

parts of our country, it helps on air-conditioning, which is vital. And as the Presiding Officer knows, the number of people who are dying of heat exposure has been increasing, alarmingly. So this is the call to the Trump administration: Do your job.

Now, Secretary Kennedy has a legal responsibility to disburse the current LIHEAP funding, and it is illegal for him to withhold those funds as well as really pretty cruel.

The reality is that this summer we in Congress came together, on a bipartisan basis, to increase and to pass the \$4 billion in funding for the program. And, again, I emphasize, it is not a red State, blue State deal. It is not a Republican, Democratic deal. It is a person who is in a home, doesn't have money, and is cold. That is what it is about.

So I am calling on President Trump and Secretary Kennedy to stop stalling and to act with alacrity and release the LIHEAP funding for the benefit of the people in the State of Vermont and in every State in this country who depend on it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, last week, Republicans in Congress passed a government funding bill that denies affordable healthcare to millions of Americans. But what most people don't know is that they also voted to provide millions of dollars to a few Republican Senators in a blatant, taxpayer-funded cash grab.

Here is what happened. In the process of passing government funding legislation, Senate Republicans airdropped a provision into the bill at the last minute. This provision allows eight Republican Senators to collect millions of dollars from the U.S. Government, when what the Department of Justice did was to lawfully subpoena those phone records during a grand jury investigation. But now these eight Senators can sue the government for at least half a million dollars for each individual instance of a lawful access to those phone records. That means that each Senator could actually pocket millions of dollars, and that money would be paid from your hard-earned tax dollars—and that is even though the law was followed by the government at the time.

Frankly, this is just outrageous to me. This is at the exact same time as 22 million Americans could see their health insurance premiums skyrocket because Republicans refuse to extend the ACA tax credits. This is at the exact same time as millions of seniors and veterans and families are learning that they will lose their SNAP food assistance altogether because of President Trump's "Big Bad Bill." It is at the exact same time as families across my home State of New Mexico and

across America are wondering how they will put Thanksgiving food on the table or how they will put presents under the tree in a month, how they will fuel their car to get to the job that is in jeopardy now because of President Trump's cancellation of Federal grants, exorbitant tariff taxes, and overall recklessness.

But instead of fixing all of that, instead of tackling the affordability crisis in this country, instead of blocking President Trump's tariffs and undoing his war on American jobs, instead of fighting to protect the 41 million people whose SNAP benefits were in jeopardy during Trump's shutdown, Republicans made time to insert this payoff. It is unprecedented in American history.

Let's put it another way. Everyday people are struggling. While one TikTok account called Dollar Tree Dinners—an account that teaches low-income folks how to make filling meals from Dollar Tree ingredients—has over 3 million followers, U.S. Senators could receive over \$3 million from your wallet.

There are no existing records of Congress creating a taxpayer-funded cash pipeline for Senators to sue the government for doing its job. That is probably because it is so patently wrong.

Even House Speaker MIKE JOHNSON agrees with me, and when Speaker JOHNSON and I agree something is bad, you know it is really, really bad.

As ranking member of the U.S. Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch, where this provision was inserted, I can tell you that the process to include it was not normal. It was not in our markup. Normally, we have the opportunity to review new language, provide edits, and negotiate. None of that happened. This was slipped in at the eleventh hour, and now the American people are expected to pony up.

I am furious that the Senate majority leader chose to airdrop this provision into that bill in particular with zero negotiation with the subcommittee that actually oversees this work. It is why this week, I introduced a bill with U.S. Senator MARK KELLY to shut down this taxpayer-funded payoff. We must reverse this last-minute giveaway that lets a few Senators pocket millions of dollars of taxpayer money while millions of Americans are revisiting their budgets to figure out how to make it to the end of the month.

Like my Anti-Cash Grab Act, H.R. 6019 will eliminate the retroactive \$500,000-per-instance cash claims for Senators. It will block millions in taxpayer-funded kickbacks to politicians. And it still keeps the door open for legitimate reforms to notification requirements without any of the self-enriching loopholes.

Now, I disagree with the title of H.R. 6019, but I agree on the substance, and that is what matters here.

The truth is that a country where a sitting elected official can get half a

million dollars or more in one go while people around the country see their monthly costs rise by hundreds or thousands of dollars—that is a country that is not serving the people. This is not the America I know, and it is not the America we should be.

This is a test. This is a test of whether Congress works for hard-working families across America or for DC insiders. It is, to put it clearly, a test of our accountability, our transparency, and most of all, our integrity. I know which side I am on.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 6019, which was received from the House and is at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read three times and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I object to a lot of stuff being said, but let's just start with sort of the facts.

You said this was a lawful subpoena. What did I do wrong? What did I do to allow the government to seize my personal phone and my official phone when I was Senate Judiciary chairman? What did I do?

There was an order issued that said if I was notified of this breach of my privacy, I am likely to intimidate witnesses or destroy evidence. Based on what?

There are 10 of us involved here. What did we do to justify having Jack Smith issue a subpoena for the phone records of a branch of government—the Senate—where all of us had to decide whether or not to certify the election?

So, no, it wasn't lawful. You have determined it was. You don't get to decide; a court does. We are not going to let the Democratic Party decide my fate; we are going to let a judge decide my fate. But I have to get in court and prove my case.

To the majority leader, was this provision socialized with the minority leader?

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. THUNE. I would say to the Senator from South Carolina the answer to that is yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Was this provision socialized with committees of relevant jurisdiction?

Mr. THUNE. The answer is yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Was this issue sent to the Ethics Committee?

Mr. THUNE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. OK. So this wasn't Republicans doing this; this was people in

the Senate believing what happened in the Senate need never happen again.

What happened in the Senate? There is a statute right on point that governs data to be released by the Sergeant at Arms, and it says in that statute: Notwithstanding a judicial order, data from the Senate cannot be released by subpoena or even a judicial order without the body being notified because of the separation of powers issue.

That statute was violated, and there is no remedy. What are we trying to do to make sure this doesn't happen again to me or you? The reason I think Senator SCHUMER went with Senator THUNE is they are worried about the body here.

We have a contract with Verizon—the Senate does—that requires us to be notified if any Senator's phone records are requested or any member working for the body.

There were 197 subpoenas issued in Arctic Frost. There are 430 Republican groups—Turning Point USA, the Republican National Committee, the Republican Attorney Generals Association, the Conservative Partnership Institute, Mark Meadows, Stephen Miller—400-some groups that were targeted.

What was going on here? What was Jack Smith up to? What was he trying to do? I think what he was trying to do is use lawfare against Donald Trump. Within 3 days of saying "I am running again for President in 2022 for the 2024 cycle," Jack Smith was appointed special counsel. Within 8 or 9 months, 91 charges were levied against President Trump in New York, Manhattan; Atlanta; Washington, DC; and the bluest of blue.

I wound up getting subpoenaed by Fani Willis in Fulton County and spent \$1.2 million going to that grand jury, having to testify what I did as Judiciary chairman.

If you will remember, on January 6, I was actually here. I think I did my part to make sure we certified the election. I voted to certify everything.

So what is going on here? Nobody actually knows.

And to the two leaders of the body, thank you for making sure we are going to do something to protect the Senate not only from what happened to us but what could happen to anybody in the future.

This is really outrageous. You want to use that word. I am really outraged that my private cell phone and my official phone were subpoenaed without cause, that a judge would suggest that I would destroy evidence or tamper with witnesses if I were told about what was going on. I am sure the other Senators—HAGERTY, HAWLEY, SULLIVAN, TUBERVILLE, JOHNSON, SCOTT, LUMMIS, BLACKBURN, TED CRUZ, at least one staff member, the Speaker of the House. Now we know Kevin McCarthy—they asked for his phone records the day he was sworn in as Speaker, and AT&T apparently gave them to them.

What is going on here? What did we do? This is why we need to go to court

and have our day in court, and the burden will be on me that I was wrong. But there is no doubt, if you were the jury, I would have no chance. You have already judged what we are doing. You made a political statement.

So you are not the person to judge. I am not the person to judge. It is the judge.

All of us who were wronged need to have a remedy to that wrong, and we are creating a chance to go to court for what happened to us and in a fashion to make sure it never happens again. This was coordinated with people in the Senate in power. This wasn't an attempt to enrich anybody. It was an attempt to deter that what was wrong, in my view, never happens again.

I am willing to work with my colleagues about the \$500,000. I am going to sue. I want to let you know. I am going to sue Biden's DOJ and Jack Smith. I am going to sue Verizon. It will be a hell of a lot more than \$500,000.

This is twice that this has happened to me. I was hauled into court in Atlanta for no good reason. I spent a million dollars. And the crime is being friends of Trump, being supporters of Trump. This was an abuse of the law. This was weaponization of the law.

It is just not me. I am going to open up the ability to other people who had their phone records subpoenaed—I think, unfairly—at least, a chance to make that case. There are 197 subpoenas with 400 groups. I am going to create a statute that anybody that was in this situation could make a claim. They will have to prove the claim.

We are not going to shut this down. We are not going to act like it is OK when it is not. We are not going to say it is legal because you are a Democrat and I am a Republican. We are going to have a judge determine whether or not it was legal. I don't think it was legal at all because I know me. I have done nothing wrong here. I wasn't conspiring with anybody to overturn the election. I did my part to make sure 2020 ended the way it should have.

So to my majority leader, thank you for working with Senator SCHUMER. And to Senator SCHUMER, thanks for trying to work together to protect the body. We will be working together to find a resolution that may be more accommodating. But as for the idea that I am backing off and I am going to let this go, you can forget that.

It is just not me. It is not about me and what happened to me alone. It is about how this happened to any of us, and it should never happen to any of us again. You have to have a reason to do what they did that I can't fathom.

This is a separate branch of government. Do you really want the Department of Justice coming after U.S. Senators' phone records when there is no warrant involved, when there is no alleged crime involved?

You are just fishing around. This is what we are talking about. That scares me. It offends me. And I am going to do something about it.

So I object. I think this provision can be changed in a way to be more acceptable to people, but we need to open up the courts to people like me and others that had our rights violated, I believe. But it will be up to the judge.

What we are trying to do is remedy a wrong. I think that is why Senator SCHUMER and the committees of jurisdiction understood why we needed to create an avenue.

It is me today. It could be you tomorrow. If you are at home, if they could do this to a U.S. Senator, what could they do to you? Maybe the Department of Justice doesn't like your post, doesn't like your political activity. They want to shut you down and find out who you have been talking to. This is scary stuff.

To Senator THUNE, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the other side to find a way to make this section more acceptable, but I am not backing off. I am not going to accept repeal because we need a way forward.

To my friends in the House, you need to start worrying about your Members. The former Speaker and two Members I know of had their phone records spied upon. So we have our work to do to clean this mess up in a way to provide remedies to those who may have been harmed, but not just sweep it under the rug.

Arctic Frost will not be swept under the rug. I will not go quietly. I will keep pushing back on behalf of myself and others in like situations.

Majority leader, I think you have a proposal here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just reiterate what the Senator from South Carolina said, and that is that this measure that we passed does, indeed, give important protections to Members. I think it is an important defense of the separation of powers. It protects Democrats, and it protects Republicans, alike, from a weaponized Department of Justice that is pursuing political enemies.

The measure was never meant to enrich Senators. It has always been true, under our rules, that Members wouldn't keep damages they recover under this measure.

I would hope that we can work together to pass a resolution to reflect what has always been true and what I have been saying all along, and that is that this measure is about accountability and not profit.

Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this resolution at desk; further, that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

Mr. President, what this would simply do is it would preserve the important elements of this, which I think are critical to the protection of the article

I branch of the government, constitutionally, but address the question that has been raised about personal enrichment, which I have said, again, is not the case here. This would clarify that any damages awarded under this law would be forfeited to the U.S. Treasury. No individual Senator could benefit.

That was the case before, but this would clarify that. And it seems to me, at least, if you want to address the concern that has been raised by the Senator from New Mexico about Senators trying to get hundreds of thousands of dollars out of the Justice Department and the Federal Government—taxpayers—this would address that by simply saying anything that is awarded—a settlement that is awarded under this statute—would be forfeited to the U.S. Treasury. But it would preserve the important protections that are in place under the statute when it comes to Members' personal information.

I happen to think—and that was what animated this—that individual Senators, Members of the article I branch of our government, should not be subject to a weaponized Department of Justice or prosecutors who go around the law. So this strengthens the law and ensures that, in the future, that doesn't happen.

It is, in my view, again, something that protects this institution, something that protects individual Senators. The unanimous consent request that I am offering here would clarify, in the form of a resolution, that it would apply to the Senate.

By the way, this only applies to the Senate. Frankly, there is a good argument that, if I am a Member of the House of Representatives, I would want the same protections included here. That wasn't the case. When we drafted this, it was in response to a statute that covered the Senate only. So this specifically applies to Senators.

And this resolution that I am offering here and asking unanimous consent for would clarify—make crystal clear—that any damages awarded as a result of claims brought under this statute would be forfeited to the U.S. Treasury and not be allowed for an individual Member to take advantage of.

Just to be clear, no personal enrichment, accountability, and, I think, protection for the article I branch of our government, which, in my view, based on what we saw and what we are seeing as the facts continue to come in from the Arctic Frost investigation, there was clearly a violation of the law and a law that needs to be strengthened and clarified so protections are in place for future Members of the U.S. Senate.

Again, I would argue, someday, probably, Members of the House would want that same protection.

So that is my request, Mr. President; that the resolution be agreed to—the resolution at the desk makes that clear—and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon

the table with no intervening objection or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HEINRICH. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. The remedy to a statutory change that is in statute is not a resolution. It is to fix the statute.

I think we should work with our colleagues in the House to address the underlying issue of protecting Members without the outrageous damage provisions that were retroactively put into this statute.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of legislation to strike the provision in the Federal funding package that would give a windfall to a handful of Republican Senators who the Biden administration investigated in connection with Trump's effort to try to overthrow the government on January 6, 2021. This provision would give those Senators \$500,000 for every phone call appearing on a call log, adding up to a corrupt giveaway of hundreds of millions or possibly even billions of taxpayer dollars. One of my colleagues has already bragged about his plans to sue the Federal Government to secure himself a payday.

How did we get here? My staff unearthed this secret provision shortly after the government funding bill was released. The brazenness of this corruption kind of takes your breath away. I immediately blew the whistle about this awful misuse of taxpayer money and alerted the press. Once the public learned of the heist, they were outraged and Members of Congress couldn't distance themselves from it fast enough.

Now, I am outraged over the corrupt Republican payoff, but I completely agree that it is important to notify Senators who have been surveilled by the government. Every American should have the right to be told, eventually, if the government spies on them, which is why I have authored the bipartisan Government Surveillance Transparency Act to do just that.

Notifying Congress when Federal, State, or Local government Agencies spy on it is essential to protecting the separation of powers and our Constitution. The fact is that right now, the FBI, any State attorney general, or even a local sheriff, can obtain the phone records of every Member of Congress, and we would never find out. This poses a major threat to the separation of powers. That is why I have called for Senators to be notified about surveillance in response to overreach by Trump in the past. Once Senator HEINRICH's bill passes, I am committed to working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address the threat

of surveillance by the executive branch.

It is deeply regrettable that my colleagues took a well-intentioned protection against government surveillance and wrapped it in an unacceptable giveaway of Americans' tax dollars to Republican Senators. I am committed to scrapping this provision and passing real protections against government overreach, not just for U.S. Senators, but for every single American.

Mr. HEINRICH. I defer to my colleague from Michigan with my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I am just so disappointed that the UC request from my colleague from New Mexico was rejected—was objected to—by Republicans here on the floor of the Senate.

The fact that we are here trying to fix a terrible wrong that occurred last week is simply outrageous. While Senate Democrats were fighting to lower healthcare costs and trying to provide some financial relief for families who are seeing their costs skyrocket across the board, the Senate Republicans snuck in—and this is literally true—they snuck in, in the dark of night, a provision, at the last minute, that would allow them to basically line their pockets.

This provision would allow a very select group of Republican Senators—let's be clear. This is to seek at least a half million dollars. It could go into the millions of dollars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I remind Senators of rule XIX, paragraph 2, that provides that no Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form or words, impute to another Senator or other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy of being a Senator.

Mr. PETERS. Very good.

This is what happened. Let's be clear. What the law does is that a group of folks can get over half a million dollars for records that were obtained. They were obtained as part of a legitimate criminal investigation.

It is unconscionable, at a time when families across the country are feeling the squeeze and struggling to make ends meet, that such a self-serving, retroactive provision was included in legislation to fund the government.

Let's be clear. No citizen of the United States gets this. No House Member gets this. This is just about Senators.

It has all the appearances, certainly, of a cash grab. And if the American taxpayers who are going to have to foot this bill—let's be clear. No Senator should get special treatment or a special payday for legally obtained records. I want to stress that part. These records were obtained through a standard legal process as part of a legitimate criminal investigation related to January 6, involving authorized subpoenas of those Senators' potential involvement.

I have heard this described as partisan, political targeting. But unlike

the bogus investigations President Trump has ordered into his political enemies, this whole situation arose from President Trump's own efforts to overturn a free and fair Presidential election. During the Department of Justice's investigation into this crime, the Special Counsel petitioned the court for a subpoena for those records, and the court approved it.

Mr. President, you know that is the law. That is the process. You go and get a subpoena. You have to go before a court. You have to present evidence, and the court looks at that evidence and then makes a decision. And the court approved it.

It is completely legal because it was relevant to their investigation of the President's attempt to overturn election results and to stay in power illegally. We can't forget that. We can't whitewash that. We cannot let attempts to spin this into some sort of partisan targeting against certain individuals.

First off, it sets a very dangerous precedent that could chill any effort to conduct legitimate investigations of criminal wrongdoing by Members of this body or anywhere else down the line. We surely should not put the American people in the position of being, basically, a slush fund for a few individuals interested in making a whole lot of money and having the taxpayers foot the bill.

I want to give my colleagues the benefit of the doubt about how this provision was put into the bill. Today, they had a chance to do the right thing. They had a chance to repeal it and say: Yes, this is bad. That is the way we ensure that no Senator gets special treatment, and we can get back to doing the work to better serve our constituents.

So I hope we can fix this wrong. Our friends across the Capitol here, in the House, voted unanimously—every Republican and every Member of the Democratic caucus. We came together.

Do you want to see bipartisanship in Washington? Everybody says: Gosh, I wish this body could come together in a bipartisan way.

We saw it in the House today. They said that this provision is terrible. They said it was outrageous, and they said it was a cash grab—and they did it unanimously. We could have done it unanimously here today. We could have fixed this.

Again, I don't know how it got in there. I am sure there was nothing nefarious. I am not saying there was anything nefarious. But it got in there. It clearly is wrong. Anybody who looks at the face of it knows it is wrong. That is why the House voted unanimously, and that is why I hope at some point we can do the right thing and fix this.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would simply respond by saying again, in clarifying this question of personal en-

richment, I am not sure exactly what that is predicated on. Clearly, the attempt being made here was to give standing to Members whose personal, private information was collected by a prosecutor who went around the law.

The law requires notification when a U.S. Senator's personal information is acquired. What happened was that the prosecutor threatened legal action if the carriers that were collecting this data on individual Senators provided the notice that was required under the law. The prosecutor clearly went around the law.

I just believe, for the future protection not only of this institution but of individual U.S. Senators, it is going to be critical that we codify some of these protections in ways that aren't currently covered in the law.

As I said before, if there is some question about the monetary judgment that might come or of the damages that might be awarded, this is what we are attempting to clarify right now, and that is that no individual Member—and frankly, that is already true under our rules, but this would further clarify that.

But if the Senator from New Mexico is interested in amending or modifying this in some fashion that preserves or retains the protections on an individual Member's data—which, frankly, again, as I said before, I think is a really important protection not just for this U.S. Senate but for U.S. Senators in the future—I think there is a willingness to be able to address that.

But I think, again, the suggestion that this is a bunch of U.S. Senators who are trying to figure out a way to enrich themselves at taxpayers' expense just is completely, completely unfounded and is inconsistent with the facts.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 472.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of David A. Bragdon, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 472, David A. Bragdon, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Jon A. Husted, John R. Curtis, Tom Cotton, Bernie Moreno, John Boozman, Chuck Grassley, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Markwayne Mullin, Kevin Cramer, Pete Ricketts, Katie Boyd Britt, Tim Sheehy, Jim Banks.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 473.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lindsey Ann Freeman, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 473, Lindsey Ann Freeman, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Jon A. Husted, John R. Curtis, Tom Cotton, Bernie Moreno, John Boozman, Chuck Grassley, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Markwayne Mullin, Kevin Cramer, Pete Ricketts, Katie Boyd Britt, Tim Sheehy, Jim Banks.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate