

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

gathering is significantly different because it involves the monitoring of foreign intelligence to detect and prevent threats before they happen.

So our criminal justice system is designed to investigate and prosecute crimes that occur after they happen. But the intelligence community needs these tools like FISA to be able to prevent bad things from happening. So it is forward-leaning rather than retrospective.

President Trump has asked Congress to reauthorize this essential authority, as the current law properly balances intelligence needs with privacy protections of U.S. citizens.

Let me just put a finer point on that. To allow this to expire would be an affront to the President; but also, it would essentially blind the President to this essential intelligence that he uses on a daily basis in his President's Daily Brief.

Many folks are familiar with the fact that the President gets intelligence briefings on a daily basis, and it is called the PDR, President's Daily—PDB, excuse me, the President's Daily Brief.

So the intelligence Agencies—notably the CIA or the Director of National Intelligence—will brief the President on national security threats.

Mr. President, 60 percent—60 percent—of the information contained in the President's Daily Brief is a product of section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. So to allow that to expire would basically handicap the President in terms of getting access to the information he needs in order to work within and U.S. Government to keep the public and our Nation safe. So 60 percent of the President's Daily Brief is a product of 702 of FISA.

In 2025, a quarter—25 percent—of the national security Agencies—that is our Signals Intelligence Agency—25 percent of their reports were comprised of information gathered under section 702.

This information, of course, has allowed the U.S. Government to thwart terrorist attacks and to make sure that we protect the public at large. It has also helped us find and rescue American hostages and much more.

In April of 2024, Congress responded to the concerns that some had raised about privacy of U.S. citizens by passing the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act, the RISAA. RISAA, I guess. I am not sure how to pronounce it, but that is the acronym; RISAA, Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act.

So these concerns which led to these reforms included incidents such as unlawful targeting of Carter Page, a Trump campaign aide, during the run-up to the President's election in 2016. But that is a different section of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Obviously, Carter Page was an American citizen, and based on what I have said—you have heard me say—you can't surveil American citizens, whether they are at home or abroad without a warrant.

So this would not apply to the Carter Page case; although, I agree it was an abomination where an FBI lawyer basically misrepresented the facts to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court who then issued a warrant on Carter Page.

And the Justice Department has since admitted that it did not have probable cause to surveil him.

So a different section—section 702 is different from the Carter Page example. So the R-I-S-A-A—RISAA—was crafted to address past abuses of the foreign intelligence surveillance authorities and privacy and civil liberty concerns while ensuring that the government had the capability in order to protect Americans from foreign threats.

The provisions enacted into law have gone a long way to curb the likelihood of abuses that were happening under FISA authorities during the Obama and the Biden administrations.

According to a recent report from the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, the reforms that Congress passed under RISAA have had positive effects regarding the safeguarding of privacy and civil liberty. These included significant reforms to the way that the FBI can conduct U.S. person queries.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act section 702 is authorized overseas on a noncitizen, but if they communicate with an American citizen here in the United States, that information is maintained in a database by the intelligence Agencies. It is lawfully collected information, not for the purposes of a criminal investigation, but for purposes of collecting intelligence to be able to connect the dots and protect the Nation.

Targeting refers to the actual collection of data on non-U.S. persons abroad who may be potential threats. While querying—or looking into—the data that is collected in that process is different. It is worth repeating again. Only non-U.S. persons abroad may be targeted under 702.

But RISAA, the reforms, include stronger oversight measures and consequences for violations of these new requirements, which is entirely appropriate. Part of this is not only to address potential violations but also to build the public's confidence that their own government is not spying on them as I have heard some people suggest.

But perhaps the most significant reforms in RISAA were how these queries of lawfully collected information were conducted. Due to new requirements from RISAA, queries of U.S. persons already collected—lawfully collected—information are now even further restricted and subject to three reviews. That is sort of a belt-and-suspenders approach to making sure we protect American citizens.

Since 2023, the total number of queries of U.S. persons has dropped by 87 percent. According to the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, within

the first year after the enactment of these reforms, more than 98 percent of the FBI's queries of already lawfully collected information weren't compliant with these new requirements.

The report concludes that, while the implementation of these reforms are still being studied, it is clear they are having a positive effect on the privacy of American citizens.

Furthermore, FISA remains a very important tool that the U.S. Government uses in order to support our national security, which is why President Trump has been so adamant that we need to get this law reauthorized and not let it go dark.

Last March, CIA Director John Ratcliffe testified that 70 percent of his Agency's success in countering advanced weapons proliferation and 90 percent of their success in interdicting synthetic drugs like fentanyl were the result of information acquired by using section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Section 702 allows the U.S. Government to vet foreign persons seeking to enter the United States for connections to terrorism and international drug trafficking operations. It is also a critical tool for combatting cyber threats. Section 702 proved particularly useful for the U.S. Government's efforts to crack down on illicit drug trafficking into the country.

This intelligence has helped the United States, together with our friends, to identify the supply chain for precursor chemicals coming from China and used to make synthetic drugs like fentanyl in Mexico. And it also has allowed the intelligence Agencies to seize machinery in China that would have been able to produce millions of pills per hour—these pill pressers, these automated pill pressers. Section 702 also allows our Border Patrol to seize these pill pressers at the border.

Reports indicate that 90 percent of the CIA's successful interdiction of synthetic drugs like fentanyl is attributable to section 702.

So some people are suggesting it ought to go dark; we ought not to extend it. It makes no sense when you begin to look at how effective it has been in keeping the country safe.

Section 702 is also important in counterterrorism. Information acquired under that section has allowed the FBI to identify a potential terrorist threat, in October of 2023, related to the Israel-Gaza conflict. The FBI was able to warn the Department of Defense and the relevant host nations about this threat against American troops.

In another instance, section 702 allowed the United States to discover and thwart a planned terrorist attack against a high-profile concert in Europe.

These are just a couple of examples—of numerous examples—of ways section 702 has helped the United States protect our citizens against foreign threats.

And no one knows that better than President Trump, who is the daily consumer of this information. Again, 60 percent of his daily intelligence brief is composed of section 702 intelligence. And, of course, the President is responsible for the protection of all of our citizens and U.S. interests, and that is why he has asked us to reauthorize this critical authority.

President Trump recently wrote on Truth Social to say:

With the ongoing successful military activities against the Terrorist Iranian Regime, it is more important than ever that we remain vigilant, PROTECT our Homeland, Troops, and Diplomats stationed abroad, and maintain our ability to quickly stop bad actors seeking to cause harm to our People and our Country.

After 4 years of weakness under President Biden, President Trump is showing the world that the United States is, once again, a power to be dealt with. It is imperative we equip the President and the entire administration, working with Congress in an oversight capacity, like on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on which I serve. It is important that we equip the Trump administration with the tools and authorities they need to maintain deterrence and, hopefully, peace through strength.

We cannot allow this authority to expire. It would be foolhardy and reckless to do so.

So President Trump has asked us to reauthorize FISA section 702, and I hope all of our colleagues in both Chambers will not tie the President's hands behind his back while we have Americans in active combat overseas.

And we need this essential intelligence in order to protect our people and our homeland.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, earlier this morning, the conservative majority on the Supreme Court took another step toward resurrecting the Jim Crow South.

In a decision that for all practical purposes upends half a century of precedent, defies the spirit of the American Civil Rights Movement, and reverses generations of progress toward racial justice, the rightwing Court

today essentially declared it valid and appropriate for States to discriminate against racial minorities in drawing districts.

The Voting Rights Act—a law written in the blood, sweat, tears, and sacrifice of Americans who marched, who fought, and died for the right to vote and to prevent racial discrimination—has been diminished once again.

The consequence of this decision is as clear as it is dangerous: fewer protections for voters, more power for politicians to draw maps that silence them—particularly historically disenfranchised voters.

The conservative Court has tried to make it seem like its decision today was narrow and tailored. But let's be very clear. In the words of Justice Kagan, this decision is a "demolition"—a "demolition"—of section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. It opens the floodgates for States across the South to redraw their congressional districts and make voters of color essentially invisible in our democracy. By some estimates, this decision could lead conservative State legislatures to draw as many as 19 additional seats that favor Republicans in the House.

So, far from being a narrow decision, this MAGA Court is trying to give Republicans a leg up—an illegitimate leg up—in future elections.

Let me say it again: This case is the MAGA Court trying to give Republicans a leg up in future elections.

It is a knife to the heart of some of the most important civil rights legislation that past generations marched for, organized for, and bled for. It will bring back the old, sinister practices long discarded to the dustbin of history: State legislatures diluting, erasing, and overpowering voters of color.

Shame on the High Court. Shame on the MAGA Justices for rigging our elections.

This did not happen all at once. For years, this Court—beginning with the Roberts decision in the awful Shelby County decision—has chipped away at the Voting Rights Act, decision by decision. Chief Justice Roberts bears a lot of the blame for this awful decision.

The commitment of equal representation has been broken before, but every time, Americans have forced it back into the law. Senate Democrats will fight it, once again, to reverse this awful, awful decision.

Even before this wretched decision, we knew the MAGA far right was hell-bent in trying to undermine our democracy.

ELECTION TASK FORCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we know that the MAGA right is trying to rig our democracy. We knew it long before this decision. Donald Trump knows and his party knows that they are going to lose this election in 2026, which is why they are working around the clock to tilt the scales unfairly in their favor.

Trump issued another Executive order, a month ago, to subvert our elections. Last week, they took aim at the Southern Poverty Law Center to chill speech and suppress actions from organizations that protect democracy. Trump continues to push for his SAVE Act to disenfranchise tens of millions of Americans, and he stacked his administration with election deniers.

So, today, I am launching the Democratic Party's most expansive effort, to date, to protect the 2026 midterm elections and to shield them from the direct threats posed by Trump and MAGA Republicans.

This afternoon, a group of Senators and I will meet with former Attorney General Eric Holder, Mark Elias, and some of the country's top election experts to talk about how we can be ready for any and all threats that might come against our elections this fall.

I want to thank my Senate Democratic colleagues for joining in today's meeting.

We know that some on the extreme right will try to rig the system. Donald Trump said it. He said he can't win the election except by rigging it. That is more or less what he said. Donald Trump's Justice Department sought to seize States' voter rolls. Rightwingers raided election offices in Georgia. They pressed election officials in Arizona to turn over documents. Online radicals are threatening poll workers and are spreading lies about voter fraud. And, here in Congress, hard-right Republicans are trying to pass Jim Crow 2.0 in the SAVE Act.

These threats are only going to intensify the closer we get to election day. So our election fraud task force represents the most aggressive and coordinated effort to date to make sure our elections this fall are protected. The goal of our task force is to ensure that every vote counts and every American can participate in our democracy without coercion, intimidation, or threats from Trump or anyone else.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, on DHS—a lot is happening today—last night, Donald Trump confirmed what I have been saying for weeks: Speaker JOHNSON and House Republicans are holding up funding for the Department of Homeland Security. They are holding it up—the Republicans, not Democrats. The White House said it, in effect. The White House put out a memo urging House Republicans to stop dithering and pass the DHS bill that every Democrat and every Republican in the Senate passed unanimously not once but twice.

For weeks, Republicans have tried to pin the blame for their shutdown on Democrats. The Trump administration just exposed how preposterous that lie is.