

That is their priority. That is why they are dragging the Senate through an arduous, convoluted reconciliation process—to put money in the coffers of Trump's rogue Agencies rather than in Americans' pockets.

Democrats want to lower Americans' grocery, gas, healthcare, and housing costs. Senate Republicans want to appease Donald Trump and Stephen Miller by giving ICE and Border Patrol tens of billions of dollars to continue spreading violence in our streets.

Democrats are going to make sure that the contrast is on open display during reconciliation. If Senate Republicans would rather acquiesce to Donald Trump and Stephen Miller than stand up for the American people, so be it. We are going to make them own that decision amendment after amendment, vote after vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### RECONCILIATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in a moment here, I am going to move to proceed to a budget resolution, but let me just say before I do that that we are in this spot because we tried to appropriate. We tried to fund the DHS Agencies ICE and CBP through the regular order, normal appropriations process—a process which had concluded in a bipartisan deal with Democrats and Republicans both having agreed to fund DHS, an outcome that was walked away from by the Senate Democrats.

Then, because they wanted reforms, we sat down for 45 days, I think it was, and went through a process where Democrats kept coming up with new ideas. The White House kept meeting them. There were a number of reforms that were made by the White House.

Then, subsequent to that, in the negotiation with the Democrats, Republicans here in the Senate and in the House and the White House worked together to try to accommodate more requests for reforms—all of which were met with a resounding no from the Democrats, so much so at one point that there was one offer made by the White House, and the Democrats didn't even respond for 18 days. Eighteen days suggests a lack of seriousness about this issue.

Ultimately, I think what has happened here is the far-left Democrat base in this country has insisted that their leadership not fund the Agencies that are responsible for law enforcement in this country, whether that is the Border Patrol, which has responsibility for ensuring that our border is secure, or ICE, which is responsible for ensuring that illegals who commit criminal acts in this country are deported. Enforcing the laws of this land—that is the job these two Agencies have been charged with, and the Democrats have determined they are not going to fund them.

So essentially, when the Democrat leader talks about Republicans owning

something, I will tell you what the Democrats own. The Democrats own the position which they have tried before and failed, and that is open borders, wide-open borders, millions of people coming into this country illegally over the past four years, and defunding the police.

Open borders and defunding the police—that is what the Democrats own. Because of that and their unwillingness to work with us on an appropriations process that provides reforms and funding for those two Agencies, Republicans have been forced to use the budget reconciliation process to ensure that those two Agencies are funded not only for today but in the future because I don't see a universe in which the far-left Democrat base is ever going to let their leaders fund these Agencies that are responsible for law enforcement in this country.

This is defund-the-police. That is simply what it is. So we are going to move to budget reconciliation to ensure that those two Agencies are funded not only for today but for the balance of this administration's term in office.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2027 THROUGH 2035—  
Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 376, S. Con. Res. 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 376, S. Con. Res. 33, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2026 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2027 through 2035.

#### VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, 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 Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Leg.]

#### YEAS—52

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

#### NAYS—46

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

#### NOT VOTING—2

Grassley Warner

The motion was agreed to.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2027 THROUGH 2035

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) setting forth the Congressional Budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2026 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2027 through 2035.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I defer to Senator GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the S. Con. Res. 33, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2026, the majority and the Democratic managers of the resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desk, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal assistant devices and tablet devices.

I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the

budget resolution; further, that the staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates for Federal revenue, the amount by which the Federal revenue should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt and debt held by the public; further, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each voting consideration of S. Con. Res. 33.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4364

Ms. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, more than 2 months ago, the Supreme Court ruled that the tariffs that President Trump had imposed under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, or IEEPA, were unlawful. That means that more than \$166 billion in taxes—or tariffs—under IEEPA were illegally collected, and they are owed back to the importers who paid them.

Now, this wasn't a shocking outcome because the law that the President tried to use for these tariffs—IEEPA—had never been used to impose tariffs. It does not even mention the words "tariff" or "duty" once, anywhere, in that law.

And so 15 months ago, a number of us introduced legislation to clarify that IEEPA cannot be used for tariffs.

Congress then submitted three amicus briefs, arguing that these tariffs were unlawful. The lower courts agreed. And on February 20, the Supreme Court blocked the tariffs and said that they should be repaid.

Now, 2 months later, here we are. No refunds have been paid, and the administration says it could take another 60 to 90 days before any refunds will be paid out.

Yesterday, some businesses were finally able to apply for refunds in the Customs and Border Protection's new system, but that system didn't allow businesses to even apply for refunds they have been waiting the longest for. This new system, which is called CAPE, disadvantages small businesses who may not know they need to file to receive refunds.

Those who don't have large legal teams to pursue these claims and have to take time away from their businesses just to give Customs information that it already has, they are not going to be able to comply with these requirements.

It also makes small businesses more likely to sell their refund claims to Wall Street banks like the one run by the Secretary of Commerce's sons and to sell those claims for a significant discount.

This administration was ready to reimpose a 10-percent tax on everything

Americans import on the same day the Supreme Court ruled, but it took 2 months to roll out a partial refund system. That has real costs.

It hurts small businesses who are already struggling with high prices and shouldn't have to wait months to get refunds for unlawful taxes. It hurts our economy, with businesses unsure when or even if they will be able to reinvest this money. And it hurts taxpayers because these refunds have to be paid with interest.

That means that every day of delay adds \$22 million to the bill for these unlawful and damaging tariffs. That is \$1.3 billion more just since the Supreme Court ruled with billions more to come. Those are added costs because this administration failed to prepare for the obvious outcome.

So let's be clear on what is happening. President Trump's tariffs raise prices across the board, and now he is slow-walking getting out the refunds that Americans are entitled to. There is a better answer. That is the Speedy Tariff Refund Act, legislation that Senators MARKEY and WYDEN and I have been working on. It is a bill that would require that Customs pay refunds automatically within 30 days, that it use the information it already has, and that all of these refunds be paid now.

The bill prioritizes refunds to small businesses rather than putting them at a disadvantage to big companies. Those businesses have already had to deal with added costs they can't easily absorb and constantly shifting tariffs that make it impossible to plan.

So this is not complicated. The Court said these tariffs were unlawful. The money was collected. It should be returned promptly and in full. It is time to pass our bill. It is time to return the \$166 billion to the American people because every day we delay adds another \$22 million to the tab.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to request unanimous consent to pass the Speedy Tariff Refund Act.

The bill forces the Trump administration to immediately return the money it has stolen from American businesses under Donald Trump's illegal tariffs. Nothing illustrates the hostility that Donald Trump has shown toward helping Americans seek refunds better than his comments to CNBC this morning.

Donald Trump said this morning that it would be "brilliant" if companies do not seek refunds and that he will remember those who don't. That sounds like a threat to me. The President of the United States basically said he will remember those who don't seek a refund or come forward.

Earlier this year, the Supreme Court struck down President Trump's so-called "emergency" IEEPA tariffs. The Court's ruling was clear: the tariffs were illegal, and the administration must refund the money to the Amer-

ican importers that paid the tariffs. It has now been 2 months since the Supreme Court's decision. Not a single penny has been paid back.

The Trump administration is deliberately delaying these refunds, even after Trump's own lawyers claimed that they would be issued.

While Donald Trump funnels money to his vanity projects and illegal war, his administration is doing everything it can to avoid returning the money it stole from American companies. That is why I quoted the President's threat this morning.

I have heard from countless small business owners who paid the tariffs but still have no idea when or if they will ever get their money back. This leaves businesses and workers on a financial rollercoaster, questioning if they are going to be able to keep their doors open.

Yesterday, Customs and Border Protection began accepting refund requests through yet another online system, which is already riddled with glitches and errors. But instead of paying refunds automatically, Customs and Border Protection is requiring businesses in America to file yet another round of paperwork to get a refund. This is just more bureaucratic red tape, making it harder for Americans to get their money back.

Customs and Border Protection is even excluding whole categories of imports from the refund system for now, and they are doing it despite the Court of International Trade's order to pay refunds of all IEEPA tariffs.

It is as clear as Crater Lake that Oregonians can't rely on this administration to return their money, so Congress needs to step up. My bill requires the administration to pay tariff refunds, with interest, within 30 days. It applies to every importer who paid IEEPA tariffs, not just certain imports, and it makes it clear that CBP must pay the refunds automatically without requiring additional paperwork.

I am sure my Republican colleagues are also hearing from small businesses in their States that are desperate to get a tariff refund. I urge them to join me, Senator MARKEY, Senator SHAHEEN, and to do it today. The Senate can act today to put money back in the pockets of small businesses and ensure Donald Trump no longer keeps scamming Americans out of the tariff refunds they are owed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4364, the Speedy Tariff Refund Act; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise to speak in opposition to the Speedy Tariff Refund Act of 2026.

I share my colleagues' support for ensuring that any administrative processes are efficient and easy to navigate, especially for small businesses, but this legislation is unnecessary. The bill would require the U.S. Customs and Border Protection to swiftly refund tariffs collected under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act. The CBP is already in the process of doing just that. In fact, yesterday, CBP launched its new portal through which importers of all sizes may file declarations requesting refunds. The portal is called the Consolidated Administration and Processing of Entries—the CAPE—portal. This portal will help CBP manage the expected high volume of submissions to ensure that importers can track the refund process.

CBP is committed to helping the public navigate this portal. In fact, it released written guidance and is holding public webinars, including one held earlier today.

As CBP demonstrated to the satisfaction of the U.S. Court of International Trade, this is a necessary process given the complexities of tariff refund calculations. By all accounts, CBP is now expeditiously complying with the court's order.

For these reasons, I object.

I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. WYDEN. Just very briefly, as I know Senator MERKLEY is waiting to speak, we are talking about CBP. If we really want to know what they are in the process of doing, they are in the process of playing more stall ball, making it tough for small businesses to get access to these tariff refunds.

As I said, it is all summed up by what Donald Trump said to CNBC. I interpret that as, point blank, a threat to people who go out and try to advance their rights, and I think it is wrong for the President to do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

S. CON. RES. 33

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today because our Republican colleagues have introduced a new budget resolution to yet again utilize a special process called reconciliation. We just voted a short while ago on a motion to proceed. That motion to proceed succeeded along purely party lines, and that takes us into the realm of this special device called reconciliation.

Just 10 months ago, we already had a reconciliation bill that is sometimes called H.R. 1. President Trump called it the One Big Beautiful Bill, but much of America has a different name for it. They call it the Big Ugly Betrayal. Why? Because it betrayed families in America to fund tax breaks for billionaires, and in the process, it added to our national debt. It slashed \$1 trillion from healthcare programs for families. It kicked 15 million Americans off of their health insurance. It took food off the plates of more than 3 million fami-

lies with children. Why? To give away the Treasury to the richest Americans. What other phrase could possibly describe this other than "families lose, and billionaires win"?

But it isn't just today's families who lose from that bill; it is the families of the next generation because that bill added, according to the Congressional Budget Office's independent, non-partisan estimate, \$30 trillion to our national debt over 30 years, and that is only if their inflation or interest rates are accurate. They note that, in general, their assumption was that interest would not go above 4 percent, but at 1 percent higher, that \$30 trillion in debt for the next generation, which essentially doubles our national debt, would instead be adding an additional \$50 trillion.

I am sharing this because this bill—this second reconciliation bill during the Trump administration—builds on the foundation of the first. The first one was "families lose, and billionaires win," but could this bill possibly be different? Not only is this bill not different, but its entire existence involves a betrayal of this Senate Chamber because the bill is based on a provision in budget law from 1974, the Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

Every single Senator who voted on that bill voted in favor of it—Democrats and Republicans together—because the complete agreement was that it would be used only to decrease the deficit, and every single Member thought we needed to have an instrument to control the deficit.

OK. Fine. Well and good. That was in 1974. But in 1996, Republicans decided they wanted to give away even more treasure to the richest Americans, so they said: The problem is we can't do that because it increases the deficit rather than decreases the deficit. There isn't a pathway to do it because we know we can't get 60 votes to close debate on giving away the Treasury to the richest Americans.

So the then-leader, Robert Dole of Kansas, proceeded to appoint a Parliamentarian who had worked for him and who had also been around in 1974 and understood that the entire reconciliation was about reducing the deficit, and the result was a ruling that that core premise could be stood on its head. You could use reconciliation not to decrease deficits but to increase them. It meant you could do a massive tax bill giveaway to the richest Americans. That is at the foundation for both of the Bush tax cuts—or tax giveaways to the rich, maybe, to more accurately describe it—and to a similar bill that was done last year and to a similar bill that was done in the first Trump administration.

So here we are. In addition to impacting tax legislation, this change saying that this special device that everyone agreed was only for decreasing the deficit meant that it could also be used in the fashion that it is being pre-

sent by my Republican colleagues today.

So the pillars of that initial act are all being violated—the pillar that in the first 10 years, there could be no net deficit; that after the first 10 years, there could be no deficit in any individual account in any individual year; that the budget had to be based on real numbers, not phony numbers; and that the real numbers would come from an independent Agency set up by the bill at the Congressional Budget Office. But that bill last year, the "Big Ugly Betrayal" bill, toppled all of those pillars—immediate deficits, long-term deficits and long-term debt, using fake numbers on the analysis, all of it—so there is no foundation for accountability left.

That is the background for what brings us to today and to the vote that was just held in which the majority party said: We are again going to present a bill that increases the deficit and increases debt.

Wow. I must say this is not the way I would like to be celebrating our 250th anniversary. Wouldn't it be great if, on a bipartisan basis, we restored accountability to our national budget? Wouldn't that be a way to celebrate this anniversary and help create a foundation for the next generation to thrive rather than shortchanging the children of today, who will be adults in the near future, and shortchanging the children of the children of today? But there we are. Instead, the majority party has decided to celebrate our 250th anniversary by—well, by expanding secret police in America, because that is what the bill is all about that they have presented.

We know what the foundations are for families to thrive. It is healthcare. It is housing. It is education. It is good-paying jobs. We know that you also need investments in infrastructure in order to make all of that happen.

So will this bill that the majority just presented address the issues families are facing?

Will it be designed to bring down the cost of groceries? No, it will not.

Will it be designed to bring down the cost of healthcare, perhaps by restoring the tax credits that their last bill took away from millions of families? No, it will not.

Will it be designed to bring down gas prices, which are more than \$1 higher than before the war was launched on Iran? In my State of Oregon, a gallon of gas is over \$5 and a gallon of diesel is over \$6. This is the Bush tax on ordinary families. Was it designed to bring that down? No.

How about to expand nutrition assistance—nutrition that was savaged in the "Big Ugly Bill" 10 months ago? Does this bill remedy that to help the children of America get enough to eat so they can actually study when they are in school? No, it does not.

Does it address the mass shortage in housing that has resulted in really high rents? No, it doesn't help that either.

How about investing in first-time home ownership to help restore the dream of home ownership because that dream has been dying? No, it doesn't address that either.

How about helping the United States prepare for unexpected disasters—wildfires? floods? hurricanes? No, it doesn't do that.

Does it, perhaps, reduce our debt? No, quite the opposite. It is unpaid for, and it increases our debt.

So nothing to help working families; nothing to improve affordability—a major crisis across this country; nothing to reduce the deficit and debt.

Instead, this bill is ICE and CBP—Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and Customs and Border Protection—up to \$140 billion. There is a set of instructions being sent to committee, and each committee is being told: You can spend up to \$70 billion. Two committees. Seventy billion. That is up to \$140 billion.

But when I say that this bill is all about funding ICE and CBP, you might say: Wait, didn't we do that 10 months ago? Didn't Republicans, on party line, pass a bill to give massive amounts of money to ICE and CBP just 10 months ago? And your memory would be correct.

This is the budget for ICE, and you can see that it increased modestly from 2017 to 2024, but look at this—an additional \$75 billion, roughly equal to seven times its normal annual appropriation.

So it funded also CBP in a very similar fashion—only gave an extra 65 billion to CBP. So 75 billion to ICE; 65 billion to Customs and Border Protection. Massive, mega increase in expanding Agencies that have been empowered by this administration to operate like secret police.

So instead of this bill being used to address the concerns of families across America, this bill is being used to expand the operations of Trump's secret police. That is what this bill is.

Now, of this massive amount of money that was provided 10 months ago, how much has been spent? Now, you would assume, because Republicans are coming back and saying: This is a top priority in America, that that money—that extra 75 billion for ICE and 65 billion for Customs and Border Protection—must have been spent.

Well, now, the Office of Management and Budget, which is in the executive branch—it is run by Mr. Russell Vought, who was the chief architect of Project 2025 aimed at creating an authoritarian state—they issue a report monthly. It is called monthly Report on Budget Execution. And the forms, for those of you who want the details, are called SF-133.

We looked at those forms for this last month, and what those forms say is that 63 billion of the ICE spending has not been obligated yet. It is not even under contract. It isn't that it hasn't gone out the door; it is not even under contract. And of the 65 billion for CBP, 40 billion is not yet obligated.

That means \$103 billion of the money that Republicans gave to expand ICE and CBP is still available. So why the hell is the top priority in America getting another \$70 to \$140 billion for these two Agencies, as opposed to addressing all the significant national challenges that we have—all of the challenges that families have as they are pressed to the wall by the cost of fuel and the cost of healthcare and the cost of housing and the cost of medicine? Why isn't this bill addressing any of that? And instead it is providing \$70 to \$140 billion more for two Agencies that still are sitting on top of over \$100 billion from last year's bill.

I noted that the goal of this bill is to expand the secret police in America. Those are strong words because ICE and CBP were not secret police before this administration, but this administration changed their conduct.

They turned them into a force that operates in secret and is terrorizing communities across this country—operating in secret wearing masks, operating in secret in uniforms without identification, operating in secret in vehicles that are unmarked and sometimes have had their license plates removed to make them as untraceable as possible, operating without warrants and crashing through people's doors, stopping citizens without cause—pulling their weapons, bashing out their windows, and dragging people out of their cars.

These are the tactics of secret police around the world, and they are happening right here in America, right now.

And in that cultivated manner of thuggery, they are not just pulling out their weapons; they are pulling the triggers. Ruben Ray Martinez—shot dead. Renee Nicole Good—shot dead. Alex Pretti—shot dead.

The day after Renee and Alex were shot dead in Minnesota, two individuals were shot sitting in their car just blocks from my house in Oregon. We didn't know that they were mortally injured because the administration wouldn't release any information.

Thankfully, they did not die. The woman, on that occasion, was shot through the chest. The man was shot through the arm—sitting in their car just one day after Renee and Alex were shot in their car.

It is certainly clear that what these two Agencies need is not more money. They are sitting on \$100 billion-plus in unobligated funds. What they need is more accountability. That bill should be on the Senate floor—the one that says no face masks, no uniforms without ID, no vans without license plates or ID, no breaking down doors without warrants, no invading sensitive places like hospitals and churches and synagogues and mosques and daycares. That is the bill.

What we need now is not more money. It is more accountability—standard practices for the way public officials operate in a democratic republic.

Instead, we now have standard practice of this administration for how secret police operate under an authoritarian organization.

My colleagues across the aisle have said: Well, we need to fund these organizations because they aren't funded. Well, clearly, if they still have \$100 billion sitting in the bank, sitting in their accounts with the government, they are funded.

And as for the rest of Homeland Security, that is not funded because the House of Representatives killed the bill. In that case, I can thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who came together and said: Homeland Security isn't just about ICE and CBP. It is also about FEMA—emergency management. It is also about TSA that provides support to get us through the airport. It is also about Cybersecurity, which is important. It is also about the Coast Guard. And the Coast Guard is so beloved in my home State of Oregon, as it is, I imagine, in every coastal city.

And so every single Senator said: Yes, fund those four Agencies while we continue to debate both ICE and Customs and Border Protection. We all agreed. In fact, the Speaker of the House agreed and said send the bill over. And then it got over there, and he got cold feet.

He got cold feet because he didn't have the support of President Trump, and he didn't have support of some Members of the most right-leaning wing of the Republican Party. That was the moment that Trump could have instantly made one phone call and that bill would have passed.

So if they are not funded, it is because the President chose to keep them unfunded, and the House of Representatives chose to keep those additional Agencies—FEMA, TSA, Cybersecurity, and Coast Guard—unfunded.

In addition, this bill doesn't just provide 1 year of funding. It says: Fund them—that is, ICE and CBP—this additional funding on top of the \$100 billion they still have—fund them for another 3 years.

Now, I would like to just remind my colleagues how extraordinary this is. Reconciliation was never supposed to be about spending money. It was supposed to be about deficit reduction, but now, we are taking a bill that was in the regular appropriations process and funding two Agencies for 3 years—that is their plan. And that is simply wrong because it means we are saying that in this—the start of the second year of the Trump administration—they are going to fund these Agencies through Trump's entire administration.

You know where this leads. There will be another administration in the future, and they will say in the first year of the administration: Fund all 4 years. Hell, fund 5 years—1 year into my successor—fund that. What does that strip away? It strips away the accountability involved in the budget process.

Further, going down the road, we are creating a vortex of unaccountable

spending and debt and a failure—a failure—to restrain this type of massive misspending of American money. It is our treasure. Our treasure is being spent, not for the things that Americans are concerned about but for doubling down on the expansion of Trump's secret police.

This vision of families lose and billionaires win began with Trump's inaugural speech. He didn't line up the champions for families behind him. There was no healthcare champion. There was no housing champion. There was no education champion. There was no champion for infrastructure in America. But there was a line of billionaires standing right behind the President. That is what this administration has been about: families lose and billionaires win.

Well, there is a better vision for our Nation, and that better vision is families thrive and billionaires pay their fair share. That is a vision—in a government by and for the people—that all 100 Senators should be supporting: Families thrive, and the rich and well-off pay their fair share.

Let's work toward that vision—not just in this year or in the year to come but for the next generation and the generation that follows.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH AND INTEGRITY IN LICENSING AND DOCUMENTATION ACT OF 2025

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 128, S. 1528.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1528) to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to ensure that businesses and organizations that work with vulnerable populations are able to request background checks for their contractors who work with those populations, as well as for individuals that the businesses or organizations license or certify to provide care for those populations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1528) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1528

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Comprehensive Health and Integrity in Licensing and

Documentation Act of 2025” or the “CHILD Act of 2025”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINING “COVERED INDIVIDUAL” FOR PURPOSES OF BACKGROUND CHECKS UNDER THE NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1993.

Section 5(9)(B) of the National Child Protection Act of 1993 (34 U.S.C. 40104(9)(B)) is amended—

- (1) in clause (i)—
  - (A) by inserting “, contracts with,” after “is employed by”;
  - (B) by inserting “, contract with,” after “be employed by”; and
  - (C) by striking “or” at the end;
- (2) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);
- (3) by inserting after clause (i) the following:
  - “(ii) is employed by or volunteers with, or seeks to be employed by or volunteer with, an entity that is under contract with a qualified entity;”;
  - (4) in clause (iii), as so redesignated, by adding “or” at the end; and
  - (5) by adding at the end the following:
    - “(iv) is licensed or certified, or seeks to be licensed or certified, by a qualified entity;”.

#### CONFLICT-FREE LEAVING EMPLOYMENT AND ACTIVITY RESTRICTIONS PATH ACT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 305, S. 2132.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2132) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent and mitigate the potential for conflicts of interest following government service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Conflict-free Leaving Employment and Activity Restrictions Path Act” or the “CLEAR Path Act”.*

#### SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

- It is the sense of Congress that—*
- (1) Congress and the executive branch have recognized the importance of preventing and mitigating the potential for conflicts of interest following Government service, including with respect to senior United States officials working on behalf of foreign governments; and
  - (2) Congress and the executive branch should jointly evaluate the status and scope of post-employment restrictions.

#### SEC. 3. POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS ON OFFICIALS IN POSITIONS SUBJECT TO SENATE CONFIRMATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.—Section 207 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*“(m) EXTENDED POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS FOR OFFICIALS IN POSITIONS SUBJECT TO SENATE CONFIRMATION.—*

- “(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:*
- “(A) COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term ‘country of concern’ has the meaning given the term in section 1(m) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(m)), except that it does not include the country described in paragraph (1)(A)(vi) of that section, as in effect on the date of enactment of the Conflict-free Leaving Employment and Activity Restrictions Path Act.*

*“(B) FOREIGN GOVERNMENTAL ENTITY.—The term ‘foreign governmental entity’ has the meaning given the term in section 1(m) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(m)).*

*“(C) REPRESENT.—The term ‘represent’ does not include representation by an attorney, who is duly licensed and authorized to provide legal advice in a United States jurisdiction, of a person or entity in a legal capacity or for the purposes of rendering legal advice.*

*“(D) SENATE-CONFIRMED POSITION.—The term ‘Senate-confirmed position’ means a position in a department or agency of the executive branch of the United States for which appointment is required to be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.*

*“(2) AGENCY HEADS, DEPUTY HEADS, AND OTHER POSITIONS SUBJECT TO SENATE CONFIRMATION.—Any person who serves in a position requiring appointment by the President as head or deputy head of, or serves in any other Senate-confirmed position in, a department or agency of the executive branch of the United States, and who, at any time after the termination of the person’s service in that position, knowingly represents, aids, or advises a foreign governmental entity of a country of concern before an officer or employee of the executive or legislative branch of the United States with the intent to influence a decision of the officer or employee in carrying out his or her official duties shall be punished as provided in section 216.*

*“(3) NOTICE OF RESTRICTIONS.—Any person subject to the restrictions under this subsection shall be provided notice of these restrictions by the relevant department or agency—*

- “(A) upon appointment by the President; and*
- “(B) upon termination of service with the relevant department or agency.*

*“(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—*

*“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the restrictions under this subsection shall apply only to persons who are appointed by the President to the positions referenced in this subsection on or after the date of enactment of the Conflict-free Leaving Employment and Activity Restrictions Path Act.*

*“(B) GRACE PERIOD FOR ADDED COUNTRIES OF CONCERN.—If the definition of the term ‘country of concern’ under subsection (m) of section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is modified in accordance with paragraph (7) of that subsection by adding a country to the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(A) of that subsection, in the case of any person who is appointed by the President to a position referenced in this subsection on or after the date of enactment of the Conflict-free Leaving Employment and Activity Restrictions Path Act and who knowingly represents, aids, or advises a foreign governmental entity of a country added to the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection (m), the restrictions under this subsection shall apply to such person on and after the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of a relevant joint resolution of approval as described in paragraph (7)(C) of such subsection (m) adding that country to the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection (m).*

*“(5) SUNSET.—*

*“(A) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of the Conflict-free Leaving Employment and Activity Restrictions Path Act, the restrictions under paragraph (2) shall not apply to any person appointed by the President, on or after such date of enactment, to a position referenced in this subsection, without regard to the date on which the service of such person in such position terminates.*

*“(B) NO EFFECT ON CONDUCT BEFORE SUNSET.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to limit the applicability of paragraph (2) with respect to any conduct by a person appointed by the President to a position referenced in this subsection that occurred before the date*