

or intelligence personnel in Venezuela for certain purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 128

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 128, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, a bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 to establish payment and performance security requirements for projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1281

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1281, a bill to establish a new nonimmigrant visa for mobile entertainment workers.

S. 1504

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1504, a bill to require the Social Security Administration to make changes to the social security terminology used in the rules, regulation, guidance, or other materials of the Administration.

S. 1552

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1552, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 1650

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1650, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration.

S. 1924

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1924, a bill to add suicide prevention resources to school identification cards.

S. 2106

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2106, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet certain eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 2858

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2858, a bill to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes.

S. 2918

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2918, a bill to amend the Rebuilding Economic Prosperity and Opportunity for Ukrainians Act to improve the implementation of the seizure of Russian sovereign assets for the benefit of Ukraine, and for other purposes.

S. 3480

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3480, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from implementing the WISER model under the Medicare program.

S. 3570

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3570, a bill to establish duties for online service providers with respect to end user data that such providers collect and use.

S.J. RES. 98

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 98, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Venezuela that have not been authorized by Congress.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I have two requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 7, 2026, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 7, 2026, at 3:00 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

CONDEMNING THE RISE IN IDEOLOGICALLY MOTIVATED ATTACKS ON JEWISH INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES, INCLUDING THE RECENT VIOLENT ASSAULT IN BOULDER, COLORADO, AND REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE SENATE TO COMBATING ANTISEMITISM AND POLITICALLY MOTIVATED VIOLENCE

RECOGNIZING THE THIRD COMMEMORATION OF THE ANTI-LGBTQ+ ATTACK THAT OCCURRED ON NOVEMBER 19–20, 2022, AT CLUB Q, AN LGBTQ+ BAR IN COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

COMMENDING CENTENARY COLLEGE OF LOUISIANA ON THE OCCASION OF ITS BICENTENNIAL AND ITS YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the applicable committees be discharged and the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following resolutions: S. Res. 288, S. Res. 503, and S. Res. 543.

There being no objection, the committees were discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The resolutions were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

The resolution (S. Res. 288) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 18, 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The resolution (S. Res. 503) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of November 19, 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The resolution (S. Res. 543) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of December 11, 2025, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 2026

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 a.m., Thursday, January 8; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in

a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that Senator KAINE or his designee be recognized to make a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 98, and if made, the Senate vote on the motion to discharge at 11 a.m.; finally, following the vote on the motion to discharge, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 574, Van Hook, and the Senate execute the order of December 18 in relation to the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

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

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand in recess under the previous order, following the remarks of my colleagues.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### PERMITTING REFORM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to give, I guess, an explanation and update to my colleagues about the status of permitting reform.

I think, as you know, the chair and ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the chair and ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee were working on a permitting reform bill until very recently. I have, together with Senator HEINRICH, declared a pause in that permitting reform process, and I want to explain that because the progress had actually been good. We were working toward what I think could have been a very meaningful, very effectual, very bipartisan permitting reform bill. There were fairly new ideas being developed in it—like requiring front-loaded stakeholder engagement so the whole rest of the process, as it goes forward, is accelerated; disciplining the despised-by-me inter-agency process mechanism that excuses so much executive branch delay and indecision. I was actually pretty pleased with the way the process was going.

Off of Rhode Island, we are developing offshore wind. Our offshore wind project, Revolution Wind, had already weathered one stop work order which came out of the blue from the administration. This was a project then with about \$4 billion of investment already expended and north of 80 percent complete—a lot of turbines fully complete out there.

And that order was without any lawful basis. As a result, the order was challenged in court. And in court, the Federal judge said: You can put that project back to work. The stop work order from President Trump is invalid.

The judge made that decision on September 22. The Trump administration had 60 days to appeal. It did not appeal.

We got to November 21, the last appeal day, no notice of appeal was filed. The matter was settled; work could continue; and everybody was already back at work.

Thirty days later, the 22nd of December, a new stop work order was dropped by the Trump administration with no explanation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the stop work letter of December 22 be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

So the first stop work attempt by the Trump administration had cited the protection of national security interests of the United States as one of its bases. And, obviously, that was deliberated in court. There were pleadings on that subject. The Trump administration lost. They did not appeal the order finding that they had lost, declaring that they had lost, so that was a settled question.

This second letter goes back and says again, national security risks. It does not identify them. In comments made on FOX News, it has been said that radar interference is the risk. Radar interference was deliberated in the initial permits. Radar interference was deliberated in the stop work order proceedings where the Trump administration lost. So what this looks like is a vindictive attack outside the law and proper due process by the Trump administration.

It is not the only mischief, and I am going to be joined here by Ranking Member HEINRICH to talk about some of the more westerly tricks that the Trump administration has been up to to interfere with clean energy.

But that second stop work order kind of tore it for me—because any negotiation that we would enter into, any good bill that would result from it, would then have to be implemented by this administration; and this administration has been found to have illegally stopped work on this project, did not appeal that finding, and then came up with a new stop work order 30 days later. If that is not vindictive harassment without legal basis, I don't know what is.

It is in litigation right now. With any luck, it will be stopped again, and they can go back to work again. And—who knows—maybe there will be a third imaginary stop work order that drops. But in an environment like that, where the executive branch refuses its constitutional duty to faithfully execute the laws, it doesn't make any sense for us to continue negotiations on a major bipartisan bill.

I want to say, in particular, that Chair CAPITO has been helpful, thoughtful, a good partner. All the Environment and Public Works Committee Republicans have been helpful and thoughtful. There is literally zero blame for this to land on the other side of the aisle in the Senate. This is entirely a legislative versus executive problem of an executive branch—a rogue executive branch—that refuses

to faithfully execute the laws, notwithstanding its constitutional duty.

It is so bad that the three major miscreants in this process—Zeldin, Burgum, and Wright—have gone on a campaign of falsehood about the cost of offshore wind. Here are some of the things that they have been saying. Secretary Burgum said that “intermittent, highly expensive wind is bad.” “Highly expensive,” he called it. He then tweeted:

Offshore wind is one of the most expensive . . . schemes ever pushed upon American taxpayers.

He said:

Offshore wind forces consumers and taxpayers to pay CONSIDERABLY more for electricity.

He said that “blue State offshore wind policies . . . lock in high prices.”

Zeldin criticized the economic impacts of wind.

Wright said that “wind and solar brings us . . . less reliable energy delivery and higher electric bills.”

So all three of them have falsely asserted that offshore wind will raise electric bills.

In court proceedings, where you actually need to tell the truth—as opposed to in tweets and talk shows—the story that emerges is exactly the opposite. In the Rhode Island and Connecticut sworn complaint, we alleged that Revolution Wind, the project off our shores, “will . . . yield substantial cost savings to the States’ ratepayers.”

[S]avings to ratepayers—

the pleading continues—

are estimated to be hundreds of millions of dollars over 20 years.

The September complaint brought in the Federal court by Orsted—again, a court filing—pled that long-term contract prices “are expected to act as a successful hedge against rising electricity rates,” projected to save ratepayers “hundreds of millions of dollars.”

In January—just now—in the litigation about the second stop work order, an affidavit was filed that swore that Revolution Wind would be a new source of low marginal cost power in New England; that “once operational, Revolution Wind alone will provide hundreds of millions of dollars each year in energy bill savings to New England.”

The ISO, the grid operator, specified that during a specific cold snap, from December 24, 2017, to January 8, 2018—what is that?—2 weeks, basically—had this offshore wind been online during that period, it would have “lowered regional electricity production costs by \$80–85 million” over those 2 weeks, “resulting in an \$11–13 per megawatt-hour reduction” in what the grid charged ratepayers.

Revolution Wind has cleared in the New England capacity market, and if it were to fail, it would require increases in electricity rates in New England of hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

Over and over again, when people who know what they are talking about