

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, now, on a separate but related topic, we go to this issue of Department of Homeland Security funding. It is important that we remember that the Agency that is responsible for protecting our President, his family, our Vice President, his family, our Cabinet members—they all have a security detail—but the Agency is the Secret Service, and the Secret Service is in the Department of Homeland Security, as is Homeland Security Investigations, ICE, Border Patrol, TSA. See, it all comes out of that DHS budget.

And we now are on day 74 of the Democrats' latest shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. It is the third time this Congress that they have chosen to shut down Homeland Security.

Now, to ensure that agents continue to receive their paychecks, President Trump has resorted to using funds from the Working Families Tax Cut—Big Beautiful Bill—that we passed last year, and thank goodness that we did. And I will remind the Chamber: Every single Democrat voted against that bill. Every single Democrat voted against your pocketbook. They voted to increase your taxes by voting no on the Big Beautiful Bill.

Well, thank goodness we got it passed because that is where the President has been able to go and move some money around and pay people that are working without a paycheck.

Now, you know, it makes you wonder how many people would choose to continue to work and not receive a paycheck? But that is what our Democrat colleagues continue to do.

Last night, I did a telephone townhall, and on this townhall was a grandmother who lives in Middle Tennessee. Her question to me was very pointed. She said: Senator BLACKBURN, my grandson is in the Coast Guard. Have you all figured out how to pay the Coast Guard?

The Coast Guard. They are funded by DHS. So our colleagues across the aisle have chosen to say to the Coast Guard: Forget it. We are not for paying you.

So think about this. When you talk about going after human traffickers and drug runners, the Democrats don't want to fund that activity.

When you talk about Homeland Security Investigations that helps to find missing children, that locks up pedophiles and predators, that locks up groomers—they don't want to go after them. They are choosing to not fund that Agency.

Well, I had another caller on the townhall last night, and they said: I don't get this. Why don't they want to pay TSA? Why don't they want to pay ICE agents who were picking up people that broke the law to come into the country and have committed crimes and need to be deported? These are people that, by and large, most have orders of deportation already issued

against them. They are ready to be deported.

And the answer is disappointing, but it is what the Democrats will tell you. Their goal is to abolish ICE, to open the border back up, and just say: You—all come. Anybody can come. We are going to vacate immigration law.

And their third goal is to defund the police. You know, during Joe Biden's era, they loved the fact—loved it—the border was wide open. And we had illegal aliens entering the country by the thousands and the millions. They liked it that way. They didn't know who was in the country, but they were glad they were here. They wanted more sanctuary cities.

And, again, what we see the Democrats doing, they are putting illegal aliens before citizens. They are not funding—will not fund Federal law enforcement, don't want to fund immigration, don't want to fund the Coast Guard, don't want to fund the TSA. I guess they just think that there should be no scanning and no review.

So we know that that is their goal, and we know also that they don't want a deal on this. They want to continue to have a fight. They want this issue. Their goal is to abolish ICE, to defund Federal law enforcement. That is where they are headed, so they like having a shutdown.

RECONCILIATION

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Well, they continue with this political charade, and we have now passed a budget resolution that is going to open the path for us for a targeted public safety reconciliation bill that is going to fund these issues through President Trump's term. We will take this issue off the table.

Now, we did this on the Big Beautiful Bill. We did it through reconciliation. We did it with 51 votes. And as I said earlier, not one single Democrat—not one—voted for the Big Beautiful Bill. And we will make certain that ICE and CBP and these other Agencies are funded, and we will do it without a single Democrat vote.

And also, doing it this way, the Democrats will have none of the reforms they pretended to want when it came to Homeland Security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). The Senator from Louisiana.

REMEMBERING MARTHA ODOM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, you and I are the elected representatives of our States, and sometimes we speak not on behalf of ourselves but on behalf of our entire State. Now is one of those times.

Everyone in Louisiana felt grief at the mass shooting in Shreveport that I spoke of on this floor last week. Now I speak for all in Louisiana who feel grief at the mass shooting in Baton Rouge last week, and our whole State feels this grief. We all grieve.

I have a friend Collis Temple—famous in Louisiana—the first African American who played basketball for LSU. He called to say that he, as a parent, felt the grief of this young lady's family, and it was Collis who compelled me to speak today because every family can imagine no longer having their child or their sibling.

We all grieve. Every classmate can picture walking to school and seeing an empty chair where their classmate once sat.

We all grieve. Every friend can imagine going on a carefree senior skip day. If you are older than 18, you can remember when you were once 18 and something awful happened—indeed, every friend grieves.

What do we say when words fail? We can say that all, in my State, in my country, are deeply and profoundly sorry and that all of Louisiana grieves with Martha's family.

So I ask that this body and all who are here join in a quiet moment for the life of Martha Odom, for everyone who loved her, loves her still, and will always love her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

INSULIN ACT OF 2026

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a bill that Senator SHAHEEN and I introduced recently. It is called the Improving Needed Safeguards for Users of Lifesaving Insulin Now Act, or the INSULIN Act. This bill would make insulin more affordable for Americans with diabetes.

I would like to also recognize the work of Senators WARNOCK and KENNEDY who joined us in introducing this important bill.

In 1997, I founded the Senate Diabetes Caucus after meeting with a family from Maine who had a 10-year-old son with type 1 diabetes.

I will never forget this young boy looking up at me and saying to me that he wished that he could just take 1 day off from having type 1 diabetes—his birthday or Christmas—just 1 day. But, of course, he could not.

It was then that I knew that I had to dedicate my efforts toward earlier diagnosis, better treatments and technology, and one day a cure.

Since 2009, Senator SHAHEEN and I have cochaired the Diabetes Caucus in the Senate and worked together to fund vital research and advance policies that will improve the lives of those who are living with diabetes. One of our top priorities has been to make insulin more affordable.

Now, insulin was first isolated more than 100 years ago in Canada, and the scientist who did discover it gave away, essentially, the patent rights because they wanted insulin to be available and affordable to everyone who needed it.

Tens of millions of Americans rely on insulin as part of their daily treatment

for their diabetes. For children, teens, and adults with type 1 diabetes, insulin is not optional; it is literally a matter of life or death. About 20 percent of those with type 2 diabetes are also insulin-dependent. While there are some exciting and extraordinary scientific breakthroughs in cell and gene therapy that may change this—and the sooner the better—the fact is that, today, people who are dependent on insulin still face great anxiety about its affordability.

I have heard from far too many people across Maine and across this country who, because of the escalating costs of insulin, feel they have to ration their insulin and do not take the full dose that their physician has prescribed and that they need to be healthy.

Let me tell you of one example.

Bek Hoskins, of Chelsea, ME, is a young adult. Bek was forced to skip her doses of insulin to try to make it last longer, to stretch it out, because she simply could not afford the cost. In one profoundly memorable instance, Bek pushed her body's limit too far, and she ended up in the emergency room. Her husband Barrett rushed her, through a snowstorm, to the hospital, and she nearly died because she tried to go without insulin for 2 days. Such a dangerous, preventable crisis should never occur. We must address this life-threatening problem.

Senator SHAHEEN and I have introduced legislation to reduce the price of insulin in the past two Congresses, and we have made some progress. For example, three of the biggest insulin manufacturers—Eli Lilly, Novo Nordisk, and Sanofi—voluntarily chose to cut their list prices. This is encouraging, but there is more work to be done. We also joined together for reforms in the pharmacy benefit manager system, which encouraged PBMs to choose the highest priced insulin for insurance formularies. That was because their compensation was frequently a percentage of the list price. Much of that we are fixing, and some of it was fixed last year. But we need more legislation to fix the fundamental problems in the insulin market, including limited biosimilar competition, as well as barriers to patients' access.

The INSULIN Act would do just that. Our bill would limit cost sharing for insulin to no more than \$35 a month, or 25 percent of the list price per month, for at least one type of insulin for each type that is needed and dosage form, for patients who have commercial insurance.

Our bill would also prohibit insurers and pharmacy benefit managers from placing utilization obstacles such as prior authorization and step therapy on products that have capped costs. These important patient protections will deliver immediate out-of-pocket relief.

The INSULIN Act of 2026 will also promote generic and biosimilar competition in the insurance market to

further drive down prices through more competition. The bill would create a new, expedited FDA pathway to promote biosimilar competition. It would take similar steps to enhance regulatory certainty for biosimilar drug companies, such as by requiring the FDA to prioritize actions such as inspections and communications with manufacturers.

We can't have a situation where a biosimilar, which is like a generic for insulin, is launched at a low price but faces obstacles to its approval even if it is absolutely identical to a brand-name insulin, and we can't allow—and we have seen this before—pharmacy benefit managers to refuse to choose that lower priced biosimilar product for the insurance company's formulary simply because they will make less on the deal.

Finally, this bill helps address the insulin needs of uninsured Americans by creating a pilot grant program for States to implement to identify people with diabetes who are uninsured and provide them with insulin at \$35 a month. It will also create an insulin resource center and a hotline for people with diabetes who are uninsured to help connect them with programs so that they can secure the insulin that they need in order to be healthy.

The INSULIN Act will help make insulin more affordable for Americans, both those with and without insurance, by capping the cost and addressing fundamental flaws in the insulin market and the FDA approval process. I thank the American Diabetes Association, Breakthrough T1D, and the Endocrine Society for endorsing this much needed legislation.

Let me just add one final point. If individuals who are insulin-dependent are able to use their insulin, they not only are going to be healthier and avoid severe ramifications of not taking insulin; the healthcare system is going to save money. It is far less expensive to help people afford the insulin that they need for their diabetes than to have them hospitalized or at risk of losing a limb or becoming blind or having other severe consequences because they are not able to afford their insulin.

So I would encourage my colleagues to join us in supporting this bipartisan and much needed legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. 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 Texas.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk about a law

that most people will have never heard of, but it is very, very important to our national security. That is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act or FISA as we sometimes refer to it.

We are approaching the expiration of this section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act later this week, and time's a-wastin' for us to get this actually done.

I know it is important for us to have debates and offer constructive suggestions about changes in these laws, but we cannot risk going dark on this essential intelligence-gathering law, which actually has empowered President Trump to help keep the country safe.

Without getting into the merits of one of these proposals or another, let me just take a step back and talk about the importance of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act and national security.

One of the major misconceptions about this is it is a law enforcement tool, but it is not. It is not primarily a law enforcement tool. Now, it is illegal to commit espionage in this country, but the main reason this is used is to collect information from people overseas on national security threats to the United States. And it allows the intelligence community to connect the dots to understand what our adversaries are up to.

FISA was enacted in 1978 in order to provide more transparency and avoid overreach of surveillance of domestic actors. If you read the history of the FBI going back to the J. Edgar Hoover days, there was a lot of things that the FBI was doing under J. Edgar Hoover that today we would blanch at and certainly consider illegal when it regards surveillance of U.S. persons.

So FISA was enacted to make sure that we did not allow any unconstitutional surveillance of American citizens, but we did preserve the ability to gain information about foreign actors overseas on potential national security threats to the United States.

Section 702, which is the provision that expires in a very short time now, was first enacted in 2008, and as I said, authorizes the U.S. Government to target foreign—hence, the name—the word “foreign” in the FISA—foreign intelligence collection of non-U.S. persons.

Now, that is a bureaucratic way of just saying: American citizens are—you cannot surveil American citizens no matter where they are, even if they are overseas. It only authorizes surveillance of foreign intelligence collection for non-U.S. persons overseas outside of the United States.

Unlike traditional criminal investigations where warrants are issued based on probable cause—that is, showing a probable cause to a judge that a crime has been committed, thus justifying issuance of a warrant to then search or collect information here in America—unlike that, intelligence