessels have failed to respect the rights of maritime nations under the Convention. As a party to the Convention, U.S. objections to these violations would have more force and credibility, and would enhance its ability to respond to excessive maritime claims, land reclamation, and militarization efforts by China in the South China Sea," in response to a question for the record from Senator Hirono on July 13, 2021;

Whereas the past Commander of the United States Indo-Pacific Command, Admiral John C. Aquilino, stated that "there's really two main reasons [to ratify the UNCLOS]: as the group gets together, it would be certainly beneficial if we had a seat at the table when there were discussions occurring as it applied to potential adjustments and the interpretations of those international laws and the second reason is it puts us in an increased position of credibility. . . we adhere to the UNCLOS treaty in our operations, and it would make our position much stronger if we were signatories," on March 23, 2021, at his nomination hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Commander of United States Indo-Pacific Command, retired Admiral Philip S. Davidson, stated that "our accession to the UNCLOS would help our position legally across the globe and would do nothing to limit our military operations in the manner in which we're conducting them now," on April 17, 2018, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Commander of United States Pacific Command, retired Admiral Harry B. Harris, stated "I believe that UNCLOS gives Russia the potential to, quote, unquote 'own' almost half of the Arctic Circle, and we will not have that opportunity because of, we're not a signatory to UNCLOS", on March 15, 2018, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Commander of United States Pacific Command, retired Admiral Harry B. Harris, stated, "I think that by not signing onto it that we lose the credibility for the very same thing that we're arguing for," and "which is the following-accepting rules and norms in the international arena. The United States is a beacon—we're a beacon on a hill but I think that light is brighter if we sign on to UNCLOS," on February 23, 2016, at a hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, retired General Joseph F. Dunford, stated that "by remaining outside the Convention, the United States remains in scarce company with Iran, Venezuela, North Korea, and Syria" and "by failing to join the Convention, some countries may come to doubt our commitment to act in accordance with international law," on July 9, 2015, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past President and Chief Executive Officer of the United States Chamber

of Commerce, Thomas J. Donahue, stated that “we support joining the Convention because it is in our national interest—both in our national security and our economic interests,” “becoming a party to the Treaty benefits the U.S. economically by providing American companies the legal certainty and stability they need to hire and invest,” and “companies will be hesitant to take on the investment risk and cost to explore and develop the resources of the sea—particularly on the extended continental shelf (ECS)—without the legal certainty and stability accession to LOS provides,” on June 28, 2012, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

Whereas the past President and Chief Executive Officer of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Thomas J. Donahue, further stated that “the benefits of joining cut across many important industries including telecommunications, mining, shipping, and oil and natural gas”, and “joining the Convention will provide the U.S. a critical voice on maritime issues—from mineral claims in the Arctic to how International Seabed Authority (ISA) funds are distributed,” on June 28, 2012, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

Whereas the past Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, retired Admiral Paul Zukunft, stated on February 12, 2016, “With the receding of the icepack, the Arctic Ocean has become the focus of international interest.”, “All Arctic states agree that the Law of the Sea Convention is the governing legal regime for the Arctic Ocean. . . yet, we remain the only Arctic nation that has not ratified the very instrument that provides this accepted legal framework governing the Arctic Ocean and its seabed.”, and “Ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention supports our economic interests, environmental protection, and safety of life at sea, especially in the Arctic Ocean.”;

Whereas the past Chief of Naval Operations, retired Admiral Michael Gilday, stated that “acceding to the Convention would strengthen our strategic position on issues pertaining to the [South China Sea and the Arctic]. The United States would have increased credibility when responding to excessive maritime claims and militarization efforts in the South China Sea. With respect to the Arctic, becoming a party to the Convention would allow the U.S. to position itself to safeguard access for the purposes of maritime traffic, resource exploitation, and other human activities, while ensuring other states comply with the law of the sea,” in response to advance policy questions on July 30, 2019, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

Whereas the past United States Special Representative of State for the Arctic and former Commandant of the Coast Guard, retired Admiral Robert Papp, Jr., stated that “as a non party to the Law of the Sea Convention, the U.S. is at a significant disadvantage relative to the other Arctic Ocean coastal States,” “those States are parties to the Convention, and are well along the path to obtaining legal certainty and international recognition of their Arctic extended continental shelf,” and “becoming a Party to the Law of the Sea Convention would allow the United States to fully secure its rights to the continental shelf off the coast of Alaska, which is likely to extend out to more than 600 nautical miles,” on December 10, 2014, before the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that it is in the national interest for the United States to become a formal signatory of the United Nations Convention

on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), done at Montego Bay December 10, 1982;

(2) urges the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the UNCLOS; and

(3) recommends the ratification of the UNCLOS remain a top priority for the Federal Government, the importance of which was most recently underscored by the strategic challenges the United States faces in the Indo-Pacific, the Arctic, and the Black Sea regions.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 332—DESIGNATING JULY 26, 2025, AS “NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY”

Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 332

Whereas pioneering men and women, recognized as “cowboys”, helped to establish the American West;

Whereas the cowboy embodies honesty, integrity, courage, compassion, respect, a strong work ethic, and patriotism;

Whereas the cowboy spirit exemplifies strength of character, sound family values, and good common sense;

Whereas the cowboy archetype transcends ethnicity, gender, geographic boundaries, and political affiliations;

Whereas the cowboy, who lives off the land and works to protect and enhance the environment, is an excellent steward of the land and its creatures;

Whereas cowboy traditions have been a part of American culture for generations;

Whereas the cowboy continues to be an important part of the economy through the work of many thousands of ranchers across the United States who contribute to the economic well-being of every State;

Whereas millions of fans watch professional and working ranch rodeo events annually, making rodeo one of the most-watched sports in the United States;

Whereas membership and participation in rodeo and other organizations that promote and encompass the livelihood of cowboys span every generation and transcend race and gender;

Whereas the cowboy is a central figure in literature, film, and music and occupies a central place in the public imagination;

Whereas the cowboy is an American icon; and

Whereas the ongoing contributions made by cowboys and cowgirls to their communities should be recognized and encouraged: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 26, 2025, as “National Day of the American Cowboy”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2963. Mrs. MOODY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military

personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2964. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2965. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2966. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2967. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2968. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. KING, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MCCORMICK, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BENNET, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JUSTICE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KELLY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2969. Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2970. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2971. Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2296, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2026 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2972. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2973. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2974. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2975. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 3944, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.