

Now, if there was a for-profit or a nonprofit and you were in the process of trying to become more efficient, right, and you were looking at a bunch of people who did a bunch of things and you think, "You know, we need an electronic system for this, or we need a better way to do this; we need a better mousetrap," you don't shut the whole thing down and then figure it out.

I am looking at the Presiding Officer. I am looking at the Senator from Delaware. Both of you have run big operations—private sector, public sector—and you know this is no way to run a railroad. You don't shut something down in order to reform it. You take seriously the proposition that there should be reform. You get aggressive. There should be no sacred cows—all of that.

But what they did was they stormed into the offices of a Federal building, sent everybody home, broke into the secure conference facilities, broke into the SCIFs, locked people out of their emails.

Does that sound like the United States of America? It really, honestly, does not sound like the United States of America to me. These people were not elected. There is a law in place.

And it doesn't matter what you think about this particular Agency. I have got Agencies I don't like. I have got Agencies that I think are spending too much money or too little money. You know what I do about that? I introduce a bill to change it because I believe in the American system of government. And part of what we have to establish here is, Do we believe in the American system of government or has the internet broken our brains to the point where this is just another partisan fight?

They stormed into a Federal office and purged employees. Think about how you would view that if it were some faraway place. Think about how the press would cover that if it were in Africa or Central Asia or South America or Central America. They would characterize it, appropriately, as autocratic behavior.

So this isn't some small, little partisan dispute among a bunch of progressives who are bleeding hearts and worried about people and suffering and all that. This is about literally: Do we uphold the rule of law in the United States?

So many people are in the U.S. Senate who care about this country and fled that kind of authoritarianism: my grandparents, my wife's grandparents. I won't presume anyone else's personal history, but, frankly, most people come to the United States to flee those kinds of behaviors.

And so we are here to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States.

PROJECT 2025

Mr. President, they really are implementing Project 2025. And I have to say, back in the campaign, I was wary about making that accusation that

they are going to implement this book, right. And I was trying to figure out if I could read the whole Project 2025 into the RECORD, and at least one of the—well, I will just say it: ChatGPT told me it would take 119 hours. So I am not going to do that this evening.

But I will tell you that, if you read it, you will understand that they are actually really implementing Project 2025. And Trump was smart enough during the campaign to realize that Democrats had broken through and made it clear that they have a very specific plan. And part of the problem for Democrats was it was always about Trump and his personality, and that wore people down. It was: Tell me what you are going to do for me. Tell me what they are going to do for me or not for me.

So this was an area where Democrats thought: Hey, this is policy. This is actually what is actually going to happen.

And Trump was clever enough to say: Nah, I don't know anything about that. That guy? I just met him—that kind of thing.

But I want you to understand that more than two-thirds of Trump's Executive orders and actions in his first week were inspired by that manifesto put together by The Heritage Foundation. And the reason for that is simple. Many of the authors of Project 2025 now hold or are nominated to hold senior roles in the Trump administration, and that includes OMB Director-nominee Russ Vought, FCC Commissioner Brendan Carr, Senior Counselor Peter Navarro, border czar Tom Homan.

So it is worth examining in some detail this 900-page document that is the basis for the avalanche of chaos and pain and confusion from the Trump administration.

I want to read the opener in Project 2025. I just want you to be clear; this is not me:

History teaches that a President's power to implement an agenda is at its apex during the Administration's opening days. To execute requires a well-conceived, coordinated, unified plan and a trained and committed cadre of personnel to implement it. In recent election cycles, presidential candidates normally began transition planning in the late spring of election year or even after the party's nomination was secured. That is too late. The federal government's complexity and growth advance at a seemingly logarithmic rate every four years. For conservatives to have a fighting chance to take on the Administrative State and reform our federal government, the work must start now. The entirety of this effort is to support the next conservative President.

In the winter of 1980, the fledgling Heritage Foundation handed to President-elect Ronald Reagan the inaugural Mandate for Leadership. This collective work by conservative thought leaders and former government hands—most of whom were not part of Heritage—set out policy prescriptions, agency by agency, for the incoming President. The book literally put the conservative movement and Reagan on the same page, and the revolution that followed might never have been, save for this band of committed and volunteer activists. With this volume, we

have gone back to the future—and then some.

It's not 1980. In 2023, the game has changed. The long march of cultural Marxism—

I am not really sure what that is. Those are my words.

—through our institutions has come to pass. The federal government is a behemoth, weaponized against American citizens and conservative values, with freedom and liberty under siege as never before. The task at hand to reverse this tide and restore our Republic to its original moorings is too great for any one conservative policy shop to spearhead. It requires the collective action of our movement. With the quickening approach of January 2025, we have two years and one chance to get it right.

Project 2025 is more than 50 (and growing) of the nation's leading conservative organizations joining forces to prepare and seize the day. The axiom goes "personnel is policy," and we need a new generation of Americans to answer the call and come to serve. This book is functionally an invitation for you the reader—Mr. Smith, Mrs. Smith, and Ms. Smith—to come to Washington or support those who can. Our goal is to assemble an army of aligned, vetted, trained, and prepared conservatives to go to work on Day One to deconstruct the Administrative State.

Under State Department civil servants:

Since the U.S. Founding, the Department of State has been the American government's designated tool of engagement with foreign governments and peoples throughout the world. Country names, borders, leaders, technology, and people have changed in the more than two centuries since the Founding, but the basics of diplomacy remain the same. Although the Department has also evolved throughout the years, at least in the modern era, there is one significant problem that the next President must address to be successful.

There are scores of fine diplomats who serve the President's agenda, often helping to shape and interpret that agenda.

At the same time, however, in all of the Administrations, there is a tug-of-war between Presidents and bureaucracies—and that resistance is much starker under conservative Presidents, due largely to the fact that large swaths of the State Department's workforce are left-wing and predisposed to disagree with a conservative President's policy agenda and vision.

I just want to stop here, and I want everyone to understand what they are saying, which is: They are targeting a Department of the Federal Government because they have assessed—I don't know if it is true or not, because I don't actually think like that—that it has got like a liberal lean.

And I have got to tell you, I am sure the FBI membership has a conservative lean. My guess is ICE has a conservative lean. I don't know about the Department of the Interior and what their political lean is, and I am just actually confused as to why anybody thinks it is legitimate to try to dismantle a Department of the Federal Government because there is a point of view about the politics of the individual employees.

Now back to the 2025:

It should not and cannot be this way: The American people need and deserve a diplomatic machine fully focused on the national interest as defined through the election of a

President who sets the domestic and international agenda for the nation.

Well, listen, the law as it relates to the State Department is made by Congress, and many smart people have described the Constitution in the area of foreign policy as an invitation to struggle. It was intentionally vague. We were supposed to have a tug and pull. And it is true that the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief and has broad foreign policy authorities. It is not true that any President can ignore a duly enacted Federal law. And that is what is being asked for us to tolerate.

And, look, I was prepared on election night to say: I hate this result. We lost the trifecta. As a party, we have got to do some soul-searching and figure out why we didn't just lose the electoral college, we lost the popular vote.

So I was prepared to do some thinking and say we are in for some conservative outcomes, we are in for some policy outcomes that I am absolutely going to hate.

But what is happening right now is unlawful. Like, I know we are outnumbered 53 to 47 in the Senate and like a 2- or 3-vote margin in the House, and we lost the Presidency. Fair enough. So there will be conservative policy for 2 or 4 years, and I don't like it, but that is—you know, that is the way the ball bounces sometimes politically.

What is happening right now is not the ball bouncing a particular way politically but someone just deciding that they are in charge of the American Government and they don't care what the law says. And I just don't think anybody should be willing to tolerate that.

I want to quote Project 2025 on Medicare because I want everybody to understand: They came for the State Department first because everybody understands that until there is an Ebola outbreak that reaches our shores, until there is international disorder that reaches our borders, until our reputation is damaged, until you see it on your screen—large or small—most people are not actively tracking the foreign aid question.

But I want you to understand that Project 2025—I mean, you heard me read the preamble. It is a really—give them credit; it is an ambitious vision. It is an ambitious document. And so they are also coming after Medicare, Medicaid and Medicaid “operate as runaway entitlements that stifle medical innovation, encourage fraud, and impede cost containment, in addition to which their fiscal future is in peril. Both programs should be managed so that the individuals enrolled are empowered to make decisions for themselves and have quality options with affordable prices driven by competition and innovation. Providers who participate should retain (or have restored) the freedom to practice medicine and take care of their patients according to their patients’ unique needs. . . . The

Affordable Care Act has made insurance more expensive.”

Now, that is just flatly not true. You can hate it, and you can say it is an expansion of government, and you can say that it is an inefficient way to do it, but it is flatly not true that people are paying more in premiums. You might hate the fact that it is a big subsidy for people.

I yield the floor to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. I thank my colleague from Hawaii.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO CATE AVON

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to Cate for her hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize her efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

Cate is a native of Virginia. She is currently a junior at Madeira School in McLean, VA. She has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made her an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of her work is reflected in her great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank Cate for the dedication she has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have her as part of our team. I know she will have continued success with all of her future endeavors. I wish her all my best on her journey.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATIONS

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex,

then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 25-0E. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 24-48 of August 13, 2024.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosure.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-0E

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(C), AECA)

(i) Purchaser: Government of Israel.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 24-08; Date: August 13, 2024; Implementing Agency: Air Force.

Funding Source: Foreign Military Financing.

(iii) Description: On August 13, 2024, Congress was notified by congressional certification transmittal number 24-08 of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of thirty (30) AIM-120C-8 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM); and one (1) AMRAAM guidance section (spare). The following non-MDE items were also included: AMRAAM control sections and containers; Common Munitions Built-In-Test/Reprogramming Equipment (CMBRE); ADU-891/E Adapter Group Computer Test Sets; spare parts, consumables, accessories, repair and return support, classified and unclassified publications, and technical documentation; classified software delivery and support; munitions support and support equipment; test support and support equipment; personnel training and training equipment; warranties; studies and surveys; contractor logistics support services; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost was \$102.5 million. Major Defense Equipment (MDE) constituted \$66 million of this total.

This transmittal notifies the inclusion of the following additional MDE items: one hundred eight (108) AIM-120C-8 AMRAAMs; and two (2) AIM-120C-8 AMRAAM guidance sections. The following non-MDE items will also be included: weapon system support, to include software, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total value of the new items is \$305 million. The estimated MDE value will increase by \$259 million to a revised \$325 million. The estimated non-MDE value will increase by \$46 million to a revised \$82.5 million. The estimated total case value will increase by \$305 million to a revised \$407.5 million.

(iv) Significance: The inclusion of this additional MDE represents an increase in quantity over what was previously notified. The proposed sale will improve Israel's capability to meet current and future threats, strengthen its homeland defense, and serve as a deterrent to regional threats.

(v) Justification: The United States is committed to the security of Israel, and it is