

these plans? No, of course not. I know I don't necessarily agree with every piece of every resource management plan that I have read. But there is a process to address that. It takes work. It takes conversations. It takes advocacy. That process cannot and should not be replaced by one that only involves Senators in Washington, DC, deciding that they know better.

From coming together to decide where to prioritize recreation and where to protect wild game habitat to identifying what lands should be used for grazing or which cultural sites should be protected, resource management plans take time because they incorporate input from the folks who own our public lands—Americans across this country.

When these plans are amended, that takes time too. Resource management plans aren't meant to be one and done; they are meant to evolve over time. Here is how that works when it is done the right way:

First, the public gets a say about what in the plan needs to be updated. Based on those comments, the Bureau of Land Management drafts a plan that includes alternatives. Those alternatives capture the range of public comments, making space for all of the voices that have weighed into the process so far—voices calling for more energy development, voices calling for more conservation, voices identifying important areas for recreation for the benefits of locals and businesses alike.

Once that draft is completed, the public gets another chance to engage. In person and with written comments, the public gets to say what they think the Agency got right and what should be considered moving forward.

Based on that, BLM prepares a final product. When BLM releases the final product, the public has another chance to engage—this time through a formal protest period where individuals can register their objections.

Throughout the entire process, the BLM meets with public land users, with Tribes, with community members, and with the leaders and elected officials in these communities.

The common theme here is clear: When it is done right, the public shapes how public lands are managed. That is not the process being proposed here on the Senate floor. It isn't one that invites the American public in; it is one that shuts them out.

By undoing resource management plans through congressional resolutions of disapproval, Congress is telling Tribal communities that their opinions don't matter about their ancestral lands; they are telling hunters that their opinions don't matter about what lands they just happen to use to fill their families' freezers; they are telling hikers that their opinions don't matter about the routes 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 make up our American birthright.

When we vote for CRAs as a way to manage our public lands, we vote against including communities in the process; we shut them out from the decision-making process when we should be inviting them in.

Third, today's vote does not account for the hundreds of millions of dollars per day that are generated for local economies by public land recreation and recreators. Recreation on public lands is an economic powerhouse. The recreation industry generates \$128 billion in economic activity from public land every single year. It drives \$6 billion in Federal tax revenue. It creates jobs. From Bureau of Land Management land alone, recreation supports 76,000 jobs and contributes more than \$12 billion—billion with a "b"—in economic output.

These numbers are big, and they matter. They matter to outfitters. They matter to small businesses. They matter to local communities. They tell the story of just how valuable these lands are to Americans—valuable both as a birthright and in dollars and cents.

That rings true in Wyoming, where the plan we are voting on today is located. For example, in 2023, according to the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, outdoor recreation contributed \$2.2 billion to Wyoming's economy. That is over 4 percent of Wyoming's GDP—the fifth highest rate in the Nation. The industry supported almost 16,000 jobs that same year. That is over 5 percent of the State's total—total—employment.

Now imagine that all of that is put at risk through congressional actions that leave no room for public comment to voice their concerns. There is no planning process—just unilateral decisions made in Washington, DC. So instead of amending the plan and allowing for more public voices to be heard and more communities to weigh in, as we have done for decades before, they just decide to override the whole process, box the public out. Well, you don't have to imagine it because that is what we are doing right now, and you deserve to know.

No land management plan is perfect. All of them need to be reviewed, updated, and improved. But we have a process for that, and it includes listening to our constituents, letting them drive the decisions. CRAs don't do that. They are a blunt instrument. They do the opposite—shutting out the public and rigging a process to guarantee an outcome of Senate Republicans' choosing.

So I stand here today, and I urge all of you to vote against this CRA. Public lands belong in public hands. They belong to all of us. That means that every single person deserves a chance to provide input on how they are managed.

I urge my colleagues to cast a "no" vote on this resolution of disapproval.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on S.J. Res. 89 be expired, the joint resolution be read a third time, and at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 130, the joint resolution be considered read a third time, and that the Senate vote on passage of H.J. Res. 130.

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

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

#### RECESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent now that the Senate recess for 1 hour.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:28 p.m., recessed until 4:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCHMITT).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed—Continued

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to resume the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 136, H.R. 4016.

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 505

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is hard to believe that we are nearly at the end of the year, and that is the end of the year since we started this session of Congress and also President Trump's second term in office.

And in that time, there is so much that we have done to get this country back on track and to begin to undo the damage that was inflicted on so many Americans by the Biden administration. We could take a look at the economy because under the Biden administration, inflation reached its highest point in over four decades; far-left regulations killed jobs, and it held industry back; and our trade deficit exploded. Now, in Tennessee, that hurt our farmers and our manufacturers.

Today, the U.S. economy is on the path to being stronger than ever before, thanks to the President's pro-growth agenda, trillions of dollars in new investments, the largest tax cut in history. All of that came about through the Big Beautiful Bill.

Inflation is down 67 percent; jobless claims are beginning to come down;

and the most recent data shows that the U.S. economy is growing at an annual rate of 3.8 percent. Now, that is the fastest pace in nearly 2 years.

At the same time, President Trump and his administration have completely reversed the Biden policies and failures at the southern border. For 4 years, President Biden claimed that there was nothing that he could do—nothing at all—to stop more than 10 million illegal aliens from entering our country, including tens of thousands of convicted criminals.

At one point, the daily average of border encounters topped 15,000, and across the country, Americans suffered the tragic consequences, including rampant migrant crime. Today, our border is secure, thanks to President Trump's strong enforcement of the rule of law. Last month, there were just under 8,000 Border Patrol apprehensions at the southwest border—95 percent lower than the monthly average under President Biden. And unlike the Biden administration, President Trump is turning these lawbreakers away instead of welcoming them with taxpayer-funded benefits.

For the sixth straight month, there were zero parole releases into our country. By comparison, in October of 2024 alone, Biden released more than 10,000 illegal aliens into the country.

President Trump and Republicans are also working to undo the damage done by President Biden's two-tiered justice system. Under his watch, the Justice Department and the FBI were rotten to the core, targeting anyone who stood up to the deep State.

They raided Mar-a-Lago, indicted President Trump on baseless charges, and weaponized America's top law enforcement Agency against conservatives, parents, and people of faith. Through Jack Reed Smith's Arctic Frost probe, this abuse of power reached the Halls of Congress, surveilling lawmakers over our political beliefs. The American people want one tier of justice: equal justice for all.

That is why President Trump and Republicans are fighting for full accountability for those who weaponized our government. We must ensure that this abuse of power never ever happens again.

Under the President's leadership, our Federal law enforcement Agencies are focused on their core purpose, enforcing the rule of law and fighting crime. Now, when we talk about fighting crime in Tennessee, we look at Memphis. Last year, the city recorded the highest crime rate in the country, and, for years, Memphians have demanded action to address the crime crisis.

Now President Trump is delivering it with the Memphis Safe Task Force. By coordinating efforts between more than a dozen Federal and State Agencies, including the Memphis Police Department, Tennessee National Guard, FBI, Justice Department, and U.S. Marshals, the task force is delivering incredible results.

In just over a month of operations, authorities have made more than 2,800 arrests, including 164 warrant arrests for aggravated assault, 185 for domestic violence, 83 for narcotics, 34 for robbery, 22 for sexual assault, 25 for homicide. The task force has also located more than 110 missing children. In many ways, the Memphis Safe Task Force is serving as a national model for President Trump's broader mission to reduce violent crime across the country.

Mr. President, that is why I am asking unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 505, which is at the desk; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions 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 Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my understanding is this is a resolution that has been fairly recently introduced, so I just got a chance to look at it just really minutes ago.

But it is a concerning resolution. I just want to talk about why I am going to object. First of all, my friend from Tennessee is right, Tennessee has a crime problem. Tennessee has the sixth highest rate of gun crime in the Nation. If you look at the list of the top 10 States with the highest rates of gun crime, it is Wyoming, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, Montana, Oklahoma, all States represented by Republican Senators, all States with Republican legislatures, all States with Republican Governors.

These aren't States that skimp on law enforcement, but they are States that have wildly irresponsible gun laws. They are States that don't invest in interrupting cycles of violence, so it is true that there is a pretty significant violent crime problem in Wyoming and in Mississippi and Alabama and Louisiana, Arkansas, Montana, Oklahoma, and in Tennessee.

But I just came across this article from the Tennessee Lookout which quotes data compiled by the University of Memphis, and it says that the increase in arrests in Memphis has been for nonviolent offenses. In fact, a quote from General Sessions Court Clerk Tami Sawyer says:

This is supposed to be a "Make Memphis Safe Task Force," and really what it is, is a "Make Memphis Drive the Speed Limit Task Force."

In fact, the University of Memphis discovered that there hasn't been any influx of new cases involving violent crimes. It seems as if the statistics that the Senator just referenced aren't really different than any other month. What is happening is that there are just a lot more traffic arrests and a lot more nonviolent drug arrests.

I came across another article entitled "'I Don't Feel Safe': Black Memphis

Residents Report Harassment by Trump's Police Task Force."

This is a long article detailing several instances of pretty horrific treatment of Memphis's Black residents, including racial profiling and other civil rights offenses.

I came across another article—this is just in like the last 5 minutes because I didn't have a lot of time to prepare for this—which details a disturbing pattern under President Trump of law enforcement resources being diverted from combating child abuse, sex trafficking, and terrorism because of this apparent obsession with safe driving in Memphis or this obsession with harassing and locking up peaceful immigrants.

So it just doesn't feel like the words in this resolution match up with the reality right now. It seems as if this task force is locking up people and arresting people for nonviolent offenses. It seems as if we are diverting resources from really serious crimes, like terrorism and child abuse. It feels like there are some potential civil rights abuses happening in Memphis.

But it also is just written in a way that is probably much more appropriate for a campaign flyer. The resolve clause is "recognizing the monumental success of Donald Trump's decisive leadership." It calls Donald Trump the most pro-law enforcement President in history. I think this is probably better in a flyer for Donald Trump's reelection campaign in 2028 that he wants to run rather than on the Senate floor.

By the way, in closing, talk to the Capitol Police here about whether Donald Trump is the most pro-law enforcement President in the history of the country. Talk to the police officer who was beat over the head by a flagpole by a rioter in this building who was pardoned by Donald Trump. Ask the police officer who was tased in the neck by one of Donald Trump's supporters and then pardoned whether Donald Trump is the most pro-law enforcement President in history.

This President pardoned every single violent rioter. All you guys said: Oh, well, you know, there were some non-violent rioters here, and they should be let off the hook, but, no, we shouldn't let off the violent rioters. Donald Trump pardoned every single violent rioter—rioters who viciously beat Capitol Police officers. All of my Republican friends just looked the other way and said: Well, if Donald Trump thinks that is OK, then so be it.

So, yeah, it seems like the story in Memphis is a lot more complicated than my friend from Tennessee would have us believe, which is why today we shouldn't pass this resolution. We should probably get to the bottom of what is happening.

But it is just offensive to call this President the most pro-law enforcement President in the history of the country when he is endorsing—endorsing and excusing violence being perpetuated on the people that serve us and

protect us here in the U.S. Capitol, and for that reason, I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, what the Senator fails to mention is that the cities with the high crime problem are blue cities. They are blue cities.

Also, what he should know is that 63 percent of the residents of Memphis support having the Memphis Safe Task Force fighting the crime that is there.

Now, Memphis had the highest rate per capita in the Nation in 2024, with 2,501 instances of violent crime for every 100,000 people. Now, that is a stat that came from the FBI, and it is why the people in Memphis wanted us to move forward and do something about this.

Since the start of the task force, overall, violent crime rates have fallen 46 percent when compared to the same period last year, and homicides are down 50 percent. Carjackings and sexual assault are down 60 percent.

So when my colleague objects to this, he is objecting to what the good people of Memphis in this fabulous, iconic city are seeing—the results they are seeing. They want Memphis to be the safest city in the country, not the most violent.

They have objected to the arrest of nearly 2,900 criminals in the last 50 days, including sex offenders, murderers, and other violent criminals. They have objected to the rescue of 116 missing children—116 children who have been recovered. They have objected to over 300 known gang members being apprehended. They have objected to the seizure of 470 illegal firearms.

We are going to continue to work to make certain that Memphis is the safest city in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I think what Senator MURPHY was objecting to was calling Donald Trump the most pro-law enforcement President in American history, and I think he laid out all the reasons why that simply isn't true.

#### INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT OF 1975

Mr. President, I am here because today marks the 50th anniversary of the Senate's passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, known as IDEA. It was just a few weeks after the Senate passed that bill that it was signed into law on November 29, 1975, by President Ford—a bipartisan achievement and a landmark achievement for the United States of America.

I am grateful that my colleagues Senator KAINE and Senator HIRONO are also on the floor with me today to discuss this important achievement 50 years later.

When that passed the Senate and, of course, when it was signed into law, it guaranteed the right to a free, appropriate public education for children

with disabilities. For the first time in America, the law required that schools meet that commitment to all our kids, including kids with disabilities. That is why schools have now developed individualized education programs for students who need them, to meet that requirement. Now children with disabilities share classrooms with kids without disabilities. And it created a process for families to challenge schools that don't uphold their child's right to a good education.

This was a watershed moment in our history and the history of education. IDEA helped end a very dark chapter in our not too distant past when our public schools excluded 80 percent of children with disabilities, and many States forced disabled people to live out their entire lives hidden away in institutions.

For decades, the Federal Government wrote off people with disabilities as "uneducable," and they claimed they could not learn in schools, and they claimed that they could not fit into our society.

The government was wrong. It was dead wrong. It was wrong on the facts because people with disabilities can succeed in school and in the workforce with the right accommodations, and it was wrong morally because that discrimination violated one of the most fundamental American values—that all people are created equal, and all deserve equal dignity and opportunity. It was IDEA that helped right that wrong.

I would be remiss if I did not take the occasion of this anniversary to acknowledge all the people who make special education work every day in America. They are the students with disabilities and their families and their caregivers. They are the teachers, the special education teachers, the paraprofessionals, and the teachers' aides. Then there are the researchers, the advocates, and so many more—the people who created IDEA and the people who keep it alive today. I commend and salute all of them on this important anniversary.

But I can't say the same about this Congress or, in fact, any of the Congresses that convened between that passage 50 years ago and today because while today marks the 50th anniversary of the Senate's passage of IDEA, it is also true that today, 50 years later, we are seeing the continuation of Congress's failure to actually fund the IDEA at the level we promised, at the level the Federal Government committed to.

You see, when Congress established IDEA, when they passed it into law and gave schools new responsibilities to uphold the rights of students with disabilities, Congress also pledged to cover 40 percent of the cost per pupil so that schools had the resources needed to meet these new responsibilities. In other words, we established a Federal mandate for a very good purpose, but then we failed to fund that mandate at the level we promised.

As a result, every year since it was first passed into law 50 years ago, Congress has failed to provide the promised funds for IDEA. In fact, today, we find that IDEA is funded at 12 percent—a little under 12 percent, in fact—of the cost per pupil instead of the 40 percent, leaving schools and students short a whopping \$38 billion every year. In my State of Maryland alone, we are getting \$670 million less per year than was promised. All across the country, States—Virginia, Hawaii, other States—struggle to make up that gap for themselves.

When we don't live up to our obligations at the Federal level, it strains the entire education budgets at the State and local level, hurting disabled students and also all other students.

Now, 20 years ago, when I was in the House of Representatives, I had the privilege of passing a number of bills related to helping people with disabilities. That included the ABLE Act, which was a bipartisan piece of legislation to help provide families with kids with disabilities with access to tax-advantaged accounts so that they can help those kids and better prepare for their futures.

I have had the great opportunity both in the House and the Senate to pass many other pieces of important legislation, but one of my greatest disappointments has been the fact that the Congress has never fully funded IDEA, never did what we promised we would do.

Way back in 2003, I introduced a bill to end the funding gap, to fully fund IDEA, to require that the funding be phased in over a period of time until the Federal Government met its responsibilities. I have introduced that legislation every Congress for the last 22 years.

I have watched as Democrats and Republicans from the Senate and the House go back to their States and to their districts and tell people that they really support IDEA and that they really want to make sure kids with disabilities have that education, that quality education. They say to families that we are all in to support IDEA. But too many, when they come back here to Washington, DC, and have to make real decisions as to where funds are allocated in the Federal budget, when they have to choose between kids with disabilities and another tax break for the ultrawealthy, somehow many have a way of forgetting what they told folks back at home.

You know, I introduced this bill again this Congress, and I am glad we have 39 Democratic Senators as cosponsors, and we may get more. We have zero—no Republican Senators as cosponsors. I hope that will change. I really hope it will change.

As I said at the outset, it was President Ford, a Republican President, who signed into law the IDEA 50 years ago this year. He signed that law. That law requires that the Federal Government provide that 40 percent, and we are at 12 percent today.

So I hope, on this 50th anniversary of the time the Senate passed it, our Republican colleagues will join us on this legislation because the consequences of failing to fund IDEA are visible all over the country. Expenses are only rising as more students struggle with disabilities.

The good news is that we are developing new techniques for screening our children and helping them succeed in school. Some of those techniques require more resources, not less. Yet we are continuing to fail to meet our responsibilities.

Today, because we don't fully fund the IDEA here at the Federal level, schools make IEPs for their students, but many cannot follow through on their own plans, those individual education plans. Deaf students are going to class without sign language interpreters. Students with intellectual and developmental disabilities are going without the one-on-one aides—the aides who help them learn and make sure they don't get physically hurt.

Underresourced special education staff burn out huge numbers, leaving tens of thousands of vacant positions. In classrooms all over America—in each of our States—there is a child who is sitting at the back of the room, struggling to follow a lesson, falling further and further behind.

While that child is trying, the Congress is not doing its job. It would cost \$38 billion for Congress to keep its promises to fund special education this year—\$38 billion. That could be made up by the entire funding gap, three times over, that was included in the so-called Big Beautiful Bill—more tax cuts for very wealthy people. If you were to add up all of those tax cuts, it would be \$132 billion only for the part of the population that was in the top 1 percent. So folks in the top 1 percent income category got \$132 billion in tax cuts. That is three times what would be needed to simply fulfill our obligations under the IDEA this year.

The Trump administration chose tax cuts for the top 1 percent over the IDEA just like it chose to give away trillions of dollars to the very wealthy and pay for it, in part, by defunding programs that working families depend on, including healthcare, Medicaid, SNAP, and public education funding, while failing to fully fund the IDEA.

It actually gets worse because, since March, the Trump administration has fired half of the people at the Department of Education. Then, during the recent shutdown, the Trump administration attempted to fire the remaining staff—all of the remaining staff—at the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Those are the people who implement the parts of the IDEA that we do fund. These are great American patriots, these Federal employees. Some of them are Marylanders, some of them are from Virginia, and some of them are from other parts of the country. They have experience in helping these kids, and they have

knowledge that is very difficult to replace.

Fortunately, a Federal judge paused the firings of these individuals during the shutdown. The judge wrote that those attempted firings were nothing more than “political retribution,” and that judgment was reflected in the recent continuing resolution, at least through the end of January. Nevertheless, the Trump administration keeps looking for new ways to take resources away from our schools.

In fact, just yesterday—just yesterday—it announced the near total dismantling of what is left of the Education Department's advancing education programs. Secretary McMahon has said that her mission at the Department of Education is to shut down the Department of Education, to put out of business the Federal Department of Education. She claims that her objective is efficiency. She claims that kids won't be hurt. She, obviously, hasn't talked to the parents of kids all over the country, including the parents of kids with disabilities.

You know, she specifically said at a Senate Appropriations Committee, on June 3, that “we are not cutting any of the IDEA funding.” That claim covers up what is really happening here because, in September, the Department of Education and the administration cut 34 grants for special education, saying that they conflicted with the Trump administration's priorities. Their targets included teacher training, parent resource centers, and assistive technology for children with both hearing and vision loss. Somehow, helping those kids did not meet with the Trump administration's priorities.

Let me just say that what we are witnessing in real time is an effort to gut the special education programs that exist today at the Department of Education. At the same time, we see a refusal to fully fund the IDEA program at levels promised by the Federal Government when it was first launched 50 years ago.

You know, there has always been a credibility gap since that first commitment was made 50 years ago. I have been standing on the floor—first in the House and now in the Senate—and making remarks about the IDEA and the importance of closing this funding and credibility gap for over 20 years. We still haven't moved ahead.

Again, as I said, every Member of Congress, when they go back home from here, says they really want to support the IDEA. Now, it is time that people actually mean what they say and follow through because we are now at the 50th anniversary of the IDEA.

Some of the children I was hoping to help back in 2003, when I first introduced the full funding legislation, now have children of their own. Some of the children we promised to help in 1975—“we” being the Congress back then—are now grandparents. We should not allow another generation to grow up under the shadow of our broken promises.

We passed the IDEA 50 years ago in the same spirit in which we signed the Declaration of Independence almost 250 years ago. In both cases, we made great and noble promises. We promised that all men and women were created equal and that the government would uphold that equality. But when it comes to funding education for kids with disabilities, that promise remains broken.

Judy Heumann, who is the mother of the disability rights movement, once wrote:

Change never happens at the pace we think it should [happen]. It happens over years of people joining together, strategizing, sharing, and pulling all the levers they possibly can. Gradually, excruciatingly slowly, things start to happen, and then, suddenly, seemingly out of the blue, something will tip.

Something tipped 50 years ago, when the Senate, on this day, passed the IDEA bill. It has been a long, excruciating length of time since then. I hope that now, 50 years later, we will see another tipping point wherein Members of the House and Senate finally live up to the obligations that were made 50 years ago to really fully fund special education at the levels which we promised. We celebrated the passage of the IDEA 50 years ago. Let us commit ourselves to finally fulfilling that promise now.

With that, I am happy to yield the floor to the great Senator from Hawaii, who has been so focused on education generally and special education in particular, Senator HIRONO.

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

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for his passionate advocacy for IDEA. IDEA is a critical program of the U.S. Department of Education.

Let me tell you what is happening to the U.S. Department of Education under President Trump.

We have a regime—that is what I call the Trump administration. It is a regime hell-bent on dismantling the Federal Government. From withholding billions in Federal funding to conducting mass firings of Federal workers and shuttering critical Agencies with hardly any notice at all, to implementing countless, harmful Executive actions, the Trump regime has sown chaos, corruption, and cruelty from day one. It is no wonder that there are now over 300 lawsuits to stop Trump's illegal actions.

It is clear Trump doesn't give a rip about our government or the millions of Americans who rely on the services it provides. That includes the U.S. Department of Education, which does critical work to ensure our country's more than 50 million—50 million—public school students can get a quality education.

Instead of trying to strengthen the Department of Education's support for our Nation's public schools, Trump and his allies are trying to eliminate the U.S. Department of Education completely. This has always been part of

his plan. He began his second term by summarily firing nearly half of the Department's workforce. He did this in one fell swoop. These committed people at the Department of Education were told: You don't have to come to work tomorrow. So this followed the plan laid out, basically, for President Trump and Project 2025. Then, just this week, his Secretary of Education laid out plans to slash and dismantle the Department even further.

Education is foundational. It certainly was for me. As an immigrant, I came to this country not knowing any English. I didn't read or write English. It is the education system that this country afforded me that provided me the opportunities that resulted in my standing here, giving these remarks.

So, while we can all agree that there are ways we can improve our education system, we should also be able to agree that there is a role for the Federal Government in helping to ensure that all students—50 million—receive a quality education. For decades, the Department of Education has played that role of working to protect students against discrimination and ensure equal opportunities in our schools.

Of course, one of the ways it does this is by supporting students with disabilities. Signed into law in 1975, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, protects the rights of more than 7 million students with disabilities across the country—7 million. The IDEA helps to ensure these students receive free and appropriate public education that meets their needs. It also provides funding—yes, we need to fund the IDEA to the extent that is required—to help support these students and ensure the oversight of services for students with disabilities.

Before the IDEA was enacted, we did not have these kinds of Federal protections for students with disabilities. As a result, there was no way to ensure that students with disabilities were not denied access to education or were not neglected in our schools. As noted by my colleague from Maryland, many of these students didn't even get to go to school. They didn't have IDEA.

So, later this month, we will celebrate the 50th year of IDEA—the landmark law that has provided millions of young people with access to a free and appropriate public education.

Despite the success of the IDEA and programs like it, this regime is accelerating plans to dismantle the Department of Education and roll back the progress it has enabled by moving important programs to other Departments with no education expertise.

Recently, for example, Trump tried to take advantage of the shutdown to illegally fire hundreds more workers from the Education Department, including the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services and the Office for Civil Rights.

Education Secretary McMahon—herself one of Trump's billionaire buddies—has made the preposterous claim

that the shutdown proved the Education Department is unnecessary. This is the kind of unsubstantiated—I can hardly believe that she would consider this proof of any kind, but this is the kind of stuff that the Trump administration always claims. The regime makes these kinds of unsubstantiated claims on a regular basis to justify its ill-conceived and often illegal acts.

In reality, I had constituents reaching out to my office during the shutdown to share concerns about how furloughs of the Department of Education were impacting Hawaii's public schools and the students they serve, including the students with disabilities.

I heard from the mother of a 4-year-old boy who attends a title I school in Hawaii. She was concerned about how the mass firings of special education staff threatened the services her child received.

Every public school child who receives special education must have, as mentioned, an individualized education program, or IEP—a plan to help meet the unique needs of each student. But without the necessary trained staff to support oversight of these programs, there is no one to help guide teachers or schools in developing these plans and ensuring that they are implemented or followed.

As mentioned, just yesterday, Secretary McMahon released a detailed plan for reorganizing the Department of Education by moving dozens of programs and services to other Agencies that do not have the necessary staffing, funding, or expertise to oversee these programs. We can expect that she will try to move IDEA too.

I heard from a middle school teacher on Hawaii island who emphasized just how unrealistic Trump's plan is to move oversight of IDEA to another Agency outside of the Education Department. He rightly pointed out that other Agencies have “no expertise in the complex education law that is I-D-E-A.”

Education specialists, officers, and analysts within the Office of Special Education programs are trained to best support IDEA. It is not as though you can just move this program to Homeland Security or Human Services and expect them to be able to provide the kind of support that IDEA requires. Moving this program would mean a loss of expertise that will not be rebuilt quickly, leaving our most vulnerable students to pay the price.

As another example of moving programs out of the Department of Education as part of the dismantling of the Department—I could not resist this example—President Trump proposes to move the student loan portfolio to the Small Business Administration, which has neither the capacity nor the expertise needed to handle this massive program. The SBA is one of the smallest Federal Government Agencies. How is it supposed to handle a Department of Education program with over 40 mil-

lion borrowers and over \$1.5 trillion in loans? It can't.

Clearly, neither Trump nor Secretary McMahon see a Federal role in education because they are just moving programs without figuring out how these programs are even going to be continued. In fact, that is not their intention. Their intention is to get rid of the U.S. Department of Education, and they can't do that because only Congress can do that. So what do they come up with? These alternative ways to dismantle the Department.

Shouldn't supporting our public schools and our children's education be a national priority? I mean, obviously President Trump and Secretary McMahon don't think it is a national priority. Certainly, it is a national priority in other countries. Why? Because these other countries know, as I said earlier, that education is foundational and that an educated populous is an engaged populous.

By gutting staff and funding that students rely on and attempting to eliminate the Department altogether—a plan that will inevitably hurt our students, no question—this regime's actions make it abundantly clear that they don't want an engaged populous. One can't help but wonder why.

This regime is not committed to public education. They are not committed to public education. They don't see a Federal role for public education, and that is the long and short of it.

We can and must do better to support the education of 50-plus million children in our country.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Virginia.

**MR. KAINE.** Mr. President, I rise together with my colleagues from Maryland and Hawaii to celebrate 50 years of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I will not speak long because I have a separate matter that I will take up after this.

My colleagues did a good job, I think, of shining a spotlight on the challenges that exist with the IDEA at 50—the chronic underfunding of this program, the Federal Government not meeting the commitment that it made in 1975 to fund 40 percent of these extra costs for kids with disabilities, the firing of staff recently.

These are serious issues, but I want to spend my time more focused on the celebration of what these 50 years of the IDEA have done.

When it was originally passed 50 years ago this month, the bill was called the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, the EHA. It was renamed the “IDEA” in a reauthorization in 1990.

Guess what the vote was in Congress around the passage of this law that was signed by President Ford. In the Senate, the vote to pass this landmark civil rights and education law was 87 to 7, and in the House, the vote was 404 to 7. For a big, landmark civil rights and education law to pass with that kind of a margin is really near miraculous.

The reason that it passed so overwhelmingly was because society realized that we had been treating kids with disabilities in a very, very tragic and unforgiveable way.

Get this: In 1975, more than a million school-age children in this country were essentially locked out of public education because of the fact that they had a disability—either not being educated at all or being educated in institutions often far away from their homes and families, far away from their friends and neighbors, in a way that was not providing them adequate educational support.

So think about that million that has now grown to 7 million—nearly 1 in 7 students in our public school system receives special education services—what the trajectory of their lives was like before the IDEA passed and after the IDEA passed.

Students with a designated disability under the IDEA receive an individualized education plan so that their particular disability can be focused in a meaningful way to enable them to be all they can be. Isn't that what we want for all children? Let all children be all they can be.

It is not often noted, but it should be noted that many students who receive individualized education plans—the IEPs—only require special education services for a couple of years because even a couple of years of speech therapy or other kinds of special services is enough to get that student completely successful without additional services.

I know this from my own family, my own three kids who went through public schools, that sometimes the IEP and the services provided only need to be provided for a short period of time. Students who receive these services early in their educational careers often don't need them for more than a couple of preschool years or early grades, and then they are perfectly successful.

The IDEA works. It works. It works to enable these students who had been consigned to the shadows of life for generations to be able to achieve all that they can.

You know, one of the measures of success of the IDEA at 50 is this: As a mayor, public education was the biggest part of my city budget. As a Governor, it was the biggest part of my State budget. And, man, did I hear a lot of complaints from people about the IDEA. My educator said that Congress isn't funding it well enough. My educator said that the paperwork to do an IEP and then to assess its compliance is way too complicated. But I never had a single person, an educator or anyone else, say we should undo the IDEA.

For all of the challenges about underfunding, for all of the challenges about paperwork, there is uniform recognition in this country that the passage of the IDEA, the 50 years of a commitment by society that every child should be all they can be, is a good thing. Can we make it better? Of

course, we can. But that bedrock promise that was made in 1975 is a good thing, and it has worked to enrich the lives now of tens of millions of people, to make them productive adults, just like any of us aspire to be. What a great thing to be able to celebrate.

That is why I join my colleagues today to celebrate what the 50 years have meant to the tens of millions of students who benefited from the IDEA and the commitment that we must do better.

I am very, very troubled by the underfunding and applaud my colleagues for focusing on that, but I am also very troubled by the actions of this administration to shed the staff who are needed to work with States and work with local governments to make sure that services are being appropriately provided.

I remember being on the HELP Committee during President Trump's first term and examining his nominee for Secretary of Education in the first term, Secretary DeVos. She was talking about letting the IDEA just be run by States, with no Federal role.

I remember questioning her at the hearing: Well, what about States that decide not to do it?

Because it is expensive, there would be some States, without Federal oversight, that would just decide they would rather not provide services, not fund services for students with disabilities.

I asked her the question: Do you think a parent of a child with a disability should just have to move to another State that is more compassionate?

No. We have a Federal, national commitment that a child born with a disability, whatever ZIP Code in this country they are born in, should be entitled to receive these basic services.

That promise is being threatened right now by the firings. That promise has always been threatened by the chronic underfunding.

So while I join with my colleagues in committing to continuing to work to improve it, I don't want this moment to be lost without acknowledging the tremendous good that has been done by this most bipartisan law to enrich the lives of tens of millions of children and their families.

With that, I yield the floor on this topic and would ask to continue on now a second matter.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 473

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, in a moment, I am going to ask unanimous consent for the passage of S. Res. 473, and that is a resolution commemorating the seventh anniversary of the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and calling for accountability for his murder.

This resolution is to honor the life and the absolutely gruesome death of the Washington Post journalist and Virginia resident Jamal Khashoggi.

For those who are not aware of Jamal Khashoggi's story, he dedicated

his life to uncovering the truth. His work shed light on the repressive nature of the Saudi Arabian Government, and it exposed him to great personal danger. He fled Saudi Arabia in 2017, and his family found a home in Northern Virginia.

The Khashoggi story is now, unfortunately, too well known. On October 2, 2018, Mr. Khashoggi was brutally murdered by the Saudi Government agents at the Saudi consulate in Istanbul, Türkiye—murdered within a consulate, a place that is supposed to be a safe haven. His body, by all accounts of the United States and other intelligence, was dismembered by those Saudi agents within the consulate.

Mr. Khashoggi was not killed because he committed a crime. He was killed for speaking the truth as a journalist and shining a spotlight on the repressive nature of the Saudi Arabian Government. He was killed for standing up for the rights of his fellow Saudi Arabians.

Mr. Khashoggi's death is not a mystery. This is not a cold case waiting to be solved. We know exactly who is responsible for this killing.

The U.S. Government's Office of the Director of National Intelligence, as well as other U.S. intelligence Agencies, determined the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia, Muhammad bin Salman, or MBS as he is often referred to, approved an official governmental operation in Istanbul to capture or kill Jamal Khashoggi.

As a result of that operation approved by MBS, Mr. Khashoggi was ambushed as he went to the consulate to get some paperwork regarding his marriage. He was strangled, killed and his body was dismembered, and then evidence of that crime was attempted to be destroyed.

Seven years later, there has been no accountability for the person most responsible for the horrifying murder, no real justice for Jamal Khashoggi, no justice for his family, no justice for the many others who have raised their voices in Saudi Arabia and who, for something as simple as tweeting, are being threatened with execution.

Instead, the leader who approved the operation to kill Jamal Khashoggi, the man who is proud to oppress his own people, MBS, is being celebrated today at our White House. MBS was welcomed with a black-tie dinner. He is being offered F-35 fighter jets—one of the crowned jewels of our security apparatus over the open objections of our ally Israel and potentially in violation of the law. He is being offered extremely high-tech computer chips and other valuable U.S. technology. He is being offered a major mutual defense agreement.

It is, frankly, outrageous to me that the President of the United States would assert that American servicemembers should put their lives on the line to defend the oppressive regime in Saudi Arabia.

Yesterday, when President Trump was asked by a reporter from ABC



about Jamal Khashoggi, he said “a lot of people didn’t like” Jamal. He said, about the killing, “things happen.” Things like a gruesome strangling in an Embassy and the dismembering of a body of a journalist for the Washington Post with a bone saw—things happen.

And then our President threatened ABC’s broadcast license because the reporter had the audacity to ask him a question he didn’t like.

I have said it many times, and I am going say it again: Standing with this regime with no accountability for the murder of Jamal Khashoggi is not “America First.” It is not consistent with our values as a world-leading democracy.

I was very vocal in my frustration about this matter not only during President Trump’s first term but also during President Biden’s term. When President Biden visited Saudi Arabia in 2022 and fist-bumped with MBS, I was vocal in my dissatisfaction.

I was vocal in my disappointment over this effort when the Biden administration’s State Department sided with MBS in his efforts to gain sovereign immunity in the United States to avoid accountability for this murder. I was frustrated when Biden administration Middle East policy officials left the White House in January of 2025 and in short order, started signing lucrative contracts with the Saudi Government.

And I continue to be appalled as the families of senior Trump administration officials—Kushner family, Witkoff family, and President Donald J. Trump’s own children—signed major deals with the Saudi regime in cryptocurrency or real estate development.

Just a few days ago, on November 15, the New York Times reported that the Trump organization was in talks to bring Trump-branded property to one of Saudi Arabia’s largest government-owned real estate development.

I have huge questions, as I think many Americans do, about whether the intertwining of cryptocurrency or real estate deals is behind the President’s casual reference to “things happen” to whitewash and excuse the assassination and dismembering of a Washington Post journalist who lived in my State.

When the Saudi-backed LIV golf tour made overtures about maybe acquiring the PGA in 2023, there was bipartisan outrage about that. But I have heard little outrage from any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle regarding MBS’s visit.

Is the PGA more important, more worth raising concerns about than the transfer of F-35 jets to Saudi Arabia?

Shouldn’t we ask: What is the Trump administration’s priority? Is it democracy? Is it human rights? Is it national security? Or is it real estate or cryptocurrency deals that benefit family members of those in the administration?

Why is the administration willing to move so far to accommodate this re-

gime, this individual, that our own intelligence Agencies have said is responsible for the murder of a Washington Post journalist who lives in my Commonwealth?

What is the United States getting from offering MBS all of this? Or is the United States getting anything? Is it instead individuals are getting their pockets filled at the expense of our Democratic human rights values?

Standing with Saudi Arabia against the interest of the American people, against our national security, against our human rights proclamations, against the security of our ally Israel, and against the freedom of the press right here at home is unconscionable.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 473; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a few observations about this resolution.

First of all, this couldn’t come at a more inappropriate time. I think my good friend knows that there is a very large delegation from Saudi Arabia visiting Washington, DC, right now. They are a long, long-term ally of the United States going back almost 100 years. We have had a long relationship with them.

Certainly, nothing I am saying here is to denigrate the murder of Jamal Khashoggi. That happened. There is absolutely no question about it. But nothing that—this resolution will do nothing to achieve accountability for the murder of Jamal Khashoggi more than has already accrued.

When Jamal Khashoggi was killed in 2019, President Trump and the administration conducted a thorough investigation into his death and determined that 17 Saudi nationals were responsible for Mr. Khashoggi’s death, and they were subsequently sanctioned.

In addition, the Saudis themselves took action. President Trump also understands—and we should all understand—that the United States needs stable and invested security partners in the Middle East. Saudi Arabia has played an increasingly important role over the last 100 years and an even more important role recently as we have had diplomacy, economic growth, and especially regional security in the Middle East.

Justice and accountability for the past are important, but with a thorough investigation complete and the responsible individuals held accountable, we can look to a better and brighter future for the United States-Saudi relationship.

With all of this in mind and the fact that, at this time and place, this reso-

lution is not in the best interest of the United States, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

S.J. RES. 76

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the CRA related to the Environmental Protection Agency, now better known as the “Polluter Protection Agency,” trying to unwind methane rules.

So there are three things I would like to say about methane: We all know that it is a pollutant. We all know that it is dangerous. It is even explosive. And yet the fossil fuel industry insists on leaking it in enormous quantities. And for years, they have falsely reported to the EPA how much their leakage was, but it is a lot, and it makes a big difference, particularly on the climate side because methane is a super pollutant in the short run—in the first, say, 20, 25 years. So it is really important to stop leakage of this dangerous substance.

And there is no value to the leakage. This is just laziness and sloppiness and bad corporate behavior. It is not like there is a methane leakage association that wants to see more methane in the atmosphere. It is just waste and sloppiness, bad corporate behavior.

This body keeps rolling over to those folks. One of the first things that we did was to undo the methane fee so that the leakers didn’t have to pay anything for their leakage. Now, we had agreed on that, working with the fossil fuel industry through Senator Manchin, who was their representative in these negotiations. And what we settled on was that only the worst polluters would be subject to the fee; only the ones who couldn’t even meet their industry’s standards, only they would have to pay.

Second, the revenues from the fee would go back to the industry to pay for fixing the mess they were creating.

And third, we front-loaded it so they got nearly a billion dollars upfront.

What did they do? Took the money and called on their Republican friends here in the Senate to undo the fee. It was a complete bait-and-switch.

Now we are here on changes to the methane rules and the effort by EPA to delay those changes. This adds the additional insult to being a violation of the Administrative Procedures Act.

I tell my colleagues: If you continue to sanction these procedural violations of regulatory Agencies, don’t think we are going to forget that when the shoe is on the other foot. This set of extensions of the methane rules was done regulatorily, without something called notice and opportunity to be heard—“notice and comment” is the technical term under the APA.

It is a basic provision of the APA that you have to go notice and comment. If you don’t want to do notice and comment—as EPA did not in this case—you have got to show good cause. And what courts have said good cause

is, is an emergency. There is no emergency here.

Look at some of the things that EPA has done. They claim that the industry needed time to adopt technologies which had, in fact, already been widely adopted—flatout lie from EPA.

They said that compliance deadlines were too close. Well, many of them actually had already been in effect. So that can't be the real reason.

And then they delayed the Super Emitter Program for the worst methane leakers, but it had already been up and running for months. So there was nothing new happening. There was no emergency.

So if you all—my colleagues on the Republican side—if this is the way you want regulatory Agencies to behave in a Democrat administration, keep this up because this is flatout rule-breaking by the EPA.

The last thing is, it is kind of pointless because we are going to catch your leakers. You can give them anything you want. You can continue to roll back methane fees; you can continue to roll back methane rules, but we are going to catch the leakers who are telling you to do this stuff.

We are going to catch them because satellite technology can now detect the plumes of methane that they emit, and they can really detect the big ones. They can source it down to a very narrow point of origin.

UCLA just opened up a website where you can go and see a summary of the satellite data: what landfills, what oil facilities, what are the big leak points so the local communities can take action against the irresponsible members of the fossil fuel industry who are leaking enormous amounts of methane.

So you may have clawed back the methane fee and bailed out the worst performers in the industry and you may have violated the APA to postpone these other rules, including rules against super emitters, but at the end of the day, you are not going to get away with the methane leakage.

You are going to be caught. It is going to be visible on satellite. There is going to be every opportunity for naming and shaming and enforcement, and we are going to end up getting this right. So it would be better if you just didn't put us through this, if you behaved properly for the Senate, if you let the methane fees stand, and if you didn't allow EPA to break the rules to give polluters yet another break from this polluter-friendly EPA.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from California.

**Mr. SCHIFF.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for 9 minutes and Senator SCHUMER for 2 minutes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**Mr. SCHIFF.** Mr. President, today's vote will determine how much methane polluters are allowed to belch into the air. It will determine how many asth-

ma attacks Americans suffer. It will determine how many Americans will die because we relaxed the standards on how much methane oil and gas companies are allowed to leak into the air that we breathe.

On July 31 of this year, the EPA decided to delay the enforcement of the Agency's own standards of methane pollution from oil and gas companies. For those who aren't aware, methane is a superpollutant. When it comes to making our air dirtier and contributing to climate change, it is 80 times worse than carbon dioxide.

EPA itself estimates that their new rule or, more accurately, their new license to pollute will pump 3.8 million tons of methane into our air—about the same amount as if we put 66 million more cars on the road.

It is really staggering when you think of it. By the EPA's new rule—the rule that we are right now, through my resolution, trying to repeal—EPA has decided to allow the same amount of pollution as 66 million cars. That is one hell of a rule. That is one hell of a gift to polluters. That is also really bad news for people who breathe; that is, all of us.

The decision by the EPA to put forward this polluter-friendly rule is perfectly emblematic of the administration's approach to our environment and the Environmental Protection Agency's hostility to rules protecting the environment. We are going to have to rebrand the EPA, if it keeps this up, to be the "Environmental Polluting Agency."

So how did we get here? It begins during the Biden administration when an EPA that was concerned about our air quality standards moved to significantly reduce methane emissions from new and existing oil and gas operations under the Clean Air Act.

The EPA didn't just put out new standards and say "good luck"; the Agency used \$1.55 billion in funding from the Inflation Reduction Act to help companies get into compliance with these new methane pollution standards. Having made that investment, this action by the Trump EPA makes even less sense.

Before and during the formulation of EPA's methane standards in the last administration, several prominent oil and gas companies, including ExxonMobil, Chevron, Shell, BP, Occidental, Pioneer, and Devon, acknowledged the need for Federal standards for methane emissions. That is because leaking methane isn't profitable for companies. It is certainly not good PR.

Methane, in fact, is a commodity that can be sold by these companies. Leaked methane represents billions of dollars in lost profits for the oil and gas industry because methane is the main ingredient in natural gas.

By halting our Nation's methane standards, the Trump EPA will help the worst polluters—those who don't want to bother to control methane leaks and who therefore waste the very

same energy resources that the Trump administration claims it wants to produce.

What is more, companies already know how to stop methane leaks, and both the private and public sector have gotten really good at detecting leaks with advanced technologies, like satellite imagery.

I am very proud that California has been a national leader in using satellite imagery to protect the environment. In the face of Federal environmental retreat, California launched its own satellite in March of this year to help detect and to help stop methane leaks. Just this year, California has used that methane-tracking satellite to close 10 large methane leaks. I congratulate Governor Newsom for his innovative leadership on this.

Many companies don't just acknowledge there should be a standard, they are already complying with the new standard and have been for almost an entire year.

To summarize, the Biden EPA promulgates new limits on methane emissions. It provides \$1½ billion for companies to adapt to the new rules. Many major oil companies do adapt, and now the Trump administration wants to repeal these rules and let the oil and gas industry go back to polluting like they did in the not so good old days. It makes no sense. It makes no sense—that is, unless your real agenda is to attack climate science, to give industry free rein to pollute our air, and to pay back an industry that President Trump promised to reward if they gave \$1 billion to his Presidential campaign.

EPA concluded 16 years ago that the Agency legally had no choice but to regulate greenhouse gas pollution because this pollution endangers the public health and welfare of the American people. Let me say that again. EPA's own scientists closed the case on this 16 years ago, but this administration is obsessed with reversing the progress we have made and taking the country backwards.

This isn't just about greenhouse pollution, which fuels wildfires, supercharges hurricanes, floods communities, and kills crops that feed us; cancer-causing benzene and volatile chemical compounds that form smog and choke our air are emitted alongside leaked methane pollution.

If we all vote today for this resolution and restore EPA's smart methane standards, then we will be voting to avoid up to 100,000 asthma attacks and to prevent premature deaths of Americans across the country.

In addition to all the health and environmental concerns with the rule we are trying to repeal today, President Trump and Administrator Zeldin's EPA also failed to issue this rule in compliance with the law. EPA, as Senator WHITEHOUSE made clear, neglected to solicit public comments and decided to move directly to a final rule, violating both the Clean Air Act and the Administrative Procedure Act. Clearly,



the Trump EPA does not want to hear from the American people.

This isn't good policymaking; this is extreme ideological obsession, with dire consequences for the health and welfare of the American people.

So this measure today will put every Member of this body on record about how much methane we want released into the air, but it is also, I think, worth noting that my Republican colleagues have used the Congressional Review Act against Democratic States, like my home State of California, when they repealed our State's clean air rules. My Republican colleagues have used the CRA even when the Parliamentarian and the Government Accountability Office said they could not legally do so, and my Republican colleagues have used the CRA against Agency actions that have never been targeted before.

It is worth noting that we on the Democratic side are going to be making a list of a lot of the Agency actions of this administration because there will come a time when we are back in the majority, and when that time comes, we will be advocating forcefully for the interests of communities all across the country, and we will not hesitate to use the CRA in the same way that our Republican colleagues are now using it. But instead of making America pollute again, we will make our air clean again, and we will make our water clean again.

I urge Senators to vote yes and to continue the fight against dangerous and wasteful emissions of methane into our air.

The leader is on his way, and he will be here shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I want to thank Senator SCHIFF and Ranking Member WHITEHOUSE for leading the charge on such an important resolution.

Around the country, people's gas and electric bills are skyrocketing. More and more Americans are looking for every penny they can find to pay the bills, especially with the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays around the corner.

As families are trying to save, Donald Trump is making it easier for gas companies to waste—that is, waste as much natural gas as they want—by delaying an important rule that reduces leaks and waste from natural gas facilities.

Can we have some order please.

Extracting natural gas costs money, and the more natural gas is wasted, the more consumers end up paying. That means it gets even more expensive to heat your home during the winter. It means more stress for families trying to make ends meet.

It is bad enough that the Republicans cut off all clean energy. That is going to cause people's electric prices to go through the roof. But now this is even worse—insult to injury to the American consumer.

So the bottom line is simple: Americans are falling behind on their energy bills, and Donald Trump and Republicans are doing the bidding of the natural gas and oil lobby to drive up energy costs, destroying good-paying American jobs in the process.

That wasted natural gas is poisonous to our communities. It leaks out into our neighborhoods, causing asthma, lung cancer, heart problems, even reproductive issues. So Democrats have acted to reduce methane leaks and waste, saving consumers money and making our communities healthy. That is a win-win.

But Trump and Republicans, again—America, when your electric bill goes up, talk to your Senator, if they are Republican, about why they are cutting wind, cutting solar, and letting oil companies waste valuable methane.

They are doing it all, and it is going to hurt the American consumer.

I urge strongly that we support this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from California.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "EXTENSION OF DEADLINES IN STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW, RECONSTRUCTED, AND MODIFIED SOURCES AND EMISSIONS GUIDELINES FOR EXISTING SOURCES: OIL AND NATURAL GAS SECTOR CLIMATE REVIEW FINAL RULE"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHIFF. With that, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 162, S.J. Res. 76.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 162, S.J. Res. 76, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Extension of Deadlines in Standards of Performance for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources and Emissions Guidelines for Existing Sources: Oil and Natural Gas Sector Climate Review Final Rule".

#### VOTE ON MOTION

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

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr.

MARKEY) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 622 Leg.]

#### YEAS—46

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

#### NAYS—51

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

#### NOT VOTING—3

Justice	Markey	Sanders
---------	--------	---------

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, with me today is one of my colleagues from my office Mr. Nick Ayers.

Every time I look at or read an article about the One Big Beautiful Bill, I am shocked—though that sounds pejorative, maybe "impressed" is the right word—at its breadth. It is such an expansive piece of legislation.

On the airplane flying back from our last break, I sat down with some of my notes and just made a quick list off the top of my head of some of the things that we did in the One Big Beautiful Bill. And I hate to read to people, but I will just read you from my notes—and I won't even read all of them—but this is what we did in the One Big Beautiful Bill.

We extended the 2017 tax cuts. We saved \$1.3 trillion for the American people. We made them permanent. We cut taxes on tips. We cut taxes on overtime. We cut taxes on Social Security. We provided deductions for car loans. We increased the standard deduction. We continued the 20 percent income deduction for LLCs. We repealed the IRS reporting requirements for gig workers. Nobody ever talks about that. That was huge.

We passed school choice tax credits—first time Congress has ever done something like that. We enhanced 529 education savings accounts. We provided full expensing for research and development.