SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Youth Poisoning Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. BANNING OF PRODUCTS CONTAINING A HIGH CONCENTRATION OF SODIUM NITRITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any consumer product containing a high concentration of sodium nitrite shall be considered to be a banned hazardous product under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2057).

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) prohibit any commercial or industrial purpose in which high concentration sodium nitrite is not customarily produced or distributed for sale to, or use or consumption by, or enjoyment of, a consumer; and

(2) apply to high concentration sodium nitrite that meets the definition of a ''drug'', ''device'', or ''cosmetic'' (as such terms are defined in sections 201(g), (h), and (i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(g), (h), and (i))), or ''food'' (as defined in section 201(f) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 321(f))), including poultry and poultry products (as such terms are defined in sections 4(e) and (f) of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 453(e)and (f))), meat and meat food products (as such terms are defined in section 1(j) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601(j))), and eggs and egg products (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1033)).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) CONSUMER PRODUCT.—The term ''consumer product'' has the meaning given that term under section 3(a)(5) of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2052(a)(5)).

(2) HIGH CONCENTRATION OF SODIUM NITRITE.—The term ''high concentration of sodium nitrite'' means a concentration of 10 or more percent by weight of sodium nitrite.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

BANKRUPTCY THRESHOLD ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2026

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 347, S. 3977.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3977) to amend title 11, United States Code, to modify certain bankruptcy eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORAN. I now 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. 3977) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3977

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 ''Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment Act of 2026''.

SEC. 2. DEBT LIMIT MODIFICATIONS.

(a) MODIFICATION TO THE SMALL BUSINESS BANKRUPTCY DEBT LIMIT.—Section 1182(1) of title 11, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) DEBTOR.—The term 'debtor'—

''(A) subject to subparagraph (B), means a person engaged in commercial or business activities (including any affiliate of such person that is also a debtor under this title and excluding a person whose primary activity is the business of owning single asset real estate) that has aggregate noncontingent liquidated secured and unsecured debts as of the date of the filing of the petition or the date of the order for relief in an amount not more than $7,500,000 (excluding debts owed to 1 or more affiliates or insiders) not less than 50 percent of which arose from the commercial or business activities of the debtor; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) any member of a group of affiliated debtors under this title that has aggregate noncontingent liquidated secured and unsecured debts in an amount greater than $7,500,000 (excluding debt owed to 1 or more affiliates or insiders);

''(ii) any debtor that is a corporation subject to the reporting requirements under section 13 or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)); or

''(iii) any debtor that is an affiliate of a corporation described in clause (ii).''.

(b) MODIFICATION TO THE CONSUMER BANKRUPTCY DEBT LIMIT.—Section 109 of title 11, United States Code is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) Only an individual with regular income that owes, on the date of the filing of the petition, noncontingent, liquidated debts that aggregate less than $2,750,000 or an individual with regular income and such individual's spouse, except a stockbroker or a commodity broker, that owe, on the date of the filing of the petition, noncontingent, liquidated debts that aggregate less than $2,750,000 may be a debtor under chapter 13 of this title.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any case that is commenced under title 11, United States Code, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

FOREIGN ROBOCALL ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 422, S. 2666.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2666) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to establish a taskforce on unlawful robocalls, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Robocall Elimination Act''.

SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY TASKFORCE ON UNLAWFUL ROBOCALLS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission.

(2) CONSORTIUM.—The term ''Consortium'' means the consortium described in section 13(d) of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act (Public Law 116–105).

(3) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term ''Federal agency'' has the meaning given the term ''agency'' in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) TASKFORCE.—The term ''taskforce'' means the taskforce on unlawful robocalls established under subsection (b).

(5) UNLAWFUL ROBOCALL.—The term ''unlawful robocall'' means a telephone call made in violation of subsection (b) or (e) of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission, after consultation with the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General, shall establish a taskforce on unlawful robocalls.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The taskforce shall be composed of the following members:

(A)(i) A representative of each Federal agency that the Chairman of the Commission, in consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General, considers appropriate.

(ii) With respect to each Federal agency considered under clause (i) to be appropriate, the Chairman of the Commission shall appoint a representative of that Federal agency to the taskforce based on the recommendations of the head of that Federal agency.

(B) Seven representatives of private sector entities, to be appointed as described in paragraph (2)—

(i) 3 of whom shall be representatives from private sector entities with expertise in combating unlawful robocalls, including—

(I) voice service providers;

(II) analytics providers;

(III) technologists; and

(IV) technology experts;

(ii) 1 of whom shall be a representative from the Consortium;

(iii) 1 of whom shall be a representative of a marketing business that communicates with consumers by telephone as part of the normal course of business of that marketing business;

(iv) 1 of whom shall be a representative of a business or nonprofit organization that communicates with consumers by telephone for nonmarketing purposes on a regular basis; and

(v) 1 of whom shall be a representative of an organization that advocates on behalf of customers and who has relevant experience and expertise in combating unlawful robocalls.

(2) APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PRIVATE SECTOR ENTITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of chapter 10 of title 5, United States Code, the members of the taskforce described in paragraph (1)(B) shall be jointly appointed by the Chairman of the Commission, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the Attorney General.

(B) INABILITY TO REACH AGREEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), if the Chairman of the Commission, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the Attorney General cannot reach agreement regarding an appointment described in subparagraph (A), as determined by the Chairman of the Commission, the Chairman of the Commission shall make that appointment.

(ii) NOTICE OF APPOINTMENTS.—Not later than 48 hours before appointing a member to the taskforce under clause (i), the Chairman of the Commission shall provide notice of the proposed appointment to the commissioners of the Commission.

(iii) REQUEST FOR VOTE.—If, after receiving notice under clause (ii) of a proposed appointment under clause (i), a commissioner of the

Commission requests that the proposed appointment be subject to a vote of the Commission, the Chairman of the Commission may not make that appointment unless a majority of the commissioners of the Commission vote to approve the appointment.

(d) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The taskforce shall prepare a report on unlawful robocalls, which shall contain recommendations and advice for Federal agencies with jurisdiction relevant to combating unlawful robocalls, and for Congress, regarding the most effective ways to combat unlawful robocalls made into the United States from outside the United States.

(2) MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the taskforce shall—

(A) compare the estimated number of suspected unlawful robocalls made within the United States with the estimated number of unlawful robocalls made into the United States from outside the United States;

(B) determine which foreign countries serve as the foreign points of departure for the highest volume of unlawful robocalls made into the United States;

(C) determine the magnitude of financial loss and the number of instances of stolen identity that occur within the United States each year as a result of unlawful robocalls made from outside the United States;

(D) examine methods for encouraging the adoption of caller identification authentication technology in foreign countries;

(E) examine and provide information on options for how countries can collaborate on solutions to authenticate and verify international calls, including relevant analytics relating to unlawful robocalls and technical options that can be used with respect to that authentication and verification;

(F) examine how better implementation of technical solutions, such as traceback and caller identification authentication technology in foreign originating countries, would improve coordination between the United States and foreign countries in combating unlawful robocalls;

(G) determine whether—

(i) the technical standards commonly known as ''STIR/SHAKEN'' adequately provide call authentication for unlawful robocalls from foreign originating providers or foreign intermediate providers through gateway providers in the United States; and

(ii) it would be desirable to encourage other countries to adopt the standards described in clause (i);

(H) examine ways to provide incentives to foreign countries to cooperate with law enforcement efforts in the United States to combat unlawful robocalls;

(I) examine whether any Federal agency, or any other organization, that combats unlawful robocalls needs additional resources in order to more effectively combat unlawful robocalls made into the United States from outside the United States;

(J) specifically consider whether the ability of the Attorney General to conduct enforcement activities with respect to unlawful robocalls would be increased through the establishment of an office within the Department of Justice dedicated to those enforcement activities;

(K) examine how increased criminal penalties based on the volume of unlawful robocalls could help prevent unlawful robocalls made into the United States;

(L) examine how many enforcement activities the Attorney General has undertaken in the year preceding the date on which the preparation of the report begins, including in response to referrals made by the Commission;

(M) specifically determine how the Attorney General has pursued forfeiture amounts in enforcement activities with respect to unlawful robocalls;

(N) seek input, as appropriate, from technologists and private sector innovators to find solutions for combating unlawful robocalls;

(O) identify a list of best practices regarding the identification and blocking of unlawful robocalls that telephone service providers and providers of technology solutions can voluntarily implement to improve the effectiveness of mitigating unlawful robocalls made into the United States from outside the United States;

(P) evaluate whether requiring periodic public disclosure, in whole or in part, of the results of trace backs conducted by the Consortium would impact the integrity and effectiveness of the trace back process of the Consortium, including by—

(i) revealing investigative methods;

(ii) allowing consumers and businesses to avoid providers with a track record of making unlawful robocalls;

(iii) exposing proprietary, competitively sensitive, or confidential information of legitimate providers or entities;

(iv) strengthening accountability and deterrence;

(v) enabling the initiators of unlawful robocalls to evade detection, adapt tactics, or exploit system vulnerabilities;

(vi) improving the efforts of voice service providers to block calls that are determined to be unwanted based on reasonable analytics;

(vii) impeding cooperation with future law enforcement investigations or future consumer protection efforts; or

(viii) ensuring fairness in the reporting of trace back information; and

(Q) examine mechanisms for improving compliance with the requirements imposed pursuant to sections 6 and 7 of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act (47 U.S.C. 227b–1, 227 note).

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 360 days after the date on which the taskforce is established under subsection (b), the taskforce shall submit to Congress the report prepared under this subsection.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 1346 of title 31, United States Code, funds made available by this or any other Act to the Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, or the Department of Justice may be used by the applicable Federal agency for coordination with, participation in, or recommendations involving the taskforce, as required under this section.

(f) TERMINATION.—The taskforce shall terminate on the date that is 90 days after the date on which the taskforce submits to Congress the report prepared under subsection (d), as required under paragraph (3) of that subsection.

SEC. 3. FCC NOTICE PROVISION.

Section 13(d)(2) of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act (Public Law 116–105) is amended by striking ''annually'' and inserting ''once every 3 years''.

SEC. 4. REGISTERED CONSORTIUM CONDUCTING PRIVATE-LED EFFORTS TO TRACE BACK THE ORIGIN OF SUSPECTED UNLAWFUL ROBOCALLS.

(a) IMMUNITY FOR RECEIVING, SHARING, AND PUBLISHING TRACE BACK INFORMATION.—Section 13(d) of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act (Public Law 116–105; 133 Stat. 3287) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) IMMUNITY FOR RECEIVING, SHARING, AND PUBLISHING TRACE BACK INFORMATION.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term 'covered information'—

''(i) means information regarding suspected—

''(I) fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful robocalls;

''(II) illegally spoofed calls; and

''(III) other illegal calls; and

''(ii) includes—

''(I) call detail records of calls described in clause (i);

''(II) the names of, and other identifying information concerning, the voice service providers that originated, carried, routed, and transmitted calls described in clause (i); and

''(III) information about the entities that made calls described in clause (i), including any contact information of individuals that such an entity provided to the voice service provider that originated the call.

''(B) TRACE BACK IMMUNITY.—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against the registered consortium for receiving, sharing, or publishing covered information or information derived from covered information.''.

(b) PUBLICATION OF LIST OF VOICE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Section 13(e) of the Pallone-Thune TRACED Act (Public Law 116–105; 133 Stat. 3287) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) LIST OF VOICE SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

''(1) PUBLICATION OF LIST.—The Commission, or the registered consortium in consultation with the Commission, may publish a list of voice service providers based on—

''(A) information obtained by the consortium about voice service providers that refuse to participate in private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls; and

''(B) other information the Commission or the consortium may collect about voice service providers that are found to originate or transmit substantial amounts of unlawful robocalls.

''(2) ENFORCEMENT.—The Commission may take enforcement action based on the information described in paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 5. ROBOCALL MITIGATION DATABASE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission.

(2) ROBOCALL MITIGATION DATABASE.—The term ''Robocall Mitigation Database'' has the meaning given the term in section 64.6300 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(3) UNLAWFUL ROBOCALL.—The term ''unlawful robocall'' has the meaning given the term in section 2(a).

(b) BOND REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall issue rules to require that, subject to the other provisions of this section, before a provider may file a certification to the Robocall Mitigation Database, the provider shall post a bond in an amount that is not more than $100,000, if the Commission determines that posting such a bond is necessary to preserve the integrity of the Robocall Mitigation Database.

(2) EXCEPTED PROVIDERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In issuing rules under paragraph (1), the Commission shall establish criteria to exempt a provider from the requirement to post a bond described in that paragraph if that requirement, as applied to the provider, is not necessary to deter unlawful robocall activity.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing criteria under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall require consideration of whether a provider—

(i) is registered with the Commission under section 64.1195 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation) and makes contributions under section 254(d) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254(d));

(ii) holds a certificate of authority, license, or registration with a State public utility commission;

(iii) is an issuer, the securities of which are listed on a national securities exchange; and

(iv) otherwise presents indicia of being a bona fide, established communications service provider, such that requiring the provider to post a bond under paragraph (1) would impose unnecessary burdens without materially improving enforcement of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In implementing this section, the Commission shall—

(1) require the posting of a bond under subsection (b)(1) from providers that do not demonstrate—

(A) legitimate, ongoing operations;

(B) regulatory oversight sufficient to ensure accountability; or

(C) the ability to pay fines or forfeitures imposed by the Commission or other governmental

enforcement authorities with respect to violations of Federal or State laws or regulations;

(2) establish categorical exemptions for identifiable classes of legitimate providers that satisfy the criteria established under subsection (b)(2); and

(3) minimize administrative and financial burdens on compliant, established, and regulated providers while ensuring effective enforcement of section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, 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 committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2666), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2026

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, August 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 6500 postcloture; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. tomorrow for the weekly conference meetings and that all time during recess, adjournment, leader remarks, and morning business count postcloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 6500.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:46 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, 2026, at 10 a.m.