

And of interest to my Democratic colleagues, 65 percent of voters, including 63 percent of Independents, think the Democrats should end the shutdown by accepting a continuing resolution like the clean funding resolution I just described that is in front of us.

So what are my Democrat colleagues doing? Well, after their resounding defeat in the Presidential election last November, you would think they might be paying attention to the strong majority of voters who would like the shutdown to end as well. You would think they might notice that 63 percent of Independents—voters I am sure Democrats would like to capture in the next election—want Democrats to accept a resolution like the clean CR in front of us. But you would be wrong, because Democrats are still deeply in thrall to the far left, and they are taking their marching orders for this shutdown from far-left interest groups. And I mean that literally.

A recent Axios article reported:

Progressive grassroots groups are blasting congressional Democrats on speed dial to “hold the line” in any negotiations to reopen the government.

Now, that followed an Axios report that found:

Senator Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER and his staff are closely coordinating their government shutdown strategy with outside liberal groups. . . . Backing down and helping fund the government, like Schumer did in March, is unacceptable, the groups have told his team.

Backing down and helping fund the government, like Schumer did in March, is unacceptable, the groups have told his team.

And so the liberal groups say “jump,” and Democrat leaders say, “How high?”

Forget the robust majority of Independents that want the Democrats to end this shutdown.

You know, back in the day—and by “back in the day” I mean as recently as 6 months ago—the Democrat leader was a pretty robust opponent of government shutdowns. Yes, he was an opponent—so much so that even though he didn’t like the continuing resolution we passed in the spring, he voted for it anyway because, in his words, “a government shutdown would be far worse.”

But then progressive groups got big-time mad, and now the Democrat leader is leading the charge to keep the government shut down—indefinitely, apparently—and all those Federal workers and hard-working Americans he was so worried about before seem to have slipped his mind.

In fact, Democrats have barely reacted to the fact that Federal workers are going to start missing pay.

When we realized we were going to need a continuing resolution to allow us more time to complete the fiscal year 2026 appropriations bills, Republicans wanted to do everything we could to ensure that there was no government shutdown, which is why we put forward a clean continuing resolution with no Republican policies or partisan policy riders.

We knew a shutdown would be costly and disruptive for hard-working Americans, and we were determined to ensure the Democrats had no reason—no reason—to oppose our CR. But Democrats weren’t deterred by the fact that there was nothing for them to object to in our bill, and they decided to oppose it anyway.

Now, Democrats will get another chance this week to vote to keep the government open. And I hope the Democrat leader and Democrat Senators can summon up some of that concern they used to have about shutdowns and vote to reopen the government.

At the very least, if the Democrat leader is too worried about his polling to vote to reopen himself, he could allow Democrat Senators who do care about the functioning of our government to join Republicans to reopen.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2983

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2983) to reauthorize the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

The majority whip.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO “MILES CITY FIELD OFFICE RECORD OF DECISION AND APPROVED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN AMENDMENT”

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, following up with what the majority leader just said, I have here the Washington Post from this morning, and they have an editorial. And what they have in bold print says:

Democratic leaders play a dangerous game. That is what the Democrats are doing.

We just heard the majority leader talk about what we are trying to do, what we are facing, how CHUCK SCHUMER is being held hostage by the liberal groups that set up the war room with him. And what we see is a dangerous game being played and threats to the American people.

This goes on to say:

There is a clean funding bill on the table.

This is the Washington Post, this morning.

There is a clean funding bill on the table. Only a handful of Senate Democrats need to vote for it.

The minority leader is leading the Democratic Party into a box canyon. You can’t get out, and it is a dangerous game. And it is not just dangerous for them; it is dangerous for the American people. That is where the danger lies.

So I come to the floor because the American people are facing an immediate crisis, and they know why. Anybody watching knows why. It is because Senate Democrats have now voted five times against a clean, bipartisan continuing resolution that would open the government today.

This is day 8 of the Schumer shutdown—day 8. The country is held hostage by the Democrats, and they are playing a dangerous game. This isn’t a game, but that is what the Democrats have turned it into.

So the question before us is simple: What have the Democrats accomplished during this dangerous game that they are playing? On October 10, on Friday, in 2 days, Border Patrol agents and other Federal workers will receive only half a paycheck. That is the result of the Democrats’ dangerous game. It will be their last paycheck until the Schumer shutdown ends and Democrats vote to reopen the government. They could do it today.

The House of Representatives passed a clean continuing resolution at current funding levels. Democrats voted 13 times under Joe Biden for a continuing resolution to keep the government funded.

A continuing resolution funds our military, pays for law enforcement, continues food assistance for moms and young children, and keeps small business loans flowing.

Thirteen times they voted for this. Now they reject it because they want to please their radical, extreme base—the base that has put up a war room that CHUCK SCHUMER has bowed down to. That is what we just heard from the majority leader—that they are the ones calling the shots—and that is why we find ourselves in this situation.

Democrats are demanding radical, new policies before they allow the government to reopen. I have seen their demand letter—\$1.5 trillion in new expenses, as the majority leader just outlined here on the floor. Their ransom note is filled with liberal policies. I look at it—it is stitched together like Frankenstein’s monster: \$1.5 trillion in reckless new spending; free healthcare for noncitizens; free Medicaid for working-age, able-bodied adults who refuse to work. There are over 5 million of these individuals in the United States, and yet they refuse to work. And the Democrats want them all to get free Medicaid.

Fifty billion dollars the Democrats want to cut from vulnerable rural hospitals, hospitals in rural communities. Do the Democrats not care at all about those communities even though there are rural communities in their States?

They are beholden to the big cities and the mayors, the sanctuary cities that control the Democratic Party.

That is what we are dealing with here. That is why the Washington Post calls what the Democrats are doing—as I pick it up again, Mr. President—“a dangerous game.” They are holding the American people hostage to extract far-left wing concessions. They are telling our servicemembers their paychecks are negotiable. They are telling small businesses their dreams are collateral damage in a partisan fight. They are telling mothers and young children that WIC benefits are leverage for the far-left demands of healthcare for noncitizens.

Republicans remain committed to ensuring families receive the support they deserve. The Democrats have chosen repeatedly to keep the government closed for political purposes only.

American families are feeling the pain nationwide.

In Georgia, more than 100,000 Federal employees are wondering where they will find the money to pay their bills and buy their groceries.

In Arizona, 344,000 children enrolled in SNAP face uncertainty. The benefits are running out.

Time is of the essence. Shutdown Democrats are telling these families their problems aren't urgent. Well, they are urgent to those families, and the Democrats don't seem to care.

In New York, almost half a million individuals who rely on WIC will lose access at the end of this week. It is already Wednesday. We are talking about pregnant women. We are talking about new mothers. We are talking about young children. They depend on this program.

In Illinois, every week the shutdown continues, it costs the State's economy over \$500 million. That is jobs lost, paychecks missed, opportunities evaporated.

In Michigan, small businesses face delays of \$92 million in loans because the Small Business Administration is frozen due to the shutdown. These businesses are the backbones of our communities and our economy. They should be able to make payroll, keep their doors open—not as the Democrats continue to play what has been termed “a dangerous game.”

In Nevada, for each month the shutdown continues, consumer spending from lost wages will fall by over \$200 million. It is money that won't flow into local businesses, won't pay rent, won't put food on the table.

In New Jersey, telehealth programs are on hold. I am a doctor. Without these programs, patients could be put at greater risk.

In New Hampshire, workers maintaining our nuclear attack submarines—they face furloughs and unpaid work.

Look, this goes beyond missing a paycheck; this is about national security. The Schumer shutdown—the dangerous game that he is playing—puts America's safety at risk.

At airports nationwide, we are already seeing the direct effects of the shutdown. Flights are being delayed. Security lines are growing longer.

Even the head of the Teamsters union, Sean O'Brien, says that Democrats' political theater is something he can see right through.

He said:

A shutdown will hurt working people. Period. American workers are not bargaining chips.

That is the leader of the Teamsters union, Mr. President.

He goes on to say:

Senators should stop screwing around and pass the House-passed clean, short term funding bill.

That is where we are today. He is right. But regrettably, Senate Democrats are treating the American people as bargaining chips, as hostages, and that is why they sent the list of demands as ransom.

Democrats have now voted five times against opening the government, five times against supporting our military, five times against paying law enforcement officers, five times against food assistance for women and infants and children, five times against the small business loans that help Main Street. Five times, Democrats have looked at the mounting damage of the Schumer shutdown and shrugged their shoulders. That is the situation we have today.

The American people overwhelmingly say Democrats should pass a clean continuing resolution and end the shutdown immediately.

There is a clean, bipartisan resolution before the Senate ready for a vote right now. It reopens the government today. It would protect the paychecks and the programs the American people depend upon. It would end the uncertainty that is gripping millions of American families.

The question is not whether the Democrats can end the shutdown; it is, Will they have the integrity to do it or will they continue to play this dangerous game with our Nation and with our families?

NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, on a separate matter, before Senate Democrats shut down the Federal Government, they shut down the very Senate floor on which I stand, and they did it by freezing the confirmation process.

For months, their blockade created a growing backlog of qualified nominees, so many of whom have come out of committees with bipartisan votes; nominees for positions that, during prior administrations, sailed through the Senate by unanimous consent or by voice vote—but not with this Democrat minority, oh, no.

So in September, Senate Republicans broke the blockade, and now the blockade is being cleared. At the peak of the Democrat obstruction, more than 150 well-qualified nominees, approved by Senate committees, were waiting for a vote on the Senate floor. Yesterday, we confirmed 107 of those nominees, and

we did it in a group. This is one of the largest confirmations in the history of the United States. Now there are only 26 nominees on the Executive Calendar.

Our committees are hard at work to approve more nominees, and we are going to confirm them in short order.

As of this morning, President Trump has had 298 nominees confirmed in his second term. By comparison, at this point, Joe Biden had confirmed only 201 at this point in his first and only term. President Trump had confirmed only 183 nominees at the same time in his first term. So the Senate's constitutional duty of advice and consent is now back.

President Trump now has his team confirmed and ready to be sworn in. From Assistant Secretaries, to Ambassadors, to U.S. attorneys, the Federal Government is in a better position today to keep our Nation safe and secure and prosperous.

Senate Republicans are going to continue to work to get America back on track no matter what obstacles the Democrats continue to throw in our path.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I came to the floor a few minutes after Senator THUNE, the Republican leader, spoke, and I missed part of his statement, but I think I heard most of it. I listened carefully to the statement by the Senator from Wyoming.

Let me say at the outset that I consider them both to be friends. We disagree on many things politically, but over the years, I have come to work with both of them and look forward to doing that again someday.

I was disappointed in both of their statements because of what was not said. How can you talk about the government shutdown without ever mentioning healthcare costs to American families? How can you do that? I mean, it is a situation where we understand, I hope, that the Democrats are not in this position for any reason other than to stop the dramatic increase in healthcare premiums that American families will face unless we do something and do it now.

In State after State, the notices are going out that the cost of health insurance for working families in America is going to go up dramatically—in some cases, more than 100 percent. That is going to be hurtful to many. They will have to look for different health insurance plans that they can afford, which means more money out of pocket, or they are going to drop their health insurance coverage altogether.

How can the Republican leader stand before us and even refuse to acknowledge that that is the issue that drives this government shutdown?

The Republicans are insisting on their approach to the budget because they don't want to see American families protected when it comes to these

health insurance increases. And the increases are already being announced. Ten States so far have announced them.

October 27 is the magic date, if you will, for the announcement in my State of Illinois. I know what is going to happen. I am going to hear from hundreds, if not thousands, of families across my State that increasing the cost for families is creating a hardship they never anticipated.

We believe on the Democratic side that this is the time to act, now, to move together to stop these increases from taking place because these increases were part of the big beautiful Republican budget—the Trump budget, voted for by every Republican Senator and no Democratic Senators; the Trump budget, which, of course, he signed into law. That is what is leading to these increases, because the Affordable Care Act insurance plans are no longer going to enjoy a subsidy, a tax credit, to help families pay the premiums, and that is why the cost is going to go up so dramatically.

We can change it. We can do it, but we have to do it quickly. We ought to move on it this week.

I wish the House of Representatives were in session. They haven't shown up for 2 weeks. Speaker JOHNSON happens to believe that being AWOL is the right thing for his Republican Members. I don't think it is the right thing for America.

Democrats and Republicans should be in this Capitol negotiating, sitting at a table together, and the first item on the agenda has to be healthcare costs for American families.

All this talk about a dangerous game and radical-left policies and management—it is not a radical-left idea that a working family ought to have affordable health insurance; it is basic in America.

As flawed as our health system is in this country and as great as it is in many respects, if people cannot afford to have coverage for their family, then hardship follows.

That is the real reason.

They say: Well, what about the cost? Remember, this is an administration that wants to give \$20 billion to Argentina. Twenty billion dollars this President is planning to give. I am worried more about 20 million Americans who will lose their health insurance if we don't do something and do it quickly.

The American people get it. This issue has gone from the beltway to the backyards of America. People know that this is coming, and they are worried about it, and they should be. They want us to do something, and they want it done now.

We are making the fight on this continuing resolution because it is timely, and we need bipartisan support to pass it. So let's do something positive in a bipartisan way, and dealing with the cost of health insurance is my approach that I would suggest.

ILLINOIS

Mr. President, let me take this to another issue that is near and dear to my heart, and that is what is happening in my home State of Illinois. We all know the popular quote:

When someone shows you who they are, believe them the first time.

Or, in President Trump's case, if a person shows you who they are a million times over, believe them.

President Trump has shown us his unlawful and inhumane priorities over and over again, city after city. He continues to deploy militarized immigration agents and National Guard troops to more American cities purely for political theater. He wants America to talk about the Texas National Guard in Illinois, not about healthcare costs facing American families.

But it is not going to work.

Unfortunately, the men and women of the Texas National Guard who are in the State of Illinois, as of yesterday, have been sent off on a political assignment, political theater. Instead of working to find a bipartisan way to reopen the government, lower the cost of healthcare, President Trump is focused on scoring points against his perceived enemies.

Just yesterday, 200 or 300 members of the Texas National Guard joined Federal law enforcement officers in Chicago, along with President Trump's loyal FBI Director Kash Patel. The truth is that the arrival of the Texas National Guard and the FBI Director will not make Chicago safer; it will only escalate the unnecessary and dangerous situation this President himself has created.

I still can't get the image out of my mind from 2 weeks ago, when the ICE officials, in full combat gear, carrying long rifles, were marching down Michigan Avenue. It was a hateful effort that was used to provoke people into strong emotional feelings. This administration's unlawful use of military resources to police American cities makes our country less safe, and it is a mistake that will be remembered in the history books.

I pray that the court system will respond accordingly as they did in the case of Oregon and Illinois when the hearing tomorrow is brought before the Federal judge. Deploying the Texas National Guard without the consent of Illinois elected officials is, in my estimation, unnecessary and unlawful.

The Posse Comitatus Act expressly forbids the use of our Nation's military for civilian law enforcement unless expressly authorized by statute or the Constitution.

National Guard personnel do not deserve to be used by the President's political pawns. Let me say and make it clear: As much as I regret the decision by the Texas Governor to send his National Guard troops into Illinois and as much as I want them to leave immediately, I do not make those statements at the expense of the individuals who are in the Guard and volunteered

to serve their State and Nation. The same thing is true with the federalized Illinois National Guard. They are doing what they were ordered to do according to the military standards.

But the bottom line is, we all know they are not fighting crime. If the Trump administration truly wants to help Chicago—and I don't believe they do—and Illinois, it won't defy our elected leaders; it will work with us. It will restore millions of dollars the Trump administration suspended in crime prevention and public safety grants. Instead, this administration has chosen to use America's military to create chaos and sow fear in our cities.

We all agree on the importance of reducing crime and making our communities safer. The President claims his aggressive immigration raids and threats to deploy troops are to help get violent criminals off the streets.

I have come to the floor 2 straight days, and this is the third, to condemn what happened last week in the city of Chicago on Tuesday. A South Shore apartment building was raided in the middle of the night. Doors were crashed down, families were rousted out of their bedrooms, many of them brought out to the street and questioned as to whether they were in America legally. Some were American citizens. We don't know how many. We certainly don't know if there were any criminals found as a result of that. No report.

But we do know this: What happened on that street on that night was not the way America does business and shouldn't be. It was to terrorize these families, with no warrant for their arrest and no suspicion that they committed crimes, simply because they looked Hispanic and maybe looked like foreigners—I am not sure. This action was taken against them.

These attacks are part of Stephen Miller's personal agenda for mass deportation at any cost. They pulled FBI, DEA, and ATF agents from their assignments, important assignments, to stop narcotics and other things to carry out the President's immigration agenda. They stopped working on fighting crimes like terrorism, gun violence, human trafficking, and drug smuggling to land a helicopter near a building in Chicago and to bring 30 families out into the street in the middle of the night.

I have fought for humane reforms to our immigration system and evidence-based ways to reduce crimes in our cities. If the President is serious about fixing our immigration system or lowering crime in our communities, I will join in on that effort. But sending in militarized Federal immigration agents and National Guard troops to our communities is not the way to do it. These actions have accomplished what I believe is the President's true intention: sowing fear in the hearts of our communities, especially our immigrant communities, and consolidating the President's power in Washington.

The actions taken by this administration undermine the very fabric of America, a nation that was founded on the belief that all people should be free from tyranny. I remember a time when every Member of Congress would have risen in outrage if an administration attempted to use the military unlawfully against cities and communities and States that they represent. Unfortunately, this time has passed. There is nothing but silence from the other side of the aisle. Congressional Republicans are content to stand aside in abject servility to this President as he tramples the Constitution.

But Americans should not stay silent. People across Illinois are peacefully making their voices heard and letting this administration know the attacks on our city will not go unchallenged.

As a Senator from Illinois, I will do everything in my power to hold this administration accountable for their unlawful actions. They may think this is a diversion of attention from the basic issue of controlling healthcare costs and helping working American families afford their health insurance. I think it is much more. It is a threat to our Republic and our Constitution, and I hope that others will join me in condemning this activity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for 5 minutes, Senator HEINRICH be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes, and Senator DAINES be permitted to speak for 5 minutes prior to the scheduled votes.

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given permission to use a prop.

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, it is day 8 of the government shutdown, but it is day 19 of the House being on vacation.

How is it possible that the party in charge of the government is sitting at home while the government is shut down?

Well, let's take a look. This is the House schedule. These yellow blocks are workdays. It is already a pretty nice schedule. Most people, if they are fortunate, get either 7 days or 10 days of vacation. Some people get less; some people get more. But nobody gets this amount of time off. We call that a district work period or a home work period. And that is true, we need to be home to interact with our constituents. But that is what August is for.

Here is what happened. They left early on the 25th, specifically, to avoid a vote on the Epstein files. Then they had this week off, this week off, this week off, this week off, this day off; come back, one, two, three, long week-end; one, two, three, four, long week-

end; one, two, three, four, long week-end; another break; another break; another break. And now they are taking another break.

Get back to work.

Get back to work.

We are facing a healthcare crisis, and we didn't pull this out of some Democratic strategist's lab. The Presiding Officer knows this in his home State. Prices are about to spike disproportionately among people who voted for Donald Trump, disproportionately in rural communities, disproportionately among farmers. And they are not going to spike a little. This is not like a normally 4-percent increase is now 7 percent.

For 22 million Americans, the price of healthcare is about to go up 114 percent—114 percent. So you can find some people who are only paying like a 40-percent or 50-percent increase. You still can't afford that. Most people can't afford a 40-percent or 50-percent increase in the cost of almost anything, but healthcare is a big chunk of the cost of living.

So here we are as Democrats saying: Help us help you, Republicans. You created this mess that is causing your signature legislative achievement to be a drag on your electoral chances. And if we were a little bit more cynical, we would just let you stew in it.

But we want those 22 million people to have relief. So we are simply saying, we can open the government tomorrow morning if Donald John Trump realizes he is hurting his own people.

ILLINOIS

Mr. President, I want to follow up on what the Democrat whip was talking about in the city of Chicago in the State of Illinois.

We all swore an oath to the Constitution. I am honestly scared. I used to do this sort of schtick on Twitter. I would say the thing Donald Trump said on Twitter is this, and then I would say he is trying to take your healthcare away. My point was that is a distraction from the main issue, which is that he was going to try to take your healthcare away.

That is not true anymore. He is going through with these authoritarian actions. The last time he posted that one of his political enemies should be jailed, it was James Comey, and then James Comey was indicted. This morning, he pled not guilty. His trial is in January.

So, this morning, Donald John Trump, with the assistance of the Texas Governor, who is endlessly servile to him, is mobilizing, over the objection of the Illinois Governor, 200 or 300 troops to go into Chicago to do nobody knows really what other than to terrorize people.

They are belaying off a helicopter into an apartment building in urban Chicago?

Give me a break.

And lest you think this is theater, this morning, Donald Trump is in one of his moods and he says: Governor

Pritzker should go to jail. Are we to assume he is kidding this time? Are you sure he is kidding this time? "Oh, he is just trolling." Last time, 3 weeks ago, he clearly wasn't trolling. The Attorney General went through with what he asked.

So I am asking my Republican colleagues who swore an oath to the Constitution and love this country just like I do to say publicly or privately—I don't care—enough is enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, there is a national monument in New Mexico that is extremely important to me and our community. It is called the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument. It has rocky spires that jut into the sky and preside over bustling communities in southern New Mexico.

It is also home to nearly 250 archaeological sites, including some of the earliest Native American heritage sites in North America, and places like Shelter Cave, Conkling Cavern, and Aden Lava Flow Wilderness.

This January, the Bureau of Land Management issued its most recent monument management plan for Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks. It sets out in this plan how the land will be used over the coming decades, and it came after years—years—of engagement with public land users. From comment periods to public meetings to feedback sessions, input from public land users is the heart of how we administer our public lands across the country. In the end, land use plans like this one take time and are the result of hundreds, even thousands, of people's work—work that deserves respect.

And that is why I am here. Beginning this week, the Senate is voting on three resolutions of disapproval on resource management plans prepared by the Bureau of Land Management.

Now, resource management plans are a pretty simple idea. Every decade or two, public land managers look at a region as a whole and figure out how to balance all the competing different uses of public land across that landscape. They figure out where recreation should be prioritized and where prime game habitats should be protected. They figure out what lands should be available for uses like grazing or oil and gas production. They identify important cultural sites and historic resources that deserve our protection. They also determine which land use requirements can be eased for things like pipelines or transmission lines. They do all of this with the input of local communities, recreation businesses, public land users, Tribal governments, energy developers, and more.

But I am here now because Republicans want to rescind these land use plans through the Congressional Review Act. By doing that, they brush away all of the local voices and community input that went into making these plans.

Imagine telling Tribal communities that their opinion no longer matters on their ancestral lands, telling hunters that their opinion no longer matters on the lands they use to fill their families' freezers, telling hikers that their opinion no longer matters on the routes that they know like the back of their hand, telling local communities that the way their land is used is no longer of importance—telling all of us that our voices do not matter when it comes to the very lands that are our American birthright.

And here is the thing: They are doing it across the board—on every resource management plan since 1996—without even admitting it. So let me walk you through what they are hoping that you won't notice.

First, it is important to understand that resource management plans affect nearly every use on public land, from bird watching to coal mining. These plans get a whole rewrite every few decades, but, in between, smaller amendments are made to address specific places and specific uses that need to be updated. These amendments have been the normal way for new administrations to change plans that they have disagreed with, until today.

Now, instead of using the usual amendment process, which involves all of those same stakeholders, Congress is voting to outright overturn and repeal these plans. Until today, Congress had never ever used a congressional resolution of disapproval to change or overturn a land use plan. That is because no administration has ever considered these land use plans to be "rules" under Federal statute. Let me say that again. No administration—none—since the Congressional Review Act was passed in 1996 has ever treated land use plans as rules.

So here is what that means legally: No land use plan has been submitted to Congress, a legal requirement for rules. It has never happened. Because the Congressional Review Act prohibits rules from going into effect until 60 days after they are submitted to Congress—and no administration has ever submitted one—then every land use plan after 1996 never legally went into effect. And if they never went into effect, then all of the leases and permits and rights-of-way that flow from those plans may not be legally valid. That means that every grazing permit, every energy right-of-way, recreation permit, outfitter guide permit, timber sale, and even oil and gas leases issued under a plan finalized after 1996 could be litigated—every single one.

That is bad and not just because it is unprecedented but because the actual impacts on real Americans could be devastating.

For the country, it means potential chaos and uncertainty about what areas are protected on public lands. One of the resolutions under consideration this week is for a land use plan in Alaska. A vote for that resolution would mean that the Ambler industrial

corridor will be built. This is a 211-mile, private access road that would destroy some of Alaska's wildest habitat and waterways to produce minerals—all for a foreign company.

As someone from American Hunters and Anglers said, in using slightly more colorful language that I will leave out, this move obliterates "years of public input from hunters and anglers," and uses taxpayer dollars to prop up—I will say it again—a foreign-owned mining company.

The headline describing this road in "Outdoor Life" magazine reads:

The Ambler Road Project Would Jeopardize One of the Last Great Wilderness Hunts in America.

Now, I have been fortunate enough to hunt caribou in Alaska, and I have to say I doubt that my grandchildren will ever have that opportunity.

What is even more concerning to me is the impact the Ambler industrial corridor will have on subsistence hunting and fishing. This private industrial mining corridor will carve its way, in addition, through Gates of the Arctic National Park. You heard me right. We are sacrificing one of our most spectacular national parks to enrich a foreign mining company.

I have to think that Teddy Roosevelt is rolling over in his grave.

The damage will be irreparable to the landscape, to our American birthright in these public lands, and to one of the largest caribou herds in Alaska and the communities that depend on that herd.

Imagine sweeping away years and years of input and conversations not just about the public lands on one landscape but about public lands across this country, all because you—what?—found a quicker, easier way, one where you didn't have to listen to anyone? one where some Senators in Washington, DC, get to override and replace the opinions of every single American who contributed to those plans? That is nuts.

Even if you don't care about how land is used by hunters or hikers or Tribes or cattle growers or energy producers—if all you care about is how our lands are used to produce fossil fuels—then look no further than my State. Look at the Bureau of Land Management leases that have been issued in the Permian Basin. Know that, when you vote for these resolutions, when you turn these resource management plans into so-called rules, you call into question those leases—all of them. Know that what you are choosing may be easier, but it is wrong, and it is destabilizing.

I would urge my colleagues to vote no on all of these resolutions of disapproval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, in the final days of President Biden's administration, he quickly and quietly issued a rule that had massive impacts on Montana's economy. This happened after the election. Biden's BLM issued

an amendment to the Miles City Resource Management Plan that prohibited all new coal development in Eastern Montana. It shuts it down. This means that the BLM prohibited all new coal leasing in the Powder River Basin. By the way, that is the home of the largest coal reserves in the United States.

They did this despite strong opposition from local counties in Montana and local elected officials—in fact, the entire Montana congressional delegation and the Governor of Montana himself, Greg Gianforte. In fact, Governor Gianforte specifically requested that the BLM Director withdraw that proposed amendment during the BLM's official "Governor's consistency review," and Biden's BLM ignored him. When the Governor submitted an official appeal to Biden's BLM Director, our Governor was rebuffed.

This lack of respect for Montana's local and statewide elected officials cannot be ignored and will not be ignored, and it is going to get changed and reversed today with the passage of this CRA.

Let's be clear as to what this resource management plan amendment is and what we are doing today with this Congressional Review Act.

The RMPA is an attack on Montana jobs. It is an attack on Montana communities. It is an attack on Montana's energy production. It is an attack on Montana's economy. What today's resolution does is it rolls back officially Biden's war on Montana coal, and it does not affect the underlying resource management plan.

What we are doing today is we are disapproving Biden's ill-conceived amendment and nothing else. This CRA does not prohibit the BLM from issuing a new amendment. This CRA simply prohibits a new administration from issuing a substantially similar coal amendment. In this case, that means they can't permanently prohibit any new coal development.

Today, you may hear from the other side of the aisle that the sky is falling. That is absolutely not true. What we are doing today is righting a wrong—something the Biden administration slipped in after the election.

We are grateful that we were paying attention, and we are going to right this wrong—a midnight Biden rule that was issued without the support from the State of Montana. Talk about Federal bureaucratic overreach.

Taking this action this day, today, will lead to more Montana jobs, more Montana energy, and, by the way, more Montana tax revenue to support K-through-12 education and stronger communities in eastern Montana.

I urge my colleagues to, again, like we did last night with the procedural vote, support, with this final vote, Montana jobs, Montana communities, and to vote yes on its passage.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 104

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read

the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 549 Leg.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 104) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). The Democratic leader.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS AND OTHER MATTERS ACT, 2026

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 2882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

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 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 167, S. 2882, a bill making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Gary C. Peters, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Murphy, Tim Kaine, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard Blumenthal, Alex Padilla, Tammy Duckworth, Michael F. Bennet, Jack Reed, Brian Schatz, Mazie Hirono, Margaret Wood Hassan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2882, a bill making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 550 Leg.]

YEAS—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
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—52

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

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, and the nays are 52.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, upon reconsideration, the motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2026

Mr. MARSHALL. I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 5371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote to proceed to H.R. 5371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371, a bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Bernie Moreno, Marsha Blackburn, Mike Rounds, Eric Schmitt, Tommy Tuberville, Todd Young, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, Rick Scott of Florida, Jim Justice, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Cindy Hyde-Smith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 5371, a bill making continuing appropriations and extensions for fiscal year 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

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 Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows: