

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have used the Congressional Review Act against Democratic States, like my home State of California, when they repealed our State's clean air rules.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.

I mean, I could keep going here.

We reformed Medicaid. We ended Federal payments for abortion and gender surgery and sex change operations through Medicaid.

I could go on for 20 more minutes. It is just an extraordinary piece of legislation.

My only regret with respect to the bill is that we did it without Democratic votes. We did it with all Republican votes. I wish that hadn't been the case. I wish we had been able to convince some of our Democratic colleagues to join with us.

The obvious question while I make my statement is: How did you do that? How did you get past the filibuster? It takes 60 votes. You don't have to be an astrophysicist to know that about the U.S. Senate.

Well, as you know, Madam President, we did it under reconciliation.

Under reconciliation, only a majority vote is required—60 votes aren't required. You can do it with a majority vote. That is how we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill.

That is how President Biden passed much of his legislation. Reconciliation, as we know, is a creature of the Budget Control Act. I think of reconciliation as sort of a minibudget. That is a gross exaggeration and oversimplification, but I think of it as a minibudget.

Madam President, could we ask for order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I ask the Senators, please take your conversations off the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I think of reconciliation as more of a minibudget. Now, that is an oversimplification and exaggeration, and we can't do everything in reconciliation, but we can do a lot—we can do a lot.

We passed the reconciliation bill on July 1, about 5 months ago. And something that even members of the media are not aware of is we have the authority before the midterm elections to do two more reconciliation bills.

The first one that we did—we can do two more—the first of three potential reconciliation bills we passed 5 months ago.

You know, you can do a lot in 5 months. Five months around here is a long time ago. In 5 months, you can learn a language. You have to work at it every day. In 5 months, you can learn how to play a musical instrument. In 5 months, you can write a book. In 5 months, you can start a small business.

In 5 months, during World War II, the United States defeated the Japanese in the Guadalcanal invasion. In 5 months, the Duke of Wellington defeated Napoleon after he escaped from Elba. In 5 months, a baby goes from gurgling and crying to saying mama and dada.

Five months is a long time.

How have we used that 5 months? Now, I am not putting anybody down. I want to say that. I am not criticizing any of my colleagues. I love my col-

leagues. I don't hate anybody. I love every one of my colleagues. And I am labor; I am not management.

But one of the reasons I came to the floor is to suggest to all of my colleagues—both my Democratic friends and my Republican friends—that time is wasting. The President has been pounding us. He has been criticizing us like we stole Christmas—like we stole Thanksgiving—for not getting rid of the filibuster.

Why does he want to get rid of the filibuster? Because he thinks we can pass a bill with 51 votes. We can already pass a bill with 51 votes. We just did it with the One Big Beautiful Bill, and we can do two more.

So why have we sat around for 5 months and not started on the second reconciliation bill? I just don't get it. I don't get it. I mean, in my opinion—and really I am not—I am just making an observation—to me, it is a 12-piece bucket of stupid not to do another reconciliation bill and to waste 5 months before we even start on a second reconciliation bill, assuming that we get started tomorrow.

I mean, humans are supposed to have evolved as a species. Why wouldn't we not do a second reconciliation bill? Think of what we could do. I mean, moms and dads all across America tonight are going to lie down to sleep, and they won't be able to.

What are they worried about? Well, they are worried about the cost of housing for one thing. They are worried about the cost of home insurance. They are worried about the cost of flood insurance. They are worried about the cost of health insurance.

We all know that.

They are worried about the cost of living. Now, I think President Trump has done a good job on inflation. At one point under President Biden, we experienced 9 percent inflation. We have got it down to 3 percent, and I think that is extraordinary.

But the American people don't understand—nor can they be expected to understand because they are too busy earning a living—they don't know the difference between deflation and disinflation.

What we have experienced is disinflation. When we went from 9 percent to 3 percent, all that meant was that prices were going up at 9 percent. Now they are only going up at 3 percent.

They are still going up.

What the American people are interested in is deflation, getting the high prices that we have as a result of the policies of President Biden's administration, getting those prices down, not stopping them from growing as quickly—getting them down. And the American people are worried about it.

And again, I applaud President Trump and his economic team for doing as well as they have, but we have got more work to do.

And reconciliation, assuming it could survive the parameters of the Budget Control Act, we could address rules and

regulations. We spend almost \$2 trillion a year—we, I say “we,” the business community does. It spends almost \$2 trillion a year complying with Federal rules and regulations. They pass that cost on.

Why do you think goods and services cost more today? In large part, in substantial part, it is the result of rules and regulations. Through a reconciliation bill, we could pass measures to get the cost of those goods and services down and actually reduce those prices by getting a little government off the backs of businesspeople.

We could do all those things through reconciliation.

And so, the first reason I came to the floor tonight is to say to my colleagues: Pretty please, with sugar on top—I will even add a cherry, I will even throw in a coupon for a personal pan pizza—please, let's do another reconciliation bill.

And when I say “we,” I am saying the Republican majority. Let's invite our Democratic colleagues to join with us—and I hope after inviting them, I sincerely hope they will take us up on it.

But if they don't—and they don't have to; it is a free country—it only takes a majority to pass the reconciliation bill. And after we do the second one, we can do a third one before the midterms.

If we do not take advantage of this opportunity to lower the cost of living for the American people through reconciliation when we only need 51 votes to do it, it is legislative malpractice. It is legislative malpractice. It is dumb as a bowl of noodles.

So that is my plea to my colleagues tonight. I am not saying we have done nothing for 5 months. We have done a lot of other things in 5 months, but we haven't done anything to lower the cost of living for the American people, and we can't look back. We have lost 5 months, but we should get started tomorrow.

BBC

Madam President, the second topic I want to talk about—gosh, I wish I started with this first. I hate to end with a negative note, but the second thing I want to talk about makes me want to stick my head in the oven.

British Broadcasting Corporation, we have all heard of it—BBC. It is the United Kingdom's version of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The BBC is the United Kingdom's state-owned, state-paid-for, state broadcast corporation. I think they call it “Beeb.” I think that is the slang term for the British Broadcasting Corporation.

And everybody in the United Kingdom pays for it. You know, we were paying—the American people were paying a lot for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting before we stopped the subsidies. The American people were paying about \$500 million a year. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, they were pikers compared to the BBC.

In the United Kingdom, every citizen, whether they watch BBC or not, every citizen has to pay \$230 a year—everybody. It doesn't matter whether you watch the BBC or not. You may just have nothing but streaming services. You still have got to pay \$230 a year to the BBC.

They collect billions of dollars a year. Somewhere here in this mess I have got the exact figure. I think it is something like \$4 billion a year. Our national broadcasting programs were just pikers compared to theirs.

And they have tentacles like an octopus.

I mean, the BBC is everywhere, not just in the United Kingdom. It is omnipresent.

I was doing some research today. I mean, they broadcast four entertainment-oriented television channels. They broadcast two children's channels. They broadcast Parliament. They have local language channels in Scotland and Wales. They have a domestic 24-hour news channel. And these folks are everywhere. They run dozens of radio stations. They operate their own video and audio streaming services.

I mean, I could go on and on and on. Why am I mentioning that? Well, the BBC is a big deal. They reach a lot of people—millions and millions of people—not just in the United Kingdom but across the world. It is important that they be fair, and it is important that they be balanced, and it is important that they be accurate. And they are not, and it has been a problem for a long time.

Five or six years ago, at the suggestion of Parliament, which was very upset with the BBC's bias, they hired a consultant—a smart gentleman—and he did a report on how to improve the BBC and make it fairer. It was a huge report. Here is just part of it right here. This isn't even all of it. This is just some of it right here.

He spent hours and spent a lot of money preparing this report. He sent it to the BBC. Do you know what the BBC did? Nothing. Nothing. Zero. Zilch. Nada. They just continued on doing what they always do, sucking on their teeth, publishing whatever they want.

And nothing would have happened except that the report issued by the consultant leaked. Somebody leaked it to a newspaper in the United Kingdom, the Telegraph, and they published it. And the whole world got to see what the BBC's own consultant had found.

I will give you a couple of examples.

We all remember January 6. President Trump gave a speech. We have all seen it. It was a long speech. It was about an hour, maybe longer.

A week before the last Presidential election in America, the BBC did a documentary on President Trump. And do you know what they did? They took his hour-plus-long speech, and they took two snippets from that speech—one snippet at the beginning and one snippet at the end.

The excerpts that the BBC took were 50 minutes apart. So they took them

totally out of context, and they spliced those two excerpts together to make it look like one speech. And they had the President of the United States calling, making a direct plea, for violence. The way the BBC edited the President's speech, he was telling the people at his speech to march on the Capitol and invade it.

Well, that is not what his speech said.

Now, reasonable people can disagree all they want to, but no reasonable person can listen to the President's speech and conclude that he told people to go out and riot and break into the Capitol.

But the BBC took these two snippets and put them together. I defy you to listen to it. They pulled it down now, but it is on the internet. It sounds like the President is telling his supporters: Go to the Capitol and raise fresh hell and invade it and hurt people.

And then you know what they did on top of that? After they edited the President's speech—he didn't say what they said he said. They showed a clip of the Proud Boys—we all know who the Proud Boys are—marching on the Capitol, as if the Proud Boys were acting in response—in direct response—to the President's speech that the BBC edited.

One problem, the footage that they aired of the Proud Boys, it didn't happen after the President's speech. It happened—the footage of the Proud Boys marching along was way before he ever gave the speech. And they packaged this junk together and ran it on television.

And this consultant called them out, and the BBC ignored it.

Do you know what else the consultant found? The consultant found that one of their news—he pointed out that a reporter on one of the BBC News channels reported this to the world. I am going to quote this news reporter from the BBC:

Trump is out there on the campaign trail saying he wants people to shoot Liz Cheney in the face. Is that the sort of thing that women react well to?

This is a reporter for the BBC. The President of the United States never said that. He never said it. They just made it up. They were either lying or they need to put down the crack pipe.

Another reporter for World News America, which is part of the BBC, reported, and I quote again, that Trump “appeared to suggest that Liz Cheney should face a firing squad for her stance on foreign policy.”

They attributed that to the President. He never said that. The consultant for the BBC sent this report to the BBC and said: What planet are you living on? You are supposed to be a news reporter. You can't just go make news up.

The consultant's report for the BBC also talked about the BBC's coverage of the Israel-Hamas war. And the consultant pointed out that the reporting by the BBC was heavily, heavily biased in favor of Hamas. It wasn't balanced.

It wasn't presenting two points of view. It was heavily weighted in favor of Hamas.

For example, in February, the BBC produced a documentary on Gaza, and it was narrated by a young man, a 13-year-old man. What the BBC forgot to tell its audience is that the 13-year-old's dad was a Hamas senior official.

Balanced reporting? Gag me with a spoon.

In June of that same year—you probably read about this—the BBC broadcast a live music performance featuring calls for the deaths of Israeli soldiers. The consultant pointed this out to the BBC. They totally ignored him.

The consultant also pointed this out. He said: Your coverage, BBC, of transgender issues is controlled—it is completely biased, and it is controlled by a certain group within BBC. And that group within BBC is a group of reporters called the LGBTQ Desk. They are reporters within the newsroom. They have their own—their own—what is the term I am looking for? Their own caucus. It is called the LGBTQ caucus—these reporters.

And the consultant said: Look, your own reporters, the members of the LGBTQ caucus, are not reporting anything contrary about transgenderism to what you say. You are not being balanced. In fact, the United Kingdom—Great Britain—they have outlawed transgender surgery and transgender treatments for minors. The BBC never bothered to mention that.

Now, look, you might be thinking: You know, what is the big deal? This is another country.

But it is not all right. We may not be brothers and sisters, but we are certainly first cousins with the United Kingdom, and the BBC broadcasts worldwide. And this is simply not right when the good people of our cousin country are having to pay 200 bucks a year.

Now, President Trump has said he is going to sue the BBC. Do you know what? I hope he does. I hope he does.

This is a disgrace, and it is why I said that it makes me want to stick my head in an oven.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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 Senator from Alaska.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am coming down to the Senate floor for the second time in about a month to try to pass a really important bill for some really heroic constituents of mine, Alaskan Native Vietnam veterans, and I am going to explain this bill a little bit.

Hopefully, the Senate is going to work well, because when I tried to pass this a month ago, Senator PADILLA said: Hey, I am going to object, but if you work with us on some bills that you can move in a pairing, then we will pass this.

So I have done that, and I will talk about that. I am actually going to try to pass two bills.

I see that the senior Senator from New Mexico is on the floor, which doesn't bode well for the passage of this bill, which is disappointing, and I am going to get to why it is disappointing. It is remarkable that this bill would be blocked, again, by Democrats. But let me give you a little bit about the background.

So Alaska Native people in my State serve at higher rates in the military than any other ethnic group in the country—what I refer to as special patriotism. You go into Alaska Native villages, you ask how many veterans are there, and almost everybody raises their hand. It is remarkable. It is patriotic. It is incredible. If the rest of the country were like Alaska Native people in terms of service to our military, we would have a better America.

They underwent an incredible injustice because so many Alaska Natives went to Vietnam to serve in the war when a lot of Americans—let's face it—were avoiding service in Vietnam. So these great men and women went to serve their country in Vietnam. When they got drafted, they would say: Hey, it is my time. My dad fought in World War II. My uncle fought in Korea. I am just going.

So they all went. And what happened—every Alaska Native had the ability to get, under a 1906 law, a Native allotment. You could go and say: Hey, I grew up in this area. I hunted and fished here. I want to get 160 acres for an allotment.

The Federal Government would say: Here, you get that allotment.

That was in the law.

When these guys were over serving in Vietnam, Congress changed that law. It is complicated, but they passed what was called the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act—a very important bill—and it extinguished the ability for Alaska Natives to get their Native allotment.

Well, guess what. A lot of these guys and a few women were overseas serving their country in Vietnam. They didn't know. There was no internet, no cellphones, right? So they got home. They weren't treated well because they were Vietnam vets. Let's face that. They weren't treated well because there is still a lot of discrimination with regard to Native people, indigenous people. And then they were told: Oh, by the way, that Native allotment that you wanted? Sorry. When you were fighting for your country, we passed a law saying you can't get it anymore.

Well, look, I thought that was a huge injustice, so I worked on a bill during

President Trump's first term to say: Now, wait a minute, if you were overseas serving your country, and you missed your ability to apply for a Native allotment, you should get your ability to do that.

That law passed. I was in the Oval Office when the President of the United States signed it. He said: This is an injustice. I am going to fix this for the Alaska Native Vietnam vets.

I mean, what is more bipartisan than that? Why would you come down to the Senate floor and block this bill?

So anyway, when Secretary Haaland, Secretary of the Interior—when she went through her confirmation process, I talked to her about a number of things. She was a Congresswoman at the time. I said: The No. 1 issue I care about more than anything—more than oil and gas, more than resource development—the No. 1 issue I care about that you need to commit to me, Congresswoman Deb Haaland, is to rapidly implement this bill, OK? These are Vietnam vets. A lot of them are dying, OK? Make this a priority.

I met with her twice, and she committed to me twice to do that. Guess what. Secretary Haaland did not keep her commitment at all. As a matter of fact, one of the first things she did when she got into office, the Secretary of the Interior under Joe Biden, she delayed implementation of this bill for 2 years, just put a moratorium on it.

I was like, whoa, you certainly lied to me there, Madam Secretary. OK. Two years. She just did nothing.

Overall, the program is a 5-year program. She shamefully did 40 allotments in 4 years. Forty Alaska Native Vietnam vets got this. There are 2,000—over 2,000 who are eligible. They just didn't do it because they didn't want people to get land—even Alaska Native Vietnam veterans.

So anyway, this bill has a 5-year window. It expires in December. All I am trying to do is extend it for 5 more years. That is it. This is a one-sentence bill. It changes the words "5 years" to "10 years."

Guess what. Last year in December, I came down to the Senate floor, and I passed this unanimously. It passed. So the Senate passed it last year. The House has already passed it. If this bill passes tonight, it is going to go to the President, and he is going to sign it.

Why would anyone block this?

So I tried to do this a month ago, and Senator PADILLA was on the floor, and he said: Hey, I am going to block it because we kind of don't think it is fair if we just get one Republican bill over the goal line.

So he and I talked on the floor and said: Let us work with you, DAN, because we know this is important to you. We know this is important to your heroic constituents. Let us work with you. If you pair this with a Democrat bill that is important, we will work to pass it.

So Senator PADILLA objected when I tried to pass it last time. Democrats

even suggested to me what bill to pair it with. It is called H.R. 1034 or S. 909. It is the La Paz County Solar Energy and Job Creation Act. It is a pretty good bill. It is a land exchange. This is Senator GALLEGOS's bill.

So the Democrats told me: If you can pair your bill for Vietnam vets with the Gallego bill, H.R. 1034, then that is fair because we are moving a Democrat bill and we are moving a Republican bill. They are paired together. By the way, they are both ready to go to be signed by the President. That would be fair.

So my team worked really hard to clear all the Republican holds on the Senator Gallego bill. We worked on it for the last 3 or 4 weeks. There were a number of holds, and I went to my Republican colleagues: Hey, guys, can you lift the hold, right? This is a pretty good bill from Senator GALLEGOS. It is important to him in Arizona, and this is really important to me.

I explained the Alaska Native Vietnam vet bill. So we lifted the holds. Republicans cleared the hotline.

So that is what has happened.

Now, I guess, unless he is here to talk about how he supports my bill—so 2 hours ago, we thought this was going to clear. Gallego's bill. Sullivan's bill. Good for Arizona, Democrats. Good for Alaska Native Vietnam vets. We get a call an hour ago saying: Nope, the Dems are going to move the goalpost, and they are going to object.

Why? I am really looking forward to hearing from my good friend from New Mexico on why they are going to object, but I am pretty sure I know why. He is going to tell me: Hey, we want to move more bills.

Well, wait. You guys just told me 2 weeks ago: Pair the Gallego bill with the Alaska Native Vietnam vet bill, and we will pass it.

Normally, the Senate works on trust, right? So I did that. But I guess now the Democrats are going to move the goalpost, and they want to leverage—leverage—Alaska Native Vietnam vets, heroes, to get more stuff. I don't know. I want to hear from Senator HEINRICH.

You know, the Dems are starting to get really good—it is a pattern—at leveraging really good Americans—air traffic controllers for the last 40 days—to get other stuff. Now it looks like they are going to leverage Alaska Native Vietnam vets who got hosed by their own government. All they want is to get their allotment that they missed the opportunity to get when they were serving their country in Vietnam. Like, how hard is that?

So, again, we have two good bills right now. One is a Dem bill, and one is a Republican bill. If we pass the H.R. bill, they are going to go right to the President's desk.

Now, the other objection I heard from my Democratic colleagues is that, well, they don't want to pass House bills. So I am like, all right. Well, if you don't want to pass House bills, let's pass the Sullivan Senate

version of this and the Gallego Senate version.

Again, I am down here on the floor trying to help Senator GALLEGO, a Democrat from Arizona. He is a marine. I like marines. He has a good bill here. It seems like it is going to help his constituents. So I am ready to go.

All right. If you guys want to object to the House bill, I get that. We are objecting—some of our Senators are objecting to House bills even though those go right to the President's desk. We will move forward on the Senate bill. Now, that means it will have to go back over to the House, so it won't get signed by the President right away. So I am ready to do that too.

I just want to help the people I represent, and these are very special people. If any of you or Senator HEINRICH met some of these Alaska Native Vietnam vets, you would cry when you hear their stories. So heroic. And all I am trying to do is help them. And we got this done.

By the way, the program expires in December. The program that I got done with President Trump's signature on it expires in a month. Secretary Haaland slow-walked it. I got it passed last year to extend it, and now my Democrat colleagues are going to slow-walk it. It is going to expire next month.

I came here a month ago. They told me: All right, DAN. We know it is important to you. Go pair it.

They said: Go pair Gallego's bill with this, and we will sign off on it.

I got all the Republicans to sign off on my bill and Gallego's, and just an hour ago: Nope. We are going to leverage these Vietnam vets against you, DAN SULLIVAN, to get more.

Now, look, the Senator from New Mexico is probably going to say: Hey, I want to move more bills.

All right. I will help you move more bills. You just saw I worked Gallego's bill. But these two bills are ready to go to the President's desk—a Democrat bill which is a pretty good bill for Arizona and a Republican bill which is a really good bill for my constituents, heroic constituents.

So I am going to try, and maybe Senator HEINRICH is going to get up and say: Gosh darn it, DAN SULLIVAN. This is a great bill, and I just want to come here and speak out on behalf of it.

You know, a lot of the Democrats talk about indigenous people, people of color, how much they care about minority communities. When it comes to my State, these guys target Alaska Natives. I have seen it my whole career. I mean, geez, the minority leader—the guy goes after Alaska Natives like they are some kind of criminals. It is outrageous.

This is a bill for indigenous people of America, and all the Democrats: Oh, we care about—no, you don't. If you did—maybe Senator HEINRICH tonight is going to talk about how much he cares about indigenous people in Alaska. I have seen him talk about it before. If he does, then he should prove it right now.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc; further, that the bills be considered read a third time and passed en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc: H.R. 410, the Alaska Native Vietnam Era Veterans Land Allotment Extension Act of 2025, and H.R. 1043, the La Paz County Solar Energy and Job Creation Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I rise today to object on behalf of my colleague from California Senator PADILLA and my colleague from Colorado Senator BENNET.

The Energy and Natural Resources Committee does have a long tradition of bipartisanship and cooperation when it comes to passing very local and oftentimes very parochial land bills. Typically, this is negotiated in a package rather than the piecemeal approach that we are seeing today—for many reasons but in part because we have literally hundreds of bills within our committee's jurisdiction that need action, including the ones that my colleague is talking about today, with most representing very important local priorities in our States.

Unfortunately, attempting to pass individual bills through unanimous consent in this manner tends to favor one party or one Chamber's priorities and is often ineffective at actually getting legislation signed into law.

Senator PADILLA, Senator BENNET, and I are happy to sit down with my colleague from Alaska and with the chairman to make sure that both our Chambers—both our parties' priorities can be put together in a way that we see them reach the finish line. Therefore, in support of my colleague from California and my colleague from Colorado, I must object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am disappointed in this. Now, I was trying to pass the H.R. bills from the House because those bills have already passed—the Gallego bill, the Sullivan bill, the lands transfer bill for Arizona, the Alaska Native Vietnam vets bill for my brave Alaska Native veterans. I was informed—and you heard it from the Senator from New Mexico—that maybe they don't want to pass House bills. He kind of said that. He did mention that he is objecting because he doesn't want to favor one party over the other. That argument is irrelevant because I am passing a Democrat bill and a Republican bill. So this is even stephen when it comes to the parties.

I am very surprised that he is objecting on behalf of Senator PADILLA because, when Senator PADILLA objected

to my bill a month ago, he literally said: Hey, DAN, work with us. Pair it with the Democrat bill. Then Senator PADILLA's team even suggested which Democrat bill to pair it with, which was the Gallego bill, which I am trying to pass right now.

So, as to what my colleague from New Mexico just said, none of it makes sense unless people are going back on their word, which is a little bit frustrating because the Senate operates on trust here. Maybe it is because my colleague doesn't like a House bill.

So what I am going to try and do now—again, for Senator GALLEGO, a Democrat from Arizona, and for me, a Republican from Alaska—is try and pass by unanimous consent the Senate version of these bills. What I did—because I told the other side that I would do it—is I told Senator GALLEGO and Senator PADILLA that I will clear Senator GALLEGO's bill; that I will clear it on the Republican side. It took a lot of work, but we got that done. So let's see if we can pass the Senate version of these bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc; further, that the bills be considered read a third time and passed en bloc and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc: Senator GALLEGO's bill, S. 909; the La Paz County Solar Energy and Job Creation Act; and my bill, S. 785, the Alaska Native Vietnam Era Veterans Land Allotment Extension Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am just going to end by saying I am very disappointed. I tried to do this a month ago. This bill of mine is really for some great heroes in America, and the program is going to expire in a month. This bill passed unanimously in December. My colleague from New Mexico came down and talked in process terms about why he is objecting. It is a little hard to understand, but I actually think there is probably something else going on here as I have been around this place long enough.

This is a chart that I have called the last frontier lockup. It lists the 70 Executive orders and Executive actions all throughout the State of Alaska to lock up my State—70 Executive orders and Executive actions issued by the Biden administration to shut down Alaska, to stop getting access to Federal lands in Alaska, to stop any kind of resource development in Alaska—and 1 of those 70 was to delay and stop the Alaska Native Vietnam Era Veterans Land Allotment Extension Act

that Secretary Haaland committed me to implement.

This is what my Democrat colleagues do. This is what they do to Alaska. They have groups—far-left groups—that tell them, when they get in power, to shut down Alaska.

But wait a minute. We have bills that help Alaska Native indigenous people.

They are like: Hey, we don't care about them. Shut down Alaska. Shut down indigenous people's opportunities.

I saw, for 4 years with the Biden administration, this whole area of the National Petroleum Reserve of Alaska, which is meant for oil and gas development—that they shut down the whole thing, OK? Guess who wanted that to be open. All the indigenous leaders of the North Slope: the Tribe, the Alaska Native Corporations, the Borough Leadership. They came down here eight times to DC—eight times—to try to meet with the Secretary of the Interior, saying: Don't lock up my lands. Don't lock up my lands. She never met with them. She never met with them.

My colleague from New Mexico has been the leader in locking up Alaska. I mean, I have come down to the floor and raised a little bit of heck on all of the actions he has taken to lock up my State.

So, look, the Democrats really don't want anyone, including heroic Alaska Native Vietnam vets, to have access to land even though that is the law. It is really, really ironic that they always say they want to help indigenous people, but in my State, their actions are very different, and this is a great example of what they are doing.

You know, it is really ironic, too, that during the 4 years of the Biden administration, when this was going on, it was “drill, baby, drill” in New Mexico. New Mexico, with the Secretary of the Interior's help, increased oil production from 1 million barrels to 2 million barrels a day on Federal lands. Yet the Senator from New Mexico and the Secretary of the Interior and Joe Biden said: We are going to shut this place down.

Now they are saying: We are going to make sure the Native Vietnam vets—they have had a real injustice. We fixed it under law. Then it was delayed by the Biden administration's Secretary of the Interior.

All I am trying to do is get a two-word change so this program can continue. These guys are dying every day, these great heroes. I came to the floor a month ago and tried to get it done.

The Democrat Senator said: Do this, DAN.

I did it.

Do this, DAN.

I did it.

Pair it with the Democrat bill.

I did it. It was ready to go.

Then, an hour ago, they said: Nope. We are going to block it again.

It is an outrage—it is an outrage—and it is not because of process. It is because they want to keep my State

shut down. I see it every time here, and it is wrong. It is wrong.

I will keep working. If you guys want to pass more bills, I will keep trying, but I am starting to lose a little trust. A month ago, I was on the floor, and you guys told me what to do to move this. I did it and none of you kept your word and that is not how this place operates.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING WILLIAM C. “BILL” KNAPP

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a remarkable business and civic leader from my home State who passed away peacefully at age 99 surrounded by his beloved family members.

A World War II veteran, William C. Knapp is an American patriot who piloted landing craft amidst kamikaze attacks during the Battle of Okinawa in the Pacific Theater, one of the bloodiest battles of World War II. A member of the “Greatest Generation,” he enlisted in the U.S. Navy at age 17, a bold decision that underscored how he would pursue entrepreneurial endeavors for the rest of his life, fueled by humble beginnings, his own “gut check,” and strong farm kid work ethic.

Bill's zest for life was shaped by his wartime experience, surviving fierce fighting during the largest amphibian landing of the Pacific theater with heavy death tolls on both sides. The experience left an indelible imprint in his mind and on his heart, compelling him time and again to pay it forward for his fellow veterans. Two decades ago, Bill donated land for the Iowa Veterans Cemetery in Van Meter, providing sacred ground for tens of thousands of burials for Iowa veterans. On Friday, November 21, Bill will be laid to rest with full military honors among other Iowa hometown heroes on the land he donated to honor veterans for generations to come.

Bill's donation of prime real estate is but one example of his generosity and commitment to share his blessings and make a difference. A decades-long philanthropist, Bill underwrote the cost of a Central Iowa Honor Flight to ensure aging Iowa veterans were able to travel to Washington, DC, to see the World War II Memorial built for their service and sacrifice.

Bill leaves behind an iconic footprint on Iowa's landscape, from the skyline of Des Moines to the celebrated Iowa

State Fair. With his business acumen and leadership prowess, Bill founded Knapp Properties and scaled Iowa Realty into a financial juggernaut that fueled transformative projects in our State capital.

Although Bill and I were on opposite sides of the political spectrum, we are both Iowa farm kids who worked hard to make Iowa a better place to live, build a business, raise a family and earn a good living. Partisanship didn't spoil our mutual love for Iowa or stop us from working to improve the lives and livelihoods of our neighbors. I am flattered he even supported me a time or two over the course of my political career.

Bill and I shared a special fondness for the Iowa State Fair. He kept up a larger-than-life tradition every year and parked a big camper at the State fairgrounds for all 10 days, hosting people in the political realm and meeting with Iowans from across the State. As always, his generosity followed his heart. Over the years, he opened his wallet generously and spearheaded fundraising efforts to help make our state fair among the very best in the Nation. Bill contributed to many charitable organizations and institutions, from childcare centers to affordable housing and human services, as well as impactful contributions to Drake University in Des Moines.

Good leaders tend to dream big and those who surround themselves with the best and brightest are able to turn those dreams into reality. Bill was one of those rare people in this world who never met a stranger. From the hotel valet to the electrician to those who helped run his businesses, Bill's kindness, optimism, and work ethic inspired others to “make things happen” and be like Bill, no matter which rung of the economic ladder you occupied. His lifetime of service and good works was recognized in 2011 when Bill was presented with the Iowa Award, becoming the 21st person to receive our State's highest citizen honor.

Barbara and I share our condolences to Bill's wife Susan and members of the Knapp family. For nearly a century, Bill led a full life, lived with virtue and purpose. May his memory be a blessing, and may his loved ones take comfort that his legacy will endure for generations yet to come.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

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