

by the Panthers in franchise history, and our Sunshine State is so very proud.

The whole Panthers' roster obviously contributed to this win, but we wanted to thank the staff and the coaches and all of those who supported the team on and off the ice. This success could not have been achieved without everybody who contributed.

We watched that team compete with resilience and grit to keep the Stanley Cup where it belongs, which is, of course, in the great free State of Florida. Our entire South Florida community celebrates with the entire State, who all kept faith in this team. Everyone's encouragement throughout the season ensured our Panthers were ready to bring home the championship when the time came. The win was well deserved, and it was a great end to an amazing year.

So with that, I thank the Presiding Officer for accommodating my request to pass a resolution on behalf of the Florida Panthers.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 333, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 333) commending and congratulating the Florida Panthers on winning the 2025 Stanley Cup Final.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. MOODY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 333) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators COLLINS and MURRAY, as well as my Democratic counterpart on the MILCON-VA Subcommittee Senator OSSOFF in presenting the fiscal year 2026 and 2027 for the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Department of Military Construction.

It is important to remember that we followed tradition in crafting the bill in a very open and a very bipartisan way. So it is built on a strong founda-

tion and deserves the support of our colleagues.

This bill takes into consideration the needs of our veterans, their families, and our servicemembers. And within that framework, we have created a thoughtful path—a path forward for both Departments and their related Agencies.

This bill provides \$153.5 billion of discretionary spending. Of that amount, the Department of Veterans Affairs has provided \$133.3 billion in discretionary funding. When combined with the \$49.8 billion from the Toxic Exposures Fund, veterans' medical care will be funded at a total of \$163.6 billion in fiscal year 2026.

Our bill funds priority accounts to prevent veteran suicide as well as increase rural access to healthcare through significant investments for the Office of Rural Health.

Additionally, we allocated approximately \$23 billion to support critical mental health issues and programs to prevent veterans' homelessness and provide funding for innovative medical research.

The bill also funds mandatory veterans' benefits, which are earned benefits that include disability pensions, employment training programs, and educational benefits.

We also make advanced appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for certain accounts, including \$122.3 billion for veterans' medical care and \$262.1 billion for mandatory veterans' benefits.

In addition, we are delivering \$19.8 billion to support military construction and family housing units, which are important to both readiness and morale. Our bill will give the Department of Defense the resources it needs to project power globally, enhance our warfighting capabilities, and train our forces.

Importantly, we provide \$1.9 billion to improve housing and quality of life for servicemembers and their families.

I also want to note that the bill includes robust funding for related Agencies, which include the American Battle Monuments Commission, the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, Arlington National Cemetery, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Funding at these priorities at these levels represents solid bipartisan work to provide the resources necessary for our veterans, their families, and the servicemembers defending our Nation, which was evident with the passage of the measure in the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 26 to 3.

I want to again thank Senator OSSOFF as well as Chair COLLINS and Vice Chair MURRAY for their hard work and collaboration. And also a special thanks to our staff who worked so, so very hard to put the bill together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 229

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, America is a great nation. Just look at the

record. When it comes to the discovery of new drugs and pharmaceuticals, we lead the world. But we also pay the highest prices in the world for the prescription drugs. The very same drugs made in the United States is for sale in Canada at a fraction of the cost. The same thing is true in Europe.

What is going on here?

Our country is producing drugs, paying more for them than other customers around the world—the problem is so glaring that even President Trump has identified fixing this issue as a priority. Bipartisan feeling—change it, reduce the price of drugs.

Why is the United States such an outlier? One of the major reasons—if you watch television, you see it every single day. The United States is one of only two industrialized countries in the world that allows people to advertise drugs on television.

This is a trivia quiz. What is the other country? New Zealand. Two countries in the world that allow advertising of prescription drugs on television—you know, the ads with the catchy jingles, flashy images of patients rock climbing, golfing, dancing, parading.

Big Pharma spends \$6 billion a year to flood the airwaves with ads for the latest wonder drug—\$6 billion.

Why? Why would they spend all this money to advertise drugs and say, Talk it over with your doctor? They spend such astronomical sums to promote their drugs because it increases their profit margins.

Big Pharma thinks if they hit you hard enough and often enough with ads on television, not only will you be able to pronounce but spell Xarelto, but you will also tell your doctor: That is my favorite blood thinner. I have seen that ad over and over again.

Don't take my word for it.

The American Medical Association said:

Direct to consumer advertising inflates demands for new and expensive drugs even when these drugs may not be appropriate for your health.

When President Biden announced 15 drugs that Medicare would negotiate for discounts, most Americans knew the names, maybe even knew the jingle: Ozempic, Trelegy, Ibrance, Otezla.

Sound familiar?

Pharma spends hundreds of millions of dollars each year so you are supposed to "ask your doctor" about these drugs.

The result, Medicare spent \$22 billion last year alone on these four heavily advertised medications—\$22 billion. With these advertisements, Big Pharma is betting they can squeeze every penny out of you and our healthcare system.

Just last week, I released a report about the new telehealth advertising scheme launched by Pfizer and Eli Lilly. With online promotions and new websites, Pharma is urging patients to "click here" if you want to speak with a doctor. But those telehealth doctors

are handpicked. They have been recruited and paid for by the drug companies.

Pharma is funneling patients to their chosen healthcare providers to influence prescriptions for costly drugs. This raises concerns about conflicts of interest and inappropriate prescribing of drugs. All of this is a result of Pharma's rampant advertising spree.

Since 2017, I have introduced bipartisan legislation to crack down on this TV advertising. Republican Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY—now on the floor to join me—has been my partner in this effort. When you turn on the evening news, one-third—one out of every three—commercials you see are for drugs from prescription drug companies. It is the same when you stream your favorite show or scroll on social media.

Americans see an average nine pharmaceutical ads every single day. With billions in targeted spending, patients are bombarded with information—often at rapid machine gun pace—but kept in the dark about one crucial fact that is essential to this conversation: The drug companies want to tell you everything, including the warnings as fast as they say them, but they don't want you to know one thing. They don't want you to know the price.

Because of outrageous drug prices, millions of Americans are faced to ration doses, skip refills, making cost of transparency absolutely essential.

I want to put an ad up here, which some of you may recognize.

In 2023, Illinois company AbbVie spent \$350 million on TV ads for Rinvoq, an eczema and arthritis drug. Nowhere in the commercial do they tell you the cost as publicized and released by the drug company—\$6,100 a month for this drug.

A lot of good news, if you are going to go out canoeing and white water rafting, but they won't tell you it is \$6,100 for Rinvoq.

It is time to end Big Pharma's secrecy. If they are going to advertise a drug, they need to also declare to the American public how much it costs.

It is basic. No gimmicks, no tricks, just the truth by advertising the very same drug that the drug companies publish at the fictional price.

Our commonsense plan to require price disclosures in direct-to-consumer drug ads has already passed the Senate one time before. Senator GRASSLEY and I worked together in 2018, because we knew that 88 percent of the American people support what we are doing—disclosure of price and reduction of the cost of drugs to consumers.

In fact, because of our work, President Donald Trump made a statement.

Big announcement . . . —

The President said—

Drug companies have to come clean about their prices in TV ads. Historic transparency for American patients is here. If drug companies are ashamed of those prices—lower them!

That is what the President said on May 8, 2019.

Vice President VANCE previously co-sponsored the measure Senator GRASSLEY and I support, while Health Secretary Kennedy has railed against drug advertising and suggested our price disclosure policy has his support too. So this is a bipartisan undertaking.

Big Pharma hates being honest with patients about the price of drugs; they fear it is going to cut into their profits. Patients in America, American citizens and others, deserve lower drug prices.

The Trump administration has called on Congress to rein in these deceptive drug advertisements, but Big Pharma is looking for one Senator—if they can just get one Senator to come down here on the floor and object to the passage of this commonsense bill. I hope we can pass it right now to deliver real relief at the pharmacy counter.

I am now going to yield to my partner in this effort, Senator GRASSLEY, before I make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I want to thank Senator DURBIN for his leadership in this area the two or three times we have attempted to do this. One time, I think we were successful, but it is still not law.

I would like to put this in the simplest form I can by saying that watching television all the time, prices are showing up all the time for this product or that product. I don't know how many times I see that something costs \$9.99 or \$19.99 or that the price of an automobile is \$26,000. But when it comes to prescription drugs, presumably there is something very sensitive about this that they don't want to tell us what it is going to cost. Of course that irritates me, but most importantly, it is not fair to the consumer.

Today, we have a President, we have a Vice President, and we have a Secretary of Health and Human Services all on record supporting this commonsense measure to require prescription drug ads to list the price of a drug. In fact, I discussed this with the HHS Secretary prior to his confirmation, and he told me he thought it could be done by regulation. It is my understanding they are studying doing it by regulation, and I would say hurry up and get it done because whether it is done by law or whether it is done by regulation, this is something that should be done.

I want to say that I think my colleagues know that lowering the cost of prescription drugs is a top priority of mine—no more than it is Senator DURBIN's. Without their prescription medication, millions of Americans would not survive.

As a nation, we are blessed to live in a country where investment and innovation unlock cures and treatments—some of them we even refer to as miracle cures. But the escalating prices of prescription drugs are a consuming concern for millions of Americans, including in my State of Iowa, where they bring up this very subject regularly at my county meetings.

There are many reasons for the high cost of prescription drugs. It could be the lack of competition and abusive practices. It could be opaque and powerful drug middlemen that we call pharmacy benefit managers and a lack of transparency on prices.

By the way, I just mentioned PBMs. There are at least 65 to 70 Senators that are cosponsors of 1 or more bills—at least 3 bills that exist out of 3 different committees—that want more transparency with PBMs, and somehow, we ought to be able to get that up. Hopefully, we will be successful before this year is out.

So I am working in all three of these areas I just told you about to advance bipartisan solutions. When voluntarily choosing to promote medications over the airways, manufacturers are already required to disclose safety and side effects. Yet, for many patients, price plays a primary role in clinical adherence.

There is a lot of value in knowing a prescription drug's list price. This is the most accessible and standardized price of a drug, which is set by the manufacturer itself.

Despite efforts by Big Pharma to stop our bill, I am confident that the American consumer will continue to demand the kind of price transparency that they deserve. President Trump, Vice President VANCE, and Secretary Kennedy will also continue to fight with us.

If critics have solutions to make our bill better, come to the table, present your ideas, and work with us.

Also, I want to thank the chairman of the Finance Committee. He is a friend. He may be against this bill today, but he is very much an advocate for PBM reforms.

I thank you, Senator, for doing that. The Finance Committee, along with several other committees in the Senate, has a bipartisan PBM reform ready to pass the Senate.

The President made it clear that he wants to see PBM transparency and accountability, and we must tackle the cost of prescription drugs through more competition, PBM reform, and, of course, through the sunshine on drug prices that Senator DURBIN and I are proposing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Take a look at the agenda of the U.S. Senate. Tell me an issue that 88 percent of the American people agree with. Tell me an issue where you have bipartisan sponsorship: Senator GRASSLEY, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee; I am ranking member of that committee—a Republican, a Democrat supporting it. Tell me an issue where you have President Trump supporting our position and a Democratic Senator like myself on the floor espousing the same position as the President of the United States. Tell me an issue that is more timely than the affordability of prescription drugs. I can't think of another issue that fits that mold.

I want to make a motion. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 229 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Reserving the right to object, I am the chairman of the Finance Committee, the committee they are trying to pull this bill out of. The fact is that I completely agree with the objective of my colleagues on the floor today that we need to get transparency in the prescription drug pricing system.

Americans deserve a transparent, affordable, and accessible prescription drug market. Far too often, the current system fails to meet those needs. It is not only, though, because we haven't got ads on TV saying the list price of the drug—I don't have an opposition to just doing something like that—but it is much more complex. Vertically integrated health plans, pharmacy benefit managers, and other intermediaries suppress competition, pocket valuable drug discounts, and increase prices for consumers—all unrelated to the list price of the drug.

Last Congress, the Senate Finance Committee, which I chair, advanced a number of our bipartisan proposals to reform our broken prescription drug supply chain. Senator GRASSLEY has just referenced those proposals, and he is a strong ally and advocate of those. These policies would ensure that patients, not middlemen, benefit from the negotiated price of drugs—not the price you see if you just look at the list price, the negotiated price of the drugs. With bipartisan support and cooperation, we can pass that package by the end of this year, but we need bipartisan support to move forward and do it.

While well-intended, the proposal before us today risks confusing patients further by requiring disclosure of list prices in advertisements that no consumer should pay—none. A drug's list price includes none of the discounts, rebates, or other price concessions found in net prices, which continue to decline even as other prices grow.

Rather than broadcast and validate a list price, Congress should ensure that patients can share in the savings reflected in the net pricing points, enabling both increased transparency and reduced out-of-pocket costs at the pharmacy counter.

What I am saying is that this is complex, and we are working and have a working solution. I stand ready to work with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle on an effective method to increase transparency and access to relevant information that patients need to make important choices about their own health

but not to pull a bill out of our committee when we are already working in committee to get the right and most effective solution put into place.

For those reasons, I object to my colleague's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Idaho is my friend. We have worked together in the past; I am sure we will in the future. But I want to tell you something. He professes deep concern about whether senior citizens are going to get confused if we tell them the actual price given by the drug company itself. He thinks it is too confusing for them to understand that that price means anything at all.

Do you know who disagrees with him? The AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons. They represent American seniors, and they endorse the Grassley-Durbin bill. They believe that seniors can understand completely how much the cost of the drug is even if it can be discounted under the insurance coverage of your policy as well.

The list price is the proper method of disclosure because the drug companies create the list price. We are not imposing a price on them; it is a price they have to publish. It is an objective, factual figure. Many patients do indeed pay this price when they don't have copays.

Let me say a word about what it means in the real world. In 2022, 19,000 seniors in the State of Idaho paid an average of \$570 out of pocket on a drug known as Eliquis—a pretty well-known drug. Another 6,000 seniors in Idaho paid on average \$607 out of pocket for Xarelto—the one that is impossible to explain. Both of these blood thinners are among the most heavily advertised medications.

We are talking about a dose of transparency in the State of Idaho and every other State so that 25,000 seniors in Idaho can save money by knowing up front what costs they may face and make informed treatment choices.

Why are we afraid to ask the drug companies to disclose a price they publish in private—at least to some sources—and not tell the American consumer? If they had to do that, we think the American consumer would think twice about falling for these ads.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes prior to the vote.

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

APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, I will be voting to move ahead with the first spending bill for fiscal year 2026.

Now, there is no doubt that the path forward on appropriations this year has been made extremely challenging by President Trump's flagrant lack of re-

gard for Congress and our laws, and it has not been made any easier by the unprecedented partisan rescissions package that Republicans passed last week. But we cannot afford another slush fund, full-year CR, and we cannot accept the draconian cuts being pushed by Trump and House Republicans. So we do need to chart a different path forward and pass full-year, bipartisan spending bills that invest in folks back home and make sure Congress and our constituents have a say in Federal spending. The way, of course, to ensure that happens is through a bipartisan appropriations process.

So I am very glad that, thanks to the senior Senator from Georgia, working across the aisle with his partner, the senior Senator from Arkansas, we were able to negotiate and report out of committee a good bill to fund our military construction needs and the Department of Veterans Affairs in fiscal year 2026.

As the daughter of a World War II veteran, the programs we fund in the MILCON-VA bill are very personal to me. Doing right by our vets and getting them the care they need and the support they were promised is a moral obligation, which is why I am pleased to say the MILCON-VA bill we are voting on delivers the funding needed to live up to our Nation's commitments to our veterans and makes crucial investments to support our servicemembers and our national security.

The bill includes essential funds for VA care, including rural health, women's health, medical research, and the caregivers program I have long championed, and for the first time, it puts funding levels for those important programs in statute. It also expands the pilot I started to make sure that childcare is not a barrier to any veteran who needs care and increases funding to address veteran homelessness and mental health needs.

When it comes to supporting our servicemembers and their families, there are investments for nearly 300 construction projects, including new family housing construction and child development centers.

There are also investments to bolster our footprint in the Pacific and support our NATO projects. These are incredibly important to our soldiers, to our veterans, and to our national security.

No doubt there is more I would like to see done in this bill. It is not, of course, the bill I would have written on my own. But I do hope Republicans will work with us now to consider critical amendments to improve the bill and make sure the administration actually delivers for veterans, something I think it has certainly failed to do on many fronts over the last few months.

There is also some discussion of adding two other funding bills that we have negotiated and reported out of committee to make this a minibuss package. These are solid, compromised bills that reject the truly draconian cuts proposed by President Trump and

House Republicans, and I would like to see them considered by the full Senate.

Now, for that to happen, I hope Republicans will work with us to ensure, once again, that there is an opportunity to debate and amend all three bills.

So I am a “yes” vote on moving forward today with debate of the MILCON-VA bill, and I hope we can keep this process moving because passing our appropriations bills is the best way we can make sure Federal spending reflects the needs we are hearing about in our States and actually solves problems for people at home.

No one wants a shutdown, and the way we avoid that shutdown is by working together. That is not a secret, not a surprise; it is a reality we all know. As the majority leader noted recently, the math tells us that it takes 60. It takes bipartisan cooperation. Unfortunately, Republicans have been chipping away at that cooperation, especially with the rescissions vote last week.

But, to be clear, if Republicans continue cutting bipartisan deals with more rescissions, that is not cooperation. If Republicans try and jam through another slush-fund CR, that is not cooperation.

So for anyone considering the partisan route, you cannot write a bill without talking to Democrats and then act surprised when Democrats don't support it. You want our votes; you work with us. And this bill today that we are considering shows that is possible. So I want to applaud the bipartisan work of the senior Senators from Georgia and Arkansas to get us to this point, and I hope all of our colleagues can take that lesson to heart as we move forward with consideration of this bill and our work on bipartisan bills to fund the government and avoid a shutdown.

Let's stay focused on that instead of embracing Russ Vought's vision for a Congress that is more partisan, less powerful, and less able to make life better for the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mrs. MURRAY. 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.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 428 Leg.]

YEAS—90

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

NAYS—8

Hawley	Murphy	Schiff
Lee	Padilla	Warren
Markey	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—2

McConnell Mullin

The motion was agreed to.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in *italic*, as follows:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$2,447,609,000, to remain available until September 30, 2030: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$446,388,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Army determines that additional obligations

are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$268,650,000 shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified in the table under the heading “Military Construction, Army” in the report accompanying this Act, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$5,906,524,000, to remain available until September 30, 2030: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$613,213,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$144,390,000 shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified in the table under the heading “Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps” in the report accompanying this Act, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Department of the Air Force when designated by the Secretary of Defense to direct and supervise Military Construction projects in accordance with section 2851 of title 10, United States Code, and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$4,090,673,000, to remain available until September 30, 2030: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$718,973,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Air Force determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor: Provided further, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$359,200,000 shall be for the projects and activities, and in the amounts, specified in the table under the heading “Military Construction, Air Force” in the report accompanying this Act, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$3,724,301,000, to remain available until September 30, 2030: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That, of the amount, not to exceed \$211,001,000 shall be available for study,