

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,*

# SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HYDROPOWER PROJECTS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF COVERED PROJECT.**—In this section, the term “covered project” means a hydropower project with respect to which the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission issued a license before March 13, 2020.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF EXTENSION.**—Notwithstanding section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806), on the request of a licensee of a covered project, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may, after reasonable notice and for good cause shown, extend in accordance with subsection (c) the period during which the licensee is required to commence construction of the covered project for not more than an additional 6 years beyond the 8 years authorized by that section.

(c) **PERIOD OF EXTENSION.**—An extension of time to commence construction of a covered project under subsection (b) shall—

(1) consist of not more than 3 consecutive 2-year periods;

(2) begin on the date on which the final extension of the period for commencement of construction granted to the licensee under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) expires; and

(3) end on the date that is not more than 6 years after the latest date to which the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is authorized to extend the period for commencement of construction under that section.

(d) **REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.**—If the time period required under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) to commence construction of a covered project expires after December 31, 2023, and before the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission may reinstate the license for the applicable project effective as of the date of expiration of the license; and

(2) the extension authorized under subsection (b) shall take effect on the date of that expiration.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

### NOMINATION OF EMIL J. BOVE III

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon the Senate will proceed to a final vote on the nomination of Emil Bove; that is to be judge on the Third Circuit.

As I said in my statement in the Judiciary Committee multiple times, I support the nomination of Mr. Bove. He has a strong legal background and has served his country honorably.

I believe he will be diligent, capable, and a fair jurist. My Republican colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee agree, and that is why he was reported out of committee with every Republican supporting his nomination.

It is no surprise to anyone who follows this nomination that I have serious concerns with how my Democratic colleagues have conducted themselves.

The vicious rhetoric, unfair accusations, and abuse directed at Mr. Bove by some on this committee have crossed the line.

I wish I could say that this posture has been limited to just this nomination, but unfortunately it appears to be a pattern. Since the very beginning of this Congress, Democrats have engaged

in obstruction campaigns for nearly every one of President Trump's nominees.

Their playbook has included maximum procedural obstruction, unfair media attacks, repeated attempts to allege misconduct, and demands for delayed consideration, records, and investigations. This Congress alone, Democrats have sent at least 26 letters to 17 agencies or parties demanding records, delays, or investigations into President Trump's nominees, just in the Judiciary Committee. Like clockwork, just before a hearing or a vote, we get another breathless accusation that one of President Trump's nominees needs to be—you guessed it—investigated. I am afraid that what we have seen recently on the Bove nomination has been more of the same.

My Democratic colleagues have tried to weaponize my respect for whistleblowers and the whole whistleblowing process against me and, in turn, against Mr. Bove. Now I am here to set the record straight.

I take whistleblower complaints very seriously. During both Republican and Democratic administrations, I have spent over four decades defending patriotic whistleblowers. My conduct in defending whistleblowers and running bipartisan investigations stands in stark contrast to the conduct of my Democratic colleagues.

During the first Trump administration, I defended the Ukraine whistleblower's use of the whistleblower process even despite serious concerns about the substance of his complaint. When I was last chairman, I interviewed Donald Trump, Jr., and other Republicans as part of my bipartisan investigation into the alleged Russian collusion, and that was conducted through the Senate Judiciary Committee.

But when it came to the Biden family and the Biden administration, despite serious allegations and overwhelming evidence of misconduct, Democrats made no effort to investigate or conduct similar interviews like I did during a Republican administration. In fact, they worked hard to thwart any attempt at oversight. Now, these weren't fringe claims; they involved potential crimes squarely within the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction.

The Trump administration has said that Mr. Reuveni isn't a whistleblower. Now, I publicly disagreed with the position of the Trump administration. Now, that happens to be the opposite posture that my Democratic colleagues took with the IRS whistleblowers who blew the whistle on the Biden administration. My Democratic colleagues tried to destroy those whistleblowers and use the press to falsely claim that they were not, in fact, whistleblowers.

No one can say that I don't take whistleblower complaints seriously or that I don't investigate allegations in good faith. I have always said my door is open to whistleblowers, and my efforts regarding the Bove nomination show that this is true.

Mr. Reuveni made allegations against Mr. Bove—can you believe this?—just the morning before the nomination hearing. The allegations broke in a New York Times story, and the paper, as you would expect, gleefully ran the unvetted accusations without so much as giving the Justice Department or even the nominee the opportunity to respond.

At our Bove hearing in the Judiciary Committee, the Deputy Attorney General flatly denied the allegations in public statements, and the nominee denied them under oath both in the hearing and in response to written questions from members of the Judiciary Committee.

Then my Democratic colleagues received yet additional records from the whistleblower on July 1 and July 7 but hid them from Republicans. I didn't receive these accusations and records until July 10. Now—can you believe it?—that is the very same day that Mr. Bove's nomination was scheduled for its first markup.

The coordinated media strategy—let me repeat that. That is so important—how the media works in line with what the Democrats want to accomplish on this nomination. The coordinated media strategy involved a New York Times exclusive about the files and a Democratic press release containing a misleading summary of the documents. Why? All designed to smear Mr. Bove. This timeline raises serious concerns, and it is legitimate to raise them as a major problem.

If my Democratic colleagues wanted to investigate allegations, they should have come to this Senator, and we could have vetted the allegations in good faith together. They didn't want this; they wanted to run a one-sided media campaign.

Regardless, I still did my job and investigated. My staff reviewed the disclosure document by document and analyzed the facts. The result: Almost none of the material referenced Mr. Bove at all. More concerning, the Democrats' summary grossly mischaracterized the documents that it purported to summarize. In short, the documents didn't say what the Democrats say the documents said.

My staff also interviewed multiple people who were present for the March 14 meeting described in the whistleblower disclosure. Four separate people other than Mr. Bove who were present at the meeting told us the following: First, there was never any directive to ignore a court order, and secondly, each of them left the meeting with the understanding that the Justice Department would aggressively litigate but would follow court orders.

My staff then spoke to numerous other individuals, including many current and former Justice Department employees who wanted to share information about the Bove nomination. All told, my staff interviewed or spoke with more than a dozen individuals who came forward to discuss the Bove nomination.