

would be paid through this next pay period—the Coast Guard as well—which is critically, critically important.

But I think our job, our responsibility, is to make sure that they don't have to worry about that; that when they are flying a rescue mission, they are not thinking about whether or not their spouse at home is concerned about whether they are buying groceries or paying the rent. So we have work to do here.

But to those back home in Alaska who are working so closely on the ground to care for those who are truly afraid right now, truly afraid about their future, know that we are all working with you, and our hearts are with you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2983

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about something that threatens nearly every American: cyber attacks.

I call on my colleagues to pass the Protecting America from Cyber Threats Act—a no-brainer step to defend our citizens from cyber threats.

This is a very wonky law, but it has a very, very simple objective: to encourage companies, private sector companies, to report hacks to the government so that together we can prevent it from happening again. This bill extends protections defined back in 2015 that encouraged companies to report cyber attacks to the Federal Government. It minimizes the risks companies once faced in reporting these hacks, and in doing so, it makes us all safer.

Extending these protections has never been more important. Today, cyber attacks are top of mind for Americans across the country and certainly across the political spectrum.

Two months ago, I traveled to Benton Harbor, MI, and Troy, MI—two communities—to talk about national security threats and what is keeping Michiganders up at night. Nearly every single person, regardless of profession or party, had a story about cyber crime: identity theft, robocalls, and scams robbing people of their life savings; hacks on hospitals for patient data; and shutdown access to electronic records.

As a former CIA officer and Pentagon official, I have responded to countless threats to American security, but never before have we seen American citizens so exposed to security threats here at home. In the age of cyber warfare, everyday Americans are quite literally on the frontlines. And Americans know the stakes. That is why they are scared. One Michigander said to me: Warfare is still on the ground—still things like rockets—but it has also changed; cyber warfare can be just as brutal.

But more than scared, Michiganders are frustrated. They don't believe that their government is taking the threat

of cyber crime seriously, and if we don't renew this law, we will prove them right.

On October 1, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 expired—this last October 1. That means that companies are no longer incentivized to report hacks to the Federal Government.

When a company self-reports a cyber attack, there is no longer a law to prevent the Justice Department from using that admission against them, and companies once again are incentivized to hide hacks from the government, which makes us all less safe.

Companies have to see the government as an ally, not as a threat, and our safety depends on it because, unlike other threats like tanks and nukes and subs, the weapons used in cyber crimes are not created, owned, and controlled by a government; they are from the private sector. So we have to work together to prevent these attacks.

This law has already been consequential. The Department of Homeland Security used it to respond to China's relentless Salt Typhoon campaign, which targeted every single American's unencrypted phone calls and text messages.

As long as the law remains expired, America is less safe. As long as we refuse to renew it, we are moving backwards in keeping the country secure.

Today, very simply, I am calling on my colleagues to renew these protections for another 10 years—they are renewed for 10 years at a time—so we can restore our cyber security defenses and better protect our Nation. There is no good reason not to renew it. Businesses support it. The Trump administration supports it. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle support it.

I know there is a proposal out there to extend the law—instead of 10 years—for just 5 weeks, in the House's version of the temporary funding bill, but it is such a pivotal time for something that is actually a bipartisan consensus idea, half measures shouldn't do. We have known that this was going to expire for 10 years. Americans deserve to have us not kick the can down the road for another 5 weeks. There is too much at stake, particularly given the losses among the American public.

Some things are bigger than party politics, and national security should always be one of them. This law is essential to keeping the country safe, to keeping Americans safe, so I urge my colleagues to renew it.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 182, S. 2983; that the Peters substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, further, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to cloture on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 136, H.R. 4016.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today the Senate has the opportunity to begin consideration of an appropriations bill that is vital to our national defense and to the well-being of the brave men and women who serve in our Armed Forces.

The fiscal year 2026 Defense appropriations bill would provide U.S. military services with the funding needed to deter China and Russia, to support our servicemembers and their families, and to strengthen the defense industrial base.

The bill would remove the uncertainty that our American troops face about when they will be paid because of the needless and reckless government shutdown that Leader SCHUMER has directed.

I would point out that passing a continuing resolution, as we have tried to do 10 times now, would also remove the cloud of uncertainty hanging over military paychecks.

In July, as the Presiding Officer is well aware, the Appropriations Committee advanced the Senate version of the Defense appropriations bill by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 26 to 3.

The Senate version addresses major funding gaps across the board. It would invest in shipbuilding, including providing a critical downpayment toward an additional DDG 51, the workhorse of the U.S. service fleet, along with investments in additional Columbia- and Virginia-class submarines.

It would expand critical munitions production, including air and missile defense interceptors, long-range missiles, and next-generation hypersonic weapons developed by our most innovative firms.

It would fund drone and counterdrone technologies, which are increasingly changing the nature of the battlefield, as we have seen in both Ukraine and Israel. And it would sustain security cooperation with close allies and partners whose growing defense capabilities are force multipliers for the United States and contribute to the deterrence of shared adversaries.

Finally, this bill would invest in our most precious asset: the courageous,

dedicated, patriotic men and women of our Armed Forces. It shows our continuing commitment to their readiness, well-being, and mission success.

Let me commend the leadership—the outstanding leadership—of subcommittee chairman MITCH MCCONNELL and ranking member CHRIS COONS for their hard work on this bill. I also want to thank majority leader JOHN THUNE for his commitment to bringing fiscal year 2026 appropriations bills to the Senate floor.

This is such a welcomed change compared to last year when then-majority leader Senator SCHUMER refused to bring a single one of the 12 annual appropriations bills to the Senate floor for consideration.

I want to note for my colleagues that the Senate version of the Defense bill was put together with input from 94 of our Senate colleagues who submitted more than 5,800 requests to the committee for our careful consideration.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to allow us to proceed to the consideration of the fiscal year 2026 Defense funding bill. We want this to be an open process, with an opportunity to add additional bipartisan bills that address vital domestic priorities, including biomedical and scientific research and infrastructure, and we want Members to have a voice in the funding decisions that affect all of our States and constituents back home. That is the approach that we took in committee. That is the approach that we want to take on the Senate 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. 136, H.R. 4016, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Jon Husted, Roger F. Wicker, Joni Ernst, Susan M. Collins, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Crapo, Tim Sheehy, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Tommy Tuberville, Marsha Blackburn, Tom Cotton, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman.

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. 4016, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 44, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 575 Ex.)

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—6

Budd	Cornyn	Tillis
Cassidy	Duckworth	Tuberville

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 44. Three-fifths of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Democrat party is the party that will not take yes for an answer. We offer Democrats a clean, nonpartisan CR, no Republican policies for them to swallow, nothing for them to object to; they said no. We offer to accommodate their healthcare demands by guaranteeing them a vote on their proposal if they vote to reopen the government; the answer is no.

OK. Fine. So we thought if they don't want to fund the government via con-

tinuing resolution, we will give them the chance to fund the government a different way, by attempting to move forward with regular-order appropriations bills. And, once again, the answer was no.

Democrats just voted to block the fiscal year 2026 Defense appropriations bill, a bill, I would add, that passed the Senate Appropriations Committee by a robust bipartisan margin—26 to 3 I think it was.

That is right. After voting last week for an authorization bill to increase troop pay, Democrats just voted against the bill that would actually pay the troops.

We have to ask the question. Why?

Because to quote a recent news story—this is a direct quote—“voting to proceed with the defense bill relinquishes some of the party's leverage.” Relinquishes some of the party's leverage? I mean, who really cares, right, if the troops are paid as long as the Democrats are able to get what they want.

Now, I offered up—and I had conversations with Democrats here on the floor—that if we could get on the Defense appropriations bill, the interest they have in adding other bills I would certainly accommodate. And I suggested that that was the business model that we adopted when we passed the first three-bill package. We got on the MILCON-VA appropriations bill, and then we worked collectively, both sides, to try and clear, adding the Agriculture appropriations bill, the leg branch appropriations bill, and we tried to add the CJS appropriations bill—which was objected to by one Member on the Democrat side—but that is how we fashioned getting these appropriations bills on the floor and getting them voted on.

Now, if anything should be clear by now—if anything should be clear by now—it is that I am interested in doing a normal appropriations process, unlike what happened when they had the majority, which was the Appropriations Committee will report bills out—11 of the 12 last year. Not a single one was brought to the floor of the Senate.

We have done three bills. We are trying to go to conference on them. They are blocking that.

So now we bring up the Defense appropriations bill, something that should get 80 votes on the floor of the Senate, that I said came out of the committee 26 to 3, and they are blocking it.

Now, there is a path forward here to do appropriations: Get on the bill. Then we will try to add other appropriations bills as we work both sides to clear up objections, concerns that people have.

The fact of the matter is, they didn't have to block us even moving to the bill because there are multiple opportunities—60-vote threshold opportunities—for them to block it later on if they don't like what happens.

This is politics. If anything was needed to demonstrate just how fundamentally uninterested Democrats are in