passed under his leadership I think is striking and will stand the test of time, whether it was bringing back advanced manufacturing through the Chips and Science Act—a generational investment in rebuilding infrastructure all over our country of all different kinds and levels; investing in protecting our veterans from the harm of burn pits and doing right by our veterans, making right on that sacred obligation; combating gun violence; investing in community mental health. All of these were landmark, bipartisan pieces of legislation.

He also struck out in a direction that made a lifetime of difference in reducing prescription drug prices and in investing in a cleaner economy through the Inflation Reduction Act, which was a moment when he abandoned bipartisanship in the interest of making a lasting difference for all Americans.

If you look briefly at what he did beyond our shores, the crisis of Russia's brutal, broad spectrum invasion of Ukraine catalyzed not just the revitalization but the expansion of NATO, moved us from a point where only four of our NATO allies had met their spending targets to today—two dozen. He led a global coalition in defense of Ukraine. He stood strong for our ally Israel after the heinous attacks of October 7 and ongoing attacks from Iran. In the Indo-Pacific, he has done more to create a new security situation than even I could have imagined: the Quad in the Indo-Pacific, the reconciliation of Korea and Japan, and the innovative AUKUS partnership that will deliver nuclear propulsion technology to the Australian submarine fleet and deliver new deterrence.

One of my favorite things he has done was celebrated in his most recent trip to Angola: the investment in infrastructure in the Global South in a way that has higher transparency, better labor standards, better environmental standards. It is more sustainable than our competitors, the Chinese, and their investment throughout the world. I have had the chance to visit both the Philippines and Angola to see our President's lasting work in investing in infrastructure.

Across all of these, strengthening our alliances, investing in our values and our partnerships, finding ways to stand up to aggression—it is my hope that we will find in this Chamber bipartisan support to continue.

What I will miss most about Joe Biden's leadership is that he is someone who lived a quintessentially American story. He never forgot the middle-class roots that gave him the strength to live what was a hard life, knocked down by grief, devastating grief, twice in his life. He got back up. Someone who believed deeply in the dignity of work. The son of a hard-working car salesman. Someone who understood the importance of not just a paycheck but having a purpose and the importance of respecting work and its role in creating and strengthening the middle class.

Last, President Biden has been someone who knew and believed in this institution. I worked with then-Leaders MCCONNELL and Reid, Senator Leahy, and Senator GRASSLEY when Joe Biden was leaving his last moments as the President of the Senate, as Vice President, to pull together a ''Recollections of our Vice President Day,'' and dozens of Senators came to this floor and told their favorite Joe Biden stories. There were stories full of compassion, full of humor, full of dedication, and full of service. That is the man I hope we will remember and recognize as he comes to the conclusion of his service as President close to a month from today. That is the man who I will continue to honor and to respect as I continue in my service on behalf of our shared State of Delaware going forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Oklahoma.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5119

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, several years ago, it was a December like this; there were big bills that were coming through the House and the Senate, one of them being the National Defense Authorization Act, which has passed every single year for the last six decades.

Stuck in that multi, multi, multipage bill was a little piece on beneficial ownership. Now, most everyone just didn't even notice what it would be. But in the past couple of years, the Biden administration has released the rules for beneficial ownership and what will be required to be able to deal with ''opportunities for fraud.''

What it has become is a way to be able to get from every single small business in America—I do need to emphasize these were all small business; in fact, smallest of the small businesses—every LLC, every businessowner in America a list of them of this: their name, their date of birth, their address, an I.D. number—that is simple—but then, also, a listing of all the senior officers of the company, someone who has authority over the appointment or removal of a senior officer, and this little jewel—someone who substantially influences important decisions in your company.

Every business owner in America is required by January 1—in just a couple of weeks—to turn in that document for every single business that they own.

Now, for many folks in real estate or in construction or in many other businesses, they actually start a company and raise it up for that company. And so they may not own one company or have one LLC; they may have 20 or 30. And they have to go through the paperwork for every single one of those and be able to turn in, including answering the question: Who influences your important decisions on your company? No one even knows what that means.

Well, you may say: Well, it is no big deal if they don't turn it in.

Oh, no, it is, because under the rule that has been put out, if they don't turn this form in, it is a $10,000 fine for each company that they don't turn in or 2 years in jail if they don't submit it.

Let that soak in. Every small business owner in America has to turn in who influences their decisions, or they could go to jail for 2 years.

Now, listen. All of us around this room would say: That is too much. Why is the Federal Government asking that of every pet owner, of every hair shop, of every builder, of every subcontractor? Why are we asking them who substantially influences them? And what authority do we have to have them do that?

Well, it is a good question, actually, because a Federal judge, just a couple of weeks ago, stepped in and did a preliminary injunction, just temporarily stepped in—this, by the way, was a Federal judge who was appointed by President Obama. They stepped in and put a halt on this rule. And they said this rule is—their term—''quasi-Orwellian'' and ''likely unconstitutional.''

Now, this was an Obama judge stepping into this. They put a pause on it. But the problem is, the pause is completely dependent on the judge at this point. They can unpause it at any moment.

So the simple thing that I have asked for throughout this entire year is, let's get rid of this rule. This rule should not be there at all. Congress has no right to go to every business owner and hand them a stack of forms and say to fill these out and tell us who helps you make decisions in your company.

What in the world? So we have no right to be able to do that. So I have asked all year long: We need to get rid of it entirely. I have not been successful getting that. So we have asked a simple thing: Let's take it out for 1 year. Let's just delay it. Let's get more time to be able to talk about this. This is a big issue that Congress is laying down.

Now, I have to tell you, I have not been successful getting that either. But do you know who has been? The House of Representatives. The House of Representatives passed a 1-year delay on this rule—wait for it—420 to 1; 420 to 1.

Yeah, the House said: This is a massive overreach; let's pause this for a year, at least, until we figure out what this actually means.

What does this mean for small business owners across the country? They could—in the very earliest time of next year under a new administration, any single small business in the country could face a $10,000 fine or 2 years in prison if they haven't turned this in.

But they have all turned it in already, right? It was due January 1. Actually, FinCEN has given us the latest numbers of who has turned it in.

Let me just give a few States as an example and the percentage. In New York State: 80 percent of the small businesses haven't turned this form in yet—80 percent.

In my State in Oklahoma, 77 percent of the small businesses have not turned this form in.

In Rhode Island, 72 percent of the small businesses have not turned this form in.

In West Virginia, 80 percent of the businesses have not turned this form in.

In Wisconsin, 74 percent of the businesses have not turned this form in.

That means they could all face—all those businesses could all face a $10,000 fine or 2 years in jail because they haven't submitted a form most of them don't even know exists.

Listen: Delaying for a year is not a radical proposal. And 420 to 1 in the House is a pretty good vote, especially considering the votes of the House in the past week.

That is broad bipartisan agreement. All I am asking is: Let's pause this for a year. Let's agree with the House and not have 75 to 80 percent of American small businesses suddenly be under the heavy hand of a potential fine or jail time because they don't even know this exists. But it does. It is Federal law.

So that is my simple request that I am bringing on this very last moment to be able to deal with this.

Madam President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5119 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time, be passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The junior Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, let me start by pointing out that this is a national security bill. And the reason that it is a national security bill is because—to paraphrase a famous author—the United States is engaged in a clash of civilizations. And I describe that clash of civilizations as between rule of law countries like the United States and countries that are run by kleptocrats and oligarchs and criminals or subject to control by traffickers and international criminal organizations.

Now, if you are an oligarch or a kleptocrat or international criminal, the thing you want more than anything else is to be able to hide what you stole. And you don't want to hide what you stole in your own corrupt and crooked country. You want to hide what you stole behind rule of law.

And the result is that the United States and other countries on the rule of law side of this clash of civilizations are giving aid and comfort to our enemies by helping them hide their crooked assets.

The concern for the United States was made pretty clear by Treasury Secretary Yellen, who admitted ''there's a good argument that . . . the best place to hide and launder ill-gotten gains is actually the United States.''

So we are trying to clean that mess up. And it is not just this administration. Under President Trump, Secretary Mnuchin said:

> Treasury's ability to combat tax evasion and to detect, deter, and disrupt money laundering and terrorist financing would be greatly enhanced through reporting of beneficial ownership information.

The suggestion that this magically appeared in some bill? No. It was worked through two committees in the Senate. It has been bipartisan from its earliest days, both in the Judiciary Committee and in the Banking Committee. It has been through enormous effort. And, in fact, the last Trump administration, working with us on this bill in 2019, released a statement of administration policy condemning this bipartisan ''measure that will help prevent malign actors from leveraging anonymity to exploit these entities for criminal gain.''

Are there examples of what has been going on? Well, terrorist groups like Hezbollah, Putin's oligarch cronies, North Korean foreign operatives, and fentanyl traffickers all need shell companies to hide what they have stolen.

Viktor Bout, the Russian arms dealer known as the ''Merchant of Death,'' used a global network of anonymous shell companies, including at least 12 incorporated in Delaware, Florida, and Texas. Anonymous LLCs impeded New York City's ability to trace the terror finance scheme that funded the 9/11 attacks—again, shell corporations that we didn't know who was really behind.

An anonymous New York company served as a front for the Iranian government in violation of U.S. sanctions, with millions of dollars in rent illegally funneled to Iran.

A DOJ indictment last year said that cartel operatives designed a network of shell companies in Wyoming to launder illegal millions for the Sinaloa cartel. Narco traffickers in New Jersey were charged with using an American shell company to buy fentanyl-related supplies from China.

So this is a real problem, which is why the Trump administration's Statement of Administration Policy was supportive.

Now, we went through a lot of effort to get here. The first group that stood up against it was the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and when it was exposed what they were arguing for, they actually ended up backing off and going to neutral on the bill, because they are bank members and they are anti-money laundering members.

And other Members of the Chamber said: What are we doing here?

And as soon as when that entity disappeared, up came the American Bar Association, doing the same thing. And their banking session and their anti-money laundering session and their former prosecutors and their national security folks all said: What are you doing?

And so the American Bar Association backed off.

The third in this game of political special interests whack-a-mole was NFIB, which came in to present the same stale argument to Senator GRAHAM, Senator GRASSLEY, and myself that were so stale and so flagrant that—well, I am not going to name names. Let's just say the NFIB had a very bad day facing down this bipartisan group.

So a lot of work has gone into this. The stakes are very high. This actually is a national security bill. And against that risk of being the loser in the clash of civilizations, because we are giving aid and comfort to our enemies by allowing them to use American shell corporations to hide what they get selling fentanyl to our citizens, here is what we ask: When you set up a corporation, you tell us your name. That is not very complicated. You can do that pretty quickly. You tell us your address. That doesn't take more than a couple of seconds to remember. What is my address? Yeah, write that down. Your date of birth? That is pretty simple too. And then either a passport or driver's license number. It is, literally, that simple. Where it gets complicated is where you have complex networks of joined shell companies in a complex corporate structure. But if that is what you have got, the very same lawyers who put that complex structure together can easily add this information.

So, in my view, delaying the Corporate Transparency Act would empower criminals who are operating through American shell companies, who outcompete and defraud honest small business owners, while emboldening and facilitating terrorist groups, foreign adversaries like Russia and China and Iran, North Korean weapons of mass destruction financing, fentanyl trafficking, and a whole array of grotesquely bad actors.

So I object. With great regard for my friend Senator LANKFORD, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, my friend from Rhode Island and I, we have a lot of great conversations. I think we both agree on the problem here. There is clearly a problem that money could be laundered and hidden in American companies and shell companies. There is no question. I think what we disagree on is the answer to that problem.

In this setting, with this set of forms, the assumption is that those who are doing international money laundering would put down their accurate information and would identify themselves as international terrorists and money launderers. In this particular setting, every small business owner who owns a restaurant or a pet store or a bookstore or is a plumber or owns a roofing company—30 million, in fact, small businesses in America—they all have to prove their innocence.

The assumption is that a Russian oligarch who is trying to hide money will tell the truth when he fills his form out, and I find that hard to believe. But in the meantime, 30 million small businesses have to go through a form, and within weeks, probably 23 million of those will be in violation of the law, and they will face penalties of $10,000 or 2 years in jail. And most of those small business owners who run that restaurant down the street don't even know this rule exists.

It is the kind of stuff that drives Americans crazy, that they woke up one day and found out they may go to jail tomorrow because they didn't fill out a form that someone wanted.

That is what we are trying to pause. The problem is real. I just don't think this is the right solution for it in the way it is being implemented. Let's see if we can solve the problem without actually causing, literally, tens of millions of small business owners to be under the sword of Damocles that they could be rounded up and go to jail at any moment because they didn't get a form filled out.

That is what we are trying to solve in the days ahead, and I wish we could at least put a pause on this and think it through more before those small business owners find out.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oklahoma.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2796

Mr. MULLIN. Madam President, for 8 years, beginning with my time in the House, I have worked on the Miami-Illinois Land Claim Settlement Act, which is now S. 2796.

I want to thank Chief Lankford of the Miami Tribe for his assistance to move this bill forward and to help lay out a solid, factual background before the Indian Affairs Committee, which is why it uniquely came out of the committee.

This is a unique piece of legislation. The Miami Tribe is not seeking a settlement for their treaty claim or an appropriation from Congress. This is zero cost to Congress. The Miami Tribe—or ''My-am-uh'' Tribe—is not seeking a settlement. The Tribe is simply asking Congress to do what only Congress can: to extinguish the Tribe's treaty title claim to the land in Illinois.

First, this bill will remove a cloud on the title for non-Indian landowners in eastern and central Illinois, benefiting the Tribe and non-Tribal members alike. Second, the bill will allow the Tribe the opportunity to plead their case before the U.S. Court of Federal Claims.

This is a straightforward bill, cosponsored by both of my colleagues from Illinois, Senator DURBIN and Senator DUCKWORTH. The Miami Tribe has waited long enough to get this done, and it is time to act.

Madam President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 489, S. 2796; 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. Is there objection?

The senior Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have great respect and admiration for my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma.

When I listen to the arguments being presented, I am reminded of a couple of things.

No. 1, these claims arise out of and relate to a treaty—a treaty going back to 1805. Those claims had the opportunity, more recently, to have been litigated in front of the previously existing Indian Claims Commission. Congress, in recognizing the need at the time to open up what might have been a confusing set of legal circumstances or an inadequate availability for relief, opened up a 5-year window for claims related to this treaty that was entered into with the Miami Tribe in 1805. They opened that up for a period between 1946 and 1951.

Jurisdiction over what was previously the Indian Claims Commission has since been transferred over to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. Interestingly, the Court of Federal Claims still maintains jurisdiction over such things, but it lacks the ability to enter orders, and the statute of limitations has long since passed. There was this 5-year window under which they were able to bring up claims like this.

Now, during that time period between 1946 and 1951, the Miami Tribe did pursue and litigate on a number of claims related to that treaty, enough for them to have received a remedy—a remedy of about $11 million at the time. I am told that, in 2024 dollars, that is about $200 million.

There are reasons why we have statutes of limitations. Those reasons have to do with the fact that, at some point, a stone rolling down the mountain has to come to rest. When you are dealing with litigation, especially litigation on claims dating back a couple hundred years, it is especially important to have finality.

Now, my friend and colleague refers to the need to reopen this window today to remove what he describes as a cloud to the chain of title. The problem with that argument is that it overlooks the fact that the United States is an indispensable party for any and all such claims as might arise so as to underlie the punitive cloud to any chain of title on these lands. As an indispensable party, the United States must be added, or the court can't handle anything like that. The court, under existing law, can't address them in the absence of the indispensable party, and because the United States is and has been deemed an indispensable party pursuant to rule 19 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, no such claim exists. Therefore, any and all claims that could create the asserted cloud to the chain of title are, in fact, illusory—entirely illusory—as the U.S. Department of Justice articulated well when delivering testimony in July of 2019 on behalf of the U.S. Department of Justice—Environment and Natural Resources Division of DOJ—before the Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Natural Resources.

These claims are especially important here. In other words, the existence of a statute of limitations is especially important here.

Here is what they say:

> Statutes of limitations serve valuable purposes. They are designed—

In supporting Supreme Court precedent here—

> to promote justice by preventing surprises through the revival of claims that have been allowed to slumber until the evidence has been lost, memories have faded, and witnesses have disappeared. Those concerns are particularly acute here, where the United States will be required to litigate claims based on events that occurred more than 150 years ago. Such litigation can be complex and expensive, and it typically requires hiring expert historians and other professionals. There is no valid basis to expend Federal resources to undertake this effort here.

I concur with that assessment and would add that this would add a layer of complexity, create a massive slippery-slope problem, and open up settled expectations and understandings regarding Federal land ownership that had been settled long ago and as to which statutes of limitations have now run.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MULLIN. Madam President, I appreciate my colleague from Utah in his fine arguments. Obviously, you can tell he is a great attorney.

What frustrates me is that I am literally down the hall. My colleague could have, at any time, picked up the phone and called me. The Senator could have simply talked to me. He could have even called me back today when I called him on the phone, and we could have discussed this. At any given time, we could have had this discussion not here on the floor, but we could have actually taken the time and walked through this.

I do understand his concerns, but his argument is that, since the statute of limitations has been looked at, we should not deal with any Indian issues—which I live in and always have lived in Indian Country, which I know my colleague from Utah has not and may not always understand the complexity which we live with consistently. But, under the Senator's argument, the court should never look at anything inside the treaty because it has been done; it is over with. So why should we even look at it? Yet the court always looks into it, and that is why we have the court. We also have the separation of powers. We are the