

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 443 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—2

Justice	Tillis
---------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 274, Susan Monarez, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (New Position)

John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John R. Curtis, Pete Ricketts, Tim Sheehy, Roger Marshall, Jim Justice, Cynthia M. Lummis, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Steve Daines, David McCormick, Bernie Moreno.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Susan Monarez, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (New Position), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 444 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—

Justice

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). On this vote, the yeas are 52, and the nays are 47. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Susan Monarez, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (New Position)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise today seeking unanimous consent to pass a package of bipartisan bills that will support current and former law enforcement officers who have sacrificed so much—sometimes everything—to protect our families.

Yesterday morning, three people died in a shooting in my home State in Reno, NV, and just hours later, four people died, including a law enforcement officer, in a shooting in New York City.

The only reason more people didn't die is because law enforcement responded quickly. Law enforcement officers run toward danger for the rest of us. These are the people we are supporting with the package of bills today.

This package includes three pieces of legislation that I am proud to cosponsor and one I introduced myself.

I am a cosponsor of S. 419, the Reauthorizing Support and Treatment of Officers in Crisis Act of 2025 introduced by Senator HAWLEY. This bipartisan bill would help fund family support, suicide prevention, and other mental health services to law enforcement officers.

I am also a cosponsor of S. 1316, the Strong Communities Act of 2025, introduced by Senator PETERS. This is bipartisan legislation that would make law enforcement recruits eligible for funding to make their education and training programs more affordable in return for their commitment to service to our communities.

And, finally, I am cosponsoring S. 539, the bipartisan PROTECT Our Children Reauthorization Act of 2025, introduced by Senator CORNYN. This bill authorizes funding for the Department of Justice to assist Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in investigating and prosecuting child exploitation.

These bills, along with four others, including my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR—these bills honor our law enforcement officers and have support from both Republicans and Democrats.

The legislation I want to focus on today is S. 911, the bipartisan Chief Herbert D. Proffitt Act of 2025, which I was proud to introduce with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL.

The men and women who serve as law enforcement officers risk their lives every day to keep our community safe. Whether they are actively serving or have retired in good standing, we owe them a debt of gratitude. That is why the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program exists.

It provides death and education benefits to the surviving family members of fallen law enforcement officers, firefighters, and other first responders.

It also provides disability benefits to officers who have suffered irreparable injuries in the line of duty. It is a critical program that supports the families of those who sacrificed everything to protect our communities.

Unfortunately, the existing PSOB Program does not cover the rare instance in which a retired law enforcement officer dies as a result of their service.

In 2012, Chief Herbert D. Proffitt, a retired law enforcement officer in Kentucky, was going about his day. When he went outside his house to check his

mail, he was tragically shot and killed by a man he had arrested a decade earlier.

Even though his murder was a direct retaliation for his service in uniform, Chief Proffitt's family was denied the benefits they deserved simply because he had already retired. To me, that is unacceptable, and I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree.

That is why Senator MCCONNELL and I worked together to write the Chief Herbert D. Proffitt Act to ensure that families of retired law enforcement officers who were killed as a result of their service are not denied benefits, so no more families have to go through what Chief Proffitt's family has gone through. This is just commonsense, bipartisan legislation that passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee—unanimously.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and the rest of the bipartisan bills in this package to protect the men and women who protect us every day, and their families.

I would like at this time to provide an opportunity for my colleague from Iowa—to yield some time to him, the Judiciary chairman, right now, to provide some remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the Senator from Nevada for coming to the floor to push for passage of these bipartisan bills that she has mentioned.

I also see that Senator KLOBUCHAR is on the floor to seek like legislation that she has worked on in a bipartisan way to protect law enforcement and first responders, and I would also support her efforts.

Law enforcement across the country put their lives on the line every day. We see examples of the dangers they face on the news and in our communities on a daily basis.

This month, Immigration and Customs Enforcement reported an 830-percent increase in assaults on their officers and agents during the course of their enforcement duties. Agents and officers had rocks and other projectiles thrown at them, causing injury to person and property. These agents and officers have been doxed and had their home addresses, family members' names, and other personal information posted on social media for anyone to see, which has resulted in an increased number of threats and intimidation to these law enforcement personnel and their families.

We had the opportunity to hear firsthand from three Federal law enforcement officers during a Judiciary Committee hearing on cartels last month about the ongoing risk and dangers to law enforcement.

We had Special Agent in Charge Matthew Allen of the Los Angeles field office of the Drug Enforcement Administration testify that his agents are oftentimes surveilled by cartel members and other bad actors. He further testi-

fied that he has lost several friends and fellow law enforcement officers as a result of their law enforcement duties.

Just recently, we learned that an off-duty Customs and Border Protection officer was shot in the face in New York City during an attempted robbery by a previously deported illegal alien. Thankfully, the officer is expected to survive.

According to the Fraternal Order of Police, as of June 30 of this year, 166 officers were shot in the line of duty, and 21 of them lost their lives. While these numbers are lower than from previous years, the shooting this weekend is yet another example of the threats and dangers our men and women in blue face every day, both on and off duty.

Earlier this year, Senator DURBIN, who is also on the floor with us—he is the ranking member of the committee I chair—he and I led a resolution honoring 234 officers who made the ultimate sacrifice and are being recognized as line-of-duty deaths. It passed with over 80 cosponsors.

We worked together across the aisle to report these bills that are being discussed here on the floor of the Senate. Those bills were voted out of committee in what we honor as Police Week in the United States. The seven bills are part of the largest Police Week package in over 15 years. The package of seven bills passed the committee with bipartisan support and also by unanimous vote. They provide a good example of the extensive problems facing our law enforcement community. For example, one bill deals with recruitment and retention issues to ensure our law enforcement is well staffed. Other bills deal with protecting law enforcement from the dangers of fentanyl and providing law enforcement with the equipment they need to serve our communities.

Lastly, the bills provide protection to the families of first responders and provide the much needed resources for the mental health of law enforcement.

Mr. President, I would yield back to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Iowa and the Judiciary Committee and all of the good work he has done on these important pieces of legislation, as they really work towards ensuring that all of our communities across the country stay safe and that we are supporting our law enforcement.

So as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 77, S. 180; Calendar No. 79, S. 419; Calendar No. 80, S. 539; Calendar No. 81, S. 911; Calendar No. 82, S. 1316; Calendar No. 83, S. 1563; Calendar No. 84, S. 1595; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 1563 be agreed to and the committee-reported amendment to S. 1316 be agreed to; that the committee-reported sub-

stitute amendment to S. 539 be withdrawn and the Cornyn substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; finally, that the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I am reserving the right to object.

I want to begin by acknowledging the tragic loss of New York City Police Officer Didarul Islam last night, just about 50 miles from where I live. He made the ultimate sacrifice, bravely placing himself in harm's way to protect strangers, people he didn't know, because that is what American police officers do. This selfless commitment is a daily reminder. It is a reminder of the reality for police officers in America who risk their lives to safeguard communities. My deepest condolences go out to his family and his young children during this time of unimaginable grief.

I rise today to propose an amendment to the bills before us, one that guarantees every officer in every State like Officer Islam has the full support they deserve in their service to our communities from this body.

Sadly, this is not what the Justice Department is doing. Rather than supporting law enforcement agencies and officers equally across the Nation, they are weaponizing public safety grants to punish State and local jurisdictions that resist the Trump policy agenda, including my home State of New Jersey.

The Department of Justice is right now withholding funds from law enforcement agencies across the country—including New Jersey—that we have passed through this body in a bipartisan way unless they enforce the administration's unjust immigration agenda and comply with the President's unjust and unlawful Executive orders and memoranda. It is disgraceful, it is unfair, it is unjust, and it is dangerously reckless towards the officers whose well-being they are jeopardizing—officers like the ones I know personally who serve and protect New Jersey.

Come on now. Federal funds should not be used for partisan political games. They shouldn't be weaponized to benefit this State that supported the President and not this State that didn't support the President. This is the shift towards authoritarianism. It is undermining the separation of powers we have here in America.

This body has duly-approved grants. It is our job. It is spelled out in the Constitution that each of us has sworn an oath to protect. And this President is upending that process, violating the

will of this body, Democrats and Republicans alike, in pursuit of his petty political agenda. And who is getting hurt? Well, in this case, New Jersey police officers are being hurt; New York police officers are getting hurt. In the wake of a murder of a police officer in New York yesterday, this is outrageous.

Public safety grants like these that I am a cosponsor of are not meant to reward law enforcement in favored jurisdictions or States while punishing others. It shouldn't matter whether a person puts on his uniform in Texas or New Jersey. Does it matter that Officer Islam, who was killed last night in New York City—does it matter that he is a New York cop and not a North Dakota cop? Sadly, it appears that Donald Trump thinks so.

For us as a body, to move forward right now is being complicit in what Donald Trump is doing. I say no. I say we stand. I say we fight. I say that we reject this and, in a bipartisan way, that we demand an end to this kind of constitutionally unjust carving up of the resources we approve.

Think about this: In April, Donald Trump's administration cut nearly 400 public safety grants administered by its Office of Justice Programs without any notice or explanation. Think about that for a second. Programs that I supported, programs that I cosponsored, programs that protect police officers and communities, he canceled without a justification.

I have written letters to the Justice Department. They have not given a justification. I have asked in open hearings: Why did you cut this funding for approved grants to States like New Jersey? No justification. I sent a letter to the DOJ signed by 30 of my colleagues demanding information about what happened and that they reinstate all grants that had been rescinded, and no action and no response. Yet, today, we want to move forward with needed grant programs to protect police officers, but that money won't go to New York; that money won't go to New Jersey. You have got to be kidding me.

When will we stand and fight this President?

This offers little consolation. Today, nobody is speaking to the organizations in New Jersey, to the police officers in New Jersey that partner with law enforcement but now lack the resources to endure a burdensome appeal or to operate without critical grants or funding now for months.

When are we going to stand up as a body and defend our work, defend our jurisdiction, defend this coequal branch of government?

I ask my colleagues to pass these bills with my amendment to provide resources to law enforcement agencies with this important provision that safeguards these grants from politicization and ensures that all law enforcement agencies have a fair chance to secure these important grants.

Our officers have the hardest job in America. Every day, they put their lives on the line. Why would we do something today that is playing into the President's politics and is going to hurt the officers in States like mine?

I believe in these bills. I am a cosponsor on some. That is why I am standing here to fight to ensure police departments in New Jersey aren't excluded from accessing these vital funds. Our officers have just as much of a right as officers in other States. So do officers in California, in New York, in Illinois, in Washington, and in other States that have been the target of this Department of Justice.

I am an American. I pledge allegiance to that flag—liberty and justice for all. Pass my amendment and make sure that all officers in America who put their lives on the line have access to these grants.

I ask consent that the bill be modified, that my amendments to S. 180, S. 419, S. 539, S. 1316, and S. 1563, which are at the desk, also be agreed to, and the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc so that all police officers in America get the intended resources that the Judiciary Committee passed unanimously for American police.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Reserving the right to object, I agree. Withholding funding for law enforcement anywhere in the country—across the country—is just not acceptable and it should not be done and it should not be based on party affiliation, playing favoritism—I absolutely agree.

But I also agree, two wrongs don't make a right. And where we are today, these bills passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee weeks ago, and my colleague from New Jersey, I have respect for him. He is on the committee. He voted to pass these bills. He had an opportunity at that time to present this amendment. This is the first time we are ever hearing about it.

We have been trying to pass this package of bills that passed out of committee unanimously in the last 8 weeks. And now that we came to the floor to try to push and get this done, we are hearing for the first time about this amendment.

Let me just say, this amendment really is not even applicable to the Proffitt bill that is part of this. It has nothing to do with grant funding. This bill has everything to do with trying to make sure that grant funding goes to all the States. I am not here to talk about grant funding. There is no funding associated with it, yet he wants to put it on my piece of legislation.

This is why it is ridiculous. This is an attempt to kill all of these bills. I don't know why. I don't know why, because at the end of the day, all of these bills are about bipartisan support.

If my colleague absolutely has concerns about getting funding to his law

enforcement, I would be willing to work with him. I would be willing to work—and I know my colleagues would try to figure out how we ensure that this administration doesn't play favorites and fight for that funding and holding them accountable to get that funding to all of our law enforcement communities across this country.

I agree; President Trump's impoundment of funding is a serious concern. But tacking on poison pill language to these bills won't guarantee that any additional funding makes it to New Jersey, Nevada, or any other State. Instead, what it will do, it will keep critical bills from passing in the first place. Let me just say that again. These are critical bills.

One bill, the Protecting First Responders for Secondary Exposure Act, requires purchasing devices that prevent secondary exposure to fentanyl and other lethal substances. Reauthorizing Support and Treatment for Officers in Crisis Act 2025 provides family support and mental health services to law enforcement personnel. PROTECT Our Children Reauthorization 2025 assists Federal, State, and local law enforcement Agencies in investigating and prosecuting child exploitation.

And we are sitting here today saying: That is not going to pass—even though it came out of committee unanimously; even though there was a time to address the concerns that my colleague has. And now he wants to kill all of these bills, some of them that his amendments are not even applicable to.

You have to question what is going on here. Is this the right venue to fight for what he is seeking?

I absolutely respect him and understand his concern and would be willing to fight with him to get that funding—essential funding—to his State that this administration has, apparently, blocked. But this is not the way to go about it, to kill all of these bills with this poison pill amendment. For that reason, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object, I am confused by my colleague because she knows I don't object to her two bills. She is going to be offering her two bills in a second. I don't know what the confusion is there.

I object to the bills that are putting resources out that States from California to New York are not eligible for because of the actions of this President.

The second thing my colleague confuses me is saying I had my chance. Actually, I didn't. The regularly scheduled Judiciary Committee hearing wrapped up, and then a hastily one was put back together. I had no notice of that, no ability to plan for it, and had a conflict.

This, to me, is the problem with Democrats in America right now, is we are willing to be complicit to Donald

Trump; to let this pass through when we have all the leverage right now there is to say that if you are as passionate about police as we are, then pass bills out of this body that will help the police officers in Washington, that will help the police officers in Illinois, that will help the police officers in New Jersey, that will help the police officers in Newark.

Don't be complicit to the President of the United States who, we both know, doesn't understand that language: "Oh please, oh please, don't hurt blue States."

We are standing at a moment where our President is eviscerating the Constitution of the United States of America, and we are willing to go along with that today.

No, no. Not on my watch. I stand against this. It is a violation of our Constitution for the President of the United States to ignore the will of Congress and decide which States are eligible to grants and which are not.

Well, we know something in New York and New Jersey. I was a Newark elected official when 9/11 happened. I saw my first responders charging into those buildings. I know what police officers do every day.

My amendment was just called a poison pill. That is ridiculous. My amendment just says police officers in New Jersey are just as important as the police officers in North or South Dakota. It says the police officers in New York are just as important as the police officers in Texas. It says the police officers in California are just as important as the police officers in Alabama.

Why would we go along with a President who is violating our Constitution time and time again? When in the history of this body—Democrats and Republicans used to stand up for their turf. These could easily pass. Put a simple amendment that says: You know what? You can play games however you want, President Trump, but when it comes to resources for police officers, no games.

Today, I stand and fight for the Constitution. I stand and fight against this President. And, heck, yeah, I am going to stand and fight for the police officers from the great State of New Jersey. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Nevada for her work in trying to bring these bills to a vote on the floor. I want to thank Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I want to thank Senator DURBIN, who is here, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee; someone who has, by the way, been a leading voice on immigration for years in this Chamber.

One of the things I don't understand here is that we have committees for a reason, and we have hearings for a reason. You can't do one thing on Police Week and not show up and not object

and let these bills go through and then say another thing a few weeks later in a big speech on the floor. I like to show up at the markups, and I like to make my case.

And I will note that Senator BOOKER objected to my police reauthorization bill, the COPS funding—the Clinton COPS funding, long before Donald Trump came into office. So this is not just about this. This is a long dispute over this type of funding, funding that I think is really important right now.

Our country's law enforcement professionals do some of the hardest and most important work out there. Every day across America, we ask them to put everything on the line to keep us safe. We ask them to run towards danger and to guide others to safety. And every day across America, they put on their uniforms, their bulletproof vests, their badges, and they get to work. We need to have their backs, and that is what this package of bills does—by the way, a bill supported out of the committee from some of the most liberal Senators and some of the most conservative Senators in this body. We came together. There were bills we would have liked to include that we did not.

If the objection is based on some of this horse show that is going on out of the White House, I agree with that piece of Senator BOOKER's points. I have been equally vociferous taking on this administration. But all of these bills came out of the committee unanimously, and I think they deserve that support on the floor.

These bills help fund grants for mental health services for law enforcement. By the way, if this issue—which I agree with Senator BOOKER on about all these States should be treated the same—well, then, I suppose then he will be voting against all of this funding for New Jersey unless this is changed. So we should be watching for that for every single vote, instead of just these bills. These bills that are in front of us were supported unanimously out of committee—grants that help law enforcement combat child sexual exploitation; grants that help address recruitment and retention crisis that is plaguing local law enforcement; Senator CORTEZ MASTO's bill, as she explained, to help support families of fallen law enforcement officers who were targeted and attacked because of their service as law enforcement.

My bill, which has now been objected to—so I am not going to mention it separately or ask for it to be called up separately. My bill, the Retired Law Enforcement Officers Continuing Service Act, done with Senator GRASSLEY, would make sure that law enforcement agencies can continue to utilize the skills that talented law enforcement retirees have built up over their career of public service. There are many retired law enforcement officers who want an active retirement and are eager and ready to serve their community.

This might sound like small ball, but when we are looking how we are going to build up these police agencies when we don't have enough police, when they are out there at these scenes getting shot at, we have to be creative in terms of the ideas.

I believe strongly, we are going to see another President in the future. We are going to see, out of these next elections, a check on some of this. But for now, I want to get these programs started.

This bill would allow law enforcement agencies across the country to keep using their expertise to review video footage to solve carjacking cases or help cyber and financial crime investigations. This bill will also help train the next generation of law enforcement officers. These and the other police bills passed during Police Week while those police officers are sitting there in the hearing room when no one objected, they are bipartisan, common-sense legislation. They passed the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

And I can't help it if someone couldn't change their schedule to be there. I think that these hearings should mean something and that people should be saying the same thing they say in Police Week when those people are sitting out there in their uniforms who have lost loved ones. As they say on this Senate floor, if we expect law enforcement to respond to some of the most difficult crises at a moment's notice, it is on us to set them up for success.

I was there at the National Mall where it rained the entire night, and not a family wasn't there when they thought it was going to be a nicer day. And that was this year on the National Mall to honor those fallen heroes, the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Candlelight Vigil. Every single officer whose name was read that night was a beloved family member and a friend to so many, including three from my State.

There was Officer Jamal Mitchell who was shot and killed in the line of duty just last June; and Officers Paul Elmstrand and Matthew Ruge who, along with Firefighter Paramedic Adam Finseth were killed responding to a domestic violence call in Burnsville, MN. They were called to duty. They answered the call. They actually got seven kids out of this house and saved their lives. One was gunned down. A paramedic came in to try to save him, and he was gunned down. I will never forget hearing from Adam Medlicott, who was there with the three fallen first responders when they answered the call.

He said of his fallen comrades:

We were there for seven children. Nothing could be more honorable.

He is absolutely right. You can't teach that kind of heroism. Our brave law enforcement professionals deserve to know that the resources they rely on will be there when they need them.

I hope we can work some of this out. I completely agree with Senator BOOKER about what this administration is doing, but you can't just pick out a few bills that came out of committee and say, "I am going to stop those," and then allow for other bills that fund other parts of your budget in your State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I was just called out by name, and I want to respond.

This is what frustrates me. I have passed numerous pieces of legislation for our police officers. I partnered with CHUCK GRASSLEY—the incredible Senator from Iowa—on a bill very similar to the one I support about police officers who fall in the line of duty. In this case, it was COVID. Police officers who got COVID and died had difficulty proving it was a line-of-duty death. We passed that legislation to make sure those families got the benefits.

I have worked in bipartisan ways and within my own party to make sure we get resources to our police officers. I don't need lectures about the urgency of this. One of my childhood best friends—a police officer in a small town in New Jersey—after a hard day's work, before he even went home to see his family, died by suicide. I don't need somebody implying in any way that this is not vital to me and my State that we have resources for our police officers. That is why I support this package. That is why I am a cosponsor of some of the bills in this package.

But what I am tired of is when the President of the United States of America violates the constitution and trashes our norms and traditions. And what does the Democratic Party do—comply? allow him? beg for scraps? No. I demand justice. Somebody is implying that this, to me, is not about resources for my State. I will fight for Jersey every day, every night and when it comes to the police officers of my State as to anybody who implies that something is going on other than my allegiance and fealty to the safety, strength, and protection of my police officers because they protect me and everybody in this body.

This is a call, folks. The Democratic Party needs a wake-up call. I see law firms bending a knee to this President, not caring about the larger principles—those free speech rights that you can take on any client. Why are you bending the knee?

I see universities that should be bastions of free speech bending at the knee to this President. I see businesses taking late-night talk show hosts off the air because they dare to insult a President. I see people who want mergers suddenly think they have to pay tribute to this President.

And what are the very people here who are elected to defend the Constitution of the United States saying? Oh, well. Today, let's look the other way and pass some resources that won't go

to Connecticut; that won't go to Illinois; that won't go to New York but that will go to the States he likes. That is complicity with an authoritarian leader who is trashing our Constitution.

It is time for Democrats to have a backbone. It is time for us to fight. It is time for us to draw lines. And when it comes to the safety of my State being denied these grants, that is why I am standing here. Don't question my integrity. Don't question my motives. I am standing for Jersey; I am standing for my police officers; I am standing for the Constitution; and I am standing for what is right.

Dear God, if you want to come at me that way, you are going to have to take it up with me because there is too much on the line in America with people's due process rights and free speech rights and as secret police are running around this country picking people up off the streets who have a legal right to be here. There is too much going on in this country.

When are we going to stand together for the principles that I just heard that were agreed with? When are we going to stand together? If we don't stand as Democrats, we deserve to lose, but if we stand united, if we stand strong, if we stand with other people, if we tell America, with a chorus of conviction, that what this President is doing is wrong—if we stand up and speak that way—dear God, we will win like all of those people who are our ancestors who joined hands together and said: We shall overcome.

No, not on my watch. I am protecting Jersey today. I am protecting our Constitution today. I am standing today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, let me try to refocus this on the bills that are before us today.

I am not sure if the answer here is to stop bipartisan legislation that gives tools to law enforcement across the community to keep our communities safe—that stopping those is the answer moving forward here. I don't know of anyone across this community who has a concern when they make that 9-1-1 call who doesn't want law enforcement to respond. I don't care whether you are a Republican, a Democrat. I don't care if you are nonpartisan. I don't care where you live. You want law enforcement to respond if there is something happening in your community.

That is what these bills are focused on, is how do we ensure that our law enforcement has the tools that it needs to ensure that it can keep our communities safe. That is all it is, and there are several of them, bipartisan, and they passed in a unanimous way for that very reason—to keep our communities safe.

Now, we can talk about the funding for those in appropriations. That is a separate subject, and I am willing to work with my colleague and fight the administration from stopping that

funding, but if we don't pass these pieces of legislation, we are not even giving the tools to law enforcement to keep our communities safe. That is what this is about, and that is why there was unanimous consent for it.

I do want to also thank one other person I didn't get a chance to, who is Senator DURBIN. He has worked tirelessly on the Judiciary Committee on these pieces of legislation, has worked with law enforcement, has worked with all of us in the understanding that it is about safe communities at the end of the day and about ensuring we keep and give law enforcement the tools it needs to keep our communities safe.

I also appreciate my colleague who is willing to work with me on two pieces of the bills that are before us, albeit we worked this out just before we walked on the floor today, but I appreciate his willingness to allow me to really kind of pull out two pieces of legislation and talk to him about it and then his willingness—what I am hearing—to support it.

CHIEF HERBERT D. PROFFITT ACT
OF 2025

IMPROVING POLICE CRITICAL AID
FOR RESPONDING TO EMER-
GENCIES ACT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: Calendar No. 81, S. 911, and Calendar No. 84, S. 1595.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to proceeding to the measures en bloc?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. So, Mr. President, this casts a shadow over everything that was just said because I support these bills. Why do I support these bills? Because the officers of the State of New Jersey are going to benefit from them because Donald Trump hasn't targeted these and cut these, and these are things that are going to help all officers. That is what this body should do—not pick and choose one State over another, not pit one State against another, not pit so-called blue States over so-called red States. It is the United States of America.

God bless my colleague for bringing these bills forward. They should have been passed a long time ago. I support them fully because they will apply to every officer in the United States of America. That is the way this body should work, and I have no objection whatsoever.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time and passed en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.