

country. Without them, we are unable to do our job.

As I near the end of my career in Congress, I reflect on the staff who have come and gone and the work we have done that will have a lasting impact on the Nation.

Today, I honor an invaluable member of my team, my HELP Committee deputy staff director, Danielle Janowski. She is leaving Capitol Hill after nearly 17 years of service.

Danielle joined my HELP Committee leadership team in 2023 when I became the ranking member. She had previously worked in the House and for Senators ERNST and THUNE. As deputy staff director, she kept the trains moving. She made sure that staff were all rowing in the same direction and that every committee product was done on time and was of the highest quality.

Danielle is an institutionalist at heart, and it was through that lens that she always fought for the HELP Committee to be strategic, thorough, and professional. She cares about this institution and what it represents. She views it as her duty to mentor other young staffers to carry forward the traditions and collaboration that the Senate deserves.

It is because of her leadership that the HELP Committee has been successful in getting bills signed into law that lower the cost of healthcare, strengthen our education system, empower workers, and enhance our retirement system.

Importantly, Danielle has been a leader in the fight for life. She spearheaded my work to protect unborn babies and mothers, an issue so important to me and to the people of Louisiana. Her passion for this cause and her deep connection with the pro-life community made her indispensable and an effective champion. She was instrumental in leading the first pro-life hearing this Congress, my investigation into abortion pill manufacturers harming mothers, and our efforts to eliminate funding for Planned Parenthood in the Working Families Tax Cuts. None of this would have been possible without her passion, strategic guidance, and unrelenting determination. Babies' lives have been saved, and families are better off because of the work that she led. And what can be more important than that?

What Danielle will be most remembered for on our HELP team is her exceptional leadership and friendship. She is beloved by everyone who worked with her—a trusted and calming presence during transitions and chaotic times. When there was conflict or when staff simply needed someone to talk to, Danielle was there. She is an advocate, a mentor, a sounding board, and a friend to everyone.

Her departure is not only a loss for the office but for the entire Capitol Hill community. But our loss is someone else's gain. I am proud she will continue her public service at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Serv-

ices, leading policy to improve families' health and drive down the cost of care. She will continue to make a positive difference and be an invaluable partner to those who remain in Congress. I look forward to working with her in this new capacity.

It has been a pleasure to watch Danielle grow as a leader and as a person. I thank her for her service to my office, to the Senate, and to the Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Missouri.

RECOGNIZING THE 1960 UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI TIGERS FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I rise today to honor one of the greatest teams to ever wear the black and gold, the 1960 Missouri Tigers. They finished 11 and 0. They conquered the Big Eight. They defeated the Navy Midshipmen 21 to 14 in the Orange Bowl in Florida. But their greatness can't be measured by their record alone; their story is about something deeper—perseverance after humiliation, accountability in the face of injustice, and the integrity of men who kept their word.

To understand what they accomplished, we must go back 2 years. Dan Devine arrived at Missouri in 1958 and inherited a program searching for its footing. His first team brought one terrible afternoon in Norman, OK. The Sooners beat Missouri 39 to nothing. It was a humiliating, dismantling, and devastating loss.

After the game, Coach Devine stood before his players in the visiting locker room, knowing full well many of those men would graduate having never beaten OU. Coach Devine looked at the younger men and made a promise: Two years from that day, Missouri would return to Norman, and Missouri would win.

That was no small pledge. Oklahoma ruled the conference at that time. The Sooners hadn't lost a conference game at home since 1942. Norman was where the soaring dreams of visiting teams came crashing down to reality. But a promise had been made by Coach Devine, so for 2 years, the Tigers went to work.

By the fall of 1960, Missouri had become a machine—powerful, disciplined, relentless. The Tigers went into Happy Valley and beat Penn State. They traveled to Lincoln, NE, and shut out the Cornhuskers. They defeated the powerhouse that was Colorado. Eight games, eight victories—not a single team put up double digits against them.

Then came the return to Norman. Oklahoma struck first. For a moment, the Tigers were seeing ghosts. For a moment, the boys in black and gold had “Boomer Sooner” ringing in their ears. For a moment, it felt like 1958 all over again. But this Missouri team did not panic; it answered.

Norris Stevenson, one of the great pioneers in Mizzou history, tore down the sideline for a 77-yard touchdown. Later, with Oklahoma threatening to seize the momentum, Stevenson broke free again, this time from 60 yards out. He finished with 169 rushing yards and two touchdowns. Missouri finished with 41 points. And when the clock hit triple zeroes, the scoreboard read “Missouri 41, Oklahoma 19.” Two years from the humiliating loss on the field, Dan Devine and his players walked out of Norman as victors—a promise they had kept.

The Tigers returned home undefeated and ranked No. 1 in the Nation. Only one obstacle remained between Missouri and an unblemished season. Unfortunately, that obstacle was Kansas.

Rivalry games can produce strange results. Sometimes, the underdog rises. Sometimes, the favorite has an off day. And sometimes, Kansas simply uses a player who wasn't eligible to be on the field.

The Jayhawks defeated Missouri on the scoreboard. For a few brief and fraudulent weeks, they called themselves conference champs, but there was a problem: The Jayhawks had discovered that the only way they could execute better than Missouri was by breaking the rules.

The Big Eight ordered Kansas to forfeit the victory and stripped the Jayhawks of the conference title. Kansas could keep the memory of the final whistle; Missouri kept the title. That distinction matters. A football game, yes, is a contest of strength, but it is a contest that is governed by rules. Without rules, victory means nothing. A championship obtained by cheating is not a championship at all.

The people of Kansas have spent more than six decades trying to turn a blatant penalty into a moral victory, but the truth is harder to bear, and facts are stubborn things. Missouri finished 11 and 0, reminding the conference and the American populace that cheaters never truly win.

But Missouri's season wasn't finished. On January 2, 1961, the Tigers took the field in Miami against fourth-ranked Navy. Watching from the stands was President John F. Kennedy. Navy had a Heisman Trophy winner named Joe Bellino. Missouri had a defense built to break the will of its opponent.

The Tigers held that year's Heisman winner just to 4 rushing yards. Then they overcame a 98-yard fumble return. They absorbed every blow Navy could deliver, and when the night was over, Missouri had won 21 to 14, securing the first bowl victory in school history.

Every generation needs examples of men who stuck to their word. Dan

Devine made a promise in the ashes of defeat. His players believed him. His players were descendants of those who fought in Europe and the Pacific. His players were hardened by parents who had weathered the Great Depression. They accepted their coach's promise as their word when they spent 2 years earning the right to fulfill it. They did not complain about the humiliation they had experienced in Norman; they prepared for a return. They didn't allow the Kansas dishonesty to define their season; they trusted that the truth would prevail. When adversity followed them to Miami, they answered it with discipline, toughness, and ultimately victory.

More than six decades later, the 1960 Tigers still embody the character of Missouri. We are a people who work. We are a people who endure. We are a people who keep our promises.

The men of that team brought home a Big Eight championship and the Orange Bowl championship game in a perfect season, but their greatest legacy was the example they left behind: Stand firm, do the work, keep your word, run the ball, and never surrender what was rightfully yours.

Today, I am proud to honor Coach Dan Devine, Norris Stevenson, and every member of the undefeated 1960 Missouri Tigers. Their promise was kept, their championship was earned, their record remains perfect, and Kansas still lost.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 833, which is before the desk.

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

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 833) recognizing the 1960 University of Missouri Tigers Football Team for its undefeated regular season, Orange Bowl victory, and claim to the 1960 National Championship.

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

Mr. SCHMITT. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 833) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 5325

Mr. BOOKER. I am grateful for your recognition, Mr. President.

And I am going to try to get this order right. This is legislative session. I am going to give some remarks and

then ask for a unanimous consent on a bill.

But I really want to, first, talk about something really challenging, tragic, that happened in the State of New Jersey. Edwin Lopez-Cornejo died. He is dead, and it is a death that did not have to be.

He was detained by ICE on June 18. He was sent to Delaney Hall in my home city, in Newark, NJ—it is a detention center—and he never came out alive.

Mr. President, 20 years—20 years—Edwin lived in the United States of America, 20 years of building a life here, 20 years of being connected to people and community, 20 years of making here in America a way forward. And yet, in less than 2 months of detention, the immigration system in our country led to his death.

And in Delaney Hall, he is the third person in 9 months to die; the 23rd person to die in ICE custody this year—not the first warning sign, not the second, this is the third death at the same facility and yet nothing changes.

Let me tell you exactly how Edwin Lopez-Cornejo died because his family deserves to have his name said on the Senate floor and his story told plainly.

Edwin had diabetes. He had high blood pressure. He needed his medication to survive, and Delaney Hall denied it to him. The day before he died, he told his mother that his arm had gone numb, half his face had gone numb. And understand, this is not a minor complaint. This was a man that was having a medical emergency, telling someone exactly what was happening to his body.

Did anyone come to his aid? No. Did he get his medication? No. Less than 24 hours, he was dead.

Doctors have warned us, attorneys have warned us in New Jersey, families have warned us, a chorus of people in our communities—not politicians, not political activists—doctors, lawyers have been warning us, detainees who walked out of that building, with their testimony and the facts and the evidence, people have said over and over again that this facility is dangerous. It is not well run, and within it is a pattern of disregard for human decency.

DHS has known that Delaney Hall is nothing short of a travesty since they reopened it over a year ago. So who runs what is, for so many, a house of horrors? Who runs the institution that I saw myself when I went there and met people? This is not for serious criminals. This is not a place for folks who have done serious crimes in our country. This is a detention facility for people, many of them have been in our country for decades, many of them have American spouses, American children.

And when I went there, I saw mothers who were recently postpartum who were not getting the support. I saw a woman who lost her child while in that detention facility, had a miscarriage there, did not get the support that she

needed. Story after story, people told me what is going on there, the horrors that are going on there.

And who runs it? The U.S. Government does not run that center. It is a private group called the GEO Group, a private for-profit prison that has high-level Republican officials among its former employees. This group won a billion-dollar contract: no competition, no bidding, lots of campaign contributions, a phone call, a signature, and they have a billion dollars of taxpayer money.

New Jersey had to sue this company just to get health inspectors through the front door of a facility operating on American soil, funded by American taxpayers, and our State couldn't even do basic health inspections.

They did not get—they did not get—the permits to open that place. They did not have inspections before they did so. This is a private company taking a billion dollars of American taxpayer money. The less they provide sanitary services, the less they provide doctors and medical professionals, the more profit they make off of taxpayers. At whose expense? At the decency of American people and at the expense of the lives of the people who are there.

We give them hundreds of millions of dollars. And what are the reports out of Delaney Hall? Spoiled food, contaminated water, staff who retaliate against people brave enough to speak up about the conditions. A billion dollars in inadequate accountability. A billion dollars in inadequate healthcare. A billion dollars and a man whose face is numb, whose arm is numb, who is asking for help—does not get treatment, does not get healthcare.

So, here is the truth. It is clear for the GEO Group that part of their business model is this cruelty: cut medical staff, skimp on food, let the air-conditioning go out during the hottest days in New Jersey, let the roof leak, cram more bodies into less space. Every corner cut is a dollar of their profit. Every dollar of their profit is a dollar that the GEO Group's executives get to celebrate on their next earnings call.

GEO Group's stock has more than doubled since February of 2026—more than doubled. You know why? Well, follow the money.

Three million dollars from the GEO Group and its executives went into Donald Trump's campaign, into his PAC, into his inauguration. It is a pay-to-play that is worse than that. A pay-to-play and people get hurt. Lives are lost.

Over \$2 billion in Federal contracts to run facilities like Delaney Hall in our country. This is not immigration policy. This is not what we stand for. No one loses their humanity because they are incarcerated. No one should lose their basic rights because they are behind bars.

Look, I am all for what this administration promised it would do. They said they would go after the "worst of the worst." They said they would go after

the people threatening our communities, menacing our families. We should all be supportive of that.

I believe we should have strong borders. I believe we should get criminals off of our streets. But the people actually locked up in that building in Delaney Hall? We know that more than 70 percent of the people have never been convicted of a single crime.

I met a high school student who had more of a Jersey accent than I do, who just wanted to walk with his class—rounded up. I have had the Catholic church reach out to me because of the sweeps they are doing around schools and churches. I have had family members beg me to get folks out in order to see their American children hit milestones like birthdays and graduations. I have been appealed to by everyone from priests to Republicans in our community. Many are following our laws.

But we in the U.S. Senate, Congress, hold the purse strings the administration depends on. We should be a check and a balance. We should demand that our taxpayer dollars are being used.

And when we see a body count climbing that is not normal, when we see more and more deaths, when we see a mother's son whose face went numb the night before, we should be asking for action and accountability.

Edwin Lopez-Cornejo's death was not a tragedy. A tragedy is something that no one could have prevented. This is a choice. Every single day the DHS keeps Delaney Hall open is another choice to let this happen, three times already. We should not make this choice.

Mr. President, I am now asking for a unanimous consent to pass the Delaney Hall Closure Act, which would close Delaney Hall within 90 days. They are out of excuses. We are out of time. How many more people should die?

So as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to immediate consideration of my bill at the desk; that the bill be considered read three times and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). Is there an objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

I have been advised to address this so-called Delaney Hall Closure Act.

My colleague's bill, though, really doesn't do anything to address the issues that he has raised. He doesn't hire a single doctor. He doesn't ask a single nurse. It doesn't require a single inspection. It simply orders the Department of Homeland Security to close Delaney Hall, cancel its contract, and permanently prevent ICE from using the facility again. Two pages, three commands: Close it, cancel it, never open it again. That is abolition with a short title.

The diagnosis is ideological, and the prescription was written before the pa-

tient entered the room. If something goes wrong at a hospital, you investigate what happened. You identify the failure. You discipline the people responsible. You repair the facility, improve the procedures, and make the hospital better. You don't unlock every door, abandon the building, and announce that healthcare itself was the crime.

If the bridge needs repair, you fix the bridge. You don't blow it up and congratulate yourself for preventing future traffic accidents. Yet that is the theory behind this bill. A tragedy did occur; therefore, Democrats say law enforcement must disappear.

But closing Delaney Hall doesn't eliminate the need for detention. It leaves three choices: transfer detainees somewhere else, possibly further from their families, lawyers and doctors; crowd them into another facility and further strain medical staff; or release people the law says should remain in custody, while this ceases the removals, and so they are not completed.

The bill provides no replacement capacity, no transfer plan, no continuity of care requirement, no additional medical funding. It removes a thousand-bed facility from the system and calls the resulting chaos compassion.

And let us be clear about why immigration detention exists. It is used to ensure appearances at immigration proceedings, facilitate lawful removals, and to protect the public from criminals.

My colleague and my friend from New Jersey says many detainees have not been convicted of crimes. That is beside the point. A person doesn't need a criminal conviction to lack a lawful right to be in the United States of America. That is our immigration laws. That is how we have operated for decades. And anyone detained can leave detention whenever they want. They must simply agree to return to their home country.

What Democrats demand is for illegal aliens to remain in America and be above the law.

Now, I am willing to take my colleague's concerns seriously. If Delaney Hall needs more doctors, let us fund more doctors. If it needs more nurses, better medication tracking, stronger inspections, faster emergency response, or better communication with families, let us write those regulations into law and pay for them.

I would gladly work with my friend the Senator from New Jersey on additional resources for safe and secure ICE detention facilities. But there is one problem. My colleague and others on his side have vowed to not give ICE one more penny.

We have just lived through this with a shutdown. We heard these words on the floor from many Members of the other side.

They also voted against a bill that allocated 45 billion to further fund and sustain the capabilities of ICE in their detention facilities.

So the position apparently is this: Vote against the beds. Vote against the facilities. Vow to deny the agency another dollar. Then point to a stray condition and demand that the facility close.

You can't pull the batteries out of a smoke alarm and then pose behind the ashes demanding to know who failed.

You can't starve a system, condemn the strain, and call abolition the only human solution. That is not good-faith oversight. That is not serious governance. That is not a viable solution.

Democrats oppose the funding needed to enforce the law. They oppose the facilities needed to hold people safely. They oppose the removals that detention makes possible. Then, when the system shows any pressure, they point to that pressure as proof that enforcement itself must end. The sequence never changes: defund, obstruct, investigate, abolish.

The goal for many Democrats is very clear. It is not better detention facilities; it is no detention at all. The bill does not make one detention facility safer; it shuts down a facility and pushes the problem somewhere else.

A serious Senate would let the current investigation run its course, correct failures, and strengthen the system. An unserious Senate shuts down the building and pretends the law no longer needs enforcement.

I object to using a pending investigation as a ploy to dismantle law enforcement. I object to defunding ICE and then blaming ICE for lacking resources. Fix what is broken. Hold wrongdoers accountable. Protect every person in Federal custody, of course, but we must enforce the law.

For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I appreciate the good-faith words of my colleague, and I will take it to heart that he is against unnecessary deaths and that the GEO Group should be investigated thoroughly and be held accountable. I do want to make followup points.

First of all, I live in North New Jersey. I used to run the police department as its mayor. There is nobody who feels more urgency for public safety in my city than I do. I hired many law enforcement officers and worked well with ICE, worked well with the FBI and with the DOJ—with all of the Federal law enforcement officers—in a coordinated effort to protect my community.

This idea that Democrats want to defund ICE is wrong. I actually believe we need law enforcement in our communities to keep us safe. But I want to make sure we do it in a way that comports with our values and our decency.

Let's be clear. There is no law enforcement agency in America that has more money than ICE has right now. As to this idea that the Democrats have done anything to defund it right

now, ICE has more than the FBI, more than the ATF, and more than the Coast Guard combined. It is the most well-funded Agency there is. So the idea that they cannot provide for the basic needs of people who are in their facilities is a lie. This is not a money problem. ICE has all the money they need, and they are showing an inability to keep their inmates alive.

Now, I like my colleague's metaphor that if a bridge is broken, you close the bridge. I know this because, again, I was a mayor. If people are falling through holes on a bridge, we close the bridge. Do the inspections, but don't leave people in a hellscape where people continue to die in that facility. Keeping that open is irresponsible. ICE has enough money to transfer to other facilities the people who are a real threat. ICE has enough money to run around my State and overspend for real estate, as they have done in one of my towns. They are throwing cash around in a way that should offend Republicans and anybody who is fiscally prudent, but we are not holding the people accountable.

Yes, if something is broken, you stop using it. If people are dying because of a defect in a car, you don't use it. If people are falling through holes on a bridge, you close it. We have a responsibility to taxpayers' money, and we have shoveled this Agency more money than any law enforcement agency there is, and then we are not doing what is necessary to hold these people, like the GEO Group, accountable.

I will continue to stand for law enforcement. One of the reasons I got elected by my State is that we drove crime down in the city of Newark. Everybody saw it. Investment came back, and the population came back. I believe in creating safety in my community. This is not about the accusations that somehow, Democrats don't believe we should have strong law enforcement. If anybody believes in that, I know my record here in the Senate speaks to that.

How can we stand here and allow this from a facility in which multiple people have died in the most gruesome ways? How can we allow this from an organization that is supposed to be providing healthcare but is denying it? How can we allow this in accordance with our own values? Enough is enough.

Delaney Hall is a nightmare. I did not come to the floor to talk about closing facilities all over the country; I am talking about one facility with a record of people dying unnecessarily, with a record of people being denied medical care, with a record of people being denied healthy food—one facility that is failing. For this body to keep it open while waiting for something to change while more people are suffering and may die is irresponsible beyond compare.

I believe there is common ground on both sides of the aisle where we can achieve the highest levels of safety and

also ensure that within our incarcerating facilities, people are treated with dignity. I have worked across the aisle with Senator Lindsey Graham, with Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, and with Senator MIKE LEE to improve conditions in the Bureau of Prisons. I hope that when it comes to ICE facilities and this private, for-profit company where people are dying that we can find some common ground to stop this nightmare from happening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

ACCELERATING ACCESS TO CRITICAL THERAPIES FOR ALS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, one of the questions we all have to wrestle with in life is, Why do the innocent suffer? Why do the righteous find, at times, the circumstances of their lives to be so painful as to be beyond imagined? And how does one make purpose out of pain?

Of all the diseases that afflict mankind, ALS is one of the most cruel. It robs someone of their ability to speak, to walk, to move, to care for themselves, yet leaves them completely present and conscious.

Over the 16 years that I have served here in the U.S. Senate, I have been blessed by visit after visit from families going from office to office to ask not for themselves, not to lessen their pain or their suffering or their challenges but to try and turn their experience into a positive investment for others, lots of different families with lots of different challenges—mostly medical—sometimes the parents of children taken hostage in other countries or veterans who didn't get the benefits they were entitled to but often families whose loved ones or who they themselves are suffering with cancer, with Parkinson's, or with ALS.

Today, I am coming to the floor to celebrate a great and enduring friendship and partnership that has helped to make a difference in this dread disease. Through some of the visits to my office, I have gotten to know some amazing people: Craig and Kristen Colby of Delaware; Brian Wallach and Sandra Abrevaya; Dan Tate, whom I knew from college.

My engagement in trying to tackle the ravages of ALS began earlier. A dear friend from Newark, DE, Alex Snyder-Mackler—his father Scott lived with and then died from ALS; my chief of staff lost his father to ALS; and my brother lost his best friend. And now today, my best friend from growing up, Dr. Jack Flynn, is bravely living through what has been a tragic and difficult diagnosis and a steadily worsening condition.

When you meet someone with ALS, they are always accompanied by someone by their side who knows every detail, who helps them to eat, to talk, to live, to communicate. And they are looking for ways to make meaning out of their suffering.

Through all of this, I have had an incredible partner and advocate, a dear

friend—the senior Senator from the State of Alaska, my colleague Senator LISA MURKOWSKI. We are the cochairs of the Senate ALS Caucus, and I am blessed to have her with me on the floor today as we announce the next step forward in our work together on ALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we go through periods here in the U.S. Senate where there are frustrating issues that we deal with. There are hours of unknown as to what is going to happen. Are we going to be able to make something happen? Are we making a difference? And some days can be particularly discouraging.

We have a long way to go before this day is through, but to be here at the midpoint of this day and to be able to, as my colleague and friend from Delaware has stated, to be able to celebrate an accomplishment is a reminder that we do good here. And we don't do good on our own. It takes teamwork. It takes cooperation and collaboration. It takes advocacy. This is really what makes me just filled with a level of optimism and hope as we are talking about where we are at this moment for the ALS community.

The House passed the Accelerating Access to Critical Therapies for ALS Act. We call it ACT for ALS. They passed it a few weeks ago, and then the Senate was able to pass it in wrapup. Yes, that means it passed by unanimous consent here yesterday. We are now in the final step of reauthorizing a program that is making a real difference for people living with ALS.

I think it is so important to just take a step back and say "What does that mean?" because we have not found the cure, unfortunately, for ALS. This legislation is not about this magical treatment that has come to be. But what we were able to do working together now 5 years ago when we passed the ACT for ALS Act, we created this pathway for individuals. It is kind of a roadmap. We said: If you are not eligible to participate in clinical trials to access investigational treatments, there is another way here for you.

We provided some pretty important funding to NIH and to FDA to accelerate the research, to improve the data sharing, to help speed up the development of new therapies. But what really comes about with ACT for ALS is it gives people who are living with ALS the opportunity to try.

Just let me try something. It might not work, but let me try because right now, the diagnosis I am living with offers no hope.

So this is something that gives those living with ALS some hope. This is a program that works. So we passed it 5 years ago. What we have now done is a reauthorization that allows us to build on this progress that we have made to ensure that individuals that are living with ALS can continue to access these clinical trials and the programs that

continue to meet the needs of the patients and the researchers.

Senator COONS has mentioned the advocacy. Those caregivers, those who stand with and are wrapping their arms and their hearts around their loved ones who are dealing with ALS—this is about hope for them as much as those who are living with this dread disease.

My friend has acknowledged the names of those he calls friends.

Dan Tate—I was able to receive a text message on passage of the reauthorization here saying, you know, “Go dudes” or something like that. I don’t know that I am a dude, but I loved the enthusiasm he had.

Brian Wallach has been an extraordinary partner over the years. You mentioned Sandra Abrevaya. Absolutely.

Then there is my personal advocate, my cousin Jenny Dwyer. It was through Jenny’s husband Pat that our family learned of ALS, as Pat lived with ALS for 8 years; and as a family, we came to not only understand the disease and the awful progression, but it allowed us to understand some of what families go through who live with the almost daily heartbreak as you are watching your loved one progress through this diagnosis.

So to the advocates: Know that your work matters. Know that your stories matter. Know that you have made a difference.

So we are pleased to be able to be at this place where we can move to finally get this reauthorization into law. We have to work things through the two bodies here and get it signed in.

There is more that we have to do. We are working on some good things as the cochairs of the ALS Caucus—the Justice for ALS Veterans Act, which is a really good one, and the ALS Better Care Act. Again, these address some of the challenges that face individuals with ALS as well as their families when they are trying to access the care and access the benefits after a loved one has passed.

We know that for those that are living with ALS, every day matters, every day is precious, and we cannot afford to lose momentum when promising therapies are being studied. I am reminded if not weekly, maybe daily sometimes that people are waiting. People are waiting, and they are counting on us to show up for them.

So to all those in the ALS community: Thank you for your advocacy. Thank you for your heart and your passion and your persistence but also your willingness to open your hearts and to share your stories so that we can also become motivated and tenacious on your behalf.

I am very grateful for my friend from Delaware. It is hard, as I hear stories of your dear friend and as he goes through these stages of this disease. And know that even though I have not met Jack, he is in my heart as well, as well as the many, many whom we are advocating for.

With that, I thank again not only Senator COONS but all Members here in the Senate that have joined us in this effort to end ALS.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and friend from the truly great State of Alaska.

Our mutual friend Dan Tate, long known here as an active lobbyist, who is living with ALS, has been texting the two of us about the impact that this research has had on him and his condition and on many others.

He most recently texted me:

NIH and FDA have done exceptional work.

The ACT for ALS bill that we helped get passed 5 years ago and that we are now reauthorizing—I will remind you that initially, advocates were seeking \$10 million.

Do you remember the Ice Bucket Challenge of 2014? They were seeking \$10 million in Federal medical research. This year, it was \$115 million. In total over the years since we have passed this legislation through this Chamber, \$391 million has been invested.

There are today 1,200 people living with ALS enrolled in a landmark genetic study, and there have been significant steps forward in experimental treatments.

Dr. Sabrina Paganoni of Mass General Brigham Neuroscience Institute said: We are at a turning point because we have a greater awareness of ALS, more funding for research than ever before, and more treatments in development than ever before.

When Lou Gehrig gave a speech announcing his retirement from baseball, he concluded by saying: I am the luckiest guy in the world. Many saw that as a bitter irony because he left an outstanding career in baseball to struggle and suffer through an ultimately terminal disease.

But I have to say that I am the luckiest man in the world to have the blessing of the great, enduring friendship of a colleague and partner from Alaska; of the steady and reliable and motivating input of so many advocates and cared-for people living with this dread disease; and the lifelong partnership and friendship of an amazing man, Dr. Jack Flynn.

In a determined effort to deliver hope and change, Senator MURKOWSKI and I and all of us in this ALS Caucus are determined to get this bill to the President’s desk, signed into law, and to deliver another generation of medical research to get us closer to that day when no one—no one—has to face the diagnosis or live with ALS and it will be a chapter in our history, not a threat for our future. But for today in this body, I am grateful for a chance to celebrate a significant step forward, a unanimous action by this Chamber, and the delivery of hope to so many around our Nation and our world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID GRANNIS

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable member of my staff who is retiring from public service: Mr. David Grannis.

I must admit I misled David into coming to the Senate floor for this speech. I told him I was coming to speak on something completely different because he is not fond of being the center of attention, particularly when he is the subject of praise, but he deserves it—both the praise and the surprise—since he has been known to play a practical joke or two himself. All I told him is I needed to discuss a very important matter on the floor of the Senate and I wanted him to hear it.

By the way, everything I made up on the way over here, you can completely ignore. That was a ruse.

What I wanted to come here to talk about was, in fact, David Grannis. David is no stranger to these farewell speeches. Congresswoman Jane Harman gave one about him leaving her office. Not to be outdone, Senator Feinstein has given two farewell-to-David speeches—one when he departed as staff director for the Senate Intelligence Committee and another when he left her office as chief of staff.

This speech today may be the last of its kind, or may not. You never know. But let me begin by quoting my former colleague, the late, great Senator Feinstein, who said:

David led with wit and wisdom and demonstrated an uncanny ability to get the job done. He has been by my side for countless meetings with foreign leaders, ambassadors, military commanders, corporate chiefs, and local officials. David has served as a mentor for many members of my staff, and his professionalism and dedication are second to none. He is someone that I am proud to call a friend.

I cannot improve on those comments, so I will not try. Instead of sharing again his long list of accomplishments—the major pieces of legislation that he has helped to pass, the critical oversight that he has delivered, or the assistance he secured for so many grateful Californians—I want to talk about David as a person and what he has meant to the many dozens of us—probably hundreds of us—who have had the privilege of working with him.

When David first joined my office as a senior policy adviser, I knew we were gaining someone with a wealth of experience. I had known him from his time on SSCI and also serving with Senator Feinstein. But what I did not fully appreciate, what I could not have known was that our team was not only gaining someone with just incredible experience but also someone who cares so deeply about the people he works with and someone who is just a superlative mentor, particularly toward the junior staff, many of whom are here with us today to honor him.

His impressive CV does not mention his acerbic wit, his many practical

jokes, his commitment to learning the lingo of the newest generation—seriously, he is quite committed to that; very awkward when he uses it, but he is quite committed to it—or the vigorous way he ensures that the staff keep the office refrigerator clean enough for surgical instruments. So, today, I want to do something a little different. I want to come here and laud once again his record of legislative service, yes, but more to the point, I want to share some of the stories of those who have had the privilege of working alongside him but who do not have the same privilege that I have to order him to sit here and listen to us say nice things about him—because, otherwise, he would not allow such a celebration; he would not allow us to share these stories of his mentorship and his presence, how he has uplifted our staff and colleagues, and how much he means to all of us—because his work is really the stuff of legend.

One of our young staff Andrea calls David “best friend.” And that is not an exaggeration. He once told her that she should “heckle every staffer on our team who was late to their meeting regardless of who they were, and yes, [including the] Chief of Staff.”

He has encouraged “spontaneous selfies” and participated in staff chats exclusively in all caps. Andrea, and all of us, know that he is someone who will never fail to make someone laugh during a very stressful day.

To know him is to be on the watch for practical jokes, sometimes by his hand and other times played upon him. And we won’t even get into the “caps lock” incident or the role he has played as “Mr. Liquid.” And I am not going to get into those things because I have no idea what they are.

When Sydney on our team noted that we would “lose a true institution” with David’s departure, she may have been thinking about this interaction she had with David:

Sydney, then assistant to our legislative director, joined a staff delegation trip with a branch of our Armed Forces, and because she was one of the only Senate staffers on the trip, and perhaps because they thought Sydney was the legislative director herself, they named the trip “STAFFDEL DUCKOR,” Sydney’s last name. And so, when Sydney returned, David had printed a floor chart version of the STAFFDEL DUCKOR documents, alongside a 30-inch-tall headshot of Sydney—a floor chart that still, on occasion, is wedged in a place that Sydney will somehow run into it when she least expects it, like in a stairwell. Sydney’s giant mug or the floor chart is sure to pop up at unexpected moments, courtesy of her mentor David Grannis.

As Ian, a former staffer for Senator Feinstein, noted, David had an “extraordinarily hard job over many years, even for a chief. But he did it so well and kept his cool, protecting the boss as well as the staff with that [s]-

eating grin as his shield and that . . . wit as his sword.”

Even when he is at his busiest, David has always had time for everyone from interns to LDs. As Ian put it, “He acted as if he wasn’t too busy for you, [not] at all.”

A consistent theme for David is talent spotting and uplifting staff. Megan, who was a young Feinstein staffer in her San Francisco office, found out when the Senator had a need for a new director of scheduling. David brought her out to interview. Now, Senator Feinstein wasn’t convinced that Megan was the right fit, but David was not deterred. So he flew her out again, this time to staff the Senator, training her on how to do the job, and then made the case again to the Senator. And wouldn’t you know it, she got the job.

As Megan told us, “It shaped my entire career trajectory, shaped me as a leader, and showed me how to lead a ship in troubled waters.” She also noted that she eventually told David a couple of years later that “the Senator said she wanted to kick [him] in the pants when [he] recommended [Megan].”

Alexandra, a mentee of David’s, remembered that he took a chance on her and remembered the time he took to engage interns and teach them about the Senate, like in a scavenger hunt that ended in the interns needing to get the torture report recreated in the documents room and have David autograph it, which he most gamely was pleased to do.

And when Brett was called by David to offer him a job, he did the sensible thing: He asked for a little bit of time to talk to his wife about it. And as Brett tells it, “There was a long pause. Then, in a tone I would come to know very well over the next several years, David said: ‘Really? You seriously need to think about this?’”

As Brett put it, “That’s David in one line—you never quite know if he’s teasing you, testing you, or just telling you the truth. Twenty-plus years in Congress, and he remains, to everyone who’s worked with him, [kind of an] enigma. The enigma is the method. He protected the staff so [they] could just do the work. That wasn’t an accident. That was David, protecting people who didn’t even know they were being protected.”

Even in our office, David had an eye for talent, never failing to mention when an intern or a junior staffer did a first draft or came up with an idea that was brought to him and then brought to me. He could do it with the smallest of projects. But he knew how to handle the biggest tasks, especially on the Intelligence Committee.

As Mike Buchwald told us, “David was known for approaching politically charged issues with integrity and a commitment to ensuring the Committee fulfilled its constitutional oversight responsibilities.” That is the highest charge of the Intelligence Committee, as we saw with David’s han-

dling of the Senate CIA torture report, its creation, and its release.

It was because of David, Senator Feinstein, and the many talented members of the SSCI staff, that this report ever saw the light of day, culminating in a floor speech by Senator Feinstein for the ages. David and Mike worked on draft after draft of the speech, announcing the “painstaking process” to chronicle each of the CIA’s abuses of power. But they were never sure the speech would actually see the light of day.

Finally, one morning at 9 a.m. David dropped by Mike’s desk, saying simply, “Let’s go to the floor. She’s giving the speech.”

She gave that speech right here, speaking truth to power, calling out abuses of power.

Dan, a SSCI staffer at the time, noted David’s immense work with a bipartisan group of Senators to ban the CIA’s “enhanced interrogation techniques,” which included torture tactics such as waterboarding. As Dan put it, David “served our country in enormously consequential ways, almost entirely out of the public view. And because of the quiet, persistent work he did, the known history of the United States is different, and more honest, than it would otherwise be.”

Now, I want to make one thing very clear. I don’t want any of this praise to make you believe he is perfect. He is not. David, for example, would prefer that, today, I quote from the wisdom of Fangorn or Lothlorien, which I will not do because, for one, I have no idea who they are; and, what is more, I suspect it is some obscure reference to “Lord of the Rings.”

He once gave a presentation to our staff at a brown bag lunch in which he said that, of the top 100 films ever made, three of the “Lord of the Rings” movies—three of them, mind you—were in the top 10. So you can see he is prone to occasional but glaring lapses in judgment.

I am sorry, David. You are just wrong about that. And I know that I am pissing off Stephen Colbert and a lot of other people by saying that. But really? Three of the greatest movies of all time, “Lord of the Rings” movies? I mean, does that even require discussion?

Another member of our amazing staff Sircey noted dryly that “behind the wit, David genuinely cared about the people he worked with—even if he wasn’t always going to admit it.” She cited specifically how he brought his wonderful humor to the—well, the bowels of the basement where our office was once located—actually, twice located—which David took to calling the “lower chamber.”

Peter, a colleague from the Senate Intelligence Committee, remembered two benches. Senator Feinstein would occupy the “hot bench,” peppering you with questions. David, in contrast, was a “cold bench,” where he would just stare at you uncomfortably with a

“resting ice face,” kind of like I am getting right now, and allow for your own internal dialogue to wreck you. Both techniques were very effective.

When Peter, a former prosecutor, was told to run a hotline, he had no idea what to do—something I can relate to after joining the Senate after so many years in the House. So Peter asked David how to hotline something. And according to Peter, he just “stared at me for a long time. He then took a long, deep breath. And then he continued to stare.” Classic David Grannis.

Deanna noted that David is the reason “so many of us got our start on Capitol Hill” through his steady advocacy.

Ricky noted a simple code to live by that David would repeat:

Don't do anything stupid.

That is outstanding advice for Senators and staff alike.

Tonya said he was “never afraid to poke fun and turning almost anything into a punchline, he truly cared for and mentored so many young staffers.”

Flavio said that “despite his seniority, or more likely because of it” through humor and pranks, David “makes our office laugh while teaching us the importance of timeliness and delivering praise” and always advocating for interns and junior staff, even if they didn't “always understand the pre-2001 movie references.”

Megan said he shared important life lessons, Grannis style: Don't attend a meeting and change the agenda. And—if you think you have it bad, someone always has it worse.

When Jahari first moved from our Fresno office to DC, she was nervous, but in her telling, David was the first person she chatted with and immediately felt at ease. When other staff ask who has become her mentor, as she put it, “David is an easy answer.”

This character of David is not new. During Senator Feinstein's first farewell speech about him, she noted the same:

I . . . want to echo many of the comments that our committee staff has made about David.

[He] has been the rock upon which the staff's foundation is built.

Now, speaking of *The Rock*, I fear this speech would be incomplete without talking about the “big hunk of beef” incident, which I am told is a favorite story of David's.

David and Senator Feinstein's legislative director Rachel were staffing the Senator during a late-night vote-arama—something we have had a lot of experience at lately. It is around 2 a.m., and the Senator is flipping channels between CNN and the floor and random channels when she finally lands on a movie starring none other than *The Rock*. After a while, she just matter-of-factly states, “That's a big hunk of meat,” causing David, at a safe distance, to laugh uncontrollably.

When I put out the call for recollections of David and their memories of his time on the Hill, the response, as

you have heard just a small sample, was overwhelming. But now I want to share my own.

David has not only been a mentor to the staff, he has helped mentor me as well. We began working together almost 2 years ago when I was elected to the Senate; and in that time, I have been such an enormous beneficiary of his experience and his wisdom, his sense of humor, his poise under pressure, his intellect, and his friendship.

I am so lucky. I am so lucky to have had you on my team—so lucky.

On the most extensive range of issues—from foreign policy, to national security, to intelligence reform, to Senate procedure, and so much more—he has been the most extraordinary source of knowledge and expertise.

I have come to rely upon him implicitly and without hesitation. The respect he is held in by Senators and staff is unrivaled on the Hill—truly. He has dedicated himself to public service for decades now, and the Senate and the country are immeasurably better for it. He is the quintessential public servant.

Thank you, David. Thank you.

Finally, I want to end my comments by thanking David's wife Kerry and their wonderful children Sarah, Amelia, and Nathaniel. Senate staff make a lot of sacrifices to serve the public—financial and otherwise, late nights, weekends, missed trips—and their families are the ones who support them the most.

So thank you, David. I can't wait to see what you do next, and the legions of staff that you helped and influenced and mentored and supported can't wait either. We all thank you.

I yield the floor.

(Mrs. MOODY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. MCCORMICK assumed the Chair.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar No. 877 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Marine Corps; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE SPACE FORCE

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Space Operations and ap-

pointment in the United States Space Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601 and 9082:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Douglas A. Schiess

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN681-4—MARINE CORPS nomination of Vincent J. Noble, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of December 2, 2025.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO NATHAN FAIRHOLM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Nathan Fairholm, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Nathan is a graduate of Vermillion High School in Vermillion, SD. Currently, he is attending Brigham Young University in Provo, UT, where he is pursuing a degree in political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Nathan for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO TYLER GROEN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Tyler Groen, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Tyler is a graduate of Brandon Valley High School in Brandon, SD, and a recent graduate of South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, having earned a degree in human biology. Next year, Tyler plans to attend medical school. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tyler for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO WALKER LARSON

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Walker Larson, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.