

version of the bill on a vote of 26 to 1. The bill at that time contained 985 items formulated by our fellow Members. Over the next few months, we continued working across this body to add amendments.

Our September substitute amendment had 20 Republican, 20 Democrat, and 9 bipartisan amendments. The second managers' package was similarly bipartisan.

In October, we considered the NDAA amid stark partisan divide during the longest Federal shutdown in the history of our Republic. Nevertheless, during that shutdown, this body came together to pass this very important legislation. We debated amendments, and we improved on the bill, and we approved it. We passed the NDAA after 14 rollcall votes and 9 voice votes. For once, we did it in prime time, finishing around 9 p.m. It cleared this Chamber by a vote of 77 to 20. We sent a strong bill to the House of Representatives, and it had the clear backing of a huge majority of this body.

Now that negotiations between Chambers have concluded, we have a bill that provides for the common defense, as the Constitution requires. This NDAA helps us align the priorities of the U.S. military with the threats of today, and they are serious—serious threats from the People's Republic of China and the entire axis of aggressors that it leads and partners with. It makes warfighting a top priority of the Department, and it reinforces a culture of merit in the Armed Forces.

Servicemembers will receive a 3.8-percent pay raise. We expanded initiatives that will reinforce President Trump's recruiting surge, and we supercharged our efforts to rebuild the American defense industrial base.

Let me talk about that for a moment. This legislation reforms decades of bureaucratic inefficiency in the Pentagon's acquisition process. It contains numerous elements of my bill, the *Fostering Reform and Government Efficiency in Defense Act*, more easily known as the *FORGED Act*.

We are about to pass and the President will enthusiastically sign the most sweeping upgrades to DOD's business practices in 60 years. This is a monumental achievement.

The 21st century poses threats that will require the most creative and innovative defenses. Americans are already building the technology to meet those threats, and these reforms will help the Pentagon tap into that energetic innovation ecosystem.

Secretary Hegseth and his staff have been strong partners in these efforts as we seek to implement our shared peace through strength agenda with President Trump. Our reforms, plus our increased defense investments, will enable us to achieve that vision. Through this bill, we will continue revitalizing the defense industrial base—an absolute requirement during these dangerous times.

I am thankful to all of my colleagues for putting in the work to make this

bill good for our servicemembers and for national security. It succeeds because it is driven by Members across this body.

I am, as I said, especially grateful to the ranking member, JACK REED. He is himself a distinguished veteran, a patriot, a statesman, and a great partner in this work.

I would also be remiss if I did not mention the staunch partnership we have with our House counterparts: Chairman MIKE ROGERS and Ranking Member ADAM SMITH. That goes, too, for the many other committee chairs and ranking members who worked so hard all year to include crucial legislation in this National Defense Authorization Act.

Speaking of great partners, I want to specifically thank my soon-to-be-retired staff director John Keast. John has been with me for the better part of three decades now—since I first ran for Congress in 1994. He will be retiring from the Senate in January to return to Mississippi, where his family lives, and to pursue new opportunities.

This bill, this 65th NDAA in a row, would not have been possible without John Keast. His work ethic, his sound advice, and his partnership with his Democrat counterpart Liz King—all were essential. We could not have achieved this bill without his tireless leadership.

I want to thank him and the rest of my staff who have labored long days and nights and weekends—Saturdays and Sundays—to get this legislation done. They include Adam Barker, Kristina Belcourt, Jonathan Bowen, Leah Brewer, Levi Brunt, Luke Chaney, Glen Diehl, Cody Emerson, Marty Fromuth, Megan Galindo, Mike Gerhart, Anna Given, Meredith Gravatte, Madeline Guenther, Isaac Jalkanen, Lauren Johnson, Katie Karam, Greg Lilly, Eric Lofgren, Katie Magnus, Jonathan Moore, Katie Stanton, Sophie Schloegel, Mike Tokar, Eric Trager, Adam Trull, Mike Urena, Dave Vasquez, Christina Sandstedt—who has been give privileges of the floor this very day—Julia Wood, Terry Miller, Emily Yetter, Dan Hillenbrand, Beth Spivey, Brendan Gavin, Brad Patout, Rick Berger, and, as I said before, my adviser and personal friend John Keast.

That is a lot of names and a lot of effort and a lot of talent. That is just the members on my side of the aisle.

I thank them all, and I thank this Senate and our friends in the House for coming together in the spirit of patriotism and comity to get this very important quantum leap in our defense accomplished.

With that said, let's begin the vote and take the next step to rebuild America's national defense.

#### MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to concur with the Senate amendment No. 3961.

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

The motion to concur with amendment is withdrawn.

The amendment No. 3962 falls.

#### VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur to House amendment to S. 1071.

Mr. WICKER. 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 senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 648 Leg.]

#### YEAS—77

Alsobrooks	Graham	Mullin
Baldwin	Hagerty	Murkowski
Banks	Hassan	Ossoff
Barrasso	Hawley	Peters
Blackburn	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Ricketts
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Rosen
Britt	Husted	Rounds
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kelly	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cotton	King	Slotkin
Cramer	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lujan	Tillis
Curtis	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warnock
Fetterman	McCormick	Whitehouse
Fischer	Moody	Wicker
Gallogo	Moran	Young
Gillibrand	Moreno	

#### NAYS—20

Bennet	Merkley	Schiff
Booker	Murphy	Smith
Cantwell	Murray	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Padilla	Warren
Kim	Paul	Welch
Lee	Sanders	Wyden
Markley	Schatz	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Coons	Ernst	Grassley
-------	-------	----------

(Mr. RICKETTS assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The yeas are 77, the nays are 20.

The motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 1071 is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 593, Jared Isaacman, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Tim Sheehy, Roger F. Wicker, Joni Ernst, Markwayne Mullin, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Pete Ricketts, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, John Barrasso, Dan Sullivan, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Ted Cruz, John Kennedy, Deb Fischer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jared Isaacman, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Iowa (Mr. ERNST) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 67, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 649 Leg.]

## YEAS—67

Baldwin	Graham	Moreno
Banks	Hagerty	Mullin
Barrasso	Hassan	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Heinrich	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Risch
Budd	Husted	Rounds
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schiff
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kelly	Shaheen
Cotton	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cramer	Kim	Slotkin
Crapo	King	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Curtis	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Durbin	Marshall	Warner
Fetterman	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	McCormick	Young
Gallego	Moody	
Gillibrand	Moran	

## NAYS—30

Alsobrooks	Lujan	Sanders
Bennet	Markey	Schatz
Blumenthal	Merkley	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Murphy	Smith
Booker	Murray	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Ossoff	Warnock
Duckworth	Padilla	Warren
Hickenlooper	Peters	Welch
Hirono	Reed	Whitehouse
Klobuchar	Rosen	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—3

Coons	Ernst	Grassley
-------	-------	----------

(Mr. RICKETTS assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). On this vote, the yeas are 67, the nays are 30.

The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jared Isaacman, of Pennsylvania, to be Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—THE CALENDAR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the American people understand to varying degrees but have a general understanding of the fact that the work we do here in the Senate is a combination of things.

Some of the things that we address are controversial. Some of them make the daily or evening news or the cover of the newspaper the next day. Those tend to be the things that are more controversial, things on which there might be sharp disagreements, sometimes sharply divided down partisan lines, reflected based on where one's desk sits in relation to the center aisle of this Chamber.

Other times, there might be controversy, but the controversy doesn't cut cleanly across party lines. We might have some Republicans and some Democrats on one side or the other.

In many instances—maybe not enough but, mercifully, there are many instances—there is not only not much controversy but no controversy at all.

There is a significant amount of legislation that passes through this Chamber every single year unanimously, without a single "no" vote. Some of this, to be sure, might recognize the naming of a post office or it might recognize—I don't know—"National Sofa Care Month," if there is such a thing. Others deal with discrete, local issues—issues that, while important to a select few people who live around, for example, a particular piece of land owned by the Federal Government and might be affected by the land management policy associated with that parcel, are very important to that local population but might be completely unknown not only to people on the other side of the country but even to people in other parts of that same State.

There is a fair amount of legislation that moves through the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources—a committee that I currently chair—that fits into each of these categories: controversial bills where there is a sharp Republican-Democratic divide; bills that have some controversy that cut across party lines; and, yes, mercifully, this other category of noncontroversial votes without a single substantive objection.

The American people understand that there will be opposition to a lot of pieces of legislation, but they also, justifiably, expect us to consider and pass bills on their merits. As to this category of bills that are important to some, unknown to most, and controversial to no one, well, they expect us to get those passed in a timely fashion.

I am trying to do this quickly, expeditiously, and to do it in the right way.

Now, I tried doing it the right way—the same way I am going to try today—back in May, on the 22nd of May. I tried to do it the right way again on July 29. I tried doing it the right way again, 2 weeks ago. This will be my fourth attempt to try to pass a small handful of extremely noncontroversial bills that already passed this Chamber unanimously, without a single "no" vote in the last Congress, at the end of last year, and that have moved forward from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee—again, without opposition from either side of the aisle, from any Senator—earlier this year.

Each of these times, I have received an objection from the Democratic side of the aisle. At no point have I heard a single substantive objection to any of these bills in this category that I have tried to pass through this procedure—a procedure which is well-worn and which exists for exactly this circumstance. You know, across multiple committees—certainly within the Energy and Natural Resources Committee—there is a lot of legislation that falls into that category.

We are told repeatedly that there are simply too many bills for the Senate to consider individually. This is often the case. And it is often the case, in particular, that for a bill that has no opposition, for a bill that is very important to a population of people within a particular State as to a discrete issue—it might be important or interesting to literally no one else in any other State or in other parts of the same State—we are told that these bloated bills that sometimes get combined, which are multiple pieces of legislation, sometimes amounting to thousands of pages at a time, can become a necessary evil to accommodate all of the small lands bills important to our States.

I am here to tell you that this is simply not the case. It certainly need not be the case here, and it isn't.

Now, had we moved these bills each time I have been on the floor this year, we certainly would have already been able to make significant progress in clearing the backlog, so that we could deal with this problem that many people cite as a reason we would need a massive, all-or-nothing, bloated, sewn-together lands package—take it or leave it, all or nothing.

If we really need the bills passed, why can't we start, at least, with the low-hanging fruit?

I have no delusions that this makes everything easy. It certainly doesn't, as there is a lot of this process that can be difficult. But we ought to start with the bills that are noncontroversial,