

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. BOOKER. I would just like the clerk to read the titles of the two bills.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 911) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include certain retired law enforcement officers in the public safety officers' death benefits program.

A bill (S. 1595) to establish standards for trauma kits purchased using funds provided under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program.

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

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 911) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 911

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chief Herbert D. Proffitt Act of 2025".

SEC. 2. INCLUSION OF CERTAIN RETIRED PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS IN THE PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' DEATH BENEFITS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1201 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10281) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(p) PERSONAL INJURY TO RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'retired law enforcement officer' means an individual who separated from service in good standing as a law enforcement officer in an official capacity at a public agency with or without compensation.

"(2) ELIGIBILITY.—A retired law enforcement officer shall be eligible for a benefit under this part if the officer died or became permanently and totally disabled as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury resulting from a targeted attack because of the retired law enforcement officer's service as a law enforcement officer."

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) apply to any matter—

(i) pending before the Bureau of Justice Assistance or otherwise on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(ii) filed (consistent with pre-existing effective dates) or accruing after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any action taken against a retired law enforcement officer described in section 1201(p) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (as added by this Act) on or after January 1, 2012.

The bill (S. 1595) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1595

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving Police Critical Aid for Responding to Emer-

gencies Act" or the "Improving Police CARE Act".

SEC. 2. TRAUMA KIT STANDARDS.

Section 521 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10202) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) TRAUMA KITS.—

"(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'trauma kit' means a first aid response kit, which includes a bleeding control kit that can be used for controlling a life-threatening hemorrhage.

"(2) REQUIREMENT FOR TRAUMA KITS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a grantee may only purchase a trauma kit using funds made available under this part if the trauma kit meets the performance standards established by the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance under paragraph (3)(A).

"(B) AUTHORITY TO SEPARATELY ACQUIRE.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall prohibit a grantee from separately acquiring the components of a trauma kit and assembling complete trauma kits that meet the performance standards.

"(3) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND OPTIONAL AGENCY BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, in consultation with organizations representing trauma surgeons, emergency medical response professionals, emergency physicians, other medical professionals, relevant law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government, professional law enforcement organizations, local law enforcement labor or representative organizations, and law enforcement trade associations, shall—

"(A) develop and publish performance standards for trauma kits that are eligible for purchase using funds made available under this part that, at a minimum, require the components described in paragraph (4) to be included in a trauma kit; and

"(B) develop and publish optional best practices for law enforcement agencies regarding—

"(i) training law enforcement officers in the use of trauma kits;

"(ii) the deployment and maintenance of trauma kits in law enforcement vehicles; and

"(iii) the deployment, location, and maintenance of trauma kits in law enforcement agency or other government facilities.

"(4) COMPONENTS.—The components of a trauma kit described in this paragraph are—

"(A) a tourniquet recommended by the Committee on Tactical Combat Casualty Care;

"(B) a bleeding control bandage;

"(C) a pair of nonlatex protective gloves and a pen-type marker;

"(D) a pair of blunt-ended scissors;

"(E) instructional documents developed—

"(i) under the 'Stop the Bleed' national awareness campaign of the Department of Homeland Security, or any successor thereto;

"(ii) by the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma;

"(iii) by the American Red Cross; or

"(iv) by any partner of the Department of Defense;

"(F) a bag or other container adequately designed to hold the contents of the kit; and

"(G) any additional trauma kit supplies that—

"(i) are approved by a State, local, or Tribal law enforcement agency or first responders;

"(ii) can adequately treat a traumatic injury; and

"(iii) can be stored in a readily available kit."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

REQUIRING THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION TO EXTEND THE TIME PERIOD DURING WHICH LICENSEES ARE REQUIRED TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HYDROPOWER PROJECTS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, hydropower produces affordable, reliable, and clean baseload power in Montana and across the United States. For years, I have worked with my colleagues to grow our hydropower portfolio in creating new jobs, lowering prices, and strengthening our grid.

I want to thank Senator FETTERMAN for joining me as my colead to push this bill across the finish line.

Our bipartisan bill, S. 1020, simply allows the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to extend licenses for the construction of new hydropower projects that have been affected by supply chain shortages back to 2020.

This bill passed the Senate last year by unanimous consent, and we can do that again here today. There are a number of projects whose licenses will expire if we don't pass my bill—projects in Montana, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Mississippi, Oregon, and Alaska—pumped storage projects that will help balance the grid and small projects that will also power rural communities. It is bipartisan and non-controversial. It is one that we must pass today. The good news is, we do not have objections so it is going to pass today.

With that, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 1020 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1020) to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to extend the time period during which licensees are required to commence construction of certain hydropower projects.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1020) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1020

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,