



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2025

No. 104

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 17, 2025.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BARRY LOUDERMILK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Daniel B. Carson, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O gracious God, You who created us and all the universe, are our refuge and our steadfast hope.

Giving You thanks, we pray now that You continue to send Your blessing down on all the people in this land. Send the light of Your wisdom to shine forth in the actions of all those who inhabit this, the people's House, in all the deliberations of the whole Congress, and in all the proceedings of our government.

Strengthen our commitment to build a better Nation and world in the present and into the future, a Nation and world of justice and harmony. Gracious God, help us to live up to this Nation's highest principles.

For this, and all that we pray, we know that You are with us always, Lord, and will always accomplish that which is good for our welfare and for Your glory and honor.

We ask this in Your holy name, O Lord.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 13 of rule I, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Lasky, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1467. An act to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prevent consumer reporting agencies from furnishing consumer reports under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 13 of rule I, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Friday, June 20, 2025.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, June 20, 2025, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1157. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Policy Office, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conversion of Ski

Area Authorizations (RIN: 0596-AD72) received June 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-1158. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Certain Existing Chemicals; Request To Submit Unpublished Health and Safety Data Under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA); Extension of Submission Deadline [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2023-0360; FRL-11164.2-02-OCSPF] (RIN: 2070-AL31) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1159. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's correcting amendments — Air Plan Approval; Arizona; Maricopa County Air Quality Department; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2022-0607; FRL-10024-04-R9] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1160. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Space Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Space and Earth Station Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2024 [MD Docket No.: 24-85] received June 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1161. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, GARFO, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Spiny Dogfish Fishery; 2025 Specifications [Docket No.: 250506-0079; RTID 0648-XE827] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1162. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — West Coast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2025 Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No.: 250512-0084] (RIN: 0648-BN19) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2827

251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1163. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID 0648-XE592] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1164. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; 2024-2025 Closure of Commercial Run-Around Gillnet Fishery for King Mackerel [Docket No.: 160426363-7275-02; RTID 0648-XE727] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1165. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Regional Office, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 250312-0036] (RTID 0648-XE802) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1166. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2025 and 2026 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish; 2025 Rockfish Program Cooperative Allocations [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID 0648-XE818] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1167. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — West Coast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's inseason modification of 2024-2025 management measures — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modification of the West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #17 Through #18 [Docket No.: 240514-0137; RTID 0648-XE743] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1168. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 240227-0061; RTID 0648-XE583] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1169. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Southeast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2025-2026 Recreational Fishing Season for Black Sea Bass [Docket No. 130403320-4891-02; RTID 0648-XE740] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1170. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 Feet (18.3 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 240304-0068; RTID 0648-XE586] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1171. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 250312-0036] (RTID 0648-XE799) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1172. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 250312-0036; RTID 0648-XE820] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1173. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — HMS, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; General Category and Harpoon Category Retention Limit Adjustments [Docket No.: 220919-0193; RTID 0648-XE816] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1174. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Recreational Fishing for Chinook Salmon in the Cook Inlet Exclusive Economic Zone Area [Docket No.: 250331-0057; RTID 0648-XE831] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1175. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Southeast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — 2025 Red Snapper Private Angling Component Accountability Measure in Federal Waters Off Louisiana [Docket No.: 200124-0029; RTID 0648-XE854] (RTID 0648-XE854) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1176. A letter from the Branch Chief, West Coast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's inseason modification of 20204-2025 management measures—Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modification of the West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Action #19 [Docket No.: 240514-0137;

RTID 0648-XE832] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1177. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; 2025 Closure of the Northern Gulf of Maine Scallop Management Area to the Limited Access General Category Fishery [Docket No.: 240314-0080; RTID 0648-XE842] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1178. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Shortraker Rockfish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID 0648-XE857] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1179. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — SERO, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — 2025 Gulf Red Snapper Recreational For-Hire Fishing Season [Docket No.: 140818679-5356-02; RTID 0648-XE873] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1180. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Final 2025 Closure of the Northern Gulf of Maine Scallop Management Area to the Limited Access General Category Fishery [Docket No.: 250416-0069; RTID 0648-XE865] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1181. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 250312-0036; RTID 0648-XE884] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1182. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2025-2026 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 241022-0278] (RIN: 0648-BN48) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1183. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Southeast, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2023 Recreational Harvest Closure of Hogfish Off Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina

in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 160906822-7547-02; RTID 0648-XD370] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1184. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID 0648-XE593] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1185. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 230306-0065; RTID 0648-XD376] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1186. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — West Coast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2025-2026 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 241022-0278] (RIN 0648-BN72) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1187. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 240304-0068; RTID 0648-XE626] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1188. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Greater Atlantic, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Blueline Tilefish Fishery; 2023 Blueline Tilefish Commercial Quota Harvested [Docket No.: 221026-0227] (RTID 0648-XD324) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1189. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Several Groundfish Species in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 230306-0065; RTID 0648-XD358] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1190. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Southeast Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Revised Reporting Requirements Due to Catastrophic Conditions for Federal Seafood Dealers and Individual Fishing Quota Dealers in Portions

of Florida [Docket Nos.: 090206140-91081-03 and 120405260-4258-02; RTID 0648-XD338] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1191. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2023 Winter II Quota [Docket No.: 2021-27773; RTID 0648-XD333] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1192. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 230306-0065; RTID 0648-XD274] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1193. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Southeast, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Re-Opening of the Commercial Sector for Blueline Tilefish in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 140501394-5279-02; RTID 0648-XD317] June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1194. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Trawl Catcher Vessels in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 230224-0053; RTID 0648-XD251] received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1195. A letter from the Branch Chief, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Southeast, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2023 Commercial Closure for South Atlantic Red Snapper [Docket No.: 121004515-3608-02] (RTID 0648-XD246) received June 6, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1196. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Closure of the General Category October Through November Fishery for 2024 [Docket No.: 220919-0193] (RTID 0648-XE334) received June 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1197. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the

Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 240227-0061; RTID 0648-XE590] received June 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1198. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 250312-0036 and 250312-0037] (RTID 0648-XE771) received June 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1199. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2023-2024 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 221206-0261] (RIN: 0648-BN32) received June 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1200. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 24034-0068; RTID 0648-XE347] received June 11, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-1201. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31608; Amdt. No.: 4168] received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1202. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31607; Amdt. No.: 4167] received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1203. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0208; Project Identifier MCAI-2024-00555-A; Amendment 39-23044; AD 2025-10-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1204. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cameron Balloons Ltd. Fuel Cylinders [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0921; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-00442-Q; Amendment 39-23056; AD 2025-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1205. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0006; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00803-R; Amendment 39-23034; AD 2025-09-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1206. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2663; Project Identifier MCAI-2023-00200-R; Amendment 39-23036; AD 2025-10-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1207. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0015; Project Identifier AD-2024-00615-E; Amendment 39-23049; AD 2025-11-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1208. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; the Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0005; Project Identifier AD-2024-00646-T; Amendment 39-23051; AD 2025-11-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1209. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0012; Project Identifier AD-2024-00219-T; Amendment 39-23047; AD 2025-11-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1210. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Warner Robins, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0316; Airspace Docket No.: 25-ASO-3] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1211. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace Over Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2025-1092; Airspace Docket No.: 25-AEA-10] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1212. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class D and Class E4 Airspace; Establishment of Class E2 Airspace; Amendment of Class E5 Airspace, Aberdeen, MD [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0400; Airspace Docket No.: 25-AEA-4]

(RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1213. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Goldsboro, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2024-1984; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASO-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1214. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jupiter, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0107; Airspace Docket No.: 25-ASO-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1215. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-161, V-163, and V-568; and Establishment of United States RNAV Route T-545 in the Vicinity of Three Rivers, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2672; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASW-13] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1216. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Amber 16 in the Northern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0978; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ANM-102] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1217. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Domestic Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Federal Airways V-7, V-35, V-157, V-159, and V-198; Eastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2024-2513; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASO-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 9, 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted on June 16, 2025]

Mr. CALVERT: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4016. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Submitted June 17, 2025]

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 275. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish on a monthly basis the number of special interest aliens encountered attempting to unlawfully enter the United States,

and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 4017. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to secure the rights of visual artists to copyright, to provide for resale royalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EZELL (for himself and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS):

H.R. 4018. A bill to unleash America's offshore critical minerals and resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GILLEN (for herself and Mr. GARBARINO):

H.R. 4019. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program for provide access to, and training on the administration of, epinephrine products for law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 4020. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into arrangements with institutions of higher education to provide dual or concurrent enrollment programs for students enrolled in schools operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRECHEEN (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GILL of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mrs. LUNA):

H.R. 4021. A bill to prohibit certain Federal activity with respect to the promotion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Pride Month and the display of flags representing sexual orientation or gender identity on Federal property or grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 4022. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the exclusion from medical assistance under the Medicaid Program of items and services for patients in an institution for mental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4023. A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a pilot program to award grants to States, territories, and Indian tribes to provide down payment assistance loans to certain borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARBAJAL (for himself and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 4024. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the hiring and rehiring of additional career law enforcement officers for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to

the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 4025. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish an initiative to provide grants to fund the development of resilient energy systems in remote communities, island communities, and Tribal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4026. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. EDWARDS):

H.R. 4027. A bill to recognize the historical achievements, the ongoing service, and to make a priority recapitalization of the front-line and surge fighter forces at active-duty Air Force bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for 12-month continuous enrollment of individuals under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4029. A bill to provide for an emergency increase in Federal funding to State Medicaid programs for expenditures on home and community-based services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNN of Florida (for himself, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. BEAN of Florida):

H.R. 4030. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to address priority substance use disorder and serious mental illness treatment needs through long-acting injectable medications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT (for himself and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 4031. A bill to authorize the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative, to enhance the United States-Caribbean security partnership, to prioritize natural disaster resilience, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. MANN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Ms. STANSBURY):

H.R. 4032. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure equitable and nondiscriminatory contributions to the mechanisms that preserve and advance universal service, to reduce the financial burden on consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FINE:

H.R. 4033. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to allow certain activities to be conducted with respect to sturgeon held in captivity or in a controlled environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 4034. A bill to authorize the establishment of a program to combat oil theft in the Permian Basin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HOYLE of Oregon (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TLAIB, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 4035. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on certain trading transactions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN (for himself and Ms. CRAIG):

H.R. 4036. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the short sale of certain financial investments by Members of Congress and their spouses and dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. NUNN of Iowa):

H.R. 4037. A bill to clarify coverage of occupational therapy under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIM (for herself and Mr. GRAY):

H.R. 4038. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to establish a standard for the response time to wildfire incidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KING-HINDS:

H.R. 4039. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to allow the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands to be eligible to receive certain funding for use providing basic essential ferry service in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LEE of Florida (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 4040. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to increase grants to combat domestic violence for States that implement domestic violence prevention training in the cosmetologist and barber licensing process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 4041. A bill to exempt certain forest management activities in Yosemite National Park from requirements of section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCORMICK (for himself, Mr. WIED, Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona, and Mr. HARRIGAN):

H.R. 4042. A bill to require a State to reimburse the Federal Government for the deployment of the National Guard to such State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR (for himself, Mr. BERGMAN, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 4043. A bill to prohibit the President or any designee from violating The Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada Concerning Transit Pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself and Mr. NEGUSE):

H.R. 4044. A bill to reauthorize the Foundation for America's Public Lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NEGUSE (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. CISCOMANI):

H.R. 4045. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense to

carry out a program to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina):

H.R. 4046. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program providing for the establishment of Agriculture Cybersecurity Centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. MOYLAN, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. GOLDEN of Maine, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PANNETTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MIN, and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 4047. A bill to amend the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to collaborate with State and local governments and Indian Tribes on vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, research planning, and similar activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. RIVAS (for herself, Mr. FIELDS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SORESENSEN, and Ms. MCBRIDE):

H.R. 4048. A bill to require the Director of the National Science Foundation to establish a program to award grants for certain STEM apprenticeship programs, require an interagency task force to submit a report regarding certain programs of the Federal Government focused primarily on career development and training in STEM, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4049. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish employer-directed skills accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4050. A bill to establish a voluntary compliance assistance initiative at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission regarding the usage of employment tests and selection procedures by employers; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 4051. A bill to address hostile and antisemitic conduct by the Republic of South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 4052. A bill to direct the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council and the Office of Personnel Management to issue regulations that require all Federal contractors and executive agencies to conduct comprehensive reviews of job classifications to identify positions for which a college degree is required without a demonstrable occupational necessity; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 4053. A bill to prohibit participation of persons convicted of certain felonies in programs of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CASAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. OMAR, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution directing the President pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution to remove United States Armed Forces from unauthorized hostilities in the Islamic Republic of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KIM (for herself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. FONG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mr. KILEY of California):

H. Res. 516. A resolution condemning the violent June 2025 riots in Los Angeles, California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H. Res. 517. A resolution congratulating St. Joseph's Hospital of Savannah, Georgia, upon its 150th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKS (for himself and Mr. HOYER):

H. Res. 518. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2913) to authorize support for Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. MORRISON (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EMMER, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. FISCHBACH, and Mr. FINSTAD):

H. Res. 519. A resolution condemning the attacks on Minnesota lawmakers in Brooklyn Park and Champlin, Minnesota, and calling for unity and the rejection of political violence in Minnesota and across the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PFLUGER (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Texas, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 520. A resolution recognizing the life, achievements, and public service of former First Lady Barbara Pierce Bush on the occasion of her 100th birthday; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. BACON, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H. Res. 521. A resolution standing with Israel as it works to dismantle Iran's nuclear enrichment capabilities and defends itself against Iranian attacks on civilians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. JACOBS, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H. Res. 522. A resolution recognizing that Adriana Smith and her family's prolonged ordeal without their consent is the direct result of the Black maternal health crisis, the danger of laws that give rights to fetuses and take them away from pregnant people, and anti-abortion laws that continue to harm people who can become pregnant; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

mitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 4016.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law" In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States" Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 4017.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, sec. 8, cl. 18

By Mr. EZELL:

H.R. 4018.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Ms. GILLEN:

H.R. 4019.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ADERHOLT:

H.R. 4020.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BRECHEEN:

H.R. 4021.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4022.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 4024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 4025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina:

H.R. 4027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNN of Florida:

H.R. 4030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H.R. 4031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 4032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FINE:

H.R. 4033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas:

H.R. 4034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. HOYLE of Oregon:

H.R. 4035.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KEAN:

H.R. 4036.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York:

H.R. 4037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. KIM:

H.R. 4038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. KING-HINDS:

H.R. 4039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LEE of Florida:

H.R. 4040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 4041.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are sub-

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

By Mr. MCCORMICK:

H.R. 4042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 4043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 4044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 4045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. NUNN of Iowa:

H.R. 4046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

To make all Laws which should be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution and foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department of the Office or Officer thereof.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 4047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. RIVAS:

H.R. 4048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 4050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 4051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. TORRES of New York:

H.R. 4052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 4053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Authority is Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 309: Ms. ROSS.
H.R. 516: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 569: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 846: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 909: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1002: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 1046: Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MAST, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. BRESNAHAN, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1047: Mr. LANGWORTHY.
H.R. 1053: Ms. NORTON and Ms. KING-HINDS.
H.R. 1103: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.
H.R. 1151: Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 1236: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 1267: Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H.R. 1421: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 1464: Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 1517: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1521: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 1575: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 1638: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1685: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 1733: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1761: Mr. OGLES.
H.R. 1893: Mr. WIED and Mr. SORESENSEN.
H.R. 2081: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 2095: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 2102: Mr. MORAN and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2199: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 2220: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2232: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. FIGURES.
H.R. 2245: Mr. SOTO and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2257: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 2314: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 2369: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 2510: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2570: Mr. KEAN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. VAN ORDEN.
H.R. 2572: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.
H.R. 2581: Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 2591: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. SCHOLTEN.
H.R. 2666: Mr. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 2705: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2708: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 2722: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2725: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 2735: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2736: Mrs. RAMIREZ.
H.R. 2757: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2808: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. CLOUD, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2937: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 3112: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. BARRAGAN.
H.R. 3144: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 3157: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 3172: Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 3190: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. KENNEDY of New York.
H.R. 3226: Mr. BACON, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HOYLE of Oregon, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3309: Ms. PETTERSEN.
H.R. 3321: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H.R. 3325: Mr. CAREY.
H.R. 3332: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 3335: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 3362: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 3400: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 3418: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Ms. KING-HINDS.
H.R. 3453: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3501: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3506: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 3514: Mr. BAUMGARTNER, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, and Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.

H.R. 3543: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3552: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 3553: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 3569: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. STANTON, Mr. DELUZIO, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 3607: Mr. LIEU.
H.R. 3616: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3640: Mr. LALOTA.
H.R. 3641: Mr. LALOTA.
H.R. 3643: Mr. ARRINGTON and Mr. HURD of Colorado.
H.R. 3678: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3682: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 3683: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3694: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 3699: Mr. EVANS of Colorado.
H.R. 3702: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 3703: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 3704: Mr. CASTEN.
H.R. 3705: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 3720: Mr. CISCOMANI.
H.R. 3733: Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 3780: Mr. BEGICH.
H.R. 3781: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama.
H.R. 3783: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 3816: Mr. KEAN and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3824: Mr. SCHMIDT and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 3856: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3863: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3865: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3868: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CASE, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 3876: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 3906: Ms. SIMON.
H.R. 3917: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PALMER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CLOUD, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. ROY, Mr. KUSTOFF, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 3920: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 3939: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3943: Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3949: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3965: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 3968: Ms. SIMON and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3971: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3977: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3991: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3993: Mr. SOTO, Mr. LICCARDO, and Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 3999: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.J. Res. 12: Mr. SORESENSEN, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. LUTTRELL, Mr. RILEY of New York, and Mr. FRY.
H.J. Res. 28: Mr. JACK.
H.J. Res. 101: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. HARRIGAN, Mr. ALFORD, and Mr. OWENS.
H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. JACK and Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.
H. Res. 168: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H. Res. 220: Mr. SELF and Ms. SALAZAR.
H. Res. 297: Mr. THANEDAR.
H. Res. 394: Mr. SORESENSEN.
H. Res. 473: Mr. CASE.
H. Res. 478: Mr. LALOTA and Mr. SCHMIDT.
H. Res. 494: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
H. Res. 514: Mr. LANDSMAN and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 2025

No. 104

Senate

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TIM SHEEHY, a Senator from the State of Montana.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by Pastor Randy Phillips, lead pastor of Life Family Austin, from Austin, TX.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

All mighty God, we humbly come before You, recognizing that all authority comes from Your hand. We thank You for this Chamber and for the leaders You have raised up to serve this Nation.

Grant to the Members of this Senate wisdom beyond their own. Let truth guide their decisions and justice be their aim. May their debates be marked with dignity and their hearts governed by compassion, and their service driven by the desire for the common good. Help them to seek unity where there is division, courage where there is fear, and clarity where there is confusion. Let integrity be their compass and humility their constant companion.

Bless their families and keep them safe. Give their staff endurance, and let their conscience be a sign with assurance that their labor is not in vain.

Let a spiritual awakening happen in this country. Let this government be a reflection of Your mercy, justice, and care for all people, especially the weak, the voiceless, and the forgotten.

We pray this not only for our glory, but that Your will would be done on Earth as it is in Heaven.

In the mighty Name of Jesus, we pray. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2025.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TIM SHEEHY, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SHEEHY thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland,

to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

MINNESOTA LAWMAKERS SHOOTING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like all Americans, I was horrified to hear about this weekend's shootings of two State lawmakers in Minnesota and their spouses. Melissa Hortman, a member of the Minnesota House of Representatives, and her husband Mark were murdered on Saturday. And John Hoffman, a member of the State Senate, and his wife Yvette were seriously wounded.

I am profoundly grateful to law enforcement that the alleged shooter is now in custody, and I look forward to seeing him prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

There is no place for this kind of violence in our country. None. My prayers this morning are with the Hortmans' family and loved ones and for the speedy recovery of John and Yvette Hoffman.

ISRAEL

Mr. President, for far too long, the mullahs in Iran have publicly aspired to wipe Israel off the face of the map. And for decades, they have fomented a campaign of terror throughout the Middle East, threatening Israel and innocents everywhere and destabilizing the entire region.

It was Hamas who killed more than 1,000 Israelis on October 7, 2023. But it was Iran who made that attack possible through years of funding, training, and weaponry provided to this terrorist organization.

In the early hours of Friday morning, Israel struck back, attacking a number of sites in Iran, including sites associated with Iran's nuclear program. I spoke with the Israeli Ambassador on Friday and assured him of my prayers for Israel's safety during this time and my hope that their operations—and

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3407

any to come—will succeed in eliminating the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran and, ultimately, help bring peace to a region that has for far too long been at war.

While the U.S. military is not involved in offensive operations against Iran, U.S. forces on land, at sea, and in the air have helped defend Israel from indiscriminate missile attacks launched by Iran.

President Trump and our country remain steadfast in our defense of Israel and committed to working towards peace in the Middle East and, first and foremost, for the safety of American personnel stationed in the region.

And should Iran have any designs on Americans, I urge the mullahs to think long and hard about the consequences.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION—MEDICAID PROVISION

Well, Mr. President, Democrats continue to melt down over the reconciliation bill that Republicans are getting ready to consider, and their statements continue to be heavy on the hysteria and short on facts, and nowhere is this more true than on the subject of the bill's Medicaid provisions. To hear Democrats talk, you would think Republicans were getting ready to rip Medicaid from the hands of needy children and pregnant women, and nothing—nothing—could be further from the truth.

Today, I would like to take a few minutes to set the record straight and highlight the facts on Republicans' efforts to root out waste, fraud, and abuse from Medicaid and ensure the focus of this program is on the people it was designed to help.

Like other Federal entitlement programs, Medicaid is not on the soundest footing. Between ObamaCare's expansion of Medicaid to able-bodied adults at or about 138 percent of the Federal poverty line and the Biden administration's rules and waivers, Democrats have been growing Medicaid beyond its original scope for quite a while now. And Federal Medicaid spending has soared. Between 2019 and 2023, Medicaid spending grew by more than 50 percent, and that kind of unsustainable growth has consequences, not just for taxpayers who are on the hook for huge, new amounts of money but for the people most in need who have to compete with a lot of new individuals for available resources.

Republicans are committed to preserving and strengthening Medicaid for the people Medicaid was intended to serve, like vulnerable children, pregnant moms, and elderly Americans, and to that end, we are making some commonsense reforms to Medicaid to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse and protect the program for the people who need it the most. That starts with removing people who should not be on the rolls. That means illegal immigrants and other noncitizens, able-bodied adults who can work but refuse to work, and individuals who don't qualify for the program.

We are going to rein in Federal spending to States that choose to di-

rect scarce State dollars to illegal immigrants. We will be instituting basic, commonsense work requirements for able-bodied, working-aged adults who should not be relying on taxpayers for their healthcare unless they are doing their best to find and maintain a job or contribute to their communities, and we will be overturning Biden-era regulations that made it difficult to remove individuals who do not qualify for the program. Are Democrats seriously going to tell us they have a problem with that? Removing these individuals is just basic, good governance. It is fulfilling our barest obligation to ensure that Medicaid is working well for its intended recipients.

I would note that, while Democrat Senators may be melting down over these basic good-governance requirements, some of their States are actually taking similar measures. No less a Democrat State than California is looking to freeze the enrollment of illegal immigrants in its Medicaid Program and charge premiums for illegal immigrants already enrolled. Why? Because the State can no longer afford to cover these individuals and maintain its other obligations. Yet the Democrat Senators here in Washington are melting down because Republicans are daring to focus limited Medicaid dollars on American citizens and those most in need.

In addition to ensuring that the individuals on Medicaid rolls are the ones who should be there, Republicans are making several other commonsense reforms.

Notably, we are taking aim at the rampant abuse of the provider tax loophole. Use of this loophole, which sees States inflate Medicaid service prices in order to garner a larger reimbursement from the Federal Government, was already a problem even before the Biden administration. In fact, President Obama, released multiple budgets featuring measures to rein in abuse of the provider tax, but thanks to waivers the Biden administration issued to California and other blue States last year allowing them to further exploit this loophole, taxpayers are now on the hook for tens of billions of dollars in new spending. Neither the Medicaid Program nor taxpayers can afford that burden, and so we are going to rein things in.

Our bill makes a handful of other modest reforms to restrain waste, fraud, and abuse, but those I just mentioned are the big ones: commonsense reforms to protect and strengthen Medicaid for those who need it the most.

And I would love to know which of these reforms my colleagues object to. We have heard a lot of bluster from Democrats about how this bill will cost enrollment and cost lives, but we have heard very little from them on the actual measures included in the bill.

So I would like to ask them:

Do they believe the Federal Government should still be giving States an enhanced Medicaid match if they cover illegal immigrants?

Do they think individuals who don't qualify for Medicaid should remain on the rolls?

Are they against work requirements for able-bodied, working-aged adults?

Do they think there should be any limits on States' exploiting the provider tax loophole?

Exactly which of our commonsense reforms do Democrats disagree with?

Democrats used to support rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicaid and getting Americans back to work. So what has changed?

While I can't guarantee the source of Democrats' hysteria, I suspect one or more of the following things is going on here:

One, Democrats are still smarting from their election loss last November and are desperate to regain ground with voters, and I suspect that Democrats think that, if they can successfully—even if inaccurately—paint Republicans as targeting vulnerable Americans, they might be able to claw back some electoral support.

Two, I think Democrats tend to reflexively oppose anything supported by President Trump no matter how sensible that policy might be.

And, three, I think that, with Democrats' increasing embrace of the far left, there are Democrats out there who really do believe that government programs can continually expand without consequences and that there is no limit to the amount of taxpayer dollars available for them to play with.

Still, it is incredible that we can't agree on these commonsense reforms, but we are going to move full speed ahead in protecting and preserving Medicaid for the Americans this program was intended to serve.

I want to thank Chairman CRAPO and members of the Finance Committee for their work on the Medicaid provisions of our bill, and I look forward to taking up these provisions in the very near future as part of our final legislation.

WAIVING QUORUM CALLS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls with respect to Executive Calendar Nos. 98 and 99, Olivia Trusty.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SENATE SAFETY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, about safety and the Capitol and our meeting today that Senator THUNE and I called.

First, I would like to say that the Capitol Police have always been the silent heroes behind the scenes, keeping Members safe. That is no secret. The country saw that for themselves on January 6 and in the footage after, and they are doing a good job. We had a very good meeting where Members

brought up their concerns, and efforts—strong efforts—are going to be made to answer those concerns with expanded—expanded—activity by the Capitol Police. But after the awful situation this weekend, there is real concern, not just here in the Capitol but with folks across the country, about the safety of elected officials.

These violent acts are an attack not just on the individuals who were targeted but on our democracy itself. Public servants should never have to fear for their lives simply for doing their jobs. There should not be an attempt to intimidate public servants not do their jobs or not to take their jobs. So we need to take immediate steps to ensure the safety of Members. That includes sending additional funding and resources to the Capitol Police. There was agreement today in the Senate, among Democrats and Republicans, that we ought to be spending some more dollars here to protect the Capitol, the Senators, and their staffs.

But it is amazing. Instead, the Trump administration is doing the exact opposite. USA Today reported that, as lone actor attacks are on the rise, Donald Trump had cut the program called AIMED at spotting them. This program is aimed to spot lone-actor, violent, domestic extremists—exactly what happened in Minnesota.

The day before a violent political attack in Minnesota [occurred], the last top officials at a program that aims to spot so-called “lone actor” violent domestic extremists were reassigned to other roles.

And that is USA Today’s reporting.

In the 4 months since Trump took office, his administration has shrunk the Department of Homeland Security’s Center for Prevention Programs and Partnerships, known as CP3, from dozens of analysts and supervisors. Now it has fewer than 10 people, and it is led by a 22-year-old recent graduate with no law enforcement experience. Here we have more violent attacks, and at the same time, the Trump administration is cutting the very unit in law enforcement that is supposed to go after these lone-wolf, violent attacks and prevent them. Right now, we need to give law enforcement more resources to prevent these horrific attacks, not less. A program in charge of doing these things shouldn’t have fewer than 10 people and be led by a 22-year-old with no experience.

What I am saying here, that this program has been cut dramatically—the AIMED Program—will reverberate among everybody who wants a safer America and should reverberate among all elected officials, Democrat and Republican, about the need to keep this program.

So we need to give more resources to law enforcement, but let me be clear: This dangerous environment isn’t spontaneous. It is being stoked, often deliberately, by the reckless rhetoric coming from some of the most powerful voices in the country.

When political opponents are treated like enemies, danger follows. And that

is what Trump has done. He has weaponized the Justice Department and law enforcement. It is going after his political enemies instead of going after criminals.

It is the responsibility of all leaders, especially the President of the United States, to not just unequivocally condemn hatred but to stop violent and aggressive language against political opponents.

Trump has to see that his words have real impact and consequences, and here is one way he could start right now: He could demand of Senator LEE that he take down his inflammatory, despicable posts about the deaths of the two people in Minnesota. They are gross. They are disgusting. They are the kind of thing that just riles people up.

Let Trump call LEE up and say: Take them down. Take those posts down.

That will be a start. But in general, he has to stop treating his political opponents as enemies because danger will always follow.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Mr. President, on reconciliation, last night, on the Senate Finance Committee, the Republicans released their portion of Donald Trump’s “Big Ugly Bill,” his big ugly betrayal, and—it is hard to believe—it is even worse than expected.

After Senate Republicans spent weeks promising they were going to moderate the House bill, they did just the opposite. They turned an ugly House bill into an outright travesty.

Senate Republicans should reject the proposals of the Finance Committee and start over, because if they proceed, they will harm tens of millions of Americans, kill millions of good-paying jobs, raise prices up on the average American, and help China.

Let’s go over these lowlights, starting with healthcare.

The House bill already had the biggest cuts to Medicaid in American history. They are regarded as devastating. But the Senate version is even worse than the House version. It is the House bill on steroids. The Medicaid cuts are deeper, reach further, and the redtape is even longer than what House Republicans came up with.

Under the Senate bill, tens of millions of Americans will lose health insurance, including working moms and dads. More hospitals will close, especially rural hospitals.

And I tell my colleagues: That is mainly in red States.

These rural hospitals are often the only way people get healthcare in the rural communities, and they are often the largest employer in the States as well.

Under their bill, doctors will lose their jobs. Nurses will lose their jobs. States will carry more and more of the burden, with fewer and fewer resources, which means cutbacks.

Premiums will go up. What the average American pays for healthcare will inevitably go up, even if you don’t have Medicare or Medicaid.

I know there are a number of Senate Republicans who were worried about the Medicaid cuts passed by the House, but because the Senate package is even worse, I urge these Republicans to forcefully reject this proposal quickly. We know that if only three or four Republicans went to Leader THUNE and said, “We can’t vote for this bill with these Medicaid cuts,” some of the cuts, at least, would be eliminated.

If they go along with this package—anyone who goes along with this package—they will be responsible for stealing healthcare from millions of their own constituents. That is true of Democrats and Republicans.

Now, what about clean energy jobs? Remember how the Senate Republicans spent weeks promising they would ease clean energy cuts passed by the House?

Well, the Senate Republican clean energy package is a total head fake. That is all it is. They are trying to act like they got better, but they didn’t. No matter what the Senate Republicans try to say about improving the House bill, the underlying substance did not change.

The Senate clean energy bill cuts are every bit as destructive as the House Republicans’. It phases out tax credits for wind and solar projects within 6 months.

These phaseouts are a death sentence for clean energy. Wind and solar represent more than 90 percent of the new electric power in the United States. It is the quickest, cheapest way to bring power.

What do Republicans think will happen when they raise taxes on 90 percent of our new electricity?

They are going to send electric bills soaring. They are going to kill good-paying clean energy jobs, and an estimated 850,000 people in the clean energy industry will lose their jobs. And they are going to surrender U.S. energy independence to China, which will leap ahead of us in wind and solar and dominate the world markets. American consumers will be at the behest of the Chinese Communist Party leaders, in terms of what they pay for electricity.

And these cuts will choke America’s energy output, right as we need to expand our capacity. We all know AI is going to demand huge amounts of electricity, and yet we cut off the quickest, cheapest way to add energy.

Many on the other side say: all of the above.

This is not all of the above. This is just taking the most polluting, most expensive, most time-consuming way of producing energy. That is what it allows. It takes away the rest.

Eighty percent of the clean energy investments, we know, have been in Republican districts. But Senate Republicans are going to shift those jobs overseas. For anyone who votes for this bill and has clean energy facilities in their States, they are going to close those factories, limit those factories, and send the jobs to China—just the opposite of what Trump says he wants to do.

The bad news keeps coming. The Senate proposal does nothing to moderate the House SNAP benefits. It is still the biggest cut to SNAP in history, depriving millions of kids and parents of vital food assistance.

Senate Republicans have even found a way to bow down to the radical gun lobby. Remember the House bill already had an insane provision that deregulated commonsense rules on silencers that go back almost a century? But Senate Republicans, refusing to be outdone by their extreme House colleagues, removed registration requirements not just for silencers but for short-barreled rifles, short-barreled shotguns, and other devices.

This is unhinged. Shame on Senate Republicans for choosing the gun lobby over the lives of our kids. Their proposal will mean gun violence will rise, police officers will be put at risk, and innocent people will die.

Finally, why are Republicans doing all of this? What is their North Star? Tax cuts for billionaires, paid for by working families.

Here is the big difference, folks, between Democrats and Republicans: Democrats believe in lowering taxes, but we need to prioritize Americans who aren't ultrarich: working families, the middle class, parents raising their kids, and small business owners trying to grow.

But Republicans, meanwhile, believe in giving most of the help to the people at the very top. They believe that helping billionaires and big corporations is somehow going to make everyone better off. It has never worked. Trickle down is discredited. They cling to it because they are in the obeisance of a handful of very greedy billionaires who seem to run the Republican Party on economic issues.

Under their proposal, the top 0.1 percent of our earners will get an average tax cut of \$400,000. But families earning less than \$75,000 will be worse off. They will actually lose household wealth. Under \$75,000, you lose wealth. The top 0.1 percent, you gain an average cut of \$400,000.

Do the American people like that? The more they know, the less they like.

When you put it all together, the Senate Republican's version of Donald Trump's "Big Ugly Bill" is even worse than the House's. It makes even deeper cuts to healthcare. It destroys American clean energy. It raises costs on working and middle-class families, and rewards the billionaires at the very top of the economic ladder.

Mr. President, I have a few more things to say.

On abortion, next week marks a very grim anniversary in America: 3 years since the disastrous Dobbs decision. Three years later, 21 States have restricted the right to choose, and 14 States have practically total abortion bans.

And what is the Republicans' response? They want to keep going and attack reproductive care even more.

Deep inside the Republicans' "Big, Ugly Betrayal Bill," they have snuck in a backdoor abortion ban. First, they have a provision that would defund Planned Parenthood. Second, they have a provision to eliminate coverage for comprehensive reproductive care from the marketplace.

Senate Democrats will fight these devastating and deadly measures with everything we have got, including through the Byrd bath—both provisions have to go through the Byrd bath—because here are the consequences of the Republican provisions: 200 Planned Parenthood health centers in 24 States would close, and 90 percent of these closures would be in States where abortion is currently legal. So much for State's rights—not when it comes to abortion or guns with this Republican Party.

Why are they doing this? Well, part of it is ideological, and part of it is to fund tax cuts for billionaires. It is an assault not just on Planned Parenthood, not just on reproductive care but on every woman in America.

Democrats will fight these backdoor abortion bans with every fiber of our being.

ALEX PADILLA

Mr. President, finally, on Senator PADILLA's speech—I see he has just come into the Chamber.

Today, at 12:30, our colleague Senator PADILLA will speak on the Senate floor for the first time since he was forcibly removed from a public briefing just for doing his job.

I will be here on the floor to listen to Senator PADILLA's speech. I encourage all of my colleagues—Democrat and Republican—to come and listen as well.

What Senator PADILLA experienced last week sickened all of us to our core—sickened every decent American to their core. No Senator should be treated the way he was—manhandled, taken to the ground, and handcuffed.

It is not a moment for partisanship. Oh, no, it is about all Senators supporting a colleague who was treated inexcusably for doing his job.

I look forward to hearing Senator PADILLA's speech later, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 98, Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025.

John Thune, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roger Marshall, Katie Boyd Britt, Tommy Tuberville, Ashley B. Moody, Ted Budd, John Barrasso, Marsha Blackburn, Roger F. Wicker, Steve

Daines, Mike Rounds, Jon A. Husted, Markwayne Mullin, Rick Scott of Florida, Pete Ricketts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 314 Ex.]

YEAS—46

Banks	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeben	Ricketts
Capito	Husted	Risch
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Sheehy
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Young
Fetterman	Moody	
Graham	Moreno	

NAYS—39

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Hassan	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Padilla	Wyden

NOT VOTING—15

Britt	Galleo	Rosen
Budd	Kelly	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Moran	Welch
Fischer	Peters	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 39, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

LOS ANGELES PRESS BRIEFING

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, it is important to me for this body to know that over the last 2 weeks in Los Angeles, my hometown, we are seeing masked Federal agents in tactical gear ordered into our communities. We have seen the disturbing pattern of increasingly extreme and cruel immigration enforcement operations targeting non-violent people at places of worship, at schools, in courthouses—all to meet an arbitrary quota. Now we are seeing President Trump federalize National Guard troops and deploy them without the Governor's consent. Active-Duty marines are now being deployed, escalating tensions in our city. It is important to note—all this without coordination with State and local law enforcement.

Despite repeated requests for the justification for these extreme actions and after months and months of little to no response from the administration on their aggressive and theatrical immigration raids, the Trump administration has done everything in their power but to provide transparency to the American people about their mission in Los Angeles. So last week, I chose to go home to try to get answers from the administration as they are literally militarizing our city. I want to share what I learned and I want to share what I heard because it should shock the conscience of our country.

One of the first items on my schedule last Thursday was a meeting and a briefing with General Guillot, the 4-star general in charge of U.S. Northern Command. Many of you know him. The briefing was scheduled at the Federal building in West Los Angeles where they are overseeing these military operations.

Now, colleagues, when the U.S. military is deployed domestically, when our troops are deployed against the wishes of the Governor for the first time since 1965, against the wishes of the local mayor, and even against the wishes of local law enforcement—both the police chief and the sheriff—we are in uncharted territory.

So in my efforts to do my duty to conduct congressional oversight and to try to get answers from the Department of Defense that State and local officials were not receiving, I went to the Federal building in West Los Angeles. I was met at the entrance—at the entrance—by a National Guardsman and an FBI agent, who escorted me through security screening and up to a conference room for my scheduled briefing.

While waiting for my scheduled briefing with General Guillot, I learned that Homeland Security Secretary Noem was holding a press conference literally just down the hall, and that press con-

ference was causing my briefing to be delayed. The thought occurred to me that, well, maybe I could attend this press conference and listen in—just listen—in the hopes of hearing Secretary Noem provide some new information that could help us make sense of what was happening.

I didn't just get up and go; I asked and was escorted by the National Guardsman and the FBI agent into the press conference. They opened the door for me. They accompanied me into the press briefing room, and they stood next to me as I stood there for a while, listening.

At one point, the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security said that the purpose of Federal law enforcement and the purpose of the U.S. military was to “liberate” Los Angeles from our Governor and our mayor, to somehow liberate us from the very people that we democratically elected to lead our city and our State.

Colleagues, let that fundamentally un-American mission statement sink in. That is not a mission focused on public safety, and that simply is not and cannot be the mission of Federal law enforcement and the U.S. military.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, are we truly prepared to live in a country where the President can deploy the Armed Forces to decide which duly-elected Governors and mayors should be allowed to lead their constituents? Is that really the precedent that we are OK with setting?

As Secretary Noem herself said last year when she was Governor of South Dakota—at the time, she said:

If Joe Biden federalizes the National Guard, that would be a direct attack on states' rights.

That was Governor Noem, now-Secretary Noem.

Throughout this country's history, we have had conflict, we have had tumult, but we have never had a tyrant as a Commander in Chief. That is not by coincidence; it is because the American people have always been willing to speak up and exercise their First Amendment right to protest, especially when our fundamental rights have been threatened.

As the proud son of immigrants from Mexico, it is that same right that I came to revere when marching through the streets with my family and my friends in 1994 in Los Angeles, protesting against the vile anti-immigrant rhetoric that was growing in California at that time. It was that year that a Republican Governor was up for reelection and was down in the polls, and he turned to scapegoating immigrants to try to improve his political standing and his reelection chances. That fight is what inspired me to leave an engineering career behind and dedicate myself to trying to influence our government and our politics.

So I have seen this before. California has seen this before. So last week, when I heard something so blatantly un-American from the Secretary of

Homeland Security, a Cabinet official, of course I was compelled, both as a Senator and as an American, to speak up. But before I could even get out my question, I was physically and aggressively forced out of the room, even as I repeatedly announced that I was a U.S. Senator and I had a question for the Secretary and even as the National Guardsman and the FBI agent who served as my escorts and brought me into that press briefing room stood by silently, knowing full well who I was.

You have seen the video. I was pushed and pulled, struggled to maintain my balance. I was forced to the ground—first on my knees and then flat on my chest. And as I was handcuffed and marched down a hallway, repeatedly asking “Why am I being detained?” not once did they tell me why.

I pray you never have a moment like this, but I will tell you, in that moment, a lot of questions came to my mind.

First of all, where are they taking me? Because I know I am not just being escorted out of the building. Am I being arrested here? And what will a city already on edge from being militarized think when they see their U.S. Senator being handcuffed just for trying to ask a question?

And what will my wife think? What will our boys think?

And I also remember asking myself, If this aggressive escalation is the result of someone speaking up against the abuses and overreach of the Trump administration, was it really worth it?

But, colleagues, how many Americans in our Nation's history have marched, have protested, have shed blood, even lost their lives to protect our rights? How many Americans have served in wars overseas to protect our freedoms here at home? And how many Americans in the year 2025 see a vindictive President on a tour of retribution, unrestrained by the majority of this separate and coequal branch of government and wonder if it is worth it to stand up or to speak out?

If a U.S. Senator becomes too afraid to speak up, how can we expect any other American to do the same?

Colleagues, you know me. I can't think of a person who would describe me as a flamethrower. I try to be respectful. I try to be considerate to every Member of this body, regardless of our political differences.

And so I do want to take a moment to thank all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, who have reached out to share your messages of support—whether they were public messages or many in private. Trust me, they mean the world to me, and I know they mean the world to my family.

But if you watched what unfolded last week and thought what happened is just about one politician and one press conference, you are missing the point. If that is what the administration is willing to do to a U.S. Senator for having the audacity to simply ask a question, imagine what they will do to

any American who dares to speak up. If what you saw happen can happen when the cameras are on, imagine not only what can happen but what is happening in so many places where there are no cameras.

Colleagues, this isn't about me. In fact, it is not just about immigrant communities or even just the State of California. It is about every single American who values their constitutional rights. It is about anyone who has ever exercised their First Amendment rights or anyone who has ever disagreed with a President or anyone who simply values our democracy and wants to keep it.

Now, the President will tell you that this is just about undocumented immigrants, about law and order, and about targeting dangerous, violent criminals. If it was just about targeting dangerous and violent criminals, there would be no disagreement. There would be no debate. But we know differently. We don't think; we know differently.

Public data released by the administration shows that the majority of immigrants currently in ICE custody have no prior criminal conviction, and new reporting shows that less than 10 percent of immigrants taken into ICE custody since October have serious criminal convictions—less than 10 percent.

But a couple weeks ago, it seemed that Donald Trump was at the lowest point of his presidency so far. He was drowning in a week of terrible headlines. The American people were finally waking up to the realities of the budget reconciliation bill that will cut healthcare, nutrition assistance, and good-paying clean energy jobs, while reducing the tax burden on billionaires. He was losing his tariff wars as the costs for everyday goods were continuing to rise. His promises to end Russia's invasion of Ukraine were falling flat, and he had been handed loss after loss in Federal court. He even had a very public breakup with Elon Musk.

And I mention this only because we know what happens when the headlines turn on Donald Trump. When Donald Trump is having a bad week, he turns to the same tired playbook he always has: When in doubt, scapegoat immigrants, and manufacture a crisis to distract the media from what is going on.

That is the reason ICE raids ramped up in California. And when Californians took to the streets to peacefully protest, he bypassed the Governor and federalized the National Guard. And even with their presence over a couple of days as things began to settle, he escalated even further by sending in the Marines.

He wants the spectacle, not just to distract, but to justify his undemocratic crackdowns and his authoritarian power grabs.

That is the reason why, even though the vast majority of protests have remained peaceful—what a weekend. That notwithstanding, the President, the Vice President, and their allies

have continued to call all the protesters out there insurrectionists. Yes, this is the same man who provoked an actual insurrection at our Capitol on January 6; the same man who incited a violent mob, carrying confederate flags against Congress; the same man who then pardoned the convicted felons who assaulted our brave Capitol police officers.

Donald Trump is continuing to test the boundaries of his power, and he has surrounded himself with yes-men and underqualified attack dogs, from the DHS Secretary to the FBI Director to the Secretary of Defense, who will rubberstamp every anti-democratic step he takes.

This administration's officials and maybe not all, but many Republicans in Congress, may choose not to do their job, but they cannot stop me from doing mine. And I refuse to let immigrants be political pawns on his path towards fascism.

Again, if you really think this is just about immigrants and immigration, it is time to wake up. What is happening is not just a threat to California, it is a threat to everyone in every State. If Donald Trump can bypass the Governor and activate the National Guard to put down protests on immigrant rights, he can do it to suppress your rights too.

If he can deploy the Marines to Los Angeles without justification, he can deploy them to your State too.

And if he can ignore due process, strip away First Amendment rights, and disappear people to foreign prisons without their day in court, he can do it to you too.

Because California is just the test case for the rest of the country. Last week, for many, it was a warning shot. But I pray that it also serves as a wake-up call.

We have now seen—since Thursday, we have now seen Trump threaten to do the same in other cities run by elected Democrats. He is saying the quiet part out loud.

It doesn't matter if you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent. We all have a responsibility to speak up and to push back before it is too late.

So I do encourage people to keep peacefully protesting. There is nothing more patriotic than to peacefully protest for your rights. Because no one is going to liberate Los Angeles but Angelenos. No one will redeem America but Americans. No one is coming to save us but us.

And we know that the cameras are not on in every corner of the country. But if this administration is this afraid of just one Senator with a question, colleagues, imagine what the voices of tens of millions of Americans peacefully protesting can do.

I thank you all for being here to hear me. I thank you, Mr. President.

(Applause.)

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:11 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUSTED).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 99, Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2025. (Reappointment)

John Thune, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roger Marshall, Katie Boyd Britt, Tommy Tuberville, Ashley B. Moody, Ted Budd, John Barrasso, Marsha Blackburn, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Mike Rounds, Jon A. Husted, Markwayne Mullin, Rick Scott of Florida, Cynthia M. Lummis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2025 (Reappointment), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 315 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Fetterman	McConnell
Barrasso	Fischer	McCormick
Blackburn	Graham	Moody
Boozman	Grassley	Moran
Britt	Hagerty	Moreno
Budd	Hawley	Mullin
Capito	Hoeven	Murkowski
Cassidy	Husted	Paul
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Ricketts
Cornyn	Johnson	Risch
Cramer	Justice	Rounds
Crapo	Kennedy	Schmitt
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Curtis	Lee	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lummis	Sheehy
Ernst	Marshall	

Sullivan Thune	Tillis Tuberville	Wicker Young
-------------------	----------------------	-----------------

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kim	Schiff
Blumenthal	King	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Booker	Lujan	Slotkin
Cantwell	Markey	Smith
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warnock
Durbin	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Gallego	Kelly
--------	---------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BRITT). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2025, (Reappointment).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Gary Andres, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

NOMINATION OF GARY ANDRES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the motion to invoke cloture on Mr. Gary Andres, who is nominated to serve as the Assistant Secretary for Legislation at the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS.

The Assistant Secretary for Legislation at HHS serves as principal adviser to the Secretary with respect to all aspects of the Department's legislative agenda and congressional liaison activities. The office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation also informs Congress of the Department's views, priorities, actions, grants, and contracts.

As a veteran of Capitol Hill, Mr. Andres knows how to implement a successful legislative agenda and will be a valuable partner to Congress at HHS. In addition, Mr. Andres has experience in the Legislative Affairs offices of previous Republican administrations, which will serve him well in this position.

At his hearing, Mr. Andres also committed to prioritize timeliness in responding to questions from Members. I thank him for this commitment and look forward to working with him, if confirmed.

Qualified nominees for this position in prior administrations normally re-

ceive widespread bipartisan support. I strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me today in voting to advance Mr. Andres' nomination.

VOTE ON ANDRES NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Andres nomination?

Ms. HASSAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 316 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Banks	Hagerty	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hassan	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hoeven	Risch
Britt	Husted	Rounds
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Warnock
Ernst	Moody	Welch
Fischer	Moran	Whitehouse
Graham	Moreno	Wicker
Grassley	Mullin	Young

NAYS—40

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kim	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	King	Schiff
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Lujan	Slotkin
Coons	Markey	Smith
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	
Heinrich	Peters	

NOT VOTING—3

Cotton	Gallego	Kelly
--------	---------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The Senator from South Carolina.

COMMEMORATING JUNE 17, 2025, AS THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MOTHER EMANUEL AME CHURCH SHOOTING

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am on the floor today with my good friend and colleague Senator SCOTT. He has a resolution commemorating the 10th an-

niversary of the Mother Emanuel Church shooting. June 17 was the 10th anniversary, and I just want to thank Tim for all he has done for that church and for the victims of that horrible day.

You have been a real inspiration to the church and to the State, and I am glad to join with you here today.

It is the oldest Black congregation in our State, opened in 1816. The man who did this, Dylann Roof, killed 9 people, seriously wounded another.

He is facing the death penalty. His goal was to go into that church—invited in, by the way—and shoot people in a house of worship, African Americans, trying to start a race war. He failed pretty miserably.

People in South Carolina embraced Mother Emanuel, the victims. We loved the church, the church family, and I am proud of how our State has rallied around this horrific event.

And to the people who lost their loved ones, there is a hole in your life that can never be filled. The senseless act of violence motivated by sheer hate and bigotry devastated your life. But I do want to let everybody in the country know, Mother Emanuel is still standing, stronger than ever. People in South Carolina came together in a way that I haven't seen in a long time; and by this horrible, terrible tragedy, I think we are stronger than we were before.

This involved a man who had serious issues, was able to get a gun in violation of existing law about background checks. They finally reached a settlement with the victims, and that was done a few years ago.

So the lessons learned for me from this horrible event was that there is no safe place when it comes to bigotry and hate. The churches all over the country, synagogues, houses of worship now have armed guards. I hate we are where we are, but as we look back over the last decade and how this has affected the people of Mother Emanuel and our State, I am here to tell you that that church is stronger than it has ever been.

To the victims and their families, the hole that has been placed in your life by this senseless act of violence can never be fully filled, but we are trying to do our best to fill that void. And to my good friend Senator SCOTT, thank you so much for your leadership from day 1. And 10 years later, because of your leadership, we are remembering on the floor of the U.S. Senate that tragic day. And I am just honored to call you my friend and colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, let me first thank Senator GRAHAM for your thoughtful comments and, frankly, standing with me and, frankly, more importantly, standing with our family of South Carolina as we faced one of the horrific challenges our State has ever faced in the history

of a State that has a very provocative history on race.

It is a rare moment when searing pain and disbelief leaves an unforgettable yet undeniable impression on both your heart and your mind.

Mr. President, 9/11 was one of those occasions. I remember exactly where I was on that fateful day. June 17, today, 10 years ago, 2015, was another one of those days.

I will never forget sitting in my bed when I received the news that there had been a shooting in my hometown of Charleston where, ultimately, nine African Americans attending a Bible study at Mother Emanuel AME Church would be murdered. Murdered for the simple reason that they were Black. No other reason.

Invited into a Bible study was the murderer. With open arms, they welcomed him in. And for 90 minutes or so he sat through a Bible study listening and watching as these Christian souls talked about and then prayed, including him.

This atrocity that was carried out in an attempt to start a race war, a second race war, at the birthplace of the Civil War, changed the landscape and, frankly, the hearts, not only of Charleston, SC and those members of the Mother Emanuel Church but our entire State and Nation.

But even in the face of such an atrocity, in the face of such grief, 36 hours after this horrific shooting, representatives from every single family looked into the eyes of the murderer and simply said what needed to be said:

I forgive you.

Thinking back on the power of our scriptures, Matthew 5:44 reminds us to love those who persecute us—to pray for those who persecute us, and to love our enemies, and to think about the capacity of love of nine family members to turn away from the grief and the pain and the misery and turn towards love.

To say to the person who just executed the person they loved dearly: We forgive you, the power of that moment started healing our Nation caught up in racial tension and violence, healed our Nation in a way that nothing else can do.

Sometimes fire can't meet fire. Sometimes hate can't meet hate. Sometimes the only thing that brings healing and restoration—or at least begins it—is meeting hate with love.

I won't ever forget the Wednesday, one week later. I was coming to this floor to give a speech, and I was talking to Daniel Simmons, Jr., whose father was one who was executed on that fateful day, his father Daniel Simmons, Sr. And I asked Daniel Simmons, Jr.: What would you want me to say to the Nation if they are listening as I go out and talk?

He said: Please remind them of Romans 8:28; that somehow, some way, all things work for good for those who love God and are called according to His purpose.

I have got to tell you, had I been in his shoes, I do not believe I would have had the strength, the conviction, the clarity of mind to find good in the midst of that tragedy. But it is the message of hope that we needed then, and I believe it is the message of hope we need now.

I am personally forever grateful to those family members, the family members of the nine, who simply chose forgiveness in the face of something I pray none of us has to experience.

Their example of a faith-filled hope in the wake of tragedy and loss not only inspires me still, it inspired our Nation, and I pray that it continues to lead us in the direction of reconciliation. As we honor those who are no longer with us, we must never be driven by our pain, our division, or our fear.

I would like to have a moment of silence for the Emanuel nine and their families.

Rev. Clementa Pinckney, Cynthia Hurd, Rev. Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Tywanza Sanders, Ethel Lance, Susie Jackson, Rev. DePayne Middleton-Doctor, Rev. Daniel Simmons, Sr., and Myra Thompson.

May America, the greatest Nation on the planet, always strive to live up to our highest ideal, the ideal that we are all created equal; that we all share the same bloodline; that we are all a part of the same family, the family of God.

Mr. President, therefore, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 282, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 282) commemorating June 17, 2025, as the tenth anniversary of the Mother Emanuel AME Church shooting.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions 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. 282) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor to remember this horrific shooting in their State and to remember those and the family ones who were affected by this. I very much appreciate this resolution.

RECOGNIZING VANCOUVER ITECH PREPARATORY

I come to talk about history as well. I just visited a group of young students from my State, Vancouver iTech—actually, it is the second time I have seen a group of students from this school in the last week. A group of them were here last week competing in a national history championship, and I am very proud to say that the young women presenting a historical review of the Kaiser shipyards in our State that changed the workforce and basically women came to the workforce during World War Two, placed second in that national championship. So hats off to those young women for capturing that moment of history and explaining what it was all about.

The competition from Vancouver iTech Preparatory had four other individuals who placed in the top 10 of the subjects that they were providing. So I love that my State is focusing on history.

(The remarks of Ms. CANTWELL pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 281 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Ms. CANTWELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this month, my fellow colleagues in the Senate—the Republican Senate Members—are working to pass a budget proposal that I feel can best be described as dangerous.

Their plans are going to dramatically reduce—even gut—services like Medicaid and SNAP, which give food to hungry, low-income workers. It will strip healthcare away from, most likely, more than 16 million Americans and threaten millions of seniors living in nursing homes.

All of this is focused, really, on just trying to give larger tax breaks to very wealthy people—who don't, really, in most cases, want them—or to the largest corporations. This lavish—and I think "lavish" is the only word that describes it fairly. This lavish tax bill gives more to the top earners while taking away from Americans with the least.

But it really doesn't have to be that way. If Republicans could focus on extending tax cuts for working families rather than on the wealthiest—that one effort, in and of itself, that one initiative—they could avoid ripping away healthcare from more than 15 or 16 million Americans; gutting our much needed investments in climate change—in fighting climate change—and making sure we have lower energy prices. Instead, they are going full steam ahead with really what is a god-awful bill.

I want to focus today on another dangerous part of this plan: how it explodes our national debt and really risks our economic future.

Many proponents of the bill love to hem and haw about being financially responsible. Like a few people in here,

I have managed budgets before. It was back when I started Colorado's first brewpub and then as mayor of Denver and as Governor of Colorado. So I know something about fiscal responsibility, and it is not partisan. At its best, fiscal responsibility should be bipartisan. I can definitely say this bill that we are looking at is the opposite of fiscal responsibility. It is fiscal madness. This is a massive spending bill that is going to create the largest national debt in American history.

You don't have to take my word for it. You can look at the numbers.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that the House Republican plan—so this is the plan coming over from the House—would add \$2.7 trillion—that is trillion with a “t,” \$2.7 trillion—to the deficit over the next decade.

The Penn Wharton model, which includes something like north of \$500 billion in additional interest payments from that accumulated debt year after year after year, over 10 years, suggests it would add up to not just \$2.7 trillion but more like \$3.2 trillion or \$3.3 trillion.

The bill our Senate colleagues are putting together makes many of the same mistakes, and I think, by most measures that a small businessperson would look at, it is reckless.

The bottom line is that more American tax dollars would go toward tax cuts for the ultrawealthy. Again, at least in Colorado, the very wealthy people I have talked to aren't asking for and aren't seeking these tax cuts. You know, under this tax plan that is coming over to us right now, those tax cuts for the very wealthy are coming instead of expanding access to healthcare or building roads or improving our schools, and more tax dollars would go to paying off the massive debt—to paying the interest on the massive debt—than all of our defense spending combined. It will become more than 25 percent of our Federal budget just to pay the interest on the debt.

Now, if that sounds like a bad idea to you, it is because it is, and the markets agree. Moody's, which is the last major credit rating agency to maintain the U.S. at its highest rating—at its highest, you know, designation as being a safe place to invest your money—just downgraded our credit rating. It is the first time that happened, and it shook investors that Moody's would downgrade our credit rating. Investors aren't confident that the United States will be able to pay its debts. At least in terms of Moody's, that has never happened before.

It is really just going to lead to more trouble. Those investors who buy those tenured bonds and help pay for our national debt are demanding higher returns because they view it as a riskier investment; that they will need a higher return if they are going to hold U.S. debt. Since you have got to attract that investment, it means you have got

to offer higher interest rates, which means you have got higher borrowing costs. That means that Coloradans and Americans are going to pay higher interest rates when they want to buy a house or expand their business or if they want to pay off their credit cards. They are going to have to pay more because the interest rates are going to be higher.

Americans are already plenty concerned about rising prices and for good reason. This whole system could lead to the dreaded stagflation. This could all become a one-two punch to working families, all the while the wealthiest families will end up being better off.

But we don't need to do this. We can certainly grow our economy. We can help working families, and we can cut the deficit. We were able to balance the budget all 8 years I was mayor of Denver and all 8 years I was Governor and still grow our investments in our roads, in our education system, and in our healthcare system. We also did this with the Inflation Reduction Act, which will reduce the deficit by over \$175 billion over the next 10 years. It has already, dramatically, lowered a number of prescription drug costs, has expanded healthcare access, and in the process, has created hundreds of thousands of good jobs. The Republicans' budget, I think, does the opposite.

We also can't forget that this budget comes in the midst of the Trump administration's efforts around tariffs and what our good friend, the Senator from Washington, was just talking about when she described the consequences of Smoot-Hawley and how those tariffs, just at 20 percent, led to a global slowdown in the overall economy. We all know that these tariff taxes are really not so hidden; they are taxes on the American people. They raise prices on everything from groceries to kitchen appliances. None of this is a growth strategy. It really is a recipe for a recession, at best, and stagflation, at worst. We can't borrow millions, we can't borrow billions, we can't borrow trillions just to hand out tax cuts to the top when working families are struggling to afford everyday goods. It doesn't add up. It never has. It never will.

There are many issues that may be partisan but being financially responsible doesn't need to be one of them, neither should good, strong economies, neither should economic fairness, neither should protecting working families. They don't have to do it this way. Now, I am always game to roll up my sleeves and dig into a balance sheet, but we haven't seen from the other side that they are willing to negotiate or really invest in long-term economic growth. I would suggest that we write a budget that reflects our values and puts tax cuts toward working families first, a budget that strengthens the middle class, one that keeps our economy strong and will keep it growing for generations to come. This bill is not any of that.

I urge my Republican colleagues in the House and the Senate not to temporarily put a pass on their values and to support, again, what I think is a truly reckless fiscal bill. I hope that we can come together and negotiate a better bill that does more for economic growth and puts a far, far lesser penalty on the working people of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as every high school student of government knows, the Constitution of the United States of America provides for three coequal branches of government: the legislative branch under article I; the judicial branch under article III; and the executive branch under article II. What I would like to talk about, briefly, is the role of the Chief Executive, the President of the United States.

Under our Constitution, the President has vast authorities. The Chief Executive enforces Federal laws; oversees the entire Federal executive branch of government; and manages Federal Agencies and Departments, which includes appointing and removing high-ranking officials like Cabinet members and Agency heads subject to Senate confirmation for certain positions.

The President of the United States—the Chief Executive—is also the Commander in Chief. He leads our Armed Forces and directs military operations. While only Congress can declare war, the President can deploy troops and respond to immediate threats, often with congressional authorization but not always. The President—the Chief Executive, the head of the executive branch—can grant pardons and reprieves for Federal crimes except in cases of impeachment. This power is nearly absolute and cannot be overturned.

The President also has some legislative powers in the form of a veto. He can veto legislation passed by Congress forbidding those acts of Congress from becoming law unless both Chambers override that veto with a two-thirds majority vote. And while the President is not a legislator per se, he can propose legislation—and often does—and influence the legislative agenda by proposing budgets, delivering the State of the Union Address, and advocating for certain policies.

The President—the Chief Executive of our government—can call special sessions of Congress and, in rare cases, actually adjourn Congress if the House and the Senate cannot agree on adjournment.

The head of the executive branch—the President of the United States—is also our chief diplomat. He shapes U.S. foreign policy, negotiates treaties, and appoints Ambassadors with Senate confirmation.

The President can also enter into executive agreements with foreign nations which do not require Senate approval but are binding during that President's term.

The President, as part of his diplomatic powers, also serves as our primary representative in international relations.

Then, when it comes to judges, the article III branch, the President of the United States—the head of the executive branch—nominates Federal judges, including Supreme Court Justices, who are obviously subject to Senate confirmation, as well as members of the inferior judiciary.

Through the Justice Department's Solicitor General, the President can also influence legal interpretations in cases brought before Federal courts.

In addition, the President of the United States—the Chief Executive—can issue Executive orders, as we have seen, or directives or proclamations to manage Federal operations or implement policy, provided they align with existing law, of course, or constitutional authority.

Then, in times of crisis, the President of the United States may assume broader authority under statutes like the National Emergencies Act, though such actions are subject to congressional oversight and review.

Then there are the implied powers as they have been called. Historical precedent and constitutional interpretation allow the President some flexibility in areas like national security, economic management, and crisis response.

These are the powers that the Constitution and laws of the United States confer upon the head of the executive branch, the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, of course, is elected by all of the American people, but what are we to do when the President of the United States is incapable of performing the duties of his office? Who is purporting to act for the President if the President is incapable of acting himself?

This was something that was contemplated even as far back as the Federalist Papers during the founding of our country.

Alexander Hamilton wrote in *Federalist* No. 70:

Energy in the Executive is the leading character in the definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks . . . [and] to the steady administration of the laws.

Hamilton also warned of the dangers associated with a weak Executive or a weak President. He said:

A feeble Executive implies a feeble execution of the government. A feeble execution is but another phrase for bad execution; and a government ill-executed, whatever it may be in theory, must be, in practice, a bad government.

Unfortunately, Alexander Hamilton's warnings ring true when we consider the Presidency of Joe Biden—a weak,

feeble Executive who proved incapable of performing many of the duties of his office.

Last June, during the Presidential debate, the American people saw with their own eyes what many had known to be true but would not admit publicly: Our sitting Commander in Chief was suffering from severe cognitive decline.

We now know that there was a conspiracy to hide the President's true condition—by his family, by his staff, by the media, and by many public officials. We were told over and over again: Don't believe your lying eyes.

Jake Tapper, who coauthored a mea culpa for the journalism profession, summed it up this way:

What the world saw at Joe Biden's one and only 2024 debate was not an anomaly. It was not a cold; it was not someone who was under or over prepared. It was not somebody who was just a little tired. It was the natural result of an eighty-one-year-old man whose capabilities had been diminishing for years. Biden, his family and his team let their self-interest and fear of another Trump term justify an attempt to put an at times addled old man in the Oval Office for four more years.

This was a true constitutional crisis—bigger than President Biden—and it cannot be absolved by a collective apology by the press or an election where that President's party loss. We should know—the American people should know—and still do not know precisely what should happen when a President is incapable of performing his or her constitutional duties.

Tomorrow, I will be cochairing, along with my colleague from Missouri Senator ERIC SCHMITT, in the Senate Judiciary Committee a hearing to delve into the constitutional implications of President Biden's cognitive decline while in office. At that hearing, we will begin to address some of the many unanswered questions from this scandal—questions that are foundational to the functioning of our form of government.

One of the aims of the hearing will be shining a light on what exactly went on at the White House during the Biden administration. The chain of events that occurred within the Biden administration matters, and we cannot discount it merely because he is no longer in office.

With a compromised President, the very legitimacy of our government is undermined. From the Biden border crisis to the disastrous results from the withdrawal in Afghanistan, the American people were the ones who paid the price. And it is now clear that for many months—no one knows exactly how long—the President was simply not up to the task.

So we have to ask difficult questions, like, who was really in charge during the last months of the Biden administration? Was it his wife? Was it other members of his family? Was it his Chief of Staff? Was it others? None of these individuals, whoever they may be, were elected by the American people. Whoever happened to be making those decisions and carrying out the duties of the

Office of the President was not somebody who was authorized by the Constitution or by a vote of the American people.

This is an existential threat to our democratic republic—this threat—and it cannot be ignored, and it will not be ignored.

History tells us this state of affairs was reminiscent of the Wilson Presidency, where the First Lady assumed many of her husband's duties during his infirmity but kept it a secret from the American people. It was one of the events that inspired those who drafted the 25th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Certainly, the American people did not consent to being governed by Jill Biden, and they didn't elect the White House Chief of Staff or whoever else purported to act on the President's behalf.

The hearing we will hold tomorrow in the Judiciary Committee will examine in depth these constitutional questions and what happens when the President is no longer capable of performing the duties of his office.

Our country has faced many difficult challenges in the past, including a succession for President—for example, when John F. Kennedy was assassinated in 1963. In the aftermath of that assassination and the questions it raised, Congress began considering a constitutional amendment about Presidential succession.

In 1965, Senator Birch Bayh and Representative Emanuel Celler introduced a resolution in Congress to clarify the order and procedures of Presidential succession. This resolution was the basis for the 25th Amendment, which Congress approved in July of that same year.

Of course, for every constitutional amendment, three-quarters of the States must actually ratify that resolution, and the States finished ratifying the 25th Amendment in 1967, after it was first proposed in 1965. President Lyndon Johnson certified the amendment that February.

The 25th Amendment to the Constitution provides a roadmap for succession in instances of Presidential incapacity. Section 4 gives the Vice President—in this case, Vice President Harris—or a majority of the President's Cabinet—that would be President Biden's Cabinet—the authority to challenge the President's ability to carry out the functions of his office subject to a vote in Congress. But in this instance that we all witnessed less than a year ago, Kamala Harris and the Cabinet did nothing—or, rather, they did something: They hid the truth from the American people.

So who, this hearing will ask, is accountable when the Cabinet fails to do its duty, when the Vice President fails to do her duty under section 4 of the 25th Amendment? Are there penalties for failing to act? Is there any accountability whatsoever? Should there be?

The Framers of this amendment wanted it to be possible, yet difficult,

to remove a President when absolutely necessary. Ultimately, though, they acknowledged that the execution of the 25th Amendment would depend on the good faith of the Cabinet and the Vice President. But Biden's Cabinet did not act in good faith, nor did the Vice President herself. They acted in their political and personal self-interest.

This is the paradox of self-government. Many of the rules, traditions, and institutions that sustain our Republic are self-executing, self-enforcing. So the health and legitimacy of our democratic Republic rest on the character of the men and women who serve in government.

This brings us to the most crucial questions we will address in the hearing: Why was the 25th Amendment not invoked, and what factors do we need to look at that may have played a role in congressional inaction? Most importantly, as part of our legislative responsibilities, should Congress consider amending the 25th Amendment further to further clarify responsibilities and protocols in case this disaster befalls our Nation again?

As a government, as an American people, it is imperative that we have clear contingency plans when emergency strikes. And, yes, it is an emergency when we have a sitting President who is unable to discharge the duties of his office. He certainly could not have been trusted to make one of the gravest decisions that faces any President in history: what to do in matters of war and peace—a situation that feels all that much more real given the current events in the Middle East.

The concerns raised by this incident stretch beyond the boundaries of partisan politics. We must not turn away from the search for answers, and it is not an overstatement to say the future of our country could one day hinge on how we choose to act or not act on this issue. So tomorrow's hearing is a first important step in preserving this land of the free for future generations.

In these United States, those in authority derive their power from the consent of the government, but during much of the last 4 years, we know that our country was largely led by unelected staff whose names are unknown by the American people.

I look forward to tomorrow's hearing examining these hard but existentially important questions that must be answered from this monumental scandal.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GENIUS ACT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, today is a day I have been working toward for over 4 months. After months of intense

negotiations, we are minutes away from passing the GENIUS Act, Senator BILL HAGERTY's legislation that will be a first step toward modernizing the American payment system and integrating digital assets into the U.S. economy in a responsible way.

I want to congratulate my friend Senator HAGERTY for this achievement and thank him for his incredible leadership on this bill. He has been a true ally of the digital asset industry, and I am so proud to have worked with him on his GENIUS Act over the past few months.

Since 2017, Wyoming has been on the forefront of digital asset policy, long before it was popular or politically expedient. In Wyoming, we recognized early on what the rest of the country is beginning to understand: that digital assets are a force for good and that you can have both responsible innovation and consumer protection side by side.

The GENIUS Act protects the dual banking system and gives stablecoin issuers a real choice between State and Federal charters, preserving the innovative spirit that has also made States like Wyoming leaders in this space while also ensuring we have robust oversight when necessary.

This legislation is also about economic security and opportunity. It protects the U.S. dollar's role as the world's reserve currency by ensuring that dollar-backed stablecoins remain strong and reliable. Most of all, it ensures American consumers and businesses can participate in the digital economy with confidence and security.

The sobering reality is that even while we have been negotiating, other nations have been hard at work offering their own frameworks and encouraging the digital asset industry to call their respective countries home. America's role as the global financial services leader is a privilege, not a right, and we must innovate to compete with other nations that want to attract American businesses.

This is only the first step. Congress must pass comprehensive market structure legislation in the coming months that draws the line between a security and a commodity and creates a pathway for digital asset exchanges to register with the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Working on this legislation has begun in earnest, and in the coming weeks, the Senate will begin to hold hearings and release draft legislation on this critical topic. I look forward to working with Chairman SCOTT, Leader THUNE, and Senator TILLIS on getting market structure done this year.

I am proud to deliver on President Trump's promise to lead the most pro-digital asset administration in our history. He understands that making America the crypto capital of the world isn't just good policy; it is an economic imperative. This legislation proves that when we work together, we can craft solutions that protect consumers without sacrificing innovation.

The time for hesitation has passed. The time for leadership is now. I want to thank Leader THUNE and Chairman SCOTT for their unwavering commitment to getting this critical piece of legislation across the finish line. I want to thank my colleagues and our staff for the absurd number of hours that we spent in windowless rooms over the last weeks to bring this bill to the finish line.

It is not too late for America to show the world that our Nation doesn't just adapt to change; we lead it. Let's get GENIUS passed and secure America's financial future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, today, on a bipartisan basis, the Senate will pass its first major digital asset legislation ever—the GENIUS Act. With this bill, the United States is one step closer to becoming the global leader in crypto.

The GENIUS Act establishes a pro-growth regulatory framework for payment stablecoins. This bill will cement U.S. dollar dominance; it will protect customers; it will drive demand for U.S. Treasuries; and it will ensure that digital asset innovation happens in the United States of America, not abroad.

With GENIUS, the value of stablecoins will be pegged to the U.S. dollar and backed one-to-one by cash and short-term U.S. Treasuries. This will provide certainty and confidence for more wide-scale adoption of this transformational technology. By combining the dollar's advantages with the speed and the efficiency of blockchain technology, the GENIUS Act facilitates traditional finance's adoption of crypto and ushers in a new era in payments.

The prospect of faster and cheaper payments will have far-reaching implications for our financial system. Once the GENIUS Act is law, businesses of all sizes and Americans across the country will be able to settle payments nearly instantaneously rather than waiting for days or sometimes even weeks. Put simply, stablecoins are a paradigm-shifting development that can bring our payment system into the 21st century.

This legislation establishes procedures for issuing stablecoins; it designates clear roles for Federal and State regulators; it implements standards for consumer protection; and it includes strong safeguards to deter illicit activity.

Protections show that with the passage of GENIUS, stablecoin issuers could become the world's largest holders of U.S. Treasuries by 2030. Such an

outcome would enhance our fiscal resilience, and it will cement the U.S. dollar's dominance as the global reserve currency. The positive implications of this legislation are hard to overstate.

Today will be remembered as an inflection point for innovation in the United States of America.

I would like to thank my colleagues for supporting this legislation. Particularly, I would like to thank Leader JOHN THUNE and Senators SCOTT, LUMMIS, GILLIBRAND, and ALSOBROOKS for helping to get this legislation across the finish line. I would also like to thank our wonderful staff, particularly calling out Luke Pettit, Chris Land, Catherine Fuchs, Bill Rockwood, Nick Larsen, and Chris Toppings, all of whom have put in effort night and day to make certain that this legislation is a success.

I look forward to getting the GENIUS Act signed into law in very short order.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report Executive Calendar No. 98.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025.

VOTE ON TRUSTY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Trusty nomination?

Mr. HAGERTY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 317 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Sheehy
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fetterman	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lujan	Slotkin
Coons	Markey	Smith
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Gallego	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Cotton Kelly

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

GUIDING AND ESTABLISHING NATIONAL INNOVATION FOR U.S. STABLECOINS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and resume consideration of S. 1582, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1582) to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with Senators HAGERTY and GILLIBRAND. As we vote on the GENIUS Act today, it is imperative to make clear for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the drafters of amendment No. 2307 included section 9, Anti-Money Laundering Innovation, language to enable the Federal Government to address illicit activities involving stablecoins by directing the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) to establish guidance and notice and comment rulemaking relating to the factors set forth in sections 9(d)(1)–9(d)(4) based on the results of the research and risk assessments required under section 9. Prior versions of amendment No. 2307 and/or S. 1582 set forth that FinCEN shall issue guidance or notice and comment rulemaking for such purposes. The drafters of amendment No. 2307 explicitly amended such provision to require that FinCEN shall issue guidance and notice and comment rulemaking. While this change from “or” to “and” was reflected in the text of section 9(d) in amendment No. 2307, the title of section 9(d) inadvertently does not reflect this explicitly stronger language. The

congressional intent of the drafters of amendment No. 2307 was to ensure that FinCEN shall issue both guidance and notice and comment rulemaking with respect to the factors set forth in sections 9(d)(1)–9(d)(4). With that, I yield to my colleague the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding, and reiterate that section 9, Anti-Money Laundering Innovation, was added to the GENIUS Act to enable the Federal Government to address illicit activities involving stablecoins by directing the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) to establish guidance and notice and comment rulemaking relating to the factors set forth in sections 9(d)(1)–9(d)(4). Prior versions of amendment No. 2307 and/or S. 1582 provided that FinCEN shall issue guidance or notice and comment rulemaking for such purposes. The drafters of amendment No. 2307 explicitly amended such provision to require that FinCEN shall issue guidance and notice and comment rulemaking. While this change from “or” to “and” was made in the text of text of section 9(d) in amendment No. 2307, it was inadvertently left out of the title of the section. The congressional intent of the drafters of amendment No. 2307 was to ensure that FinCEN shall issue both guidance and notice and comment rulemaking with respect to the factors set forth in sections 9(d)(1)–9(d)(4). I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his leadership on these issues, and yield to my colleague the Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding and thank both him and the Senator from New Jersey for their leadership on these issues. I rise today to reiterate my colleagues' clarification that the express congressional intent of section 9 of the GENIUS Act, as amended, is to ensure that FinCEN shall issue guidance and notice and comment rulemaking. While the change from the “or” in prior versions of the bill text to “and” in the final version being voted on today was made in the text of section 9, it was inadvertently not made in the title thereof. With that, I reiterate my thanks to my colleagues for their work on this issue.

VOTE ON S. 1582

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

Mr. TILLIS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 318 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Alsobrooks	Graham	Mullin
Banks	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hagerty	Ossoff
Blackburn	Hassan	Padilla
Booker	Heinrich	Ricketts
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Risch
Britt	Hoeven	Rosen
Budd	Husted	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schiff
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cortez Masto	Kim	Sheehy
Cramer	Lankford	Slotkin
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lujan	Thune
Curtis	Lummis	Tillis
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	McConnell	Warner
Fetterman	McCormick	Warnock
Fischer	Moody	Wicker
Gallego	Moran	Young
Gillibrand	Moreno	

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	King	Schatz
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Markey	Shaheen
Cantwell	Merkley	Smith
Coons	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Paul	Welch
Hawley	Peters	Whitehouse
Hirono	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Cotton Kelly

The bill (S. 1582), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 1582

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Guiding and Establishing National Innovation for U.S. Stablecoins Act” or the “GENIUS Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.**—The term “appropriate Federal banking agency” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(2) **BANK SECRECY ACT.**—The term “Bank Secrecy Act” means—

(A) section 21 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1829b);

(B) chapter 2 of title I of Public Law 91–508 (12 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.); and

(C) subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) **BOARD.**—The term “Board” means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(4) **COMPTROLLER.**—The term “Comptroller” means the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

(5) **CORPORATION.**—The term “Corporation” means the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

(6) **DIGITAL ASSET.**—The term “digital asset” means any digital representation of value that is recorded on a cryptographically secured distributed ledger.

(7) **DIGITAL ASSET SERVICE PROVIDER.**—The term “digital asset service provider” means—

(A) means a person that, for compensation or profit, engages in the business in the United States (including on behalf of customers or users in the United States) of—

(i) exchanging digital assets for monetary value;

(ii) exchanging digital assets for other digital assets;

(iii) transferring digital assets to a third party;

(iv) acting as a digital asset custodian; or

(v) participating in financial services relating to digital asset issuance; and

(B) does not include—

(i) a distributed ledger protocol;

(ii) developing, operating, or engaging in the business of developing distributed ledger protocols or self-custodial software interfaces;

(iii) an immutable and self-custodial software interface;

(iv) developing, operating, or engaging in the business of validating transactions or operating a distributed ledger; or

(v) participating in a liquidity pool or other similar mechanism for the provisioning of liquidity for peer-to-peer transactions.

(8) **DISTRIBUTED LEDGER.**—The term “distributed ledger” means technology in which data is shared across a network that creates a public digital ledger of verified transactions or information among network participants and cryptography is used to link the data to maintain the integrity of the public ledger and execute other functions.

(9) **DISTRIBUTED LEDGER PROTOCOL.**—The term “distributed ledger protocol” means publicly available and accessible executable software deployed to a distributed ledger, including smart contracts or networks of smart contracts.

(10) **FEDERAL BRANCH.**—The term “Federal branch” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(11) **FEDERAL QUALIFIED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUER.**—The term “Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer” means—

(A) a nonbank entity, other than a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, approved by the Comptroller, pursuant to section 5, to issue payment stablecoins;

(B) an uninsured national bank—

(i) that is chartered by the Comptroller, pursuant to title LXII of the Revised Statutes; and

(ii) that is approved by the Comptroller, pursuant to section 5, to issue payment stablecoins; and

(C) a Federal branch that is approved by the Comptroller, pursuant to section 5, to issue payment stablecoins.

(12) **FOREIGN PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUER.**—The term “foreign payment stablecoin issuer” means an issuer of a payment stablecoin that is—

(A) organized under the laws of or domiciled in a foreign country, a territory of the United States, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands; and

(B) not a permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(13) **INSTITUTION-AFFILIATED PARTY.**—With respect to a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, the term “institution-affiliated party” means any director, officer, employee, or controlling stockholder of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(14) **INSURED CREDIT UNION.**—The term “insured credit union” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(15) **INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term “insured depository institution” means—

(A) an insured depository institution, as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(B) an insured credit union.

(16) **LAWFUL ORDER.**—The term “lawful order” means any final and valid writ, process, order, rule, decree, command, or other requirement issued or promulgated under Federal law, issued by a court of competent

jurisdiction or by an authorized Federal agency pursuant to its statutory authority, that—

(A) requires a person to seize, freeze, burn, or prevent the transfer of payment stablecoins issued by the person;

(B) specifies the payment stablecoins or accounts subject to blocking with reasonable particularity; and

(C) is subject to judicial or administrative review or appeal as provided by law.

(17) **MONETARY VALUE.**—The term “monetary value” means a national currency or deposit (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)) denominated in a national currency.

(18) **MONEY.**—The term “money”—

(A) means a medium of exchange currently authorized or adopted by a domestic or foreign government; and

(B) includes a monetary unit of account established by an intergovernmental organization or by agreement between 2 or more countries.

(19) **NATIONAL CURRENCY.**—The term “national currency” means each of the following:

(A) A Federal Reserve note (as the term is used in the first undesignated paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 411)).

(B) Money standing to the credit of an account with a Federal Reserve Bank.

(C) Money issued by a foreign central bank.

(D) Money issued by an intergovernmental organization pursuant to an agreement by 2 or more governments.

(20) **NONBANK ENTITY.**—The term “nonbank entity” means a person that is not a depository institution or subsidiary of a depository institution.

(21) **OFFER.**—The term “offer” means to make available for purchase, sale, or exchange.

(22) **PAYMENT STABLECOIN.**—The term “payment stablecoin”—

(A) means a digital asset—

(i) that is, or is designed to be, used as a means of payment or settlement; and

(ii) the issuer of which—

(I) is obligated to convert, redeem, or repurchase for a fixed amount of monetary value, not including a digital asset denominated in a fixed amount of monetary value; and

(II) represents that such issuer will maintain, or create the reasonable expectation that it will maintain, a stable value relative to the value of a fixed amount of monetary value; and

(B) does not include a digital asset that—

(i) is a national currency;

(ii) is a deposit (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)), including a deposit recorded using distributed ledger technology; or

(iii) is a security, as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b), section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c), or section 2 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a–2), except that, for the avoidance of doubt, no bond, note, evidence of indebtedness, or investment contract that was issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall qualify as a security solely by virtue of its satisfying the conditions described in subparagraph (A), consistent with section 17 of this Act.

(23) **PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUER.**—The term “permitted payment stablecoin issuer” means a person formed in the United States that is—

(A) a subsidiary of an insured depository institution that has been approved to issue payment stablecoins under section 5;

(B) a Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer; or

(C) a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer.

(24) **PERSON.**—The term “person” means an individual, partnership, company, corporation, association, trust, estate, cooperative organization, or other business entity, incorporated or unincorporated.

(25) **PRIMARY FEDERAL PAYMENT STABLECOIN REGULATOR.**—The term “primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator” means—

(A) with respect to a subsidiary of an insured depository institution (other than an insured credit union), the appropriate Federal banking agency of such insured depository institution;

(B) with respect to an insured credit union or a subsidiary of an insured credit union, the National Credit Union Administration;

(C) with respect to a State chartered depository institution not specified under subparagraph (A), the Corporation, the Comptroller, or the Board; and

(D) with respect to a Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer, the Comptroller.

(26) **REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM.**—The term “registered public accounting firm” has the meaning given that term under section 2 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 7201).

(27) **STABLECOIN CERTIFICATION REVIEW COMMITTEE.**—The term “Stablecoin Certification Review Committee” means the committee of that name and having the functions as provided in this Act—

(A) of which—

(i) the Secretary of the Treasury shall serve as Chair; and

(ii) the Chair of the Board (or the Vice Chair for Supervision, as delegated by the Chair of the Board), and the Chair of the Corporation shall serve as members; and

(B) which, unless otherwise specified in this Act, shall act by $\frac{2}{3}$ vote of its members at any meeting called by the Chair or by unanimous written consent.

(28) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and each territory of the United States.

(29) **STATE CHARTERED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.**—The term “State chartered depository institution” has the meaning given the term “State depository institution” in section 3(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(c)).

(30) **STATE PAYMENT STABLECOIN REGULATOR.**—The term “State payment stablecoin regulator” means a State agency that has primary regulatory and supervisory authority in such State over entities that issue payment stablecoins.

(31) **STATE QUALIFIED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUER.**—The term “State qualified payment stablecoin issuer” means an entity that—

(A) is legally established under the laws of a State and approved to issue payment stablecoins by a State payment stablecoin regulator; and

(B) is not an uninsured national bank chartered by the Comptroller pursuant to title LXII of the Revised Statutes, a Federal branch, an insured depository institution, or a subsidiary of such national bank, Federal branch, or insured depository institution.

(32) **SUBSIDIARY.**—The term “subsidiary” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(33) **SUBSIDIARY OF AN INSURED CREDIT UNION.**—With respect to an insured credit union, the term “subsidiary of an insured credit union” means—

(A) an organization providing services to the insured credit union that are associated with the routine operations of credit unions, as described in section 107(7)(I) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757(7)(I));

(B) a credit union service organization, as such term is used under part 712 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to which the insured credit union has an ownership interest or to which the insured credit union has extended a loan; and

(C) a subsidiary of a State chartered insured credit union authorized under State law.

SEC. 3. ISSUANCE AND TREATMENT OF PAYMENT STABLECOINS.

(a) **LIMITATION ON ISSUERS.**—It shall be unlawful for any person other than a permitted payment stablecoin issuer to issue a payment stablecoin in the United States.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON OFFERS OR SALES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c) and section 18, beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, it shall be unlawful for a digital asset service provider to offer or sell a payment stablecoin to a person in the United States, unless the payment stablecoin is issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(2) **FOREIGN PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS.**—It shall be unlawful for any digital asset service provider to offer, sell, or otherwise make available in the United States a payment stablecoin issued by a foreign payment stablecoin issuer unless the foreign payment stablecoin issuer has the technological capability to comply, and will comply, with the terms of any lawful order and any reciprocal arrangement pursuant to section 18.

(c) **LIMITED SAFE HARBORS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may issue regulations providing safe harbors from subsection (a) that are—

(A) consistent with the purposes of the Act;

(B) limited in scope; and

(C) apply to a de minimis volume of transactions, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(2) **UNUSUAL AND EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines that unusual and exigent circumstances exist, the Secretary may provide limited safe harbors from subsection (a).

(B) **JUSTIFICATION.**—Prior to issuing a limited safe harbor under this paragraph, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the chairs and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a justification for the determination of the unusual and exigent circumstances, which may be contained in a classified annex, as applicable.

(d) **RULEMAKING.**—Consistent with section 13, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue regulations to implement this section, including regulations to define terms.

(e) **EXTRATERRITORIAL EFFECT.**—This section is intended to have extraterritorial effect if conduct involves the offer or sale of a payment stablecoin to a person located in the United States.

(f) **PENALTY FOR VIOLATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Whoever knowingly participates in a violation of subsection (a) shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 for each such violation, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(2) **REFERRAL TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—If a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator has reason to believe that any person has knowingly violated subsection (a), the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator may refer the matter to the Attorney General.

(g) **TREATMENT.**—A payment stablecoin that is not issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall not be—

(1) treated as cash or as a cash equivalent for accounting purposes;

(2) eligible as cash or as a cash equivalent margin and collateral for futures commission merchants, derivative clearing organizations, broker-dealers, registered clearing agencies, and swap dealers; or

(3) acceptable as a settlement asset to facilitate wholesale payments between banking organizations or by a payment infrastructure to facilitate exchange and settlement among banking organizations.

(h) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **EXEMPT TRANSACTIONS.**—This section shall not apply to—

(A) the direct transfer of digital assets between 2 individuals acting on their own behalf and for their own lawful purposes, without the involvement of an intermediary;

(B) to any transaction involving the receipt of digital assets by an individual between an account owned by the individual in the United States and an account owned by the individual abroad that are offered by the same parent company; or

(C) to any transaction by means of a software or hardware wallet that facilitates an individual's own custody of digital assets.

(2) **TREASURY AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this Act shall alter the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to block, restrict, or limit transactions involving payment stablecoins that reference or are denominated in United States dollars that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 4. REQUIREMENTS FOR ISSUING PAYMENT STABLECOINS.

(a) **STANDARDS FOR THE ISSUANCE OF PAYMENT STABLECOINS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall—

(A) maintain identifiable reserves backing the outstanding payment stablecoins of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer on an at least 1 to 1 basis, with reserves comprising—

(i) United States coins and currency (including Federal Reserve notes) or money standing to the credit of an account with a Federal Reserve Bank;

(ii) funds held as demand deposits (or other deposits that may be withdrawn upon request at any time) or insured shares at an insured depository institution (including any foreign branches or agents, including correspondent banks, of an insured depository institution), subject to limitations established by the Corporation and the National Credit Union Administration, as applicable, to address safety and soundness risks of such insured depository institution;

(iii) Treasury bills, notes, or bonds—

(I) with a remaining maturity of 93 days or less; or

(II) issued with a maturity of 93 days or less;

(iv) money received under repurchase agreements, with the permitted payment stablecoin issuer acting as a seller of securities and with an overnight maturity, that are backed by Treasury bills with a maturity of 93 days or less;

(v) reverse repurchase agreements, with the permitted payment stablecoin issuer acting as a purchaser of securities and with an overnight maturity, that are collateralized by Treasury notes, bills, or bonds on an overnight basis, subject to overcollateralization in line with standard market terms, that are—

(I) tri-party;

(II) centrally cleared through a clearing agency registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission; or

(III) bilateral with a counterparty that the issuer has determined to be adequately creditworthy even in the event of severe market stress;

(vi) securities issued by an investment company registered under section 8(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-8(a)), or other registered Government money market fund, and that are invested solely in underlying assets described in clauses (i) through (v);

(vii) any other similarly liquid Federal Government-issued asset approved by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator, in consultation with the State payment stablecoin regulator, if applicable, of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer; or

(viii) any reserve described in clause (i) through (iii) or clause (vi) through (vii) in tokenized form, provided that such reserves comply with all applicable laws and regulations;

(B) publicly disclose the issuer's redemption policy, which shall—

(i) establish clear and conspicuous procedures for timely redemption of outstanding payment stablecoins, provided that any discretionary limitations on timely redemptions can only be imposed by a State qualified payment stablecoin regulator, the Corporation, the Comptroller, or the Board, consistent with section 7; and

(ii) publicly, clearly, and conspicuously disclose in plain language all fees associated with purchasing or redeeming the payment stablecoins, provided that such fees can only be changed upon not less than 7 days' prior notice to consumers; and

(C) publish the monthly composition of the issuer's reserves on the website of the issuer, containing—

(i) the total number of outstanding payment stablecoins issued by the issuer; and

(ii) the amount and composition of the reserves described in subparagraph (A), including the average tenor and geographic location of custody of each category of reserve instruments.

(2) PROHIBITION ON REHYPOTHECATION.—Reserves required under paragraph (1)(A) may not be pledged, rehypothecated, or reused by the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, either directly or indirectly, except for the purpose of—

(A) satisfying margin obligations in connection with investments in permitted reserves under clauses (iv) and (v) of paragraph (1)(A);

(B) satisfying obligations associated with the use, receipt, or provision of standard custodial services; or

(C) creating liquidity to meet reasonable expectations of requests to redeem payment stablecoins, such that reserves in the form of Treasury bills may be sold as purchased securities for repurchase agreements with a maturity of 93 days or less, provided that either—

(i) the repurchase agreements are cleared by a clearing agency registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission; or

(ii) the permitted payment stablecoin issuer receives the prior approval of its primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator or State payment stablecoin regulator, as applicable.

(3) MONTHLY CERTIFICATION; EXAMINATION OF REPORTS BY REGISTERED PUBLIC ACCOUNTING FIRM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall, each month, have the information disclosed in the previous month-end report required under paragraph (1)(D) examined by a registered public accounting firm.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—Each month, the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Financial Officer of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall submit a certification as to the accuracy of the monthly report to, as applicable—

(i) the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator or the permitted payment stablecoin issuer; or

(ii) the State payment stablecoin regulator of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(C) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person who submits a certification required under subparagraph (B) knowing that such certification is false shall be subject to the same criminal penalties as those set forth under section 1350(c) of title 18, United States Code.

(4) CAPITAL, LIQUIDITY, AND RISK MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators shall, or in the case of a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, the State payment stablecoin regulator shall, consistent with section 13, issue regulations implementing—

(i) capital requirements applicable to permitted payment stablecoin issuers that—

(I) are tailored to the business model and risk profile of permitted payment stablecoin issuers;

(II) do not exceed requirements that are sufficient to ensure the ongoing operations of permitted payment stablecoin issuers; and

(III) in the case of the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators, if the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators determine that a capital buffer is necessary to ensure the ongoing operations of permitted payment stablecoin issuers, may include capital buffers that are tailored to the business model and risk profile of permitted payment stablecoin issuers;

(ii) the liquidity standard under paragraph (1)(A);

(iii) reserve asset diversification, including deposit concentration at banking institutions, and interest rate risk management standards applicable to permitted payment stablecoin issuers that—

(I) are tailored to the business model and risk profile of permitted payment stablecoin issuers; and

(II) do not exceed standards that are sufficient to ensure the ongoing operations of permitted payment stablecoin issuers; and

(iv) appropriate operational, compliance, and information technology risk management principles-based requirements and standards, including Bank Secrecy Act and sanctions compliance standards, that—

(I) are tailored to the business model and risk profile of permitted payment stablecoin issuers; and

(II) are consistent with applicable law.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit—

(i) the authority of the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators, in prescribing standards under this paragraph, to tailor or differentiate among issuers on an individual basis or by category, taking into consideration the capital structure, business model risk profile, complexity, financial activities (including financial activities of subsidiaries), size, and any other risk-related factors of permitted payment stablecoin issuers that a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator determines appropriate, provided that such tailoring or differentiation occurs without respect to whether a permitted payment stablecoin issuer is regulated by a State payment stablecoin regulator; or

(ii) any supervisory, regulatory, or enforcement authority of a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator to further the safe and sound operation of an institution for which the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator is the appropriate regulator.

(C) APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING CAPITAL STANDARDS.—

(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term “depository institution holding com-

pany” has the meaning given that term under section 171(a)(3) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371(a)(3)).

(ii) APPLICABILITY OF FINANCIAL STABILITY ACT.—With respect to the promulgation of rules under subparagraph (A) and clauses (iii) and (iv) of this subparagraph, section 171 of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5371) shall not apply.

(iii) RULES RELATING TO LEVERAGE CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS OR RISK-BASED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.—Any rule issued by an appropriate Federal banking agency that imposes, on a consolidated basis, a leverage capital requirement or risk-based capital requirement with respect to an insured depository institution or depository institution holding company shall provide that, for purposes of such leverage capital requirement or risk-based capital requirement, any insured depository institution or depository institution holding company that includes, on a consolidated basis, a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, shall not be required to hold, with respect to such permitted payment stablecoin issuer and its assets and operations, any amount of regulatory capital in excess of the capital that such permitted payment stablecoin issuer must maintain under the capital requirements issued pursuant to subparagraph (A)(i).

(iv) MODIFICATIONS.—Not later than the earlier of the rulemaking deadline under section 13 or the date on which the Federal payment stablecoin regulators issue regulations to carry out this section, each appropriate Federal banking agency shall amend or otherwise modify any regulation of the appropriate Federal banking agency described in clause (iii) so that such regulation, as amended or otherwise modified, complies with clause (iii) of this subparagraph.

(5) TREATMENT UNDER THE BANK SECRECY ACT AND SANCTIONS LAWS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall be treated as a financial institution for purposes of the Bank Secrecy Act, and as such, shall be subject to all Federal laws applicable to a financial institution located in the United States relating to economic sanctions, prevention of money laundering, customer identification, and due diligence, including—

(i) maintenance of an effective anti-money laundering program, which shall include appropriate risk assessments and designation of an officer to supervise the program;

(ii) retention of appropriate records;

(iii) monitoring and reporting of any suspicious transaction relevant to a possible violation of law or regulation;

(iv) technical capabilities, policies, and procedures to block, freeze, and reject specific or impermissible transactions that violate Federal or State laws, rules, or regulations;

(v) maintenance of an effective customer identification program, including identification and verification of account holders with the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, high-value transactions, and appropriate enhanced due diligence; and

(vi) maintenance of an effective economic sanctions compliance program, including verification of sanctions lists, consistent with Federal law.

(B) RULEMAKING.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall adopt rules, tailored to the size and complexity of permitted payment stablecoin issuers, to implement subparagraph (A).

(C) RESERVATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall restrict the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to implement, administer, and enforce the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(6) COORDINATION WITH PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS WITH RESPECT TO BLOCKING OF PROPERTY AND TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITIES TO COMPLY WITH LAWFUL ORDERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury—

(i) shall, to the best of the Secretary's ability, coordinate with a permitted payment stablecoin issuer before taking any action to block and prohibit transactions in property and interests in property of a foreign person to ensure that the permitted payment stablecoin issuer is able to effectively block a payment stablecoin of the foreign person upon issuance of the payment stablecoin; and

(ii) is not required to notify any permitted payment stablecoin issuer of any intended action described in clause (i) prior to taking such action.

(B) COMPLIANCE WITH LAWFUL ORDERS.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer may issue payment stablecoins only if the issuer has the technological capability to comply, and will comply, with the terms of any lawful order.

(C) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report, which may include a classified annex if applicable, on the coordination with permitted payment stablecoin issuers required under subparagraph (A).

(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter or affect the authority of State payment stablecoin regulators with respect to the offer of foreign-issued digital assets that are issued within a foreign jurisdiction.

(7) LIMITATION ON PAYMENT STABLECOIN ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer may only—

(i) issue payment stablecoins;

(ii) redeem payment stablecoins;

(iii) manage related reserves, including purchasing, selling, and holding reserve assets or providing custodial services for reserve assets, consistent with State and Federal law;

(iv) provide custodial or safekeeping services for payment stablecoins, required reserves, or private keys of payment stablecoins, consistent with this Act; and

(v) undertake other activities that directly support any of the activities described in clauses (i) through (iv).

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall limit a permitted payment stablecoin issuer from engaging in payment stablecoin activities or digital asset service provider activities specified by this Act, and activities incidental thereto, that are authorized by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator or the State payment stablecoin regulator, as applicable, consistent with all other Federal and State laws, provided that the claims of payment stablecoin holders rank senior to any potential claims of non-stablecoin creditors with respect to the reserve assets, consistent with section 11.

(8) PROHIBITION ON TYING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer may not provide services to a customer on the condition that the customer obtain an additional paid product or service from the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, or any of its subsidiaries, or agree to not obtain an additional product or service from a competitor.

(B) REGULATIONS.—The Board may issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this paragraph, and, in consultation with

other relevant primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators, may by regulation or order, permit such exceptions to subparagraph (A) as the Board considers will not be contrary to the purpose of this Act.

(9) PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF DECEPTIVE NAMES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer may not—

(i) use any combination of terms relating to the United States Government, including “United States”, “United States Government”, and “USG” in the name of a payment stablecoin; or

(ii) market a payment stablecoin in such a way that a reasonable person would perceive the payment stablecoin to be—

(I) legal tender, as described in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code;

(II) issued by the United States; or

(III) guaranteed or approved by the Government of the United States.

(B) PEGGED STABLECOINS.—Abbreviations directly relating to the currency to which a payment stablecoin is pegged, such as “USD”, are not subject to the prohibitions in subparagraph (A).

(10) AUDITS AND REPORTS.—

(A) ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A permitted payment stablecoin issuer with more than \$50,000,000,000 in consolidated total outstanding issuance, that is not subject to the reporting requirements under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78o(d)), shall prepare, in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, an annual financial statement, which shall include the disclosure of any related party transactions, as defined by such generally accepted accounting principles.

(ii) AUDITOR.—A registered public accounting firm shall perform an audit of the annual financial statements described in clause (i).

(iii) STANDARDS.—An audit described in clause (ii) shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable auditing standards established by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, including those relating to auditor independence, internal controls, and related party transactions.

(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to limit, alter, or expand the jurisdiction of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board over permitted payment stablecoin issuers or registered public accounting firms.

(B) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AND SUBMISSION TO FEDERAL REGULATORS.—Each permitted payment stablecoin issuer required to prepare an audited annual financial statement under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) make such audited financial statements publicly available on the website of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer; and

(ii) submit such audited financial statements annually to their primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator.

(C) CONSULTATION.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators may consult with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to determine best practices for determining audit oversight and to detect fraud, material misstatements, and other financial misrepresentations that could mislead permitted payment stablecoin holders.

(11) PROHIBITION ON INTEREST.—No permitted payment stablecoin issuer or foreign payment stablecoin issuer shall pay the holder of any payment stablecoin any form of interest or yield (whether in cash, tokens, or other consideration) solely in connection with the holding, use, or retention of such payment stablecoin.

(12) NON-FINANCIAL SERVICES PUBLIC COMPANIES.—

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) FINANCIAL ACTIVITIES.—The term “financial activities”—

(I) has the meaning given that term in section 4(k) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1843(k)); and

(II) for the avoidance of doubt, includes those activities described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 2(7) and section 4(a)(7)(A) of this Act.

(ii) PUBLIC COMPANY.—The term “public company” means an issuer that is required to file reports under section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(a), 78o(d)).

(B) PROHIBITION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A public company that is not predominantly engaged in 1 or more financial activities, and its wholly or majority owned subsidiaries or affiliates, may not issue a payment stablecoin unless the public company obtains a unanimous vote of the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee finding that—

(I) it will not pose a material risk to the safety and soundness of the United States banking system, the financial stability of the United States, or the Deposit Insurance Fund;

(II) the public company will comply with data use limitations providing that, unless the public company receives consent from the consumer, nonpublic personal information obtained from stablecoin transaction data may not be—

(aa) used to target, personalize, or rank advertising or other content;

(bb) sold to any third party; or

(cc) shared with non-affiliates; and

(III) the public company and the affiliates of the public company will comply with the tying prohibitions under paragraph (8).

(ii) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under clause (i) against the sharing of consumer information shall not apply to sharing of such information—

(I) to comply with Federal, State, or local laws, rules, and other applicable legal requirements;

(II) to comply with a properly authorized civil, criminal, or regulatory investigation, subpoena, or summons by a Federal, State, or local authority; or

(III) to respond to judicial process or a government regulatory authority having jurisdiction over the public company.

(C) EXTENSION OF PROHIBITION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Any company not domiciled in the United States or its Territories that is not predominantly engaged in 1 or more financial activities, may not issue a payment stablecoin unless the public company obtains a unanimous vote of the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee finding that—

(I) it will not pose a material risk to the safety and soundness of the United States banking system, the financial stability of the United States, or the Deposit Insurance Fund;

(II) the public company will comply with data use limitations providing that, unless the public company receives consent from the consumer, nonpublic personal information obtained from stablecoin transaction data may not be—

(aa) used to target, personalize, or rank advertising or other content;

(bb) sold to any third party; or

(cc) shared with non-affiliates; except

(III) the public company and the affiliates of the public company will comply with the tying prohibitions under paragraph (8).

(ii) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under clause (i) against the sharing of consumer information shall not apply to sharing of such information—

(I) to comply with Federal, State, or local laws, rules, and other applicable legal requirements;

(II) to comply with a properly authorized civil, criminal, or regulatory investigation, subpoena, or summons by a Federal, State, or local authority; or

(III) to respond to judicial process or a government regulatory authority having jurisdiction over the public company.

(D) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee shall issue an interpretive rule clarifying the application of this paragraph.

(13) ELIGIBILITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as expanding or contracting legal eligibility to receive services available from a Federal Reserve bank or to make deposits with a Federal Reserve bank, in each case pursuant to the Federal Reserve Act.

(14) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Compliance with this section does not alter or affect any additional requirement of a State payment stablecoin regulator that may apply relating to the offering of payment stablecoins.

(b) REGULATION BY THE COMPTROLLER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 5136C of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 25b), section 6 of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1465), or any applicable State law relating to licensing and supervision, a Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer approved by the Comptroller pursuant to section 5 of this Act shall be licensed, regulated, examined, and supervised exclusively by the Comptroller, which shall have authority, in coordination with other relevant primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators and State payment stablecoin regulators, to issue such regulations and orders as necessary to ensure financial stability and implement subsection (a).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 324(b) of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 1(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) REGULATION OF FEDERAL QUALIFIED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS.—The Comptroller of the Currency shall, in coordination with other relevant regulators and consistent with section 13 of the GENIUS Act, issue such regulations and orders as necessary to ensure financial stability and implement section 4(a) of that Act.”.

(c) STATE-LEVEL REGULATORY REGIMES.—

(1) OPTION FOR STATE-LEVEL REGULATORY REGIME.—Notwithstanding the Federal regulatory framework established under this Act, a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer with a consolidated total outstanding issuance of not more than \$10,000,000,000 may opt for regulation under a State-level regulatory regime, provided that the State-level regulatory regime is substantially similar to the Federal regulatory framework under this Act.

(2) PRINCIPLES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, through notice and comment rulemaking, establish broad-based principles for determining whether a State-level regulatory regime is substantially similar to the Federal regulatory framework under this Act.

(3) REVIEW.—State payment stablecoin regulators shall review State-level regulatory regimes according to the principles established by the Secretary of the Treasury under paragraph (2) and for the purposes of establishing any necessary cooperative agreements to implement section 7(f).

(4) CERTIFICATION.—

(A) INITIAL CERTIFICATION.—Subject to subparagraph (B), not later than 1 year after the effective date of this Act, a State payment stablecoin regulator shall submit to the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee an initial certification that the State-level

regulatory regime meets the criteria for substantial similarity established pursuant to paragraph (2).

(B) FORM OF CERTIFICATION.—The initial certification required under subparagraph (A) shall contain, in a form prescribed by the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee, an attestation that the State-level regulatory regime meets the criteria for substantial similarity established pursuant to paragraph (2).

(C) ANNUAL RECERTIFICATION.—Not later than a date to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury each year, a State payment stablecoin regulator shall submit to the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee an additional certification that confirms the accuracy of the initial certification submitted under subparagraph (A).

(5) CERTIFICATION REVIEW.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a State payment stablecoin regulator submits an initial certification or a recertification under paragraph (4), the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee shall—

(i) approve such certification if the Committee unanimously determines that the State-level regulatory regime meets or exceeds the standards and requirements described in subsection (a); or

(ii) deny such certification and provide the State payment stablecoin regulator with a written explanation of the denial, describing the reasoned basis for the denial with sufficient detail to enable the State payment stablecoin regulator and State-level regulatory regime to make any changes necessary to meet or exceed the standards and requirements described in subsection (a).

(B) RECERTIFICATIONS.—With respect to any recertification certification submitted by a State payment stablecoin regulator under paragraph (4), the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee shall only deny the recertification if—

(i) the State-level regulatory regime has materially changed from the prior certification or there has been a significant change in circumstances; and

(ii) the material change in the regime or significant change in circumstances described in clause (i) is such that the State-level regulatory regime will not promote the safe and sound operation of State qualified payment stablecoin issuers under its supervision.

(C) OPPORTUNITY TO CURE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a denial described under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee shall provide the State payment stablecoin regulator with not less than 180 days from the date on which the State payment stablecoin regulator is notified of such denial to—

(I) make such changes as may be necessary to ensure the State-level regulatory regime meets or exceeds the standards described in subsection (a); and

(II) resubmit the initial certification or recertification.

(ii) DENIAL.—If, after a State payment stablecoin regulator resubmits an initial certification or recertification under clause (i), the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee again determines that the initial certification or recertification shall result in a denial, the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee shall, not later than 30 days after such determination, provide the State payment stablecoin regulator with a written explanation for the determination.

(D) APPEAL OF DENIAL.—A State payment stablecoin regulator in receipt of a denial under subparagraph (C)(ii) may appeal the denial to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(E) RIGHT TO RESUBMIT.—A State payment stablecoin regulator in receipt of a denial under this paragraph shall not be prohibited from resubmitting a new certification under paragraph (4).

(6) LIST.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall publish and maintain in the Federal Register and on the website of the Department of the Treasury a list of States that have submitted initial certifications and recertifications under paragraph (4).

(7) EXPEDITED CERTIFICATIONS OF EXISTING REGULATORY REGIMES.—The Stablecoin Certification Review Committee shall take all necessary steps to endeavor that, with respect to a State that, within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act, has in effect a prudential regulatory regime (including regulations and guidance) for the supervision of digital assets or payment stablecoins, the certification process under this paragraph with respect to that regime occurs on an expedited timeline after the effective date of this Act.

(d) TRANSITION TO FEDERAL OVERSIGHT.—

(1) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—A State chartered depository institution that is a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer with a payment stablecoin with a consolidated total outstanding issuance of more than \$10,000,000,000 shall—

(A) not later than 360 days after the payment stablecoin reaches such threshold, transition to the Federal regulatory framework of the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator of the State chartered depository institution, which shall be administered by the State payment stablecoin regulator of the State chartered depository institution and the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator acting jointly; or

(B) beginning on the date the payment stablecoin reaches such threshold, cease issuing new payment stablecoins until the payment stablecoin is under the \$10,000,000,000 consolidated total outstanding issuance threshold.

(2) OTHER INSTITUTIONS.—A State qualified payment stablecoin issuer not described in paragraph (1) with a payment stablecoin with a consolidated total outstanding issuance of more than \$10,000,000,000 shall—

(A) not later than 360 days after the payment stablecoin reaches such threshold, transition to the Federal regulatory framework under subsection (a) administered by the relevant State payment stablecoin regulator and the Comptroller, acting in coordination; or

(B) beginning on the date the payment stablecoin reaches such threshold, cease issuing new payment stablecoins until the payment stablecoin is under the \$10,000,000,000 consolidated total outstanding issuance threshold.

(3) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), the applicable primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator may permit a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer with a payment stablecoin with a consolidated total outstanding issuance of more than \$10,000,000,000 to remain solely supervised by a State payment stablecoin regulator.

(B) CRITERIA FOR WAIVER.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall consider the following exclusive criteria in determining whether to issue a waiver under this paragraph:

(i) The capital maintained by the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer.

(ii) The past operations and examination history of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer.

(iii) The experience of the State payment stablecoin regulator in supervising payment stablecoin and digital asset activities.

(iv) The supervisory framework, including regulations and guidance, of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer with respect to payment stablecoins and digital assets.

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(i) FEDERAL OVERSIGHT.—A State qualified payment stablecoin issuer subject to Federal oversight under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection that does not receive a waiver under this paragraph shall continue to be supervised by the State payment stablecoin regulator of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer jointly with the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator. Nothing in this subsection shall require the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer to convert to a Federal charter.

(ii) STATE OVERSIGHT.—A State qualified payment stablecoin issuer supervised by a State payment stablecoin regulator that has established a prudential regulatory regime (including regulations and guidance) for the supervision of digital assets or payment stablecoins before the 90-day period ending on the date of enactment of this Act that has been certified pursuant to subsection (c) and has approved 1 or more issuers to issue payment stablecoins under the supervision of such State payment stablecoin regulator, shall be presumptively approved for a waiver under this paragraph, unless the Federal payment stablecoin regulator finds, by clear and convincing evidence, that the requirements of subparagraph (B) are not substantially met with respect to that issuer or that the issuer poses significant safety and soundness risks to the financial system of the United States.

(e) MISREPRESENTATION OF INSURED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Payment stablecoins shall not be backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, guaranteed by the United States Government, subject to deposit insurance by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or subject to share insurance by the National Credit Union Administration.

(2) MISREPRESENTATION OF INSURED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful to represent that payment stablecoins are backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, guaranteed by the United States Government, or subject to Federal deposit insurance or Federal share insurance.

(B) PENALTY.—A violation of subparagraph (A) shall be considered a violation of section 18(a)(4) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(a)(4)) or section 709 of title 18, United States Code, as applicable.

(3) MARKETING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful to market a product in the United States as a payment stablecoin unless the product is issued pursuant to this Act.

(B) PENALTY.—Whoever knowingly and willfully participates in a violation of subparagraph (A) shall be fined by the Department of the Treasury not more than \$500,000 for each such violation.

(C) DETERMINATION OF THE NUMBER OF VIOLATIONS.—For purposes of determining the number of violations for which to impose penalties under subparagraph (B), separate acts of noncompliance are a single violation when the acts are the result of—

(i) a common or substantially overlapping originating cause; or

(ii) the same statement or publication.

(D) REFERRAL TO SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—If a Federal payment stablecoin regulator has reason to believe that any person has knowingly and willfully violated subparagraph (A), the Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall refer the matter to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(f) OFFICERS OR DIRECTORS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN FELONIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No individual who has been convicted of a felony offense involving insider trading, embezzlement, cybercrime, money laundering, financing of terrorism, or financial fraud may serve as—

(A) an officer of a payment stablecoin issuer; or

(B) a director of a payment stablecoin issuer.

(2) PENALTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly participates in a violation of paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 for each such violation, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(B) REFERRAL TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—If a Federal payment stablecoin regulator has reason to believe that any person has knowingly violated paragraph (1), the Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall refer the matter to the Attorney General.

(g) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO FEDERAL SAVINGS ASSOCIATION RESERVES.—A Federal savings association established under the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1461 et seq.) that holds a reserve that satisfies the requirements of section 4(a)(1) shall not be required to satisfy the qualified thrift lender test under section 10(m) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a(m)) with respect to such reserve assets.

(h) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with section 13, the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators shall, and State payment stablecoin regulators may, issue such regulations relating to permitted payment stablecoin issuers as may be necessary to establish a payment stablecoin regulatory framework necessary to administer and carry out the requirements of this section, including to establish conditions, and to prevent evasion thereof.

(2) COORDINATED ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—All regulations issued to carry out this section shall be issued in coordination by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators, if not issued by a State payment stablecoin regulator.

(i) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) as expanding the authority of the Board with respect to the services the Board can make directly available to the public; or

(2) to limit or prevent the continued application of applicable ethics statutes and regulations administered by the Office of Government Ethics, or the ethics rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives, including section 208 of title 18, United States Code, and sections 2635.702 and 2635.802 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations. For the avoidance of doubt, existing Office of Government Ethics laws and the ethics rules of the Senate and the House of Representatives prohibit any member of Congress or senior executive branch official from issuing a payment stablecoin during their time in public service. For the purposes of this paragraph, an employee described in section 202 of title 18, United States Code, shall be deemed an executive branch employee for purposes of complying with section 208 of that title.

SEC. 5. APPROVAL OF SUBSIDIARIES OF INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS AND FEDERAL QUALIFIED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS.

(a) APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall—

(A) receive, review, and consider for approval applications from any insured depository institution that seeks to issue payment stablecoins through a subsidiary and any nonbank entity, Federal branch, or uninsured national bank that is chartered by the Comptroller pursuant to title LXII of the Revised Statutes, and that seeks to issue pay-

ment stablecoins as a Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer; and

(B) establish a process and framework for the licensing, regulation, examination, and supervision of such entities that prioritizes the safety and soundness of such entities.

(2) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS AND PROCESS APPLICATIONS.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators shall, before the date described in section 13—

(A) issue regulations consistent with that section to carry out this section; and

(B) pursuant to the regulations described in subparagraph (A), accept and process applications described in paragraph (1).

(3) MANDATORY APPROVAL PROCESS.—A primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall, upon receipt of a substantially complete application received under paragraph (1), evaluate and make a determination on each application based on the criteria established under this Act.

(b) EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS.—A substantially complete application received under subsection (a) shall be evaluated by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator using the factors described in subsection (c).

(c) FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED.—The factors described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The ability of the applicant (or, in the case of an applicant that is an insured depository institution, the subsidiary of the applicant), based on financial condition and resources, to meet the requirements set forth under section 4.

(2) Whether an individual who has been convicted of a felony offense involving insider trading, embezzlement, cybercrime, money laundering, financing of terrorism, or financial fraud is serving as an officer or director of the applicant.

(3) The competence, experience, and integrity of the officers, directors, and principal shareholders of the applicant, its subsidiaries, and parent company, including—

(A) the record of those officers, directors, and principal shareholders of compliance with laws and regulations; and

(B) the ability of those officers, directors, and principal shareholders to fulfill any commitments to, and any conditions imposed by, their primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator in connection with the application at issue and any prior applications.

(4) Whether the redemption policy of the applicant meets the standards under section 4(a)(1)(B).

(5) Any other factors established by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator that are necessary to ensure the safety and soundness of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(d) TIMING FOR DECISION; GROUNDS FOR DENIAL.—

(1) TIMING FOR DECISIONS ON APPLICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after receiving a substantially complete application under subsection (a), a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall render a decision on the application.

(B) SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an application shall be considered substantially complete if the application contains sufficient information for the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator to render a decision on whether the applicant satisfies the factors described in subsection (c).

(ii) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 30 days after receiving an application under subsection (a), a primary Federal payment

stablecoin regulator shall notify the applicant as to whether the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator considers the application to be substantially complete and, if the application is not substantially complete, the additional information the applicant shall provide in order for the application to be considered substantially complete.

(iii) **MATERIAL CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES.**—An application considered substantially complete under this subparagraph remains substantially complete unless there is a material change in circumstances that requires the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator to treat the application as a new application.

(2) **DENIAL OF APPLICATION.**—

(A) **GROUND FOR DENIAL.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall only deny a substantially complete application received under subsection (a) if the regulator determines that the activities of the applicant would be unsafe or unsound based on the factors described in subsection (c).

(ii) **ISSUANCE ON OPEN, PUBLIC, OR DECENTRALIZED NETWORK NOT GROUND FOR DENIAL.**—The issuance of a payment stablecoin on an open, public, or decentralized network shall not be a valid ground for denial of an application received under subsection (a).

(B) **EXPLANATION REQUIRED.**—If a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator denies a complete application received under subsection (a), not later than 30 days after the date of such denial, the regulator shall provide the applicant with written notice explaining the denial with specificity, including all findings made by the regulator with respect to all identified material shortcomings in the application, including actionable recommendations on how the applicant could address the identified material shortcomings.

(C) **OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING; FINAL DETERMINATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of any notice of the denial of an application under this section, the applicant may request, in writing, an opportunity for a written or oral hearing before the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator to appeal the denial.

(ii) **TIMING.**—Upon receipt of a timely request under clause (i), the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall notice a time (not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of the request) and place at which the applicant may appear, personally or through counsel, to submit written materials or provide oral testimony and oral argument.

(iii) **FINAL DETERMINATION.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of a hearing under this subparagraph, the applicable primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall notify the applicant of a final determination, which shall contain a statement of the basis for that determination, with specific findings.

(iv) **NOTICE IF NO HEARING.**—If an applicant does not make a timely request for a hearing under this subparagraph, the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall notify the applicant, not later than 10 days after the date by which the applicant may request a hearing under this subparagraph, in writing, that the denial of the application is a final determination of the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator.

(3) **FAILURE TO RENDER A DECISION.**—If a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator fails to render a decision on a complete application within the time period specified in paragraph (1), the application shall be deemed approved.

(4) **RIGHT TO REAPPLY.**—The denial of an application under this section shall not pro-

hibit the applicant from filing a subsequent application.

(e) **REPORTS ON PENDING APPLICATIONS.**—Each primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall—

(1) notify Congress upon beginning to process applications under this Act; and

(2) annually report to Congress on the applications that have been pending for 180 days or more since the date the initial application was filed and for which the applicant has been informed that the application remains incomplete, including documentation on the status of such applications and why such applications have not yet been approved.

(f) **SAFE HARBOR FOR PENDING APPLICATIONS.**—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators may waive the application of the requirements of this Act for a period not to exceed 12 months beginning on the effective date of this Act, with respect to—

(1) a subsidiary of an insured depository institution, if the insured depository institution has an application pending for the subsidiary to become a permitted payment stablecoin issuer on that effective date; or

(2) a Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer with a pending application on that effective date.

(g) **RULEMAKING.**—Consistent with section 13, the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators shall issue rules necessary for the regulation of the issuance of payment stablecoins, but may not impose requirements in addition to the requirements specified under section 4.

(h) **RELATION TO OTHER LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.**—The provisions of this section supersede and preempt any State requirement for a charter, license, or other authorization to do business with respect to a Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer or subsidiary of an insured depository institution or credit union that is approved under this section to be a permitted payment stablecoin issuer. Nothing in this subsection shall preempt or supersede the authority of a State to charter, license, supervise, or regulate an insured depository institution or credit union chartered in such State or to supervise a subsidiary of such insured depository institution or credit union that is approved under this section to be a permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(i) **CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the approval of an application, and on an annual basis thereafter, each permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall submit to its primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator, or in the case of a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer its State payment stablecoin regulator, a certification that the issuer has implemented anti-money laundering and economic sanctions compliance programs that are reasonably designed to prevent the permitted payment stablecoin issuer from facilitating money laundering, in particular, facilitating money laundering for cartels and organizations designated as foreign terrorist organizations under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) and the financing of terrorist activities, consistent with the requirements of this Act.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF CERTIFICATIONS.**—Federal payment stablecoin regulators and State payment stablecoin regulators shall make certifications described in paragraph (1) available to the Secretary of Treasury upon request.

(3) **PENALTIES.**—

(A) **APPROVAL REVOCATION.**—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator or State payment stablecoin regulator of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer that does

not submit a certification pursuant to paragraph (1) may revoke the approval of the payment stablecoin issuer under this section.

(B) **CRIMINAL PENALTY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person that knowingly submits a certification pursuant to paragraph (1) that is false shall be subject to the criminal penalties set forth under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

(ii) **REFERRAL TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—If a Federal payment stablecoin regulator or State payment stablecoin regulator has reason to believe that any person has knowingly violated paragraph (1), the applicable regulator may refer the matter to the Attorney General or to the attorney general of the payment stablecoin issuer's host State.

SEC. 6. SUPERVISION AND ENFORCEMENT WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL QUALIFIED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS AND SUBSIDIARIES OF INSURED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.

(a) **SUPERVISION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each permitted payment stablecoin issuer that is not a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer with a payment stablecoin with a consolidated total outstanding issuance of less than \$10,000,000,000 shall be subject to supervision by the appropriate primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator.

(2) **SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.**—Each permitted payment stablecoin issuer described in paragraph (1) shall, upon request, submit to the appropriate primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator a report on—

(A) the financial condition of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer;

(B) the systems of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer for monitoring and controlling financial and operating risks;

(C) compliance by the permitted payment stablecoin issuer (and any subsidiary thereof) with this Act; and

(D) the compliance of the Federal qualified nonbank payment stablecoin issuer with the requirements of the Bank Secrecy Act and with laws authorizing the imposition of sanctions and implemented by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(3) **EXAMINATIONS.**—The appropriate primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall examine a permitted payment stablecoin issuer described in paragraph (1) in order to assess—

(A) the nature of the operations and financial condition of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer;

(B) the financial, operational, technological, and other risks associated within the permitted payment stablecoin issuer that may pose a threat to—

(i) the safety and soundness of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer; or

(ii) the stability of the financial system of the United States; and

(C) the systems of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer for monitoring and controlling the risks described in subparagraph (B).

(4) **REQUIREMENTS FOR EFFICIENCY.**—

(A) **USE OF EXISTING REPORTS.**—In supervising and examining a permitted payment stablecoin issuer under this subsection, a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall, to the fullest extent possible, use existing reports and other supervisory information.

(B) **AVOIDANCE OF DUPLICATION.**—A primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall, to the fullest extent possible, avoid duplication of examination activities, reporting requirements, and requests for information in carrying out this subsection with respect to a permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(C) **CONSIDERATION OF BURDEN.**—A primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall, with respect to any examination or request

for the submission of a report under this subsection, only request examinations and reports at a cadence and in a format that is similar to that required for similarly situated entities regulated by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF REGISTRATION.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer that is not a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer with a payment stablecoin with a consolidated total outstanding issuance of less than \$10,000,000,000 may prohibit the permitted payment stablecoin issuer from issuing payment stablecoins, if the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator determines that such permitted payment stablecoin issuer, or an institution-affiliated party of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer is willfully or recklessly violating or has willfully or recklessly violated—

(A) this Act or any regulation or order issued under this Act; or

(B) any condition imposed in writing by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator in connection with a written agreement entered into between the permitted payment stablecoin issuer and the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator.

(2) CEASE-AND-DESIST PROCEEDINGS.—If the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer that is not a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer with a payment stablecoin with a consolidated total outstanding issuance of less than \$10,000,000,000 has reasonable cause to believe that the permitted payment stablecoin issuer or any institution-affiliated party of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer is violating, has violated, or is attempting to violate this Act, any regulation or order issued under this Act, or any written agreement entered into with the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator or condition imposed in writing by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator in connection with any application or other request, the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator may, by provisions that are mandatory or otherwise, order the permitted payment stablecoin issuer or institution-affiliated party of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer to—

(A) cease and desist from such violation or practice; or

(B) take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from any such violation or practice.

(3) REMOVAL AND PROHIBITION AUTHORITY.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer that is not a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer may remove an institution-affiliated party of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer from the position or office of that institution-affiliated party or prohibit further participation in the affairs of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer or of all such permitted payment stablecoin issuers by that institution-affiliated party, if the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator determines that—

(A) the institution-affiliated party has knowingly committed a violation or attempted violation of this Act or any regulation or order issued under this Act; or

(B) the institution-affiliated party has knowingly committed a violation of any provision of subchapter II of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code.

(4) PROCEDURES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator identifies a violation or attempted violation of this Act or makes a determination under paragraph (1),

(2), or (3), the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator shall comply with the procedures set forth in subsections (b) and (e) of section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818) or subsections (e) and (g) of section 206 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(e) and (g)), as applicable.

(B) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A person aggrieved by a final action under this subsection may obtain judicial review of such action exclusively as provided in section 8(h) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(h)) or section 206(j) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(j)), as applicable.

(C) INJUNCTION.—A primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator may, at the discretion of the regulator, follow the procedures provided in section 8(i)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(i)(1)) or section 206(k)(1) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(k)(1)), as applicable, for judicial enforcement of any effective and outstanding notice or order issued under this subsection.

(D) TEMPORARY CEASE-AND-DESIST PROCEEDINGS.—If a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator determines that a violation or attempted violation of this Act or an action with respect to which a determination was made under paragraph (1), (2), or (3), or the continuation thereof, is likely to cause insolvency or significant dissipation of assets or earnings of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, or is likely to weaken the condition of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer or otherwise prejudice the interests of the customers of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer prior to the completion of the proceedings conducted under this paragraph, the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator may follow the procedures provided in section 8(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(c)) or section 206(f) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(f)), as applicable, to issue a temporary cease and desist order.

(5) CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.—Unless otherwise specified in this Act, the civil money penalties for violations of this Act consist of the following:

(A) FAILURE TO BE APPROVED.—Any person that issues a United States dollar-denominated payment stablecoin in violation of section 3, and any institution-affiliated party of such a person who knowingly participates in issuing such a payment stablecoin, shall be liable for a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000 for each day during which such payment stablecoins are issued.

(B) FIRST TIER.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A), a permitted payment stablecoin issuer or institution-affiliated party of such permitted payment stablecoin issuer that materially violates this Act or any regulation or order issued under this Act, or that materially violates any condition imposed in writing by the appropriate primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator in connection with a written agreement entered into between the permitted payment stablecoin issuer and that primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator, shall be liable for a civil penalty of not more than \$100,000 for each day during which the violation continues.

(C) SECOND TIER.—Except as provided in subparagraph (A), and in addition to the penalties described in subparagraph (B), a permitted payment stablecoin issuer or institution-affiliated party of such permitted payment stablecoin issuer who knowingly participates in a violation of any provision of this Act, or any regulation or order issued under this Act, shall be liable for a civil penalty of not more than an additional \$100,000 for each day during which the violation continues.

(D) PROCEDURE.—Any penalty imposed under this paragraph may be assessed and collected by the appropriate primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator pursuant to the procedures set forth in section 8(i)(2) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(i)(2)) or section 206(k)(2) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1786(k)(2)), as applicable.

(E) NOTICE AND ORDERS AFTER SEPARATION FROM SERVICE.—The resignation, termination of employment or participation, or separation of an institution-affiliated party (including a separation caused by the closing of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer) shall not affect the jurisdiction and authority of a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator to issue any notice or order and proceed under this subsection against any such party, if such notice or order is served before the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date on which such party ceased to be an institution-affiliated party with respect to such permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

(6) NON-APPLICABILITY TO A STATE QUALIFIED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUER.—Notwithstanding anything in this subsection to the contrary, this subsection shall not apply to a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to modify or otherwise affect any right or remedy under any Federal consumer financial law, including 12 U.S.C. 5515 and 15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.

SEC. 7. STATE QUALIFIED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State payment stablecoin regulator shall have supervisory, examination, and enforcement authority over all State qualified payment stablecoin issuers of such State.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH THE BOARD.—A State payment stablecoin regulator may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Board, by mutual agreement, under which the Board may participate in the supervision, examination, and enforcement of this Act with respect to the State qualified payment stablecoin issuers of such State.

(c) SHARING OF INFORMATION.—A State payment stablecoin regulator and the Board shall share information on an ongoing basis with respect to a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer of such State, including a copy of the initial application and any accompanying documents.

(d) RULEMAKING.—A State payment stablecoin regulator may issue orders and rules under section 4 applicable to State qualified payment stablecoin issuers to the same extent as the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators issue orders and rules under section 4 applicable to permitted payment stablecoin issuers that are not State qualified payment stablecoin issuers.

(e) ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY IN UNUSUAL AND EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES.—

(1) BOARD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), under unusual and exigent circumstances that the Board determines to exist, the Board may, after not less than 48 hours' prior written notice to the applicable State payment stablecoin regulator, take an enforcement action against a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer or an institution-affiliated party of such issuer for violations of this Act during such unusual and exigent circumstances.

(B) RULEMAKING.—Consistent with section 13, the Board shall issue rules to set forth the unusual and exigent circumstances in which the Board may act under this paragraph.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—If, after unusual and exigent circumstances are determined to exist pursuant to subparagraph (A), the Board determines that there is reasonable cause to

believe that the continuation by a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer of any activity constitutes a serious risk to the financial safety, soundness, or stability of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, the Board may impose such restrictions as the Board determines to be necessary to address such risk during such unusual and exigent circumstances, which may include limitations on redemptions of payment stablecoins, and which shall be issued in the form of a directive, with the effect of a cease and desist order that has become final, to the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer and any of its affiliates, limiting—

(i) transactions between the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, a holding company, and the subsidiaries or affiliates of either the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer or the holding company; and

(ii) any activities of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer that might create a serious risk that the liabilities of a holding company and the affiliates of the holding company may be imposed on the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer.

(D) REVIEW OF DIRECTIVE.—

(i) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—After a directive described in subparagraph (C) is issued, the applicable State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, or any institution-affiliated party of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer subject to the directive, may object and present to the Board, in writing, the reasons why the directive should be modified or rescinded.

(II) AUTOMATIC LAPSE OF DIRECTIVE.—If, after 10 days after the receipt of a response described in subclause (I), the Board does not affirm, modify, or rescind the directive, the directive shall automatically lapse.

(ii) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—If the Board affirms or modifies a directive pursuant to clause (i), any affected party may immediately thereafter petition the United States district court for the district in which the main office of the affected party is located, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to stay, modify, terminate, or set aside the directive.

(II) RELIEF FOR EXTRAORDINARY CAUSE.—Upon a showing of extraordinary cause, an affected party may petition for relief under subclause (I) without first pursuing or exhausting the administrative remedies under clause (i).

(2) COMPTROLLER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), under unusual and exigent circumstances determined to exist by the Comptroller, the Comptroller shall, after not less than 48 hours' prior written notice to the applicable State payment stablecoin regulator, take an enforcement action against a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer that is a nonbank entity for violations of this Act.

(B) RULEMAKING.—Consistent with section 13, the Comptroller shall issue rules to set forth the unusual and exigent circumstances in which the Comptroller may act under this paragraph.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—If, after unusual and exigent circumstances are determined to exist under subparagraph (A), the Comptroller determines that there is reasonable cause to believe that the continuation of any activity by a State qualified payment stablecoin issuer that is a nonbank entity constitutes a serious risk to the financial safety, soundness, or stability of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer that is a nonbank entity, the Comptroller shall impose such restrictions as the Comptroller determines to be necessary to address such risk during such unusual and exigent circumstances,

which may include limitations on redemption of payment stablecoins, and which shall be issued in the form of a directive, with the effect of a cease and desist order that has become final, to the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer that is a nonbank entity and any of its affiliates, limiting—

(i) transactions between the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer, a holding company, and the subsidiaries or affiliates of either the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer or the holding company; and

(ii) any activities of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer that might create a serious risk that the liabilities of a holding company and the affiliates of the holding company may be imposed on the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer.

(D) REVIEW OF DIRECTIVE.—

(i) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—After a directive described in subparagraph (C) is issued, the applicable Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer, or any institution-affiliated party of the Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer subject to the directive, may object and present to the Comptroller, in writing, the reasons that the directive should be modified or rescinded.

(II) AUTOMATIC LAPSE OF DIRECTIVE.—If, after 10 days after the receipt of a response described in subclause (I), the Comptroller does not affirm, modify, or rescind the directive, the directive shall automatically lapse.

(ii) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—If the Comptroller affirms or modifies a directive pursuant to clause (i), any affected party may immediately thereafter petition the United States district court for the district in which the main office of the affected party is located, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to stay, modify, terminate, or set aside the directive.

(II) RELIEF FOR EXTRAORDINARY CAUSE.—Upon a showing of extraordinary cause, an affected party may petition for relief under subclause (I) without first pursuing or exhausting the administrative remedies under clause (i).

(f) EFFECT ON STATE LAW.—

(1) HOST STATE LAW.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the laws of a host State, including laws relating to consumer protection, shall only apply to the activities conducted in the host State by an out-of-State State qualified payment stablecoin issuer to the same extent as such laws apply to the activities conducted in the host State by an out-of-State Federal qualified payment stablecoin issuer.

(2) HOME STATE LAW.—If any host State law is determined not to apply under paragraph (1), the laws of the home State of the State qualified payment stablecoin issuer shall govern the activities of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer conducted in the host State.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall only apply to an out-of-State State qualified payment stablecoin issuer chartered, licensed, or otherwise authorized to do business by a State that has a certification in place pursuant to section 4(c) of this Act.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The laws applicable to an out-of-State qualified payment stablecoin issuer under paragraph (1) exclude host State laws governing the chartering, licensure, or other authorization to do business in the host State as a permitted payment stablecoin issuer pursuant to this Act.

(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Except for State laws relating to the chartering, licensure, or other authorization to do business as a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, nothing in this Act shall preempt State consumer

protection laws, including common law, and the remedies available thereunder.

SEC. 8. ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING PROTECTIONS.

(a) PAYMENT STABLECOINS ISSUED BY A FOREIGN PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A payment stablecoin that is issued by a foreign payment stablecoin issuer may not be publicly offered, sold, or otherwise made available for trading in the United States by a digital asset service provider unless the foreign payment stablecoin issuer has the technological capability to comply and complies with the terms of any lawful order.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall have the authority to designate any foreign issuer that publicly offers, sells, or otherwise makes available a payment stablecoin in violation of paragraph (1) as noncompliant.

(B) DESIGNATION AS NONCOMPLIANT.—Not later than 30 days after the Department of the Treasury has identified a foreign payment stablecoin issuer of any payment stablecoin trading in the United States that is in violation of paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with relevant Federal agencies, may, pursuant to the authority under subparagraph (A), designate the foreign payment stablecoin issuer as noncompliant and notify the foreign payment stablecoin issuer in writing of the designation.

(3) APPEAL.—A determination of non-compliance under this subsection is subject to judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

(b) PUBLICATION OF DESIGNATION; PROHIBITION ON SECONDARY TRADING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a foreign payment stablecoin issuer does not come into compliance with the lawful order within 30 days from the date of issuance of the written notice described in subsection (a), except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary of the Treasury shall—

(A) publish the determination of non-compliance in the Federal Register, including a statement on the failure of the foreign payment stablecoin issuer to comply with the lawful order after the written notice; and

(B) issue a notification in the Federal Register prohibiting digital asset service providers from facilitating secondary trading of payment stablecoins issued by the foreign payment stablecoin issuer in the United States.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF PROHIBITION.—The prohibition on facilitation of secondary trading described in paragraph (1) shall become effective on the date that is 30 days after the date of issue of notification of the prohibition in the Federal Register.

(3) EXPIRATION OF PROHIBITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition on facilitation of secondary trading described in paragraph (1)(B) shall expire upon the Secretary of the Treasury's determination that the foreign payment stablecoin issuer is no longer noncompliant.

(B) RULEMAKING.—Consistent with section 13, the Secretary of the Treasury shall specify the criteria that a noncompliant foreign issuer must meet for the Secretary of the Treasury to determine that the foreign payment stablecoin issuer is no longer non-compliant.

(C) PUBLICATION.—Upon a determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury shall publish the determination in the Federal Register, including a statement detailing how the foreign payment stablecoin issuer has met the criteria described in subparagraph (B).

(4) CIVIL MONETARY PENALTIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury may impose a civil monetary penalty as follows:

(A) DIGITAL ASSET SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Any digital asset service provider that knowingly violates a prohibition under paragraph (1)(B) shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty of not more than \$100,000 per violation per day.

(B) FOREIGN PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS.—Any foreign payment stablecoin issuer that knowingly continues to publicly offer a payment stablecoin in the United States after publication of the determination of noncompliance under paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to a civil monetary penalty of not more than \$1,000,000 per violation per day, and the Secretary of the Treasury may seek an injunction in a district court of the United States to bar the foreign payment stablecoin issuer from engaging in financial transactions in the United States or with United States persons.

(C) DETERMINATION OF THE NUMBER OF VIOLATIONS.—For purposes of determining the number of violations for which to impose a penalty under subparagraph (A) or (B), separate acts of noncompliance are a single violation when the acts are the result of a common or substantially overlapping originating cause. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Secretary of Treasury may determine that multiple acts of noncompliance constitute separate violations if such acts were the result of gross negligence, a reckless disregard for, or a pattern of indifference to, money laundering, financing of terrorism, or sanctions evasion requirements.

(D) COMMENCEMENT OF CIVIL ACTIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may commence a civil action against a foreign payment stablecoin issuer in a district court of the United States to—

(i) recover a civil monetary penalty assessed under subparagraph (A) or (B);

(ii) seek an injunction to bar the foreign payment stablecoin issuer from engaging in financial transactions in the United States or with United States persons; or

(iii) seek an injunction to stop a digital asset service provider from offering on the platform of the digital asset service provider payment stablecoins issued by the foreign payment stablecoin issuer.

(C) WAIVER AND LICENSING AUTHORITY EXEMPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may offer a waiver, general license, or specific license to any United States person engaging in secondary trading described in subsection (b)(1)(B) on a case-by-case basis if the Secretary determines that—

(A) prohibiting secondary trading would adversely affect the financial system of the United States; or

(B) the foreign payment stablecoin issuer is taking tangible steps to remedy the failure to comply with the lawful order that resulted in the noncompliance determination under subsection (a).

(2) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, may waive the application of the secondary trading restrictions under subsection (b)(1)(B) if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(3) WAIVER FOR INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—The head of a department or agency may waive the application of this section with respect to—

(A) activities subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or any authorized intelligence activities of the United States; or

(B) activities necessary to carry out or assist law enforcement activity of the United States.

(4) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 7 days after issuing a waiver or a license under paragraph (1), (2), or (3), the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the chairs and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, a report, which may include a classified annex, if applicable, including the text of the waiver or license, as well as the facts and circumstances justifying the waiver determination, and provide a briefing on the report.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as altering the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to block, restrict, or limit transactions involving payment stablecoins that reference or are denominated in United States dollars that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

SEC. 9. ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING INNOVATION.

(a) PUBLIC COMMENT.—Beginning on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall seek public comment to identify innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies that regulated financial institutions use, or have the potential to use, to detect illicit activity, such as money laundering, involving digital assets, including comments with respect to—

- (1) application program interfaces;
- (2) artificial intelligence;
- (3) digital identity verification; and
- (4) use of blockchain technology and monitoring.

(b) TREASURY RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Upon completion of the public comment period described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury shall conduct research on the innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies that regulated financial institutions use, or have the potential to use, to detect illicit activity, such as money laundering, involving digital assets that were identified in such public comment period.

(2) RESEARCH FACTORS.—With respect to each innovative or novel method, technique, or strategy described in paragraph (1), the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network shall evaluate and consider the following factors against existing methods, techniques, or strategies:

(A) Improvements in the ability of financial institutions to detect illicit activity involving digital assets.

(B) Costs to regulated financial institutions.

(C) The amount and sensitivity of information that is collected or reviewed.

(D) Privacy risks associated with the information that is collected or reviewed.

(E) Operational challenges and efficiency considerations.

(F) Cybersecurity risks.

(G) Effectiveness of methods, techniques, or strategies at mitigating illicit finance.

(c) TREASURY RISK ASSESSMENT.—As part of the national strategy for combating terrorist and other illicit financing required under sections 261 and 262 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44; 131 Stat. 934), the Secretary of the Treasury shall consider—

(1) the source of illicit activity, such as money laundering and sanctions evasion involving digital assets;

(2) the effectiveness of and gaps in existing methods, techniques, and strategies used by regulated financial institutions in detecting illicit activity, such as money laundering, involving digital assets;

(3) the impact of existing regulatory frameworks on the use and development of innovative methods, techniques, or strategies by regulated financial institutions; and

(4) any foreign jurisdictions that pose a high risk of facilitating illicit activity through the use of digital assets to obtain fiat currency.

(d) FINCEN GUIDANCE OR RULEMAKING.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network shall issue public guidance and notice and comment rulemaking, based on the results of the research and risk assessments required under this section, relating to the following:

(1) The implementation of innovative or novel methods, techniques, or strategies by regulated financial institutions to detect illicit activity involving digital assets.

(2) Standards for payment stablecoin issuers to identify and report illicit activity involving the payment stablecoin of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, including, fraud, cybercrime, money laundering, financing of terrorism, sanctions evasion, or insider trading.

(3) Standards for payment stablecoin issuers' systems and practices to monitor transactions on blockchains, digital asset mixing services, tumblers, or other similar services that mix payment stablecoins in such a way as to make such transaction or the identity of the transaction parties less identifiable.

(4) Tailored risk management standards for financial institutions interacting with decentralized finance protocols.

(e) RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the chairs and ranking members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on—

(A) legislative and regulatory proposals to allow regulated financial institutions to develop and implement novel and innovative methods, techniques, or strategies to detect illicit activity, such as money laundering and sanctions evasion, involving digital assets;

(B) the results of the research and risk assessments conducted pursuant to this section;

(C) efforts to support the ability of financial institutions to implement novel and innovative methods, techniques, or strategies to detect illicit activity, such as money laundering and sanctions evasion, involving digital assets;

(D) the extent to which transactions on distributed ledgers, digital asset mixing services, tumblers, or other similar services that mix payment stablecoins in such a way as to make such transaction or the identity of the transaction parties less identifiable may facilitate illicit activity; and

(E) legislative recommendations relating to the scope of the term “digital asset service provider” and the application of that term to decentralized finance.

(2) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—A report under this section may include a classified annex, if applicable.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the existing authority of the Secretary of the Treasury or the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators to, prior to the submission of a report required under this section, use existing exemptive authorities, the no-action letter process, or rulemaking authorities in a manner that encourages regulated

financial institutions to adopt novel or innovative methods, techniques, or strategies to detect illicit activity, such as money laundering, involving digital assets.

SEC. 10. CUSTODY OF PAYMENT STABLECOIN RESERVE AND COLLATERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A person may only engage in the business of providing custodial or safekeeping services for the payment stablecoin reserve, the payment stablecoins used as collateral, or the private keys used to issue permitted payment stablecoins if the person—

(1) is subject to—

(A) supervision or regulation by a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator or a primary financial regulatory agency described under subparagraph (B) or (C) of section 2(12) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301(12)); or

(B) supervision by a State bank supervisor, as defined under section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813), or a State credit union supervisor, as defined under section 6003 of the Anti-Money Laundering Act of 2020 (31 U.S.C. 5311 note), and such State bank supervisor or State credit union supervisor makes available to the Board such information as the Board determines necessary and relevant to the categories of information under subsection (d); and

(2) complies with the requirements under subsection (b), unless such person holds such property in accordance with similar requirements as required by a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

(b) CUSTOMER PROPERTY REQUIREMENT.—A person described in subsection (a) shall, with respect to other property described in that subsection—

(1) treat and deal with the payment stablecoins, private keys, cash, and other property of a person for whom or on whose behalf the person described in that subsection receives, acquires, or holds payment stablecoins, private keys, cash, and other property (hereinafter referred to in this section as the “customer”) as belonging to such customer and not as the property of such person; and

(2) take such steps as are appropriate to protect the payment stablecoins, private keys, cash, and other property of a customer from the claims of creditors of the person.

(c) COMMINGLING PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Payment stablecoin reserves, payment stablecoins, cash, and other property of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer or customer shall be separately accounted for by a person described in subsection (a) and shall be segregated from and not be commingled with the assets of the person.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1) or subsection (b)—

(A) the payment stablecoin reserves, payment stablecoins, cash, and other property of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer or customer may, for convenience, be commingled and deposited in an omnibus account holding the payment stablecoin reserves, payment stablecoins, cash, and other property of more than 1 permitted payment stablecoin issuer or customer at a State chartered depository institution, an insured depository institution, national bank, or trust company, and any payment stablecoin reserves in the form of cash held in the form of a deposit liability at a depository institution shall not be subject to any requirement relating to the separation of such cash from the property of the applicable depository institution;

(B) such share of the payment stablecoin reserves, payment stablecoins, cash, and other property of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer or customer that shall be necessary to transfer, adjust, or settle a transaction or transfer of assets may be withdrawn and applied to such purposes, including the payment of commissions, taxes, storage, and other charges lawfully accruing in connection with the provision of services by a person described in subsection (a);

(C) in accordance with such terms and conditions as a primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator may prescribe by rule, regulation, or order, any payment stablecoin reserves, payment stablecoins, cash, and other property described in this subsection may be commingled and deposited in permitted payment stablecoin issuer or customer accounts with payment stablecoin reserves, payment stablecoins, cash, and other property received by the person and required by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator to be separately accounted for, treated as, and dealt with as belonging to such permitted payment stablecoin issuers or customers; or

(D) an insured depository institution that provides custodial or safekeeping services for payment stablecoin reserves shall be permitted to hold payment stablecoin reserves in the form of cash on deposit provided such treatment is consistent with Federal law.

(3) CUSTOMER PRIORITY.—With respect to payment stablecoins held by a person described in subsection (a) for a customer, with or without the segregation required under paragraph (1), the claims of the customer against such person with respect to such payment stablecoins shall have priority over the claims of any person other than the claims of another customer with respect to payment stablecoins held by such person described in subsection (a), unless the customer expressly consents to the priority of such other claim.

(d) REGULATORY INFORMATION.—A person described under subsection (a) shall submit to the applicable primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator information concerning the person's business operations and processes to protect customer assets, in such form and manner as the primary regulator shall determine.

(e) EXCLUSION.—The requirements of this section shall not apply to any person solely on the basis that such person engages in the business of providing hardware or software to facilitate a customer's own custody or safekeeping of the customer's payment stablecoins or private keys.

SEC. 11. TREATMENT OF PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS IN INSOLVENCY PROCEEDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 507(e) of title 11, United States Code, as added by subsection (d), in any insolvency proceeding of a permitted payment stablecoin issuer under Federal or State law, including any proceeding under that title and any insolvency proceeding administered by a State payment stablecoin regulator with respect to a permitted payment stablecoin issuer—

(1) the claim of a person holding payment stablecoins issued by the permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall have priority, on a ratable basis with the claims of other persons holding such payment stablecoins, over the claims of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer and any other holder of claims against the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, with respect to required payment stablecoin reserves;

(2) notwithstanding any other provision of law, including the definition of “claim” under section 101(5) of title 11, United States Code, any person holding a payment stablecoin issued by the permitted payment

stablecoin issuer shall be deemed to hold a claim; and

(3) the priority under paragraph (1) shall not apply to claims other than those arising directly from the holding of payment stablecoins.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 101 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding after paragraph (40B) the following:

“(40C) The terms ‘payment stablecoin’ and ‘permitted payment stablecoin issuer’ have the meanings given those terms in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.”

(c) AUTOMATIC STAY.—Section 362 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking “and”;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(9) the redemption of payment stablecoins issued by the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, from payment stablecoin reserves required to be maintained under section 4 of the GENIUS Act.”; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B)(ii), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (4)(B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

“(5) with respect to the redemption of payment stablecoins held by a person, if the court finds, subject to the motion and attestation of the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, which shall be filed on the petition date or as soon as practicable thereafter, there are payment stablecoin reserves available for distribution on a ratable basis to similarly situated payment stablecoin holders, provided that the court shall use best efforts to enter a final order to begin distributions under this paragraph not later than 14 days after the date of the required hearing.”

(d) PRIORITY IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS.—Section 507 of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The following” and inserting “Subject to subsection (e), the following”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if a payment stablecoin holder is not able to redeem all outstanding payment stablecoin claims from required payment stablecoin reserves maintained by the permitted payment stablecoin issuer, any such remaining claim arising from a person's holding of a payment stablecoin issued by the permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall be a claim against the estate and shall have first priority over any other claim, including over any expenses and claims that have priority under that subsection, to the extent compliance with section 4 of the GENIUS Act would have required additional reserves to be maintained by the permitted payment stablecoin issuer for payment stablecoin holders.”

(e) PAYMENT STABLECOIN RESERVES.—Section 541(b) of title 11, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (9), in the matter following subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (10)(C), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following:

“(11) required payment stablecoin reserves under section 4 of the GENIUS Act, provided that notwithstanding the exclusion of such reserves from the property of the estate, section 362 of this title shall apply to such reserves.”

(f) INTERVENTION.—Section 1109 of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) The Comptroller of the Currency or State payment stablecoin regulator (as defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act) shall raise, and shall appear and be heard on, any issue, including the protection of customers, in a case under this chapter in which the debtor is a permitted payment stablecoin issuer.”.

(g) APPLICATION OF EXISTING INSOLVENCY LAW.—In accordance with otherwise applicable law, an insolvency proceeding with respect to a permitted payment stablecoin issuer shall occur as follows:

(1) A depository institution (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)) shall be resolved by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Credit Union Administration, or State payment stablecoin regulator, as applicable.

(2) A subsidiary of a depository institution (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)) or a nonbank entity may be considered a debtor under title 11, United States Code.

(h) STUDY BY PRIMARY FEDERAL PAYMENT STABLECOIN REGULATORS.—

(1) STUDY REQUIRED.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators shall perform a study of the potential insolvency proceedings of permitted payment stablecoin issuers, including an examination of—

(A) existing gaps in the bankruptcy laws and rules for permitted payment stablecoin issuers;

(B) the ability of payment stablecoin holders to be paid out in full in the event a permitted payment stablecoin issuer is insolvent; and

(C) the utility of orderly insolvency administration regimes and whether any additional authorities are needed to implement such regimes.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains all findings of the study under paragraph (1), including any legislative recommendations.

SEC. 12. INTEROPERABILITY STANDARDS.

The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators, in consultation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, other relevant standard-setting organizations, and State bank and credit union regulators, shall assess and, if necessary, may, pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code, and in a manner consistent with the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (Public Law 104-113), prescribe standards for permitted payment stablecoin issuers to promote compatibility and interoperability with—

(1) other permitted payment stablecoin issuers; and

(2) the broader digital finance ecosystem, including accepted communications protocols and blockchains, permissioned or public.

SEC. 13. RULEMAKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each primary Federal payment stablecoin regulator, the Secretary of the Treasury, and each State payment stablecoin regulator shall promulgate regulations to carry out this Act through appropriate notice and comment rulemaking.

(b) COORDINATION.—Federal payment stablecoin regulators, the Secretary of the Treasury, and State payment stablecoin regulators should coordinate, as appropriate, on the issuance of any regulations to implement this Act.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the effective date of this Act, each

Federal banking agency shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that confirms and describes the regulations promulgated to carry out this Act.

SEC. 14. STUDY ON NON-PAYMENT STABLECOINS.

(a) STUDY BY TREASURY.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Board, the Comptroller, the Corporation, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall carry out a study of non-payment stablecoins, including endogenously collateralized payment stablecoins.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report that contains all findings made in carrying out the study under paragraph (1), including an analysis of—

(A) the categories of non-payment stablecoins, including the benefits and risks of technological design features;

(B) the participants in non-payment stablecoin arrangements;

(C) utilization and potential utilization of non-payment stablecoins;

(D) the nature of reserve compositions;

(E) types of algorithms being employed;

(F) governance structure, including aspects of decentralization;

(G) the nature of public promotion and advertising; and

(H) the clarity and availability of consumer notices disclosures.

(3) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—A report under this section may include a classified annex, if applicable.

(b) ENDOGENOUSLY COLLATERALIZED PAYMENT STABLECOIN DEFINED.—In this section, the term “endogenously collateralized payment stablecoin” means any digital asset—

(1) the originator of which has represented will be converted, redeemed, or repurchased for a fixed amount of monetary value; and

(2) that relies solely on the value of another digital asset created or maintained by the same originator to maintain the fixed price.

SEC. 15. REPORTS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Beginning on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators, in consultation with State payment stablecoin regulators, as necessary, shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Director of the Office of Financial Research a report, which may include a classified annex, if applicable, on the status of the payment stablecoin industry, including—

(1) a summary of trends in payment stablecoin activities;

(2) a summary of the number of applications for approval as a permitted payment stablecoin issuer under section 5, including aggregate approvals and rejections of applications; and

(3) a description of the potential financial stability risks posed to the safety and soundness of the broader financial system by payment stablecoin activities.

(b) FSOC REPORT.—The Financial Stability Oversight Council shall incorporate the findings in the report under subsection (a) into the annual report of the Council required under section 112(a)(2)(N) of the Financial Stability Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5322(a)(2)(N)).

SEC. 16. AUTHORITY OF BANKING INSTITUTIONS.

(a) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to limit the authority of a depository institution, Federal credit union, State credit union, national bank, or trust company to engage in activities permissible pursuant to applicable State and Federal law, including—

(1) accepting or receiving deposits or shares (in the case of a credit union), and issuing digital assets that represent those deposits or shares;

(2) utilizing a distributed ledger for the books and records of the entity and to effect intrabank transfers; and

(3) providing custodial services for payment stablecoins, private keys of payment stablecoins, or reserves backing payment stablecoins.

(b) REGULATORY REVIEW.—Entities regulated by the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators are authorized to engage in the payment stablecoin activities and investments contemplated by this Act, including acting as a principal or agent with respect to any payment stablecoin and payment of fees to facilitate customer transactions. The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators shall review all existing guidance and regulations, and if necessary, amend or promulgate new regulations and guidance, to clarify that regulated entities are authorized to engage in such activities and investments.

(c) TREATMENT OF CUSTODY ACTIVITIES.—The appropriate Federal banking agency, the National Credit Union Administration (in the case of a credit union), and the Securities and Exchange Commission may not require a depository institution, national bank, Federal credit union, State credit union, or trust company, or any affiliate thereof—

(1) to include digital assets held in custody that are not owned by the entity as a liability on the financial statement or balance sheet of the entity, including payment stablecoin custody or safekeeping activities; or

(2) to hold in custody or safekeeping regulatory capital against digital assets and reserves backing such assets described in section 4(a)(1)(A), except as necessary to mitigate against operational risks inherent in custody or safekeeping services, as determined by—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agency;

(B) the National Credit Union Administration (in the case of a credit union);

(C) a State bank supervisor; or

(D) a State credit union supervisor.

(d) STATE-CHARTERED DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A depository institution chartered under the banking laws of a State, that has a subsidiary that is a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, may engage in the business of money transmission or provide custodial services through the permitted payment stablecoin issuer in any State if such State-chartered depository institution is—

(A) required by the laws or regulations of the home State to establish and maintain adequate liquidity, and such liquidity is regularly reassessed by the home State banking supervisor to take into account any changes in the financial condition and risk profile of the institution, including any uninsured deposits maintained by such institution; and

(B) required by the laws or regulations of the home State to establish and maintain adequate capital, and such capital is regularly reassessed by the home State banking supervisor to take into account any changes in the financial condition and risk profile of the institution, including any uninsured deposits maintained by such institution.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall limit, or be construed to limit, the authority of a host State bank regulator, to perform examinations of a depository institution's subsidiary permitted payment stablecoin issuer or activities conducted through the permitted payment stablecoin issuer to ensure compliance with host State consumer protection laws that the host State bank regulator has specific jurisdiction to enforce, which shall apply to such institution consistent with section 7(f).

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **HOME STATE.**—The term “home State” means the State by which the depository institution is chartered.

(2) **HOST STATE.**—The term “host State” means a State in which a depository institution establishes a branch, solicits customers, or otherwise engages in business activities, other than the home State.

SEC. 17. AMENDMENTS TO CLARIFY THAT PAYMENT STABLECOINS ARE NOT SECURITIES OR COMMODITIES AND PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS ARE NOT INVESTMENT COMPANIES.

(a) **INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.**—Section 202(a)(18) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)(18)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include a payment stablecoin issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, as such terms are defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.”.

(b) **INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940.**—The Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-1 et seq.) is amended

(1) in section 2(a)(36) of the Act (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(36)), by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include a payment stablecoin issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, as such terms are defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.”; and

(2) in section 3(c)(3) of the Act (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)(3)), by inserting “any permitted payment stablecoin issuer, as such term is defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act;” after “thereof;”.

(c) **SECURITIES ACT OF 1933.**—Section 2(a)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include a payment stablecoin issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, as such terms are defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.”.

(d) **SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**—Section 3(a)(10) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(10)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include a payment stablecoin issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, as such terms are defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.”.

(e) **SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT OF 1970.**—Section 16(14) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78ll(14)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘security’ does not include a payment stablecoin issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, as such terms are defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.”.

(f) **COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT.**—Section 1a(9) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “The term ‘commodity’ does not include a payment stablecoin issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer, as such terms are defined in section 2 of the GENIUS Act.”.

SEC. 18. EXCEPTION FOR FOREIGN PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS AND RECIPROCITY FOR PAYMENT STABLECOINS ISSUED IN OVERSEAS JURISDICTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The prohibitions under section 3 shall not apply to a foreign pay-

ment stablecoin issuer if all of the following apply:

(1) The foreign payment stablecoin issuer is subject to regulation and supervision by a foreign payment stablecoin regulator of a foreign country, a territory of the United States, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands that has a regulatory and supervisory regime with respect to payment stablecoins that the Secretary of the Treasury determines, pursuant to subsection (b), is comparable to the regulatory and supervisory regime established under this Act, including, in particular, the requirements under section 4(a).

(2) The foreign payment stablecoin issuer is registered with the Comptroller pursuant to subsection (c).

(3) The foreign payment stablecoin issuer holds reserves in a United States financial institution sufficient to meet liquidity demands of United States customers, unless otherwise permitted under a reciprocal arrangement established pursuant to subsection (d).

(4) The foreign country in which the foreign payment stablecoin issuer is domiciled and regulated is not subject to comprehensive economic sanctions by the United States or in a jurisdiction that the Secretary of the Treasury has determined to be a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern.

(b) **TREASURY DETERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may make a determination as to whether a foreign country has a regulatory and supervisory regime that is comparable to the requirements established under this Act, including the requirements under section 4(a). The Secretary of the Treasury may make such a determination only upon a recommendation from each other member of the Stablecoin Certification Review Committee. Prior to such determination taking effect, the Secretary of the Treasury shall publish in the Federal Register a justification for such determination, including how the foreign country's regulatory and supervisory regime is comparable to the requirements established under this Act, including the requirements under section 4(a).

(2) **REQUEST.**—A foreign payment stablecoin issuer or a foreign payment stablecoin regulator may request from the Secretary of the Treasury a determination under paragraph (1).

(3) **TIMING FOR DETERMINATION.**—If a foreign payment stablecoin issuer or foreign payment stablecoin regulator requests a determination under paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall render a decision on the determination not later than 210 days after the receipt of a substantially complete determination request.

(4) **RESCISSION OF DETERMINATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury may, in consultation with the Federal payment stablecoin regulators, rescind a determination made under paragraph (1), if the Secretary determines that the regulatory regime of such foreign country is no longer comparable to the requirements established under this Act. Prior to such rescission taking effect, the Secretary of the Treasury shall publish in the Federal Register a justification for the rescission.

(B) **LIMITED SAFE HARBOR.**—If the Secretary of the Treasury rescinds a determination pursuant to subparagraph (A), a digital asset service provider shall have 90 days before the offer or sale of a payment stablecoin issued by the foreign payment stablecoin issuer that is the subject of the rescinded determination shall be in violation of section 3.

(5) **PUBLIC NOTICE.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall keep and make publicly available a current list of foreign countries for

which a determination under paragraph (1) has been made.

(6) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue such rules as may be required to carry out this section.

(c) **REGISTRATION AND ONGOING MONITORING.**—

(1) **REGISTRATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A foreign payment stablecoin issuer may offer or sell payment stablecoins using a digital asset service provider if the foreign payment stablecoin issuer is registered with the Comptroller.

(B) **REGISTRATION APPROVAL.**—A registration of a foreign payment stablecoin issuer filed in accordance with this section shall be deemed approved on the date that is 30 days after the date the Comptroller receives the registration, unless the Comptroller notifies the foreign payment stablecoin issuer in writing that such registration has been rejected.

(C) **STANDARDS FOR REJECTION.**—In determining whether to reject a foreign payment stablecoin issuer's registration, the Comptroller shall consider

(i) the final determination of the Secretary of the Treasury under this section;

(ii) the financial and managerial resources of the United States operations of the foreign payment stablecoin issuer;

(iii) whether the foreign payment stablecoin issuer will provide adequate information to the Comptroller as the Comptroller determines is necessary to determine compliance with this Act;

(iv) whether the foreign payment stablecoin presents a risk to the financial stability of the United States; and

(v) whether the foreign payment stablecoin issuer presents illicit finance risks to the United States.

(D) **PROCEDURE FOR APPEAL.**—If the Comptroller rejects a registration, not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of such rejection, the foreign payment stablecoin issuer may appeal the rejection by notifying the Comptroller of the request to appeal.

(E) **RULEMAKING.**—Pursuant to section 13 of this Act, the Comptroller shall issue rules relating to the standards for approval of registration requests and the process for appealing denials of such registration requests.

(F) **PUBLIC NOTICE.**—The Comptroller shall keep and make publicly available a current list of foreign payment stablecoin issuer registrations that have been approved.

(2) **ONGOING MONITORING.**—A foreign payment stablecoin issuer shall

(A) be subject to reporting, supervision, and examination requirements as determined by the Comptroller; and

(B) consent to United States jurisdiction relating to the enforcement of this Act.

(3) **LACK OF COMPLIANCE.**—

(A) **COMPTROLLER ACTION.**—The Comptroller may, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, rescind approval of a registration of a foreign payment stablecoin issuer under this subsection if the Comptroller determines that the foreign payment stablecoin issuer is not in compliance with the requirements of this Act, including for maintaining insufficient reserves or posing an illicit finance risk or financial stability risk. Prior to such rescission taking effect, the Comptroller shall publish in the Federal Register a justification for the rescission.

(B) **SECRETARY ACTION.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Comptroller, may revoke a registration of a foreign payment stablecoin issuer under this subsection if the Secretary determines that reasonable grounds exist for concluding that the foreign payment stablecoin issuer presents economic sanctions evasion, money

laundering, or other illicit finance risks, or, as applicable, violations, or facilitation thereof.

(d) RECIPROCITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may create and implement reciprocal arrangements or other bilateral agreements between the United States and jurisdictions with payment stablecoin regulatory regimes that are comparable to the requirements established under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall consider whether the jurisdiction's requirements for payment stablecoin issuers include

(A) similar requirements to those under section 4(a);

(B) adequate anti-money laundering and counter-financing of terrorism program and sanction compliance standards; and

(C) adequate supervisory and enforcement capacity to facilitate international transactions and interoperability with United States dollar-denominated payment stablecoins issued overseas.

(2) PUBLICATION.—Not later than 90 days prior to the entry into force of any arrangement or agreement under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury shall publish the arrangement or agreement in the Federal Register.

(3) COMPLETION.—The Secretary of the Treasury should complete the arrangements under this subsection not later than the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 19. DISCLOSURE RELATING TO PAYMENT STABLECOINS.

Section 13104(a)(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended, in the first sentence, by striking “, or any deposits” and inserting “, any payment stablecoins issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer aggregating \$5,000 or less held, or any deposits”.

SEC. 20. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on the earlier of

(1) the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date that is 120 days after the date on which the primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators issue any final regulations implementing this Act.

(Mr. HUSTED assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Tennessee.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Sen-

ate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 25-39, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$2.0 billion. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-39

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Australia

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * \$0.6 billion.

Other \$1.4 billion.

Total \$2.0 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Australia has requested to buy the following equipment and services related to follow-on sustainment of its F/A-18F Super Hornet and EA-18G Growler aircraft fleet:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Sixty (60) Global Lightning—Joint Tactical Terminal—Transceivers (JTT-X).

Forty (40) Advanced Electronic Warfare systems.

Twenty-four (24) Next Generation Electronic Attack Units (NGEAU).

Non-Major Defense Equipment: The following non-MDE items will also be included: AN/PYQ-10C Simple Key Loaders; Inline Network Encryptions; AN/ALE-47 electronic warfare countermeasures systems (common carriage); Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) software; aircraft spares and repair parts; other support equipment; software and hardware updates and development; system configuration upgrades; avionics software support; aircraft armament equipment; Foreign Liaison Officer support; technical data; engineering change proposals; engine component improvements; training and training equipment; training aids, devices, and spares; flight test services; transportation costs; system integration and testing; software development and integration; tools and test equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (AT-P-FBS).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: AT-P-SAF, AT-P-GQY, AT-P-LEN, AT-P-SCI, AT-P-GQF.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 16, 2025.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Australia—F/A-18F and EA-18G Sustainment Support

The Government of Australia has requested to buy the following equipment and services related to sustainment of its F/A-18F Super Hornet and EA-18G Growler aircraft fleet: sixty (60) Global Lightning—Joint Tactical Terminal—Transceivers (JTT-X); forty (40) Advanced Electronic Warfare systems; and twenty-four (24) Next Generation Electronic Attack Units (NGEAU). The following non-MDE items will also be included: AN/PYQ-10C Simple Key Loaders; Inline Network Encryptions; AN/ALE-47 electronic warfare countermeasures systems (common carriage); Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) software; aircraft spares and repair parts; other support equipment; software and hardware updates and development; system configuration upgrades; avionics software support; aircraft armament equipment; Foreign Liaison Officer support; technical data; engineering change proposals; engine component improvements; training and training equipment; training aids, devices, and spares; flight test services; transportation costs; system integration and testing; software development and integration; tools and test equipment; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$2.0 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States. Australia is one of our most important allies in the Western Pacific. The strategic location of this political and economic power contributes significantly to ensuring peace and economic stability in the Western Pacific. It is vital to the U.S. national interest to assist our ally in developing and maintaining a strong and ready self-defense capability.

The proposed sale will improve Australia's capability to meet current and future threats by providing the necessary follow-on sustainment support services for its F/A-18F Super Hornet and EA-18G Growler aircraft fleet. It will also improve Australia's capability to support coalition operations and contribute to mutual security goals in the region. Australia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment and services into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be The Boeing Company, located in Arlington, VA. At this time, the U.S. Government is not aware of any offset agreement proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require twenty-five U.S. Government personnel and fifteen U.S. contractor representatives to visit Australia on a temporary basis in conjunction with program technical oversight and support requirements, including program and technical reviews.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-39

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Global Lightning—Joint Tactical Terminal—Transceiver (JTT-X) is a single software defined radio with the capability to provide aircrew connectivity to secure government and commercial beyond line-of-sight data and voice communication. It is a stand-alone system that is interoperable and miniaturized with embedded capabilities to support future waveforms.

2. The Advanced Electronic Warfare system is a fully integrated multi-spectral suite enabling both offensive and defensive electronic warfare capabilities for the F/A-18E/F. These new capabilities include all aspect, high sensitivity detection; jamming of radio frequency threats; Open Mission Systems compatibility with the APG-79 and Distributed Targeting Processor—Networked; and tighter integration with platform data sensor fusion functions.

3. The Next Generation Electronic Attack Unit (NGEAU) will support an OMS processor architecture, include Multi Level Security (MLS), and include a Multi-Tier Resource Management (MTRM) framework. Additionally, the NGEAU addresses diminishing manufacturing sources and material shortages concerns with the current electronic attack unit.

4. The Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) will provide mission planning capability for support of military aviation operations. It will also provide support for unit-level mission planning for all phases of military flight operations and have the capability to provide necessary mission data for the aircrew. JMPS will support the downloading of data to electronics data transfer devices for transfer to aircraft and weapon systems. A JMPS for a specific aircraft type will consist of basic planning tools called the Joint Mission Planning Environment (JMPE) mated with a Unique Planning Component (UPC) provided by the aircraft program. In addition, UPCs will be required for specific weapons, communication devices, and moving map displays. The JMPS will be tailored to the specific releasable configuration for the F/A-18E/F Super Hornet and EA-18G Growler.

5. The AN/ALE-47 electronic warfare countermeasures dispensing system (common carriage) is a threat-adaptive dispensing system for chaff, flares, and expendable jammers for self-protection against airborne and ground-based radio frequency and infrared threats. The operational flight program and mission data files used in the AN/ALE-47 contain algorithms used to calculate the best defense against specific threats. AN/ALE-47 common carriage provides increased survivability against aircraft threats by increasing the quantity of airborne expendable countermeasures (AECM) carried per aircraft and enabling the use of next generation AECM required to defeat emerging threat systems.

6. The AN/PYQ-10(C) Simple Key Loader (SKL) is an advanced secure cryptographic device that enables safe distribution and storage of communications security (COMSEC) key material, electronic protection data, and signal operating instructions using encrypted keys or codes. AN/PYQ-10(C) is the next generation of the currently fielded AN/CYZ-10 data transfer device. The AN/PYQ-10(C) provides automated, secure, and user-friendly methods for managing and distributing cryptographic key material, signal operating instructions, and electronic protection data. This course introduces some of

the basic components and activities associated with the AN/PYQ-10(C) in addition to hands-on training. Learners will become familiar with the security features of the SKL, practice the initial setup of the SKL, and will receive and distribute electronic keys using the SKL.

7. KG-250X is a certified Type 1 inline network encryptor that provides network security designed to protect Sensitive Compartmented Information and is suitable for a variety of applications and missions.

8. Software provides for initial design and development of the Electronic Warfare and Advanced Systems Software builds.

9. Technical Data provides for the F/A-18E/F post-production of classified test reports and other related documentation.

10. Training aides and devices expenditures provide for upgraded classified lessons as well as hardware, spares, and installation for the tactical operational flight trainers, low-cost trainers (LCT), aircrew courseware, and spares for delivery and installation of systems configuration sets.

11. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

12. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

13. A determination has been made that Australia can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

14. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Australia.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of

the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 25-44, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Italy for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$211 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. MILLER,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-44

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Italy

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$188 million.

Other \$23 million.

Total \$211 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Thirty (30) AIM-120D-3 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

Forty (40) AIM-120C-8 AMRAAMs.

Two (2) AIM-120C-7 AMRAAM guidance sections.

Non-Major Defense Equipment: The following non-MDE items will also be included: AMRAAM control section spares and containers; spare and repair parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; weapon system support and software; classified software delivery and support; classified publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (IT-D-YAE).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: IT-D-YAD.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 16, 2025.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Italy—Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles

The Government of Italy has requested to buy thirty (30) AIM-120D-3 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM), forty (40) AIM-120C-8 AMRAAMs, and two (2) AIM-120C-7 AMRAAM guidance sections. The following non-MDE items will also be included: AMRAAM control section spares and containers; spare and repair parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; weapon system support and software; classified and unclassified software delivery and support; classified and unclassified publications and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; U.S. government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$211 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve Italy's capability to meet current and future threats by ensuring Italy has modern, capable air-to-air munitions. It will also advance United States interoperability with NATO and the Italian Armed Forces. Italy already has AMRAAMs in its inventory and will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be RTX Corporation, located in Tucson, AZ. At this time, the U.S. government is not aware of any offset agreement proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. government or contractor representatives to Italy.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 25-44

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM-120D-3 series Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) is a supersonic, air-launched, aerial intercept guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high and low-flying and maneuvering targets. The AIM-120D-3 features a quadrangle target detection device and an electronics unit within the guidance section that performs all radar signal processing, mid-course and terminal guidance, flight control, target detection, and warhead detonation.

2. AIM-120C-8 AMRAAM is a supersonic, air launched, aerial intercept, guided missile featuring digital technology and micro-miniature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down/shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high and low-flying and maneuvering targets.

3. This potential sale will include AMRAAM guidance and control section spares.

4. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

5. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

6. A determination has been made that Italy can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

7. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Italy.

GENIUS ACT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, for too long, stablecoins have operated in a

regulatory gray area, putting consumers, markets, and national security at risk. The bipartisan GENIUS Act brings much-needed oversight and standards to the \$250 billion stablecoin market. It also creates guardrails for responsible innovation and will enact sensible consumer protections for payment stablecoins. As an early supporter and negotiator of the final version of the bill, I pushed for provisions which clearly preserve State consumer protection laws in the negotiated rule of construction in section 7(f)(4). This provision is commonsense and furthers the goal of ensuring that consumer interests come first.

GENIUS ACT

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Mr. President, I supported passage of S. 1582, the GENIUS Act, because it creates new Federal regulations and consumer protections for payment stablecoins. Specifically, the bill was amended to explicitly and clearly preserve State consumer protection laws in the negotiated rule of construction in section 7(f)(4). This was always the intent of the bill, as evidenced by the public discussion between Senators of both parties during the March 13, 2025, markup in the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. The amended, final version of the bill includes this negotiated rule of construction to prevent State consumer protection laws from being preempted, as intended by the bill's sponsors and supporters.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, on June 16, 2025, I missed rollcall vote No. 313. Had I been present, I would have voted no on vote No. 313, cloture on the nomination of Gary Andres to be Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

On June 17, 2025, I missed rollcall vote No. 314. Had I been present, I would have voted no on vote No. 314, motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Olivia Trusty to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. President, I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 308, Confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 173 William Long, to be Commissioner of IRS.

I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 309, on the Motion to Table S. Amdt. 2310.

I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 310, motion to Waive the Merkley Budget Point of Order.

I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted yea

on rollcall vote No. 311, adoption of Hagerty-Gillibrand Substitute Amendment No. 2307 to Calendar No. 66, S. 1582, GENIUS Act.

I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted yea on rollcall vote No. 312, motion to Invoke Cloture on Calendar No. S. 1582, GENIUS Act, as Amended, if Amended.

I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 314, motion to Invoke Cloture on Executive Calendar No. 98, Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025.

I missed the following votes, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 315, motion to Invoke Cloture on Executive Calendar No. 99, Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2025 (Reappointment).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hanley, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1159. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rescinding Regulations on Projects of National and Regional Significance" (RIN2125-AG17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1160. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Performance Management Measures; Rescinding Requirements for the First Performance Period" (RIN2125-AG27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1161. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "State Highway Agency Equal Opportunity Programs" (RIN2125-AF87) received in the Office of the President

of the Senate on June 10, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1162. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rescinding Preliminary Engineering Project 10-Year Repayment Provision" (RIN2125-AG25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2025; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1163. A communication from the Chairman of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Abnormal Occurrences: Fiscal Year 2024"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1164. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Open Payments Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1165. A communication from the Chief of Staff and Program Counsel of the Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2026 Congressional Budget Justification and the Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1166. A communication from the Chairman, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period from October 1, 2024 through March 31, 2025; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1167. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from October 1, 2024 through March 31, 2025; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1168. A communication from the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2024 through March 31, 2025 received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1169. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partial Replacement of an Earlier National Registration or Registrations by an International Registration" (RIN0651-AD82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2025; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1170. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 for fiscal year 2023; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CASSIDY, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

Special Report entitled "Report on the Legislative Activities of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions during the 118th Congress" (Rept. No. 119-31).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2086. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to allow health marketplace pools to be deemed an employer under section 3(5) of such Act for purposes of offering a group health plan or group health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2087. A bill to prohibit the use of funds for military force against Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

S. 2088. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a person from engaging in the business of destroying firearms unless such person has received a license to do so from the Attorney General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 2089. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to allow certain activities to be conducted with respect to sturgeon held in captivity or in a controlled environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 2090. A bill to improve the budget process; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE:

S. 2091. A bill to eliminate statutory provisions relating to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Ms. SLOTKIN):

S. 2092. A bill to prohibit the use of smartphones at Department of Defense Education Activity schools; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2093. A bill to establish, within the United States Agency for International Development, a program to promote mobility in rural communities through access to affordable, fit-for-purpose bicycles, to provide support to sustainably increase access to critical services in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2094. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the partnership rules for taxation of basis-shifting transactions involving related parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2095. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the rules related to partners and partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2096. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Transition Assistance Program and Solid Start Program to address mental health issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEEHY:

S. 2097. A bill to provide remedies to members of the uniformed services discharged for not complying with the COVID-19 vaccination mandate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2098. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southcentral Foundation located in Anchorage, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2099. A bill to repeal the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. WARNER, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain rules applicable to qualified small issue manufacturing bonds, to expand certain exceptions to the private activity bond rules for first-time farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2101. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for electronic communication relating to educational assistance benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 2102. A bill to establish the Ralph David Abernathy, Sr., National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. Res. 281. A resolution commemorating the 95th anniversary of the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. Res. 282. A resolution commemorating June 17, 2025, as the tenth anniversary of the Mother Emanuel AME Church shooting; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 283. A resolution commemorating the 90th birthday of His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama on July 6, 2025, as "A Day of Compassion" and expressing support for the human rights and distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and historical identity of the Tibetan people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 284. A resolution designating June 10, 2025, as "DACOR Bacon House Bicentennial Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 285. A resolution designating July 16, 2025, as "Glioblastoma Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 286. A resolution recognizing the life, achievements, and public service of former First Lady Barbara Pierce Bush on the occasion of her 100th birthday; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 199

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 199, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to combat illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing at its sources globally.

S. 873

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 873, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to preserve and recapitalize the fighter aircraft capabilities of the Air Force and its reserve components, and for other purposes.

S. 961

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 961, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the Armed Forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member.

S. 1032

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1032, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans' disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with combat-related disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1193

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1193, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1241

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1241, a bill to impose sanctions and other measures with respect to the Russian Federation if the Government of the Russian Federation refuses to

negotiate a peace agreement with Ukraine, violates any such agreement, or initiates another military invasion of Ukraine, and for other purposes.

S. 1298

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1298, a bill to authorize the continuation of lawful nonimmigrant status for certain religious workers affected by the backlog for religious worker immigrant visas.

S. 1337

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1337, a bill to improve availability of information relating to cybersecurity threats.

S. 1399

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1399, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure appropriate payment of certain algorithm-based healthcare services under the Medicare program.

S. 1480

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1480, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to issuers of American infrastructure bonds.

S. 1481

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1481, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate advance refunding bonds.

S. 1546

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1546, a bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to address matters relating to patent subject matter eligibility, and for other purposes.

S. 1582

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1582, a bill to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes.

S. 1594

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1594, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit certain activities involving pro-

hibited primate species, and for other purposes.

S. 1711

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1711, a bill to address national security risks and prohibit the use of Federal funds for the procurement of certain vehicles and vehicle technologies produced or provided by entities based in certain countries, and for other purposes.

S. 1749

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1749, a bill to prohibit United States Government recognition of the Russian Federation's claim of sovereignty over Crimea, and for other purposes.

S. 1761

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1761, a bill to end unemployment payments to jobless millionaires.

S. 1818

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1818, a bill to significantly lower prescription drug prices for patients in the United States by ending government-granted monopolies for manufacturers who charge drug prices that are higher than the median prices at which the drugs are available in other countries.

S. 1865

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1865, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1883, a bill to require the executive branch to develop a whole-of-government strategy to disrupt growing cooperation among the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which are the foremost adversaries of the United States, and mitigate the risks posed to the United States.

S. 1965

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1965, a bill to eliminate employment-based visa caps for abused, abandoned, and neglected children who are classified as special immigrant juveniles, and for other purposes.

S. 2029

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2029, a bill to protect the privacy of personal reproductive or sexual health information, and for other purposes.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. SCHMITT, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2067, a bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on June 3, 2025, in accordance with section 1012(a) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2068, a bill to ban drug manufacturers from using direct-to-consumer advertising, including social media, to promote their products.

S. 2070

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2070, a bill to provide limited authority to use the Armed Forces to suppress insurrection or rebellion and quell domestic violence.

S. 2077

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2077, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure health insurance coverage continuity for former foster youth.

S. RES. 236

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 236, a resolution calling for the return of abducted Ukrainian children before finalizing any peace agreement to end the war against Ukraine.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 2093. A bill to establish, within the United States Agency for International Development, a program to promote mobility in rural communities through access to affordable, fit-for-purpose bicycles, to provide support to sustainably increase access to critical services in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2093

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bicycles for Rural African Transport Act”.

SEC. 2. RURAL MOBILITY PROGRAM IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this Act as “USAID”) shall establish a rural mobility program (referred to in this section as the “Program”) to carry out the purposes described in paragraph (2), including through grants made to eligible nongovernmental partner organizations. In carrying out the program, the Administrator shall prioritize organizations with demonstrated success conducting rural mobility programs in the region.

(2) PURPOSE.—The Program shall focus on country-driven projects within sub-Saharan Africa—

(A) to promote rural communities’ access to critical services and opportunities, including education, health care, and livelihood opportunities, through access to affordable, fit-for-purpose bicycles; and

(B) to provide support to sustainably increase access to critical services, such as education, health care, and livelihood opportunities in rural areas, including through support for rural-based mechanics, access to spare parts, reduction of social and gender-based stigma, and community project management capacity.

(3) PARTNERSHIPS.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Program shall partner with existing entities overseas that have successful models for providing access to affordable bicycles to achieve development objectives.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated—

(A) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2026;

(B) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2027;

(C) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2028;

(D) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2029; and

(E) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2030 and for each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) PRIOR PROJECTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of USAID shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives regarding projects carried out by USAID during each of the fiscal years 2022 through 2025 relating to the purposes described in subsection (a)(2).

(B) CONTENTS.—The report required under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) identify the countries in which USAID embedded rural bicycle mobility into its strategies, programs, and projects;

(ii) describe the mechanisms by which rural bicycle mobility was so embedded;

(iii) specify the number of bicycles distributed each fiscal year;

(iv) assess the outcomes for, and the impacts on, participants in such projects; and

(v) assess USAID’s efforts to disseminate lessons learned from such projects.

(2) CURRENT PROJECTS.—Not later than December 30, 2026, and annually thereafter, the Administrator of USAID shall submit a report to the congressional committees listed in paragraph (1)(A) regarding projects carried out by USAID during the fiscal year immediately preceding the submission of such report. Each such report shall include information relating to the matters described in clauses (i) through (v) of paragraph (1)(B).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 281—COMMEMORATING THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WELCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 281

Whereas on June 17, 1930, President Hoover signed into law the Tariff Act of 1930 (commonly known as the “Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930”);

Whereas the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 raised tariffs on goods imported into the United States in an attempt to protect farmers and manufacturers in the United States from foreign competition;

Whereas the Senate Historical Office has characterized the passage of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 as “among the most catastrophic acts in congressional history”;

Whereas the sudden and steep increase in tariffs encouraged retaliation by foreign countries, including major trading partners such as Canada and countries in Europe, which responded by raising their own tariffs on goods imported from the United States, triggering a dramatic reduction in international trade;

Whereas the resulting retaliatory tariffs contributed to a substantial decline in farm and manufacturing exports from the United States, which plummeted from \$5,240,000,000 in 1929 to \$1,670,000,000 in 1933, a 68 percent drop, according to records kept by the Bureau of the Census;

Whereas the tariffs contributed to anti-United States sentiment in foreign countries, leading to consumer boycotts in Canada, France, Spain, Italy, and other countries;

Whereas the effects of the tariffs and counter-tariffs contributed to the Great Depression, during which global trade decreased by as much as 60 percent;

Whereas the effects of the tariffs were amplified by deflation, causing the gross domestic product of the United States to fall from \$104,600,000,000 in 1929 to \$57,000,000,000 in 1933, according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis;

Whereas the unemployment rate spiked from 3.2 percent in 1929 to a peak of approximately 23 percent in 1932, before decreasing slightly to 21 percent in 1933, according to the Journal of Economic Perspectives of the American Economic Association;

Whereas, after the tariffs were imposed, the trade surplus of the United States declined because exports fell more than imports;

Whereas in 1934 Congress directed the President to reduce tariff rates applied by the United States and to seek reductions in tariffs applied to exports from the United States through the Act entitled “An Act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930”, enacted June 12, 1934 (73 Stat. 943, chapter 474) (commonly known as the “Reciprocal Tariff Act”), and later Acts that provided the President with trade negotiating objectives and tariff proclamation authority;

Whereas tariffs were decreased in the United States and abroad, falling in the United States from a trade-weighted average of 19.8 percent in 1933 to 6.9 percent by 1950, and continuing to fall afterwards as a result of multilateral trade agreements; and

Whereas the United States has since benefited substantially from an open and rules-

based international trading system that promotes innovation and growth, lowers input costs for goods manufactured in the United States, reduces consumer prices, supports supply chain resiliency, and enables the United States to maintain an export market valued at more than \$3,000,000,000,000; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) observes the 95th anniversary of the enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930 (commonly known as the “Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930”) as a moment of historical reflection on the consequences of protectionist economic policies;

(2) views the Tariff Act of 1930 as a significant contributor to the Great Depression;

(3) affirms the importance of rules-based trade policy that reduces production costs for farmers, manufacturers, and construction firms in the United States, strengthens international economic cooperation, helps provide consumers in the United States with a larger variety of affordable goods, and opens up vast foreign markets to exports from the United States; and

(4) commits to encouraging trade and economic policies that encourage economic growth and avoid the repetition of historic policy mistakes.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I am here too to focus on some history and a resolution. Today is the 95th anniversary of one of the worst economic policies our country ever made: the Smoot-Hawley tariffs.

Don't just take my word for it. The Senate Historical Office has characterized it as “among the most catastrophic acts in congressional history.”

So today I am introducing a resolution that commemorates this anniversary as a moment to reflect on the devastating impact and the consequences. It shows you what we can learn from history, and at its peak, the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act placed an average rate of 20 percent tariffs on goods imported into the United States—just 20 percent. So we have had this big discussion about many other things, definitely well above 20 percent.

The goal then was to bolster U.S. farmers and manufacturers by protecting them from foreign competition. But that goal, as we all know, if you study history, was not met. What it did instead was widen and deepen the Great Depression.

My resolution recounts our major trading partners, including Canada and countries in Europe, responded to those tariffs placed on by the United States by raising tariffs on the United States' exported goods. So yes, let's say a trade war. And anti-United States sentiment rapidly intensified in foreign countries, leading to a consumer boycott of American products in Canada, France, Spain, Italy, and many other countries.

The retaliatory tariffs and consumer boycotts caused farm and manufacturing exports from the United States to plunge from 68 percent, basically \$5.24 billion, in 1929, to basically \$1.6 billion—so from \$5 billion to basically \$1 billion in 1933, so a big drop in what the United States was able to do.

The U.S. gross domestic product fell nearly in half, from \$104 billion in 1929

to just \$57 billion in 1932. And the unemployment rate rose from 3.2 percent to a peak of around 23 percent in 1932. So the Great Depression had arrived.

In my State, the State of Washington, we have always been dependent on trade. Back then, lumber was our main export, and the trade war essentially destroyed that industry. Production dropped 70 percent, and the board feet dropped down to just 2 billion board feet in 1932—more than cutting in half what we had done before. More than half of our State's loggers lost their jobs. The unemployment rate in my State was 33 percent much higher than the national average. And where do we stand 95 years later? Do we want to take a moment and understand the lessons of Smoot-Hawley?

The administration is running a very high tariff playbook. The world's economy is much more interconnected now than it was in the 1930s. Uncertainty is the enemy of continued economic growth. And at least the Smoot-Hawley tariffs were set at an established rate. American businesses knew what they were standing up against and could make forecasts and plans accordingly.

These tariffs in the Trump administration change at the discretion of the President, creating huge uncertainty. Small business owners in my State tell me that while the tariffs are a challenge, the uncertainty is what keeps them up at night. The administration's tariffs are on par with Smoot-Hawley era tariffs. On that, the economic historians agree: That was a prolonged and deepened global depression. Last week, the President said the tariffs on China would be set at 55 percent.

So what have we learned from this historical date? Before President Hoover signed the Smoot-Hawley Act, he got a signed letter from more than 1,000 economists—1,000 economists sent a letter. The economists warned that raising tariffs would cause the cost to rise on consumers; farmers and manufacturers would suffer; and retaliatory tariffs would make exports dry up. And they said that starting a trade war would damage our foreign relations.

As early as 1934, Congress tried to right the ship. That year, we passed the Reciprocal Tariff Act directing Presidents to reduce us and world tariff rates. This year, my colleague Senator GRASSLEY and I are trying to stop the administration by introducing the Trade Review Act of 2025 that establishes limits on the President's ability to impose tariffs. Why? Because this is the constitutional power given to Congress, not to the President. The courts have already said at certain levels that this President, as it relates to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, does not have this authority.

So out of the ashes of World War Two, the U.S. led in a way of creating an open and rules-based international trading system. Tariffs were lowered in the U.S. and abroad—falling in the

U.S.—from a trade weighted average of 20 percent in '33 to 7 percent in 1950 and continuing to fall afterward with trade agreements.

So it means we established rules. That is what trade needs. We don't need a President whose authority isn't in this particular area to start trade wars with no end in sight. The rules-based trading system provided the stability we needed to drive investment and to drive growth.

So the resolution I am introducing today asked the Senate to affirm the importance of a rules-based trade policy that reduces production costs for American farmers, for manufacturers, and one that opens markets to US exports.

It is time for us to commit to encouraging trade policies, particularly when so many other countries are getting their products on the shelves in foreign markets, leaving our products at home.

Let's avoid the repetition of this historical policy mistake and instead do something that reaffirms this institution's oversight of this issue and recognize the problems that tariffs are causing.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—COMMEMORATING JUNE 17, 2025, AS THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MOTHER EMANUEL AME CHURCH SHOOTING

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mrs. BLACKBURN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 282

Whereas, on June 17, 2015, a peaceful Wednesday evening prayer meeting at the Mother Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church in Charleston, South Carolina, ended in tragedy as an armed gunman killed 9 African-American parishioners;

Whereas the killer, Dylann Roof, a White supremacist, sat in the Mother Emanuel AME Church, the oldest African Methodist church in the South, for more than an hour before opening fire, shooting 12 people and killing 9 before escaping;

Whereas the “Emanuel Nine” includes the Reverend Clementa Pinckney, Cynthia Hurd, the Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Tywanza Sanders, Ethel Lance, Susie Jackson, the Reverend DePayne Middleton-Doctor, the Reverend Daniel Simmons, Sr., and Myra Thompson;

Whereas Reverend Clementa Pinckney, elected to the South Carolina General Assembly in 1996 at the age of 23, becoming the youngest African-American elected to the South Carolina State Legislature, was a 15-year member of the South Carolina Senate from the 45th District, a beloved husband of Jennifer Benjamin and father of Eliana and Malana, and was a recipient of a bachelor's degree from Allen University in 1995 and a master of public administration degree from the University of South Carolina in 1999;

Whereas Cynthia Hurd served as a librarian in the Charleston, South Carolina library system for 31 years, worked at the St. Andrews Regional Library since 2011, had previously worked as the branch manager of the John L. Dart Library in downtown Charleston, and after her death, was honored by the Charleston County Public Library system,

which renamed St. Andrews Library the Cynthia Graham Hurd St. Andrews Regional Library;

Whereas Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton was a member of the ministerial staff at Mother Emanuel AME Church, spent her life making a long-lasting difference in the lives of those around her, was a speech and language pathologist, and was a girls' track and field coach for Goose Creek High School;

Whereas Tywanza Sanders, who was only 26 years old when his young life was taken, earned a bachelor's degree in business administration from Allen University, played instruments such as the keyboard and was in the process of writing his own book of poetry, and in his last moment, stepped in front of Susie Jackson, giving his life in an attempt to save his great-aunt;

Whereas both Tywanza Sanders and Susie Jackson were celebrated in a joint funeral attended by hundreds of mourners;

Whereas Ethel Lance, whose favorite gospel song was "One Day at a Time", was born in Charleston, where she and her husband, Nathaniel Lance, raised their family, and she was a lifelong member of Mother Emanuel AME Church, where she worked as a custodian to help keep the facilities clean for 5 years;

Whereas Susie Jackson, a longtime member of the Mother Emanuel AME Church, served as a trustee and an usher at her church, sang in the adult choir for many years, and was 87 years old when she was killed on that tragic day;

Whereas Reverend DePayne Middleton-Doctor earned a bachelor's degree in biology from Columbia College in 1989, and a master's degree in organizational management from Southern Wesleyan University in 1994, served as a minister at Mount Moriah Missionary Baptist Church in North Charleston before joining Mother Emanuel AME as a minister in March 2015, and was the loving mother of 4 daughters—Gracyn, Kaylin, Hali, and Czana;

Whereas Reverend Daniel Simmons, Sr. was a fourth-generation preacher who assisted Reverend Pinckney with pastoral duties, was nicknamed "Super Simmons from the Super Seventh", earned a bachelor's degree in education administration from Allen University, a master's degree in social work from the University of South Carolina, and a master of divinity degree with a concentration in leadership and theology from the Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary in Columbia, was a loving husband to his wife, Annie Graham Simmons, and was a devoted father to his 2 children, Daniel L. Simmons, Jr. and Rose Ann Simmons;

Whereas Myra Thompson was a Charleston native and longtime member of the Mother Emanuel AME Church, earned a bachelor's degree in english education from Benedict College, received a master of education degree in reading and a second degree of master of education in school counseling from the Citadel Military College of Charleston, was married to Reverend Anthony B. Thompson, Vicar of Holy Trinity Reformed Episcopal Church in Charleston, and was a loving mother to her 2 children, Kevin and Denise, and her 2 grandchildren;

Whereas, on December 15, 2016, Roof was convicted in Federal court of all 33 Federal charges against him (including hate crimes) that stemmed from the shooting;

Whereas, on January 11, 2017, he was sentenced to death for those crimes;

Whereas, on March 31, 2017, Roof agreed to plead guilty in South Carolina State court to all state charges pending against him—9 counts of murder, 3 counts of attempted murder, and possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony—to avoid a second death sentence;

Whereas, as part of the plea agreement, Roof accepted a sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole;

Whereas, on April 10, 2017, Roof was sentenced to 9 consecutive sentences of life without the possibility of parole after formally pleading guilty to the state charges; and

Whereas Roof is currently on death row at United States Penitentiary, Terre Haute, awaiting execution for the Federal convictions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates June 17, 2025, as the tenth anniversary of the Mother Emanuel AME Church shooting;

(2) remembers that in the face of unimaginable pain, the church stood firm in faith, a living reminder that—

(A) as Romans 8:28 says, "in all things God works for the good of those who love him"; and

(B) as Matthew 18:21-22 teaches, "Peter came up and said to him, 'Lord, how often will my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? As many as seven times?' [and] Jesus said to him, 'I do not say to you seven times, but seventy-seven times'";

(3) honors the victims' memory, their legacy, and the enduring hope that evil never has the final word; and

(4) remembers each victim of the shooting—

(A) Reverend Clementa Pinckney;

(B) Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton;

(C) Cynthia Hurd;

(D) Susie Jackson;

(E) Ethel Lance;

(F) Reverend DePayne Middleton-Doctor;

(G) Tywanza Sanders;

(H) Reverend Daniel Simmons Sr.;

(I) Myra Thompson;

(J) Polly Sheppard;

(K) Jennifer Pinckney;

(L) Felicia Sanders; and

(M) two minor children.

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—COMMEMORATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF HIS HOLINESS THE 14TH DALAI LAMA ON JULY 6, 2025, AS "A DAY OF COMPASSION" AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE HUMAN RIGHTS AND DISTINCT RELIGIOUS, CULTURAL, LINGUISTIC, AND HISTORICAL IDENTITY OF THE TIBETAN PEOPLE

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 283

Whereas July 6, 2025, marks the 90th birthday of His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama;

Whereas the 14th Dalai Lama was born in northeastern Tibet in 1935, was enthroned as the 14th incarnation in 1940, and was called upon to assume temporal leadership of Tibet in 1950 in response to a tumultuous time as the newly established People's Republic of China sent its military to seize control of Tibet;

Whereas the leader of the People's Republic of China, Mao Zedong, assured the Dalai Lama that "the Tibetan people have the right of exercising national regional autonomy" under Chinese rule and conveyed to the Dalai Lama that Tibet's distinct religious and cultural traditions would be respected, as reflected in the Seventeen Point Agreement of 1951;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China, led by the Chinese Com-

munist Party, steadily eroded the Tibetan autonomy to which it committed in the Seventeen Point Agreement through repressive political and military actions, leading to tension, resistance, and ultimately the Dalai Lama's exile in 1959;

Whereas, in March 1959, the Dalai Lama fled Tibet after Chinese Communist forces began shelling Lhasa and has since been residing in India, along with tens of thousands of Tibetan refugees;

Whereas, for more than 7 decades, His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama has significantly advanced greater understanding, tolerance, harmony, and respect among the religious faiths of the world;

Whereas the Dalai Lama has led the effort to preserve the rich and distinct cultural, religious, historical, and linguistic heritage of the people of Tibet while working to safeguard other endangered cultures throughout the world;

Whereas the Dalai Lama has been gravely concerned by the degraded state of the environment of Tibet and the unchecked exploitation of the natural resources of Tibet, including fresh water, because they have implications not only for Tibetans, but also for the whole of Asia;

Whereas, beginning in 1979, the Dalai Lama has visited various parts of the United States and subsequently gained the admiration of all levels of society in the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States have consistently expressed their appreciation for the culture and religion of Tibetan Buddhists, including through their support of its preservation, and political and diplomatic support for the Dalai Lama in his capacity as a spiritual leader;

Whereas there is strong bipartisan support from successive Congresses and Administrations for the Dalai Lama's vision for Tibet and the world and for a negotiated resolution that leads to meaningful autonomy for Tibetans that ensures they are able to freely practice their religion, culture, and language;

Whereas, on October 17, 2007, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to the Dalai Lama, finding in the Fourteenth Dalai Lama Congressional Gold Medal Act (Public Law 109-287; 120 Stat. 1231) that he is recognized around the world as "a leading figure of moral and religious authority" and is "the unrivaled spiritual and cultural leader of the Tibetan people";

Whereas, wherever followers of Tibetan Buddhism reside, including Tibet, the United States, Bhutan, India, Mongolia, Nepal, the Russian Federation, and other countries around the world, those followers look to the Dalai Lama for religious leadership and spiritual guidance;

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights holds that "[e]veryone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion," including the freedom to change religion or belief and to practice it in private or public;

Whereas at least 159 Tibetans in Tibet are known to have self-immolated, with statements or records left by many of them calling for freedom for Tibet and the return of the Dalai Lama;

Whereas, in 1991, section 355 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-138; 105 Stat. 713) expressed the sense of Congress that Tibet "is an occupied country under the established principles of international law" and that "Tibet's true representatives are the Dalai Lama and the Tibetan government in exile as recognized by the Tibetan people";

Whereas, in 1961, with the support of the United States, United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1723 called for “the cessation of practices which deprive the Tibetan people of their fundamental human rights and freedoms, including their right to self-determination”;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has interfered in the identification and installation of reincarnated leaders of Tibetan Buddhism as part of its efforts to maintain control over Tibet, including, in 1995, arbitrarily detaining the then-recently identified 11th Panchen Lama, Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, then a 6-year-old boy, and installing China's own candidate, Gyaltzen Norbu, as Panchen Lama;

Whereas, in 2011, the 14th Dalai Lama declared that the responsibility for identifying a future 15th Dalai Lama will “primarily rest” with officials of Gaden Phodrang, the Dalai Lama's office, and that “apart from the reincarnation recognized through such legitimate methods, no recognition or acceptance should be given to a candidate chosen for political ends by anyone, including those in the People's Republic of China”;

Whereas, in 2011, the 14th Dalai Lama initiated a historic devolution of power to the Central Tibetan Administration, in which he formally renounced his political role, transferring full democratic governance to an elected Tibetan leadership, thereby ensuring a democratic and secular political system for Tibet;

Whereas, on December 21, 2020, the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2020 (subtitle E of title III of division K of Public Law 116-260; 134 Stat. 3119) was passed, strengthening the landmark Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note), including by—

(1) addressing the issue of water security and environmental destruction in Tibet;

(2) providing humanitarian assistance and support for Tibetans in Tibet and in exile;

(3) stipulating that the objectives of the United States Special Coordinator for Tibet include promoting “substantive dialogue without preconditions, between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama, his or her representatives, or democratically elected leaders of the Tibetan community”;

(4) stating that it is the policy of the United States that “decisions regarding the selection, education, and veneration of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders are exclusively spiritual matters that should be made by the appropriate religious authorities within the Tibetan Buddhist tradition and in the context of the will of practitioners of Tibetan Buddhism” and that the wishes of the 14th Dalai Lama “should play a key role” in the selection, education, and veneration of a future 15th Dalai Lama; and

(5) stating that it is the policy of the United States to hold accountable, including through the imposition of sanctions, any officials of the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party who directly interfere with the identification and installation of a future Dalai Lama;

Whereas, on July 12, 2024, the Promoting a Resolution to the Tibet-China Dispute Act (Public Law 118-70; 138 Stat. 1488) was signed into law, with the Act affirming that it is the policy of the United States that the Tibet issue must be resolved in accordance with international law by peaceful means, through dialogue without preconditions, and that the People's Republic of China should cease propagating disinformation about Tibet's history, and stating that it is the sense of Congress that the People's Republic of China's claims that Tibet has been part of the People's Republic of China since “ancient times” are “historically inaccurate”;

Whereas the Central Tibetan Administration, the institution that represents and re-

flects to the greatest extent the aspirations of the Tibetan diaspora around the world, has officially decided to celebrate the 14th Dalai Lama's 90th birth year as the “Year of Compassion”;

Whereas the 14th Dalai Lama has highlighted the oneness of humanity and has dedicated his life to the promotion of compassion and human values and is considered a leader of compassion by the international community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes July 6, 2025, as a “Day of Compassion”;

(2) congratulates His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama on his 90th birthday and affirms its recognition of his outstanding contributions to peace, nonviolence, human rights, and mutual respect within and across faiths;

(3) affirms the Tibetan people's human rights and fundamental freedoms, including their right to exercise regional autonomy and to protect the distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and historical identity of the Tibetan people;

(4) reiterates, as outlined in the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2020 (subtitle E of title III of division K of Public Law 116-260), that the identification and installation of Tibetan Buddhist religious leaders, including a future 15th Dalai Lama, is a matter that should be determined by the present 14th Dalai Lama and within the Tibetan Buddhist faith community, in accordance with the inalienable right to religious freedom;

(5) reiterates that any attempt by the Government of the People's Republic of China or any other government to recognize a successor or reincarnation of the 14th Dalai Lama and any future Dalai Lamas not selected by the Tibetan people would represent a clear abuse of the right to religious freedom of Tibetan Buddhists and the Tibetan people; and

(6) requests that a copy of this resolution be presented to His Holiness the Dalai Lama as an expression of its esteem and respect.

SENATE RESOLUTION 284—DESIGNATING JUNE 10, 2025, AS “DACOR BACON HOUSE BICENTENNIAL DAY”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 284

Whereas the DACOR Bacon House (in this preamble referred to as the “House”) rests upon land originally belonging to the Anacostian people, who lived in the area between the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers for generations before European settlers arrived on their shores;

Whereas the House is built upon land previously owned by David Burnes, a Revolutionary War veteran who negotiated with President George Washington for the sale of his property to the Federal Government, which included the land upon which the White House and much of the National Mall are built;

Whereas the property was acquired in 1815 by Tobias Lear V, George Washington's personal secretary, who was the last person to whom President Washington spoke before passing and who was instrumental in ending the First Barbary War during his service as Consul General to Algiers;

Whereas Tench Ringgold, United States Marshal for the District of Columbia and Keeper of the Keys of the Capitol, who personally led President James Madison and several members of his Cabinet to safety during the 1814 British burning of the White

House, completed building the present-day DACOR Bacon House in 1825, through the use of enslaved people;

Whereas Chief Justice John Marshall, a previous Secretary of State, boarded at the House and was joined at times by Justices Joseph Story, Gabriel Duval, Smith Thompson, and Henry Baldwin;

Whereas former Maryland Governor Samuel Sprigg, who was instrumental in the completion of the historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, purchased the House as a gift for his daughter Sally Sprigg and nephew William Thomas Carroll, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States and a member of the prominent Carroll family, which includes signers of the Declaration of Independence, Articles of Confederation, United States Constitution, as well as numerous elected officials and the founder of Georgetown University;

Whereas William Thomas Carroll was also known for providing President Abraham Lincoln with the Bible that was used for his first inauguration, which has since become known as the “Lincoln Bible” and has been utilized by other presidents, including President Barack Obama and President Donald Trump, for their oaths of office;

Whereas the DACOR Bacon House served as the official residence of Russian Imperial Minister Nikolai Shishkin, the Russian Federation's top diplomatic representative to the United States, from 1875 to 1878 while he was dispatched to Washington, D.C.;

Whereas Chief Justice Melville Fuller and his family resided at the House from 1896 to 1910, during which time the House remained a fixture in Washington, D.C., high society and hosted President Grover Cleveland, President Theodore Roosevelt, and Secretary of War William Howard Taft;

Whereas, from 1911 to 1925, Alice Cornelia Copley Thaw owned the House and modernized its inner workings;

Whereas Illinois Senator Medill McCormick and his wife, the future Congresswoman Ruth Hanna McCormick, resided in the House during the 1920s when they entertained lawmakers and their spouses;

Whereas socialite Virginia Murray Bacon and her husband, 8-term New York Congressman Robert Low Bacon, owned the House from 1925 to 1980, during which period Virginia Murray Bacon's hosting abilities earned her the reputation of being one of Washington, D.C.'s last grandes dames;

Whereas the House was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1973, paying homage to its nearly 150 years of contributions to American history and society;

Whereas Virginia Murray Bacon established the Bacon House Foundation, which worked hand in hand with the DACOR Education and Welfare Foundation to establish the DACOR Bacon House Foundation, which was charged with caring for the historic House in perpetuity;

Whereas, on May 23, 1986, Secretary of State George P. Shultz attended the dedication ceremony that marked the DACOR Bacon House Foundation's new ownership and charged those present to “protect and advance the interests and ideals of America”;

Whereas, since 1986, the House has served as the headquarters of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers, Retired (DACOR) organization, a premier organization of foreign affairs professionals, whose members include ambassadors, foreign service officers, military and intelligence officials, political appointees from both major parties, Members of Congress and their staffs, Peace Corps and International Monetary Fund officials, global business leaders, and other professionals dedicated to promoting American interests and diplomatic relations;

Whereas, through DACOR and the DACOR Bacon House Foundation, which host regular educational discussions, policy programs, leadership development opportunities, and musical events, the House continues to be a vibrant center of cultural and diplomatic exchange, a museum of American life, and the home of the foreign affairs community; and

Whereas, 200 years after its construction, the House remains a pillar of strength in the President's neighborhood, pays tribute to the legacy of its prior owners, enslaved workers, and distinguished guests, and serves as a unique prism for understanding the history of both the District of Columbia and the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the historic importance of the DACOR Bacon House to the history of the United States, including American diplomacy, the Supreme Court, and Congress;

(2) applauds the DACOR Bacon House Foundation and the Diplomatic and Consular Officers, Retired organization for their decades-long efforts to preserve this historic landmark located in the heart of the capital of the United States; and

(3) designates June 10, 2025, as “DACOR Bacon House Bicentennial Day”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—DESIGNATING JULY 16, 2025, AS “GLIOBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 285

Whereas it is estimated that more than 13,000 individuals in the United States will be diagnosed with glioblastoma in 2025;

Whereas glioblastoma is—

(1) the most common malignant (cancerous) brain tumor, accounting for approximately 1/2 of all primary malignant brain tumors; and

(2) the most aggressive, complex, difficult to treat, and deadly type of brain tumor;

Whereas it is estimated that more than 10,000 individuals in the United States will succumb to glioblastoma each year;

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for glioblastoma patients is only 6.9 percent, and the median length of survival for glioblastoma patients is only 8 months;

Whereas glioblastoma is described as a disease that affects the “essence of self”, as the treatment and removal of glioblastoma presents significant challenges due to the uniquely complex and fragile nature of the brain, the primary organ in the human body that controls not only cognitive ability, but also the actions of every organ and limb;

Whereas patients and caregivers play a critical role in furthering research for glioblastoma;

Whereas, relative to patients with other types of cancers, brain cancer patients pay the second highest out-of-pocket costs for medical services in both the initial and end-of-life phases of care;

Whereas, although research advances may fuel the development of new treatments for glioblastoma, challenging obstacles to accelerating progress toward new treatments for glioblastoma remain, and there are no screening or early detection methods;

Whereas, in 2021, significant changes were made to the molecular characteristics of a glioblastoma diagnosis, necessitating crit-

ical biomarker testing for patients suspected of having a possible glioblastoma;

Whereas, although glioblastoma was first described in medical and scientific literature in the 1920s, and despite its devastating prognosis, only 5 drugs and 1 medical device have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration to specifically treat glioblastoma since the 1920s, and the mortality rates associated with glioblastoma have changed little during the past 30 years;

Whereas, since the first Glioblastoma Awareness Day, the National Cancer Institute established the Glioblastoma Therapeutics Network (referred to in this preamble as “GTN”) in 2020 as part of a national infrastructure to enhance and support the discovery and development of glioblastoma therapies available for multi-institutional GTN teams to drive therapeutic agents through preclinical studies and early phase clinical trials, which are necessary to rapidly evaluate potential treatments to advance toward cures and improved quality of life; and

Whereas there is a need for greater public awareness of glioblastoma, including awareness of both—

(1) the urgent unmet medical needs of glioblastoma patients; and

(2) the opportunities for research of, and treatment advances for, glioblastoma: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 16, 2025, as “Glioblastoma Awareness Day”;

(2) encourages increased public awareness of glioblastoma;

(3) honors the individuals who have died from the devastating disease of glioblastoma or are currently living with the disease;

(4) supports efforts to develop better treatments for glioblastoma that will improve the long-term prognosis for, and the quality of life of, individuals diagnosed with the disease;

(5) recognizes the importance of molecular biomarker testing to the diagnosis and treatment of glioblastoma;

(6) expresses support for the individuals who are battling brain tumors, as well as the families, friends, and caregivers of those individuals;

(7) urges a collaborative approach to brain tumor research among governmental, private, and nonprofit organizations, which is a promising means of advancing the understanding and treatment of glioblastoma; and

(8) encourages continued investments in glioblastoma research and treatments, including through the Glioblastoma Therapeutics Network and other existing brain tumor research resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—RECOGNIZING THE LIFE, ACHIEVEMENTS, AND PUBLIC SERVICE OF FORMER FIRST LADY BARBARA PIERCE BUSH ON THE OCCASION OF HER 100TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 286

Whereas, on June 8, 1925, Barbara Pierce Bush (referred to in this preamble as “Barbara Bush”) was born in New York City, New York;

Whereas Barbara Bush attended Ashley Hall and Smith College;

Whereas Barbara Bush worked a factory job to support the United States war effort during World War II in 1943;

Whereas, on January 6, 1945, Barbara Bush married George Herbert Walker Bush after he returned from serving in World War II;

Whereas, in 1948, Barbara Bush and George Herbert Walker Bush moved to Odessa, Texas, and had 6 children, George W., Robin, Jeb, Neil, Marvin, and Dorothy;

Whereas Barbara Bush supported the early business ventures of her husband in oil, which would later evolve into the Pennzoil Corporation;

Whereas Barbara Bush supported the first forays of her husband in politics during his 1963 Harris County Republican Party chairmanship and 1966 election to the House of Representatives in the 7th Congressional District of Texas;

Whereas Barbara Bush kept the constituents in Houston informed of happenings in Washington, DC, by writing frequent newspaper columns during the time George Herbert Walker Bush served in the House of Representatives;

Whereas, during the career of George Herbert Walker Bush before becoming President of the United States, Barbara Bush orchestrated cross-country moves for her family 29 times in 44 years;

Whereas Barbara Bush supported the political ascension of George Herbert Walker Bush during his appointments as the United States Ambassador to the United Nations in 1970, the Chair of the Republican National Committee in 1972, and the Director of Central Intelligence in 1976;

Whereas Barbara Bush became Second Lady of the United States when George Herbert Walker Bush was sworn in as the 43rd Vice President of the United States in 1981, and again in 1985 after the 1984 re-election of the Reagan-Bush Administration;

Whereas, as Second Lady of the United States, Barbara Bush revitalized the vice presidential residence at 1 Observatory Circle with extensive renovations and the hosting of more than 1,000 social events;

Whereas, as Second Lady of the United States, Barbara Bush used her platform in the Reagan-Bush administration to champion public literacy to combat the cycle of poverty in the United States;

Whereas, as Second Lady of the United States, Barbara Bush played a significant role in the successful presidential campaign of George Herbert Walker Bush, which saw him win the 1988 Presidential election with 426 electoral votes, a feat which has not been matched since;

Whereas, as First Lady of the United States, Barbara Bush continued to champion public literacy by establishing the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy in 1989, and played a significant role in the passage of the National Literacy Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-73; 105 Stat. 333);

Whereas, as First Lady of the United States, Barbara Bush showed immense compassion to AIDS patients at a time when public opinion was still hostile towards their plight;

Whereas, after leaving the White House, Barbara Bush published her bestselling book, “Barbara Bush: A Memoir”;

Whereas, after the victory of her son George W. Bush in the 2000 Presidential election, Barbara Bush became the second woman in the history of the United States to have been both married to a President of the United States and the mother of a President of the United States;

Whereas Barbara Bush showed unwavering support for the presidential campaigns of her sons, George W. Bush in 2000 and 2004, and Jeb Bush in 2016; and

Whereas, on her passing at her Houston home on April 17, 2018, Barbara Bush was survived by her husband of 73 years, George Herbert Walker Bush, 5 children and their

spouses, 17 grandchildren, and 8 great-grandchildren: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, achievements, and distinguished public service of Barbara Pierce Bush (referred to in this resolution as “Barbara Bush”);

(2) recognizes Barbara Bush on the occasion of her 100th birthday and expresses thanks and commendations to her and her family;

(3) acknowledges the positive impact that Barbara Bush contributed to the United States through her tireless dedication to promoting literacy and uplifting her fellow citizens; and

(4) celebrates the legacy of Barbara Bush as a model citizen and public servant of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I have three 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 Tuesday, June 17, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 17, 2025, 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 Tuesday, June 17, 2025, at 3 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following resolutions, which are at the desk: S. Res. 284, S. Res. 285, and S. Res. 286.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. HAGERTY. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Sen-

ate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 11 a.m. on Wednesday, June 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 130, Rodney Scott; further, notwithstanding rule XXII, at 12 noon the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Scott nomination and, following the cloture vote, the Senate vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 99, Olivia Trusty; further, if cloture is invoked on the Scott nomination, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m.; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday's session of the Senate, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

REMEMBERING MELISSA AND MARK HORTMAN

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Minnesota Senator SMITH to honor two Minnesotans, who are friends of ours, who were taken from us this weekend in a shocking act of political violence: Representative Melissa Hortman, our former speaker of the house, and her husband Mark Hortman.

I am also continuing to pray for State Senator John Hoffman and his wife Yvette, who survived a brutal assassination attempt. John took nine bullets, and Yvette took eight, and they are continuing to recover in the hospital. I have been in touch with Yvette, and she is grateful for the outpouring of support from all over the country for their family.

And I want to extend my enormous gratitude to the hundreds and hundreds of local, State, and Federal law enforcement who worked tirelessly over the course of a 43-hour manhunt to apprehend the suspect. They ran toward the danger. They risked their lives. And because of their bravery and diligence, our State was able to breathe a sigh of relief Sunday night knowing that this man was no longer at large.

The local officers from Brooklyn Park, MN, also stopped further assassinations, along with other officers, in

the moment by going over to check on legislators after learning about what had happened at Senator Hoffman's house. We now know that the assassin went to two other legislators' homes in between the two shootings that night and in one case sped off after being spotted by the police.

While it was too late to save Melissa and Mark, the officers' decision to check on their house allowed them to spot the assassin, separate him from his vehicle, and begin the manhunt.

But, right now, we want to focus on who Melissa and Mark were as people. They were great neighbors, wonderful friends, and great parents to their beloved children, Sophie and Colin.

Melissa is someone whom I wish the whole Senate and the whole Nation knew. We treasured her in Minnesota. She was the epitome of what you want in a public servant. She went into it for all the right reasons.

She grew up in Spring Lake Park and Andover, MN, working at her family's used auto parts company in Blaine in the summers. After leaving for college, she came back to Minnesota for law school and began her career in our State.

She was always devoted to her community. She was a Girl Scout leader and taught Sunday school at her local Catholic church, and she was always one of the first to raise her hand when someone needed a volunteer for, well, just about anything, including training service dogs for veterans.

One of them, Gilbert, was just too friendly for service because he couldn't just focus on one person, and so their family adopted him and loved him very much. Sadly, he was shot that night, and the two children had to make the decision to put him down this weekend. How they loved that dog.

Melissa and I first ran for public office around the same time—both with little kids—me for the county attorney's office and her for the State legislature. That is how I got to know her: I was the county attorney; she was running for the legislature. We went door to door together, and it seemed like she knew everyone in the district already.

She was elected in 2004 and served in the Minnesota House for 20 years, and she left a lasting impact. As a legislator, she authored legislation that created Minnesota's solar energy standard. As minority leader, she guided her caucus with conviction and a sense of humor. And she wasn't afraid to call out the all-male card game taking place during debates. When her colleagues chose to make her the speaker, her first order of business was getting rid of the speaker's mute button. As she said at the time, “I have a gavel . . . and a gavel is good enough for me.”

Melissa was one of the most consequential speakers in the history of our State. She knew no limits in terms of trying to get people together, trying to get things done. And while I cannot

believe she is gone, Minnesotans will be feeling the impact of her leadership forever.

When a Minnesota student gets a free school lunch, that is Melissa. When a Minnesota parent is able to take paid leave to spend those early precious moments with a newborn, that is Melissa. When a Minnesota voter casts a ballot without facing unfair discrimination, that is Melissa. When a woman is able to access reproductive care in our State, that is Melissa. And when our State achieves 100 percent clean energy by 2040, that will be because of Melissa. And when we had a tied State house this year, it was Melissa who forged a power-sharing agreement and a budget with her Republican counterpart. She was a generational leader, and she led with integrity and with courage.

She and her husband Mark, who you see here, who also was accomplished in business and a kind, kind person—they were compassionate, and they were smart. They were just nice to everyone, and I can't believe they are gone.

Here they are with their kids.

The polarization in our country—the divisions, the online hate—needs to stop. Violence has absolutely no place in our democracy. We need to come together and bring down the rhetoric. We must be united in the face of this attack. It was simply un-American.

That is why the entire Minnesota delegation, Democrats and Republicans—including Senator SMITH, including Congressman EMMER—came together over the weekend to call this violence out. We spoke with one voice to condemn it. And in our State, Melissa's colleagues on both sides of the aisle have done the same.

We need to recognize the reality that there are unbalanced people out there who read things online, they believe them, and they act on them. We have seen this too many times.

There are many things we can do as a body to fix this problem, and I am sure, in the days to come, we will offer legislation on security and all kinds of things. But we don't need to pass a law for people to turn down the rhetoric, to treat each other with decency and respect, to act a little more like Melissa and Mark.

Mr. President, Melissa and Mark Hortman were the best of us. I am shattered to have lost them but eternally grateful to have known them.

I want to end by sharing a message from their beloved kids Sophie and Colin. They wrote this just last night:

This tragedy must become a moment for us to come together. Hold your loved ones a little closer. Love your neighbors. Treat each other with kindness and respect. The best way to honor our parents' memory—

they said—

is to do something, whether big or small, to make our community just a little better for someone else.

I urge my colleagues to hear that message, and I am honored to be here with my wonderful colleague Senator SMITH.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

REMEMBERING MELISSA AND MARK HORTMAN

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, many thanks to my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR for her heartfelt words.

I rise today because my friend Melissa Hortman, speaker emerita of the Minnesota State House, incredible person and strong leader, was shot and killed Saturday morning, along with her husband Mark, in a tragic, politically motivated attack.

State Senator John Hoffman and his wife Yvette were also shot a total of 17 times, and Yvette—incredibly and selflessly—used her own body to shield their daughter from the attacker. I thank God that they are expected to recover.

I am filled with gratitude for the State and local and Federal law enforcement that marshaled all of their resources to keep Minnesota safe after this horrendous attack and to mount the largest manhunt in the history of our State to capture this shooter late on Sunday evening.

This was an unspeakable act of political violence, an attack on our democracy, as well as a personal tragedy.

There will be a time and a place to discuss the evilness of Speaker Emerita Hortman's assassination, the forces that drove her assassin to violence, and how we as leaders must rise to this moment and speak with one voice to condemn violent political attacks; but, today, I want my colleagues and America and everybody back home in Minnesota to know the kind of person and leader that Melissa was, and I want to think especially of Colin and Sophie, who have lost their parents, their mom and dad, and understand that they will not be forgotten by me or Senator KLOBUCHAR or many, many thousands of people.

I hope that everyone will be able to understand a little bit more keenly the depth of our grief, the human cost to the loss of Melissa and Mark's family, their friends, their community, and to Minnesota and our Nation.

So I don't know about you, but I need a little inspiration right now, and Melissa was inspirational.

The first thing you need to know about Melissa is that she was a middle-class girl from the north metro of the Twin Cities. She was funny, she was straightforward, and she was kind. She was smart and driven and determined, and she did well because she worked hard at everything she did—from her first job making burritos to her last job leading her caucus through a deeply divided legislative session. Nothing was handed to her, and she earned it through her work. That is the inspiration of the American dream.

The second thing that I want you to know about Melissa is that she believed and acted on one of our most

American of values: the conviction that we all have a responsibility to one another. We have a responsibility to contribute to our communities, and we have this unshakable belief that our country is great because we feel that conviction and that obligation to one another.

Service to and respect for others was the guiding principle in Melissa's life.

Over the last few days, there have been so many beautiful tributes written to Melissa's life and work. I see a common thread in all of these remembrances—that even in the rough business of politics, she was someone who never lost focus on our shared humanity, those shared values, and that shared goal that we should all have in public service, which is improving life for Americans. Her gift for focusing on our shared humanity helped her not only to earn the deep loyalty of the members of her own caucus but also the trust and respect of Republicans on the other side of the aisle.

Current house speaker Republican Lisa Demuth recently recalled how Melissa reached out to her at the start of Lisa's leadership—Melissa was the speaker of the house, and Lisa was coming into leadership—and how she came to view Melissa as a mentor to her leadership. Many disagreements on policy, but Melissa was a mentor to her because she brought such clarity and honesty and compassion to their working relationship.

Former senate majority leader Republican Paul Gazelka reflected on his years of working closely with Melissa. He noted that they had built a “deep trust” with one another because of her honesty, because of her even-keeled temperament, even though she was a very tough negotiator.

He remembered their moment of human connection as they shared a hug after the passage of a landmark public safety bill in the aftermath of the murder of George Floyd. That hug was in recognition of how they had worked so hard, coming from different places in such a difficult moment for Minnesota.

Melissa always approached her work by leading with compassion and respect for our shared humanity, and, of course, she was unafraid to demand that respect in return both for herself and others. I mean, she was fearless.

One of the most famous anecdotes of her speakership is—Amy was referring to this—one night—it was a long night; colleagues in this room can relate to it—it was a long night. The debate was going on and on. But there were members of the house that were making important speeches, making personal speeches about the impact of the bill that would have increased criminal penalties on certain protests.

Meanwhile, there was a group of male legislators in the back room that were playing cards. Melissa called them out on this, and these legislators—unaccustomed, I think, to being confronted with their rude behavior—expressed their indignation. Melissa's response

was pretty simple. She said: You know, I am really tired of watching women and especially women of color being ignored. She said: "So I'm not sorry."

Mr. President, I have to tell you that "sorry, not sorry" became a little bit of a rallying cry around the Minnesota State Capitol after that and is something we all remember Melissa for.

She lived her values, and she knew how to stand up for others and insisted that we all treat one another with dignity and respect as we undertake the serious work of public service, even in a political climate that too often rewards meanness and sort of a dehumanizing of one another.

Here is the third thing I want everyone to know about Melissa Hortman: She was a formidable legislator.

Melissa's tenure of public service began long before her election to the Minnesota Legislature. She was an intern in this very body for then-Senators Al Gore and John Kerry. After law school, she served as a clerk in our State's court system and then as an assistant Hennepin County attorney.

She first rose to prominence after winning a housing discrimination case as a legal aid attorney. What she won for her client was at the time the largest civil award in Minnesota history for housing discrimination—and she was 27 years old.

She volunteered on campaigns and ran for office twice, losing before she won and came to the Minnesota Legislature. She was tenacious.

Once elected, her talent was immediately obvious to her caucus. By her second term, she was already mounting and growing in leadership. By the time she was elected speaker, she had a remarkable record as a negotiator, an honest broker, someone who was true to her principles even when she had to make tough choices.

Melissa's leadership during the 2023 legislative session of the Minnesota Legislature was nothing short of historic. Much has been written about the great accomplishments of this legislative session in Minnesota, but I think an underappreciated part of this was that this remarkable session didn't just happen in one short period; it happened because of years and years and years of work by legislators and organizers and activists building support of consensus, and Melissa was a part of that work from the very beginning.

The success of that legislature and that legislative session came because of her ability to see an opportunity and to meet the moment and meet it with deftness and courage, and the result has been transformational to Minnesota.

She always believed that you can make a difference for people if you work at it, and she did. Because of her leadership, more than 13½ million more Minnesota students get a healthy and free breakfast and lunch in 2024. Minnesota is on track to eliminate all lead water service lines by 2033 thanks to Melissa. More than 65,000 Minneso-

tans were automatically registered to vote. Minnesota, of course, is the State—we are very proud of this—with the second highest voter turnout in the 2024 Presidential election and the highest youth voter turnout by far.

Starting next year, working Minnesotans who are starting or growing or caring for their families will have access to paid leave thanks to Melissa.

In short, millions—millions—of Minnesotans are better off because of the work that she did. Her record of accomplishment is so extensive, it is hard to capture it all in just a few short minutes. It is so bitter to realize that she was only 55. She had so many more contributions to make, so much—as Melissa would say: Don't get carried away. I was just going to do my work. I was going to work as hard as I could.

It is bitter for us that her life was taken in this way, and it will now be up to all of us to carry on these fights. I will miss her leadership and her friendship as our State navigates these uncertain times.

Mr. President, I look around this Senate Chamber, and I see legislators who, like Melissa, understand that the job of a legislature and a legislator is to help fix things, not just talk about fixing things, to lift up people who need help, to build opportunity, and to use the power of our connections to one another to build a better, stronger, more fair community.

I hope my colleagues will take heart and inspiration from Melissa's example and rededicate ourselves to what it means to be a legislator, working across lines of difference to solve problems for the people who sent us here.

I want to close with a suggestion from Melissa and Mark's beloved children Sophie and Colin to all of us in Minnesota just yesterday. It is in the spirit of Melissa's directness and down-to-earthness.

She said:

If you would like to honor the memory of Mark and Melissa, please consider the following: Plant a tree. Visit a local park and make use of the amenities, especially a bike trail. Pet a dog. A golden retriever is ideal, but any will do. Tell your loved ones a cheesy dad joke and laugh about it. Bake something—bread for Mark or a cake for Melissa—and share it with someone. Try a new hobby and enjoy learning something. Stand up for what you believe in, especially if that thing is justice and peace.

May the memory of Melissa and Mark be a blessing to all who knew and loved them. May John and Yvette have a speedy recovery. And may we all find a way to recover and be better after these terrible attacks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, first of all, I just want to say how powerful the presentations were talking about the tragedy in Minnesota and how all of our hearts go out to the families and to

the entire State because it is obviously something that had a profound impact upon the entire community, and it is something that has all of us grieving for them. I was just touched, as I think everyone who heard them was, with the presentations that we heard.

Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the Republican's "Big Billionaire Boondoggle," which is economic sabotage and climate denial masquerading as fiscal policy.

Last night's Senate Finance Committee text doesn't just double down on repealing smart clean energy tax credits, it erodes our progress and our chance at a livable future.

Senate Republicans are doubling down on egregious attacks against historic investments in the Inflation Reduction Act, cutting more than \$500 billion in investments and programs, threatening hundreds of thousands of jobs, and raising monthly household energy bills.

In 2024—this is the big number—in 2024, 94 percent of all new electricity generation added to our country was wind and solar and batteries. I want to repeat that. In 2024, 94 percent of all of the new electricity generation capacity added in our country was wind and solar and batteries. That is 50,000 megawatts of solar, 4,000 megawatts of wind, and 11,000 megawatts of batteries. Compare that with the fuels of the past. Last year, only 2,500 megawatts of natural gas were added and zero from coal.

That is the present state of affairs for electricity generation installation in our country in 2025 as we begin this debate in the Senate over the reconciliation bill—over the tax policy for our country.

Unfortunately, it is why the oil and gas and coal industry, through the Republicans, are using the budget bill to rig the game while eliminating incentives that lower energy costs and reduce collusion, but they are not going to remove the tax breaks for the fossil fuel industry.

So what is about to unfold is that we are going to see the pursuance of a vendetta against wind and solar energy by cutting incentives for the cleanest and cheapest sources of electricity, all to pad the pockets of the big oil and big gas industries.

This bill eliminates the residential clean and efficient energy incentives. Let me say that again. If you want to put solar panels on your roof, that tax break is going to be gone. If you want to make your home more energy efficient, that tax break is going to be gone. Heat pumps, all of it, is gone. Robbing homeowners—homeowners—of the ability to save money on energy bills, breathe safer air indoors at home, and ensure a livable future for their families. And it also removes support for families looking to buy a clean vehicle, an electric vehicle, and saving money at the pump.

It imposes draconian restrictions on large-scale solar and wind incentives.

That is the solar and wind installations that the utilities may want to install in our country. So it is a multipronged attack upon what is—in 2024, and it is already unfolding again in 2025—the future. It is wind and solar and batteries.

And it is unfolding in a way which, again, threatens the incumbent energy sources. And in place of these programs, there are no solutions. There is just more pollution that is going to be what happens as a result of what the Republicans are trying to do with this bill.

And you wind up with higher prices. You wind up with fewer jobs. If this bill passes, solar deployment is expected to drop nearly 40 percent by 2030 than what was expected before.

And as energy demand increases driven by power-hungry AI data centers and natural gas LNG exports, Republicans are choosing to strangle America's supply of cheap solar and wind, which we are going to need for the AI revolution. The estimates are that AI itself over the next 10 years could double the need for electricity in our country.

And what this bill will do is take wind and solar and batteries off the field and then say to the natural gas industry and oil industry: You figure out how to get it done.

But that is not what, obviously, people in our country want. They are making decisions that have resulted in 2024 with 94 percent of all new electricity being wind and solar and batteries. So it is heading in just the opposite direction of where the American people are headed.

So this is just economics 101: High demand plus low supply means higher energy prices for everyone. That is what they are setting up if we take wind and solar out of the mix, forcing families, on average, to pay \$150 more per month on their energy bills just in 5 years, and \$260 per month more each month in 10 years because there won't be the competition, and there won't be the supply.

And the less the supply is the higher the price for the remaining electricity in our society. And it will also destroy 840,000 American jobs by the year 2030, jobs that would have been people up on roofs installing the solar or having offshore wind work or electricians off the Atlantic Coast or installing coal efficiency into homes across our country and just going through the home to make it more energy efficient, solar installation, and fewer manufacturing jobs for solar and wind all across our country.

Republicans want to frame their cuts as eliminating wasteful Democratic spending, but the communities and constituents they were elected to represent, they are going to stand to lose a great deal. The States with the highest spikes in energy prices are going to be South Carolina, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Mississippi, and Louisiana under this bill. We are taking out the alternatives that could have helped them moderate the prices in those States.

And the States with the largest job losses: Texas, Florida, Indiana, and Georgia. So this isn't a red State or a blue State issue; this is creating a national economic crisis. Eighty percent of the IRA funding has gone to red States—80 percent, only 20 percent to blue States. And by the way, that is how the bill was designed.

The extra tax breaks went to the States that would be energy transition States, and there has been an explosion by the hundreds of thousands of new jobs. And the Republican bill would make the United States the laggard, not the leader in innovation.

Already China is investing four times more than the United States in renewable energy. Here is China's plan. They plan on investing \$1 trillion a year for the next 10 years every year—\$10 trillion—and the same thing is true for Japan. They have already made an announcement that they are going to invest a trillion dollars over the next 10 years.

So we might as well just be gift wrapping the clean energy industry, gift wrapping it for China and other countries to be the global leader.

So that is where we are. Instead of catching up and overtaking China, this bill will cede more jobs and more progress, and Republicans are putting our health and our planet up for sale. This bill would increase emissions equivalent to putting 72 million more cars on the road and eliminates pollution-reduction programs, leading to approximately 930 additional premature deaths every single year.

So that is the plan when it comes to clean energy, and it is going to be an absolute disaster for us. And, additionally, as affirmed last night, Republicans want to slash over \$1 trillion from our healthcare system, and the House already passed cuts that would rip \$800 billion from Medicaid and \$500 billion from Medicare.

The Senate Republicans released text last night that doesn't just support these cuts but makes them actually worse, and their changes would make it harder for people to stay on their insurance. It would create more paperwork for patients to fill out. It would make it more difficult for States to fund their healthcare programs, and it would leave less people with access to healthcare across our Nation. It would take 16 or 17 million people and take away their insurance in our country.

So this isn't just line items or a spreadsheet; this is people's lives. If we cut people off their health insurance and less money goes to hospitals, nursing homes, health clinics, people will not be able to get healthcare. People will lose their local hospitals, nursing homes, and clinics. Health workers will lose their jobs, and rural communities could lose their biggest employers.

People will be forced to make impossible decisions about whether their healthcare is worth going into bankruptcy or medical debt. And if Republicans pass this bill, instead of address-

ing our country's healthcare crisis, we will be supercharging it.

But they don't need to listen to me. Here is what the experts have found. A study published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine* found that Republican cuts would increase the number of people skipping medical care because of cost from nearly 129,000 people to nearly 839,000 people a year.

A study from Yale and Penn found that Federal cuts from Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act would lead to 51,000 deaths per year. And just last week, I released data produced by the Sheps Center at the University of North Carolina about how substantial cuts to Medicare and Medicaid could force 338 hospitals across the country into financial distress, leading them to cut services or close the hospital altogether.

Where are those hospitals? Well, in Kentucky, there are 35 of them that could be at risk for their viability. Louisiana is 33 hospitals. These are rural hospitals. They rely upon Medicaid. They rely upon the Affordable Care Act to pay the bills.

So this is something that is going to be very, very dangerous, hundreds of rural hospitals put on the brink because of the decisions made by Republicans in this Congress and in this White House. This is a lethal risk to take on to pay the tax breaks for billionaires.

If this bill passes and even one patient loses their insurance because of burdensome paperwork in a single hospital or nursing home, the responsibility will fall on anyone who voted yes on this bill.

And our State and local public health officials know this risk, which is why they are asking to stop these cuts. The Louisiana State house, with a Republican majority, passed a resolution just this week asking Congress to "oppose sweeping or indiscriminate cuts to Medicaid and to instead work in partnership with states to strengthen and preserve the program for the future." That is the Louisiana State house Republicans.

The Houghton County Board of Commissioners in Michigan voted to oppose Medicaid cuts. Mr. President, 52 organizations in Alabama, including the Alabama Cancer Society, the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, churches all across the State, wrote to the Governor urging opposition to healthcare cuts, citing the need for more care and less bureaucracy.

And on June 12, 900 State and local elected officials from across the country—including mayors and State senators and representatives, attorneys general—all stood up to come out against "the damaging and reckless plan."

And these proposed cuts are as dangerous as they are pointless.

So I am going to conclude on this: Donald Trump and Republicans only need to rush these cuts through to guarantee tax breaks for billionaires.

So the people who will benefit the most are the upper 0.1 percent. And as millions more Americans lose their healthcare, billionaires who can afford concierge medicine will get a handout from the government.

The rich will get richer, while the sick who are the poorest are going to be left without their healthcare. The other ones are going to lose their insurance.

This is what this billionaire boondoggle is all about. It takes financial security from children, rips dinner off the family table, and crushes people's opportunities for health and financial security and sells it away to the ultrawealthy.

This is not a big beautiful bill, as Donald Trump would call it, it is a big billionaire buyoff and a bludgeoning of our health, our economy, our future.

We don't have to do this. Making these cuts is optional, and I am asking my Republican colleagues to please vote no. We can do a lot better with this legislation. Please—please—let us negotiate a sensible resolution of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for laying out how families lose and billionaires win on this not so beautiful bill that Trump has put forward.

It is really a big beautiful betrayal, betrayal because Trump campaigned for helping families. But as we have seen with the details in the end, this is about helping billionaires. The bottom 20 percent, the less affluent, they get tax benefits of about \$90 a year.

Somebody who earns a million dollars gets \$90,000 a year of tax benefit—\$90,000 for an already, well-off, rich individual, and \$90 for ordinary families struggling to get on its feet.

REMEMBERING MELISSA AND MARK HORTMAN

Mr. MERKLEY. I am going to talk about a different aspect of the reconciliation bill, but before I do so, my heart is with the people of Minnesota, who have lost Melissa and Mark Hortman. Melissa was speaker of the house. As a former speaker of the house in Oregon, I know the type of effort that goes into coordinating a legislative session and commitment to so many different policy issues, striving to build a better State, a better State of Minnesota.

And Melissa and Mark are no longer with us because of an act of hate, an act of violence, something that so goes against the vision of free speech and free assembly in America, where we can come together and argue our points and disagree profoundly with each other, but out of that stew of

ideas comes policies that hopefully take us forward, not violence that takes us to the grave.

So, again, my heart is with Melissa and Mark's family and the people of Minnesota.

And I hope we can all work together to end the type of rhetoric, the type of framing that suggests that on the differences that we have, though large on policy, neither side is coming from an evil point of view. We bring differences that have to be worked out in legislatures like the U.S. Senate.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, now, turning to an issue that has to be worked out in our U.S. Senate, is the challenge of having honest budget numbers for the conversation over the reconciliation bill.

Back in 1974, the Senate and House were alarmed over the growing deficits. They were microscopic compared to the type of deficits we have today, but still people said: Let's not get on that path of expanding the national debt. Let's create a real budgeting process where we lay out a vision at the front end so that the bills that are passed by the committees—the revenue bills and the policy bills—fit into that budget framework so we will have control over the result, whether it is a surplus that we want or whether we want to spend more and run up some deficit because, perhaps, it is a year in which the economy is dipping, and we need to provide some stimulus. But the point was a front-end budgeting process into which we could put the effects of all of these different bills in the course of a year.

So it was an act designed to bring planning for revenue and spending levels into a coherent framework by laying out a budget and holding committees accountable to that budget vision.

In this Budget Act, Congress created two significant tools for very different and separate purposes. One of them is section 312 of the Budget Act. Section 312 says that the Committee on the Budget will establish estimates of "the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, and revenues for a fiscal year." So there is the framework.

And to clarify, for most of the work that is done, the committee depends on the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue projections and depends on the Congressional Budget Office for the cost of programs.

But this section in 312 has also been interpreted to give the chair of the Budget Committee the authority to resolve complex scoring questions that come up or technical ambiguities that come up on particular programs for particular revenue measures during normal legislating.

I emphasize "during normal legislating." It has nothing to do with reconciliation.

Now, Congress created a second tool that was specifically about reconcili-

ation. It is presented in the Budget Act and for a very special purpose. This section, reconciliation, was to be a filibuster-free pathway in the Senate for one reason and one reason alone: decreasing the deficit.

And you can imagine: There is Robert Byrd, who is the champion of the filibuster, who wants everything to have to go through a supermajority vote. It was often used against civil rights bills but was often used in other ways as well. And he would not let go of that for any reason, except the special role of reducing the national deficit.

A hundred Senators said yes to that vision—all the Democrats, all the Republicans.

So we have in that act a section 313, affectionately known as the Byrd rule, that lays out some very specific details for how to handle that reconciliation process.

So we have section 312, normal budgeting, for nonreconciliation bills, and we have section 313 with special rules for reconciliation bills.

Now, why am I coming to the floor to make such a detailed examination of issues that we wouldn't normally, well, wrestle with in a public forum. Well, the answer is because there is a plan afoot to take this tool that was always used and framed for regular budgeting to give a bit of flexibility to the Budget Committee through the Budget chair to resolve complex technicalities or abnormalities—issues—on small issues in normal bills and apply it in a completely corrupted version to section 313, overruling the foundation for reconciliation. Two very different tools, two very different purposes, but taking one and applying it to the other destroys the integrity of the reconciliation process, and I am going to lay that out in some detail.

Section 312 allows the Budget chair to be a referee, to find bipartisan common ground to solve those ambiguities in the budgets—but, again, never used in reconciliation because it wasn't intended for that purpose.

Now, if you are going to have a special process to reduce deficits, you have to agree to have honest numbers. So, therefore, the act created the Congressional Budget Office to give us those honest numbers on what programs cost.

And then you have honest integrity with numbers on revenue coming from the Joint Committee on Taxation.

So you have these two institutions and a commitment in section 313 to honest budgeting numbers. So we will quit fooling ourselves, and we will quit fooling the public because the goal was to reduce the deficit, and you can't reduce the deficit if you are lying about what new measures will cost, whether it be revenue measures or they be policy measures.

So it would completely defeat the purpose of reconciliation to simply have the Budget chair, who could resolve a technical ambiguity in a normal bill, be able to say: Well, that is

such a power, I am going to transport it from a normal budget bill over to reconciliation. Instead of using honest numbers from CBO and from the Joint Committee on Taxation, I am going to just create my own hall of mirrors, my own smoke, and my own baseline to pretend that things don't cost what they really cost.

It is a complete obliteration of the responsibility for integrity in the reconciliation process, which, again, was designed only to decrease the deficit.

Now, there has been a bit of a journey for the House and Senate since 1974, and that foundation that this reconciliation process would only be used to reduce the deficit got blown up in 1996. My colleagues across the aisle decided that, well, they wanted to pass a big tax bill, and they knew they couldn't do it through regular order. So they repurposed a process designed to reduce the deficit and said it could also be used for a tax bill that increases the deficit.

Well, that was a painful blow to fiscal responsibility because each and every one of their tax bills has vastly increased the deficit.

But they retained two other things: a second pillar, that said, after 10 years, every title has to either be deficit-neutral or reduce the deficit—so after a 10-year frame—and that they would continue to use honest numbers.

OK. Well, so now we have another situation where we rely here on using reconciliation not for its original purpose, to decrease the deficit, but for a tax bill. But pillars 2 and 3 were still in place up until this moment: no deficits in any title after 10 years and using honest numbers.

But the chair of the Budget Committee is saying: I don't want to keep pillar 2 and 3. I don't want to keep pillar 2 that says everything after 10 years has to be deficit-neutral or deficit reduction; and I don't want to use honest numbers because it lets the world see how expensive this bill is and kind of destroys our reputation for fiscal responsibility. So we want to create some magic math, some false baseline, to pretend that the bill does not have a lot of deficit.

Well, this is a huge mistake, and I am just here to say: Let's not let this happen. Let's not destroy the second and third pillars. Let's not destroy the second pillar which says: no deficits after 10 years.

Let's not destroy the third pillar which says: We use honest numbers from the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office.

There are two reasons that my colleague who chairs the Budget Committee wants to take this provision from section 312 for normal budgeting that gives some flexibility to the Budget chair and bring it over and create this new fake baseline so this bill doesn't look like it will run up the debt that it obviously runs up. One is that he wants to make the tax cuts permanent, meaning deficits will be run far

beyond the 10-year period. And, second, he wants the American people to believe that this is not going to create huge, massive, additional deficits and debt.

Well, those are not good reasons. We should all work together to maintain the second and third pillars of no deficits after 10 years—the third pillar that, in fact, we will use honest numbers and not lie to ourselves and not lie to the American people about the cost of a bill.

He calls this new, fake baseline “current policy baseline.” And part of the little twist is to say: Hey, the law says that a tax provision ends, but we will pretend that it doesn't say that—the law doesn't say that—and it just continues on forever. And since we are now pretending that the law was written differently than it was really written, it is really not a new provision that costs anything. Because a lot of these new extensions or new tax provisions cost because they reduce the revenues, we will just pretend they don't.

But you know it is that kind of pretending that got us into this trouble to begin with. That is what the 1974 bill was about. Let's quit lying to ourselves. Let's quit lying to the public. Let's quit pretending we are not creating deficits when we are. Let's have honest, honest budgeting.

So the irony is that you can even see how this philosophy fails even within the Republican bill, because if this philosophy that every bill or measure that the law says ends actually continues, then there would be no reason to have in the bill what my Republican colleagues have put in the bill, which is that they end a bunch of tax provisions in the middle of the 10-year period so they can say the bill costs less.

So the old laws that are going to expire, we pretend they continue. But the new laws that we are creating at this very moment, that end within the 10 years, we pretend they actually end.

You can see how phony this situation is, and we need to do better.

Now, let me just go through how modest the use of section 312, in general budgeting, was. The first is, it was always bipartisan. It was bipartisan in 2017. It was bipartisan in 2023 and 2024 and 2025. Each of these times, it was bipartisan.

But this new proposal is to use it in this partisan fashion. It is a complete deviation from a Budget chair working out a gnarly problem in order to be able to figure out how we should really resolve how this individual policy should be evaluated, and, instead, turn it into an instrument in which you fake the numbers and do it in a partisan way.

So that is not the only way that this would break protocol. The second is that each time it was used, it was used on a very narrow provision. It was routine—in 2017, on the Crime Victims Fund; on the Power Marketing Administrations; on the preventing of double counting of a dairy program; on adjust-

ments to the Fiscal Responsibility Act. It was always on a very narrow provision, not creating a whole new baseline out of thin air in order to fake the numbers over deficits and debt.

One example in this is 2017, when Republican Chair Mike Enzi directed CBO to use the original current law baseline for the Crime Victims Fund, rather than a new baseline with updated numbers, because, essentially, if you have a baseline at the start of the year and then, a few months pass, the numbers change slightly. And if you keep inventing or having to use a new baseline that is changing just, like, small amounts, it makes no sense because they aren't significant changes.

So it was an issue to say: No. Let's go ahead and use the baseline from the start of the year rather than updating it every single time that every week goes by. So a narrow, very narrow, issue.

And, as I noted before, it was to resolve an ambiguity. Each time it has been used, it has been to resolve an ambiguity. But, in this case, it is to create ambiguity; it is to create confusion; it is to create smoke and mirrors; it is to create a phony baseline to lie to ourselves and to the public about what this bill costs, and that is just wrong.

Let me give you an example.

In 2000, a deal had been struck on how to score activities of the Power Marketing Administrations, but over the years, the Congressional Budget Office had started scoring the program differently from the 2000 arrangement. In 2023 and 2024, Senate Budget Chair SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and House Budget Chair JOEY ARRINGTON invoked section 312 to have the CBO remember and observe the original 2000 agreement. It was the example of section 312 being used to resolve a technical ambiguity.

Let's look at one other way that it has been used in the past.

It was never used on reconciliation. It was not used on reconciliation in 2017. It was not used when they addressed the Power Marketing Administrations. That was not in reconciliation. Preventing the double counting of a dairy program is not in reconciliation. Adjusting the Fiscal Responsibility Act was not in reconciliation.

This provision wasn't designed for reconciliation. Reconciliation has its own set of rules in section 313, and those rules say each provision—the word is “provision”—in the proposed law is accounted for in terms of estimating accurately through these numbers from the CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation what its real effect will be.

So that is the story, and I will give you an example.

In 2023, Senator WHITEHOUSE and Representative ARRINGTON again worked together to resolve an issue in the farm bill. The CBO was scoring the dairy program and reducing the costs of extending the program by \$105 million over 10 years, but the CBO didn't include it in the new farm bill's baseline, meaning the Ag Committee has to

pay for the program a second time out of the funding allocated to their committee. That didn't make any sense so they fixed it.

That is an example—very narrow, bipartisan—and we are talking small numbers.

Let's turn to those issues over small numbers. Well, they aren't so small when you think about this in terms of our normal trip to the grocery store—\$73 million or less than \$200 million. One case in the Fiscal Responsibility Act—again, in a bipartisan, specific provision—is \$2.8 billion. What is this bill about? What is this fake baseline being used to hide in this case? It is \$37 trillion of additional debt.

Again, this is absolutely a crime against fiscal responsibility. It is blowing up the last two pillars from the 1974 Act: no additional debt or deficit past 10 years of any title; the honest use of numbers from the CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation. It is taking a provision to allow the taking on of small ambiguities to be wrestled with in a bipartisan fashion and resolved—taking that flexibility—and using it in the wholesale destruction of responsible budgeting. So let's not do this.

Colleagues, the deficit now, annually, is sizable. It is about 6 percent of our gross domestic product. Remember the end of the Clinton administration? We were raising in revenue about 21 percent of GDP. We were spending about 21 percent. We were actually running a surplus. Now we are spending 6 percent more of GDP than we are bringing in as revenue. We are no longer bringing in 21 percent of GDP in revenue. We are bringing in 17 percent. We are no longer spending 21 percent. We are spending 23 percent.

This bill, by the way, will crank up that gap between revenue and spending even more as time passes. It is a pathway to not only destroying the current programs that my colleague from Massachusetts was talking about—16 million people losing healthcare, 4 million children going hungry to give tax breaks to billionaires. It is not only a pathway to destroy current programs, but it runs up debt to destroy the ability to provide fundamental programs in housing and healthcare and education for the next generation, and that is wrong.

That is why I say to you colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Let's be honest about the numbers. Let's not corrupt the process by bringing a measure that belongs in the regular budgeting world, not in the reconciliation world, in order to destroy reconciliation as a process that will not increase deficits after 10 years and will honestly convey the effect of each provision in the bill as to whether it raises revenue or spends money.

Preserve honest budgeting. Let's do that. It will serve us well. It will serve the Nation well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise at a late hour with few folks on the floor to talk about the most serious issue we could ever talk about on the floor of the U.S. Senate: the prospect that America may soon be in a war.

There is no part of the Constitution that is more important than the article I provisions making claim that the United States should not be at war without a vote of Congress. Yet the news of the day suggests that we are potentially on the verge of a war with Iran.

When I was elected to the Senate in 2012, having served as a Governor from 2006 to 2010 during a tremendous upsurge in the two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, I visited our troops multiple times in the Green Zone in Baghdad and in Afghanistan. I went to the deployments and the homecomings; I went to the wakes and funerals, and I told myself when I came to the Senate that, if I ever had the chance to stop this Nation from getting into an unnecessary war, I would do everything I could to stop us from getting into an unnecessary war. I happen to believe that the United States engaging in a war against Iran—a third war in the Middle East since 2001—would be a catastrophic blunder for this country.

I think there are some in this body who have a different point of view than I on this point, but I think we should all be able to agree in the fundamental constitutional principle that says we shouldn't be in a war if Congress doesn't have the guts to debate it and vote on it; that we should all, in having taken an oath to the Constitution, at least support the principle that war is something that should be for Congress to declare.

Just recently—right before I walked on the floor—the New York Times published this article, and I am just going to read this to demonstrate the imminence of the threat that this country faces.

The article from the New York Times, dated today, reads "Iran is Preparing Missiles for Possible Retaliatory Strikes on U.S. Bases, Officials Say," and I will just read the first few paragraphs.

Iran has prepared missiles and other military equipment for strikes on U.S. bases in the Middle East should the United States join Israel's war against the country, according to American officials who have reviewed intelligence reports.

Fears of a wider war are growing among American officials as Israel presses the White House to intervene in its conflict with Iran. If the United States joins the Israeli campaign and strikes Fordo, a key Iranian nuclear facility, the Iranian-backed Houthi militia will almost certainly resume striking ships in the Red Sea, the officials said. They added that pro-Iranian militias in Iraq and Syria would probably try to attack U.S. bases there.

Other officials said that in the event of an attack, Iran could begin to mine the Strait of Hormuz, a tactic meant to pin American warships in the Persian Gulf. Commanders put American troops on high alert at mili-

tary bases throughout the region, including in the United Arab Emirates, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. The United States has more than 40,000 troops deployed in the Middle East.

I met the father of an Apache helicopter pilot currently deployed in Syria yesterday.

Finally, from the article:

Two Iranian officials have acknowledged that the country would attack U.S. bases in the Middle East, starting with those in Iraq, if the United States joined Israel's war.

We stand tonight as close to the potential initiation of a third war in the Middle East—the United States against Iran—as we have been during my time in the Senate. So, yesterday morning, when the Senate came into session, I announced and then I followed up with a filing of a War Powers Resolution in this body—a privileged resolution—that, by my clock, will mature and be subject to a vote on this floor because of its privileged status a week from Thursday. Ten days from the filing of such a motion, even by a single Senator, the Senate is required to take this matter up for an up-or-down floor vote about whether or not war should happen without a vote of Congress.

A little bit about the Constitution. Many in here have heard me speak about this over the years about the Constitution. The Framers of the Constitution grappled with the question about how wars should begin, and they grappled with the question in a most unusual way.

In the Constitution of 1787, the article I power is the congressional, the legislative power, and the article II power is the executive power. The Framers of the Constitution split war powers into a legislative responsibility and an executive responsibility. The legislative responsibility is clear: Congress declares war. It is in article I. The executive responsibility is to be the Commander in Chief. Once Congress—535 people—has declared war, you don't need 535 Commanders in Chief. That would lead to chaos. So a war once declared by a debate and vote by the people's elected body then gets handed to the President, who as Commander in Chief is responsible for executing on that declaration.

The Framers of the Constitution did understand one thing about the President's power, which is the President as Commander in Chief should defend the Nation. The President always has the ability to defend the United States without asking Congress's permission.

Back in 1787, Congress might adjourn and ride horseback back to Vermont. What if the United States were attacked? You couldn't wait for all of Congress to come back to enable the United States to defend itself. So a President has the inherent power under article II to defend the United States without asking for permission. But it has been the understanding since the very beginning of this Republic that, if it is more than defending the United States—if it is going on offense in any

way—congressional authorization is needed.

It is so rare. In other countries and at other times, war has been for the Executive. It has been for the King. It has been for the Emperor. It has been for the Monarch. It has been for the Czar. It has been for the Sultan. But in the United States, we made a very careful choice to do it differently, and that choice was described most eloquently in a letter from the main drafter of the Constitution James Madison to President Thomas Jefferson. Actually, he was not yet President. This letter was dated April 2, 1798, and James Madison described what were they getting at when they vested the power to declare war with Congress.

Here is what James Madison wrote:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. [Our Constitution] has accordingly with studied care, vested the question of war in the Legislature.

Other countries don't do this, but the Framers of our Constitution in 1787 decided we are going to be different. Before we send troops into harm's way where they could be killed, where they could be injured, where they could see people they love and their colleagues killed and injured—before we are going to send troops in harm's way in war, we want to see the people's elected bodies—both Houses—have a debate about what the stakes are and whether we should force our troops into harm's way and potentially lose their lives, and that debate will be in full view of the American public so the American public can understand what is at stake, and then they can call their Representatives or write them a letter and tell them what they think about whether war is necessary and whether the sacrifice we ask of our troops should be the ultimate sacrifice that we are often asking of them in war.

That has been the Constitution since 1787. The Constitution has been amended, probably, in 25 or 26 amendments now. That has never been amended. That has never been amended.

In 1974, Congress grappled with a challenging problem and passed the War Powers Resolution of 1974. What was the problem?

The problem in 1974 was this: A President began war without telling Congress. In 1974, we were in the midst of the Vietnam war. Congress did know that, and Congress had passed some legislation at least appropriating funds for it and somewhat authorizing it during the Johnson administration. Congress knew about the war in Vietnam.

Obviously, there was a draft, and 56,000 Americans were killed in that war. But President Nixon, without informing Congress, extended the war and started bombing Cambodia—it was called the secret bombing of Cambodia—a new country that had not been covered by war authorizations. So

Congress stepped up and acted and passed the War Powers Resolution of 1974.

That resolution did a number of things. It established some protocols for when the President initiates military action, providing notice to Congress so that there can't be a secret war; giving Congress some ability, once notice is provided, to try to withdraw notice if it thinks that the war is ill-advised.

But the War Powers Resolution also did something else: It gave the power to even one Member of Congress, one Senator or one House Member, if a President initiates war or is on the verge of initiating war—the War Powers Resolution gave to one Senator, one Congressman, the ability to file a resolution to stop a war before it starts or to stop a war once it started.

The War Powers Resolution over time has made that a privileged motion, meaning it can bypass committee and be brought up on the floor of the Senate for a vote within an expeditious period of time.

A privileged motion is one that sort of elbows everything else out of the way because Congress has judged that the matter is so important that it should take precedence over normal committee proceedings and it should be considered in a prompt fashion. It is a simple majority vote, not subject to filibuster and cloture. It can't be buried in a committee. It has to be debated on the floor. It is amendable. It can be amended.

But as long as you meet the criteria, the privileged criteria, under the War Powers Resolution of 1974, you are entitled to try to stop a war before it starts. The criteria that you have to meet to have the privilege are two:

One, hostilities between the United States and another actor nation—Iran in this case—have to either be underway or they have to be imminent. That has to be the case. You can't just say: I want to stop a war that no one has contemplated and nothing is happening. So you have to demonstrate imminence. You also have to show that there is no existing congressional authorization authorizing the United States to be at war—in this case, with Iran. That second criteria has been met.

We had a similar resolution on the floor a few years ago following the U.S. strike that killed the Iranian military leader Soleimani, and the ruling of the Parliamentarian and really the acknowledgement of the body was that there was no current congressional authorization authorizing war against Iran.

So the question is, Is the imminence standard met? I would argue that it clearly is. The United States is already using U.S. weaponry to knock down Iranian missiles. That is more than imminence; that is actual kinetic hostility.

The United States is being urged to enter the war. The United States is

moving military assets into the region and withdrawing diplomats from the region.

The Iranians are acknowledging that: If the United States enters the war, we have plans to go after U.S. troops, the 40,000 U.S. troops in the area.

Since Congress clearly wanted a Member to be able to file such a motion to be heard before a war begins, I believe the imminence standard is clearly met in this case with actual kinetic activity between U.S. weaponry and Iranians.

So over the course of the next few days, you will likely hear me talk more than once about the need for Congress to stand up and say there shall not be a war against Iran without a congressional vote. It is a pretty simple proposition: No U.S. war against Iran without a congressional vote.

Let me answer a couple of questions that colleagues of mine have asked about the resolution that I filed yesterday.

First, what about self-defense? What about if Iran does take action against the United States, the homeland, or at a U.S. base in the Middle East or at a U.S. consulate in Erbil in the Kurdish area of Iraq? What if Iran takes action against the United States?

The answer is pretty straightforward: Under the Constitution, the President can defend the United States, and the President doesn't need Congress to do that. So if there is an Iranian attack on the United States, the President can and has said he will—and I would strongly support him, as I know everyone in this body would—defend U.S. interests against an Iranian attack.

So the self-defense question is mentioned in the resolution. The resolution says: Nothing in this resolution will block the ability of the United States to take legal action to defend itself, and that is clearly contemplated by article II.

The second question I am asked is, What about the United States helping Israel defend itself?

I have been here since January of 2013. I have voted for every Israel defense package that has ever been before this body, and there have been many. Israel receives more defense aid from the United States than any other nation year after year after year with my support. And I have done more than vote for Israel defense aid; on a couple of instances, I have whipped votes to make sure that we found enough aid for Israel.

In April of last year, we passed a supplemental bill in this body that had billions of dollars of aid for Israel in the aftermath of the horrific attacks on Israel by Hamas on October 7. It was shortly after that vote that Iran launched a set of attacks against Israel.

The defense aid that the United States provided enabled us to knock down and assist Israel in knocking down Iranian drones and missiles. That was a good thing. Had those drones and

missiles landed in Israel, they would have not only killed and wounded tons of civilians, but they would have led to escalation in the region that would have been unhelpful for all countries in the region.

So I stand strong for Israel's right to defend itself, and I stand strong for the United States in providing Israel support so that they can defend themselves, but that is a different question. That is a different question than whether the United States should go to war with Iran.

In my view, there is no compelling security reason for the United States to go to war with Iran.

The last question that I want to ask and sort of reflect upon before concluding is this: What about diplomacy? What about diplomacy?

The pages are here. You have a lot of time on the floor. Sometimes there are speeches, and sometimes there aren't, and I imagine you have looked a lot in this room and what is in the room. One of the things you have noticed is that in the panels—all around the room, the blue panels—at the top of the panel is the seal of the United States. That seal of the United States was designed and embraced by the United States in 1782. The seal of the United States is also in the skylight in the ceiling of the Senate Chamber, and that seal has essentially been constant since 1782. There is a seal of the President of the United States that has changed a little bit, but the seal of the United States that Congress has used has been constant since 1782.

One thing that is very notable about the seal is the eagle and two claws holding the arrows of war and the olive branches of peace. But since the very beginning of this Republic, the eagle's face has been turned to the olive branches of peace. It was designed that way to send a symbol that the United States always prefers peace, always prefers diplomacy, and only uses war as a last resort when diplomacy fails.

We had a diplomatic deal with Iran that was entered into in 2015 that was limiting their nuclear program—peacefully, without having to bomb them, without having to kill civilians, without having to assassinate scientists.

The United States, together with other nations, used the power of congressional sanctions—Congress did this well—to leverage an agreement whereby Iran agreed—in the first sentence of the first paragraph of the first page of the agreement, Iran reaffirmed that it would “never seek to purchase, acquire, or develop nuclear weapons.”

In the body of that agreement, Iran agreed to a whole series of limitations upon nuclear research, nuclear activity, centrifuge construction, and the percentage of enriched uranium it was allowed to have. Also, Iran agreed to the most comprehensive inspection regime of any nation on the planet, overseen by the International Atomic Energy Agency, to ensure that they were meeting their requirements that they

would never seek to purchase, acquire, and develop nuclear weapons and that they would abide by their limits on centrifuges and the limits on enriched uranium and other activities.

The agreement was working. Don't take it from Senator KAINE; the International Atomic Energy Association said the agreement was working. The allies and adversaries—Russia and China—were part of this deal, as were the UK and France and Germany. Those who worked on the deal said the agreement was working. It wasn't turning Iran from a bad actor to a good actor. It wasn't stopping all of Iran's bellicose behavior. But it was limiting the very nuclear program that is now trying to be bombed out of existence. We had an agreement that was working.

President Trump became President in January of 2017, and he said: I don't like the agreement that President Obama did. I want to get out of it.

President Trump's own Cabinet—his Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis said: Don't get out of this agreement. It is working.

His Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said: Don't get out of this agreement. It is working.

His National Security Advisor H.R. McMaster, a former general, said: Don't get out of this agreement. It is working.

For God's sake, we have used diplomacy just as we are supposed to—by preferring peace and diplomacy first—to deprive Iran of a path to a nuclear weapon. Shouldn't we prefer diplomacy rather than putting at risk the lives of American troops, the 40,000 troops who are in the Middle East?

So what happened to the diplomatic agreement? President Trump started to talk about abandoning it.

I wrote a piece in *Time* magazine in 2017, and I said: If you abandon this agreement when it is working, what will Iran do? They will go back to developing nuclear weapons, because if the United States backs out of it, they will as well.

If you abandon this agreement, North Korea will never do a nuclear deal with the United States because why do a deal with the United States if the United States is going to abandon the deal even when it is working?

President Trump didn't listen to me. He didn't listen to his Secretary of State. He didn't listen to his Secretary of Defense. He didn't listen to a lot of people in his administration. He tore the deal up. What a tragedy.

You have Israeli civilians who have been killed in the Iranian missile attacks who have nothing to do with the military and Iranian civilians who have been killed in missile attacks who have nothing to do with the military. They would be alive today and 40,000 U.S. troops in the region would be safe today if we had decided to act in accord with our values and put diplomacy first and put peace over war.

That is water under the bridge. But the question for this body that we will

grapple with over the course of the next couple of weeks is whether the United States should be in another war in the Middle East—in particular, whether we should allow a war to start without us, whether we should hide in the tall grass rather than exercise our constitutional responsibility under article I.

This is fundamentally a debate about Congress being true to its oath of office and actually also being true to the obligations we have to our public.

The Framers put this in the Constitution so that we wouldn't be at war without a debate in front of the public. They had a view about the morality of war, and I think their view was basically this: There would be nothing more publicly immoral, in the public space, than to send troops into harm's way, risking death, if Congress was too chicken to have a debate and vote about whether the war was in the national interest.

If we had that debate and we decide that war is in the national interest, then the troops go into war knowing that the civilian leadership of this country have had the hard debate in view of the American public and decided that the stakes are sufficient to ask people to make the ultimate sacrifice.

But how dare we—how dare we—and I say this as the father of a U.S. marine: How dare we ask people to make the ultimate sacrifice if we don't have the guts to have a debate and decide whether a war is in the interest of this country?

I know what the American public thinks about this. There was a poll that was released today, and this is completely consistent with what I have heard from Virginians. And Virginia is one of the most pro-military States in this country. I am on the Armed Services Committee. One out of every eight Virginians is a veteran. That is not one out of every eight adults; that is one out of every eight Virginians is a veteran—and you add Active Duty, you add the Guard, you add the Reserve, and you add the civilian DOD and the military contractors and their families. We train all the Marine officers in the world. We have the biggest shipbuilding enterprise in the world. We have the Pentagon, the largest military office in the world. We have been the site of more battles on U.S. soil than any State in this country, in Virginia: the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the attack on 9/11 at the Pentagon.

We are as pro-military a State as there is, but I can tell you this: Virginians do not believe the United States should be in another war in the Middle East. Neither do Americans.

A poll today suggests 16 percent of Americans think the U.S. military should get involved in the conflict between Israel and Iran—one-sixth, 16 percent—60 percent say we should not; 24 percent are not sure.

We need to have this debate in front of the American public and let them

watch us debate the stakes of this. And it might be that colleagues in this body or in the House think a war with Iran is a good idea. Let them put a war authorization on the table. Let's debate that. Let's debate that in front of Virginians and Kansans and Californians and hear what our constituents have to say. Let's debate that in the full view of people whose spouses are in the military or whose kids are in the military. Let's have that debate in front of them and hear what they think before we cast a vote that would be one of the most serious votes that you ever cast on the floor of a body like this.

But we should not allow a war of the magnitude of this to begin with Congress hiding from the responsibility that was put on Congress's shoulders in 1787.

I will be asking my colleagues to support my simple resolution as early as next week: No war without a vote of Congress. I will be asking my colleagues to support it and uphold the oath we have all taken to support the Constitution that established that most unusual principle, most unique principle, that is part of what makes this Nation special.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:19 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 18, 2025, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. CASE A. CUNNINGHAM
LT. GEN. JOHN J. DEGOES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

CATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ADRIAN L. SPAIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 10505:

To be general

LT. GEN. THOMAS M. CARDEN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE POSITION INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 7037:

To be judge advocate general of the United States Army

MAJ. GEN. BOBBY L. CHRISTINE

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be general

GEN. CHRISTOPHER J. MAHONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. BENJAMIN T. WATSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM J. BOWERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID L. ODOM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN E. LISZEWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. GREGORY L. MASIELLO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAY M. BARGERON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8033:

To be admiral

ADM. DARYL L. CAUDLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FREDERICK W. KACHER
REAR ADM. ELIZABETH S. OKANO
REAR ADM. CURT A. RENSHAW
REAR ADM. MICHAEL P. DONNELLY
REAR ADM. THOMAS M. HENDERSCHIEDT

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHAD M. HENDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LILY M. DIAKHATE
JEFFREY B. KUSYJ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

PATRICIA L. MASHBURN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PETER I. BELK

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2101, AS PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS:

To be commander

KEVIN P. CARMICHAEL

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL G. CARMAN
NICHOLAS P. ZIESER

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 17, 2025:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OLIVIA TRUSTY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2025.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

GARY ANDRES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING GARY STEELE

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Gary Steele for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity, and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

RECOGNIZING THE ARMY & AIR FORCE EXCHANGE SERVICE 130TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Army & Air Force Exchange Service, the Department of Defense's largest retailer, as it marks its 130th year of serving our military community with distinction.

Since its founding in 1895, the Exchange has brought a piece of home to Soldiers, Airmen, and Guardians around the world, staying true to its motto: "We Go Where You Go."

From providing uniforms and meals to managing stores, wellness services, and online retail, the Exchange has stood as a pillar of support for those who serve.

Headquartered in Dallas, Texas, the Exchange continues to reinvest in military families—returning \$15 billion in value to the community over the last decade alone.

As we reflect on its 130-year legacy, we celebrate not only its longevity but the critical role it plays in supporting readiness, morale, and quality of life.

I congratulate the Exchange. Here's to many more years of dedicated service.

HONORING ANGELICA MICHELLE JONES AS A DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Angelica Michelle Jones, aka Angelica Sanchez, was born in Jacksonville, Florida, on November 8, 1977.

She moved to Orlando in 1996 to live in her truth and become her authentic self.

A Black trans woman and drag performer, she has won numerous national pageants, including Miss. Continental Plus, Miss. Gay U.S. of A at Large, Miss. Duval, and Miss. Florida FFI at Large.

She's an LGBTQIA advocate as well as a Pulse survivor.

CELEBRATING THE GRAND OPEN- ING OF MOLINA HEALTHCARE

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate Molina Healthcare, a leader in community-based healthcare since its launch nearly five decades ago. It is with great enthusiasm that I highlight the opening of their newest location in Buffalo, New York. This expansion continues Molina's decades-long tradition of providing exceptional, one-on-one services to communities across Western New York.

Structured to address health disparities across the United States, Molina Healthcare has provided quality federally supported healthcare for more than 5.1 million patients nationwide by using trusted clinical expertise to guide individuals in achieving their health and wellness goals. Founded with a commitment to patient-centered care, the new office will bring Molina Healthcare's physical, social, and emotional approach for their patients, ensuring the continuation of Molina's commitment to exceptional care.

Today, we celebrate the ongoing success and growth of Molina Healthcare and their steadfast commitment to empowering patients across the United States. With the increasing need for quality low-cost and reliable healthcare services, Molina remains at the forefront of quality member healthcare, continually adapting to meet the needs of all communities. Congratulations to Molina Healthcare as they continue to provide exceptional care and contribute to the well-being of our region.

HONORING THE 160TH ANNIVERSARY OF JUNETEENTH

HON. RANDY K. WEBER, SR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Juneteenth, a day that holds deep meaning not just for our Nation but especially for the proud people of Galveston, Texas.

One hundred sixty years ago, Union troops arrived in Galveston and issued General Order No. 3—delivering long-overdue news: that the enslaved people of Texas were free, in accordance with President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. Though that proclamation had been signed more than two years earlier, it was on June 19, 1865, that the promise of freedom finally reached our shores.

Galveston, which I have the honor of representing, is where Juneteenth was born. And I'm proud that our community continues to lead in preserving this history. From the mural that commemorates where General Order No. 3 was read to the many community events held throughout the month of June, Galveston is living proof that remembering our history makes us stronger—not weaker.

Not long ago, Juneteenth was not even recognized as a federal holiday. But in a rare moment of unity, Congress came together to pass H.R. 1320. I was honored to cosponsor this legislation and even prouder to see it signed into law on June 17, 2021. It marked the first new federal holiday in nearly four decades—and rightfully so.

Juneteenth is a reminder that while freedom may be delayed, it must never be denied. We must always strive to live up to the founding principles of this great country: liberty, justice, and opportunity for all.

Let us honor the past, reflect on our progress, and commit to forging a future that preserves liberty—not just in word, but in action.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF SUMMER MCCRAY AS A DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Deputy Sheriff Summer McCray is an innovative law enforcement professional who has proudly served her hometown of Orlando, Florida, as a member of the Florida Department of Corrections, Orange County Corrections, and the Orange County Sheriffs Office (OCSO).

Deputy McCray knew she ultimately wanted to be a Deputy Sheriff, so she pursued a degree in criminal justice at the University of Central Florida. In 2022, Ms. McCray was sworn in as an Orange County Deputy, and since joining the agency, she has served the residents and visitors of Orange County in various roles. She has worked as a Patrol Deputy, an LGBTQ+ Liaison, a Public Information Officer (PIO) in Strategic Communications, and a Critical Incident Stress Management (CISM) Team member.

As a PIO, Deputy McCray has used her talents in content creation to spotlight the good work of the Orange County Sheriff's Office on its social media platforms. As an active member of the LGBTQ+ Liaison Group, Deputy McCray has strengthened the relationship between local law enforcement and the LGBTQ+ community by educating agency members on LGBTQ+ topics and policy. She is also a member of the Gay Officers Action League of Central Florida (GOALcfl), where, as vice president, she continues to advocate for change. In addition, she serves as an ambassador of the OCSO Safe Place Initiative, which invites businesses to display a decal identifying them as safe environments for LGBTQ+ community members to report crimes or harassment.

In 2025, Deputy McCray was featured in a Watermark Out News article that highlighted her role with GOALcfl, as well as the positive relationships she and the organization have fostered throughout the LGBTQ+ community in Central Florida.

RECOGNIZING PATRICK SULLIVAN

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Patrick Sullivan for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite

daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity, and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

REGOGNIZING JAEHYUNG KIM

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize President Jaehyung Kim of the Dallas Taekwondo Association, a dedicated leader whose work has advanced both sport and community across North Texas and beyond.

Through his leadership at White Tiger Taekwondo and the Dallas Taekwondo Association, Mr. Kim has elevated the practice of Taekwondo while instilling discipline, pride, and cultural identity in generations of students. His efforts have created a community rooted in respect and unity.

Mr. Kim's passion for youth development and multicultural outreach has helped foster deeper understanding across communities, and his role in bringing the 23rd Annual Korean American National Sports Festival to North Texas underscores his commitment to cultural celebration and civic engagement.

We honor Mr. Kim for his service, his vision, and the inclusive spirit he brings to our region.

CELEBRATING THE 90TH
BIRTHDAY OF JANET HARPER

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of Mrs. Janet Harper, a beacon of light in the Buffalo community. Mrs. Harper's life story is a beautiful tapestry woven with love and resilience.

Born on June 28, 1935, in Buffalo, New York to Mr. Edward Zamojski and Mrs. Carmella Amigone, Mrs. Harper was raised to inspire everyone she met with her selflessness

and compassion. Over the years, she has witnessed many changes in her life and community, yet her love for those around her has remained a constant source of strength.

Mrs. Harper has conducted herself in Christian principles through her many roles of service; whether that be as a community leader or spiritual counselor, but her most rewarding role has been being a dedicated wife, mother, and grandmother. In 1953, Mrs. Harper married the late Mr. Norman Harper. Their loving union blessed them with three community-minded children—Leona, Robert, and Kevin Harper, providing them with a home filled with love, respect and responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mrs. Janet Harper, a woman of poise and resilience, whose influence extends beyond her beloved family and community. On this milestone birthday, we celebrate her extraordinary life, her enduring legacy, and the profound impact she has made on all who know her. Mrs. Harper is truly a remarkable woman, and her legacy of care and kindness will surely live on for generations to come.

RESCISSIONS ACT OF 2025

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 12, 2025

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4, the Rescissions Act of 2025, because this bill undermines and outright destroys long-held, bipartisan American values at home and abroad.

I'll start right here at home. This bill makes an unprecedented attack on public media that Americans rely on for unfettered access to information, educational programming for kids, cultural programming, as well as nationwide emergency alerting. Spanning many different Administrations, public media has received bipartisan support for the past 50 years because Congress has continuously recognized that access to public media is in the public's best interest. That's why Congress has always forward-funded public media—to ensure the consistent access to nonpartisan, unbiased information for Americans in every state, regardless of which party controls the White House. These airwaves belong to every American—and they're a bargain: public media receives less than 0.01 percent of federal spending, and yet it provides essential services to every citizen in every part of this country. That's roughly \$1.60 per taxpayer. Public media is the country's only local, no-cost, commercial-free, nonprofit news and information service, and passing this bill puts this service at great risk. For stations like Minnesota Public Radio, valued services will be eroded. For many smaller stations in rural communities across the country, these cuts will prove utterly devastating. They will not survive, resulting in news deserts for these communities.

This bill also rescinds billions of dollars in lifesaving and life-affirming international assistance—another in a long line of cruel decisions from this administration to abdicate U.S. leadership abroad and put millions of lives at risk. If enacted, H.R. 4 will rescind over \$8.3 billion in foreign assistance funding already appropriated by Congress on a bipartisan basis.

The recissions in this bill will cut lifesaving food assistance for families, emergency services for families fleeing conflict, agriculture development programs, and core nutrition services for children under five—just to name a few. This bill even goes as far as to cut the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR, a historically bipartisan and uncontroversial program that has saved an estimated 26 billion lives since its inception. Not only will this bill have devastating impacts on the lives of millions of children and families around the world; the cuts in this bill will actively make our country less safe. Our Nation's ability to prevent conflict, eradicate extremism, and promote democracy will be utterly destroyed—and our adversaries are eager to step in.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons and many more, I strongly oppose this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING THOMAS FRAZIER

HON. SAM T. LICCARDO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. LICCARDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and contributions of U.S. Army Intelligence Officer and Vietnam veteran Thomas Frazier, a model of service.

Tom dedicated his life to law enforcement, public safety, and community service. His life was defined by his kindness, dedication, and quiet strength that touched all who knew him. His service to the San Jose Police Department, the Bay Area as a whole, and the United States will continue to inspire those he left behind.

As a decorated U.S. Army veteran, Tom's service was recognized with a Bronze Star, Air Medal, and Combat Infantryman's Badge. He attended San Jose State University, where he earned a Bachelor of Science and a Master of Science degree. Tom dedicated his life to public service, launched his career with the San Jose Police Department while in college, and rose through the ranks to become Deputy Chief of Police.

In 1994, Tom was appointed Police Commissioner of the Baltimore Police Department, overseeing more than 3,000 officers and 600 civilian personnel. He also served as President of the Board of the Police Executive Research Forum, advancing innovation in law enforcement nationally and globally. A few years later, Tom served as Director of the Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services in the U.S. Department of Justice, where he oversaw the hiring of 100,000 new police officers nationwide. He also served as Executive Director of the Major Cities Chiefs Association for ten years. He led a consulting company that served a diverse clientele, including the Department of Homeland Security, NASA, Johns Hopkins University, and various cities across the Nation.

Tom also dedicated time to education and community service. He spent years teaching hostage negotiation techniques throughout the United States and Canada. While doing so, he collected police patches given to him by those he taught. He also lectured at Johns Hopkins University, mentoring future leaders in public safety and organizational leadership. Tom

coached youth soccer teams in Los Gatos and Baltimore, in addition to coaching the San Jose Police soccer teams. He generously contributed to local projects through his involvement with Rotary in Petaluma and Novato.

Most importantly, Tom was a devoted father of three children and a grandfather to six. He will be remembered for his warm smile, easy laugh, unwavering integrity, and generous spirit. May his enduring commitment to education, public safety, and love of country serve as a guiding light for future generations.

RECOGNIZING SEAN MCKILLEN

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Sean McKillen for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity, and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

HONORING JULIE RUIZ AS A DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Julie Ruiz was born in Arizona and raised in Mexico. As a

young woman, she came to Florida looking out for herself. She lived with friends who supported each other in building their lives in Central Florida, with few resources and no family here.

She began working at Disney Springs as a cashier for a restaurant run by Delaware North, making just \$16 an hour and sleeping on her friends' couch. Because Julie is a fighter, she quickly began to fight for restaurant workers to be treated better—especially as a young bisexual woman who believed that she and all her coworkers should be equals. Even while sometimes working two jobs and rushing from shift to shift, she was paying rent to sleep in a living room and was classified as a part-time employee at Disney Springs with no benefits.

One day, Julie and her coworker reported their supervisor for sexual harassment, but the company left him in his position as their supervisor. She became a union leader with Unite Here Local 737, organizing her coworkers to win a better life, saying: "We should feel safe in our restaurant. I want to be treated as a human being. We ARE their restaurants—they don't run without us."

One week after passing out a union flyer with her story on it, Julie was fired for nothing more than wearing an earbud while walking into work. She continued to fight, telling her story of sexual harassment and worker organizing more and more publicly. She has inspired thousands of people to sign on to support her fight—not just for herself, but for her coworkers, for women and LGBTQ workers, and for workers in the tourism industry everywhere.

HONORING GRAYSON "ROCKY" COCHARO

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the remarkable life of Mr. Grayson "Rocky" Cocharo, a centenarian whose strength, humility, and quiet heroism have inspired generations.

Born in 1924 in Pueblo, Colorado, Mr. Cocharo's early life was marked by resilience, having lost both parents and been raised by his grandmother. At the age of 18, he answered the call to serve in World War II, becoming a navigator with the elite "Carpetbaggers" operation. Flying covert missions behind enemy lines, his bravery remained unspoken for decades, yet left a lasting legacy.

Following his service, Mr. Cocharo built a life of purpose and devotion—marrying his beloved Beatrice and working for over 40 years in aeronautical engineering. Known for his craftsmanship and intellect, he brought joy to others through hobbies like restoring antique toys and refinishing furniture.

He is celebrated not only for his remarkable longevity but for a lifetime defined by service, love, and community. His family and all who know him are deeply enriched by his legacy.

Happy 101st Birthday, Mr. Cocharo. I thank him for his service, and thank him for the life he has lived in quiet strength.

HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 11, 2025

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. 331, the HALT Fentanyl Act.

This bill is not a solution to the proliferation of Fentanyl Related Substances (FRS) in America. We need legislation and investments in health interventions that will save lives while taking meaningful action to stop illicit drug sales.

S. 331 would permanently criminalize all FRS based solely on their molecular structure. This would seriously hamper the medical community from working on the development of treatments to fentanyl overdose or other medically beneficial FRSs. The HALT Fentanyl Act also imposes harmful mandatory minimum sentences. Decades of research shows that mandatory minimum laws that focus solely on supply reduction and incarceration are not effective in slowing the flow of illicit drugs into our country or the rates of overdoses in our communities. In fact, the current fentanyl epidemic has been found to have its roots in crackdowns on prescription opioids and heroin that were not paired with evidence-based overdose prevention and treatment services. We should be pursuing policy solutions that incorporate evidence-based strategies to addiction and overdose prevention that are rooted in health and science, not just increasing criminalization.

Congress should bring forward a comprehensive bill that reflects the input of medical professionals, addiction specialists, researchers, and law enforcement. Republicans are trying to present a “quick and easy” solution to a complex problem.

HONORING DANNY GARCIA AS A DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Danny Garcia is a proud first-generation American, born to Costa Rican parents, and a lifelong Florida native who proudly calls Orlando home.

Danny's dedication to the LGBTQ+ community began early. As a youth, he volunteered with organizations focused on HIV awareness and support, including the Pediatric AIDS Foundation and Hope & Help.

Today, that same passion continues through his leadership as the board president of The LGBT+ Center Orlando, where he works to advance visibility, equality, and vital services for the community.

As a teenager, Danny was a member of the Delta Youth Alliance, which eventually became the Orlando Youth Alliance. It was there that he first found a sense of community, marching in his first Pride parade before he even had his learner's permit and volunteering at fundraisers and local events that supported LGBTQ+ youth.

In the late 1990's, Danny began freelancing for Watermark, Central Florida and Tampa Bay's LGBTQ+ newspaper—a publication he had followed since its founding in 1994. That role marked the start of his journey in LGBTQ+ media, leading to opportunities with other publications and platforms that elevated queer voices and stories.

In 2014, Danny joined Watermark full-time as an account manager. Through hard work and a deep understanding of the community he serves, he was promoted to become the publication's sales director.

Over the years, Danny has remained committed to uplifting LGBTQ+ voices and using media as a tool for connection, representation, and change. His story is one of advocacy, authenticity, and lifelong pride in the community he serves.

RECOGNIZING JAMEN MONBARREN

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Jamen Monbarren for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the “Light Up Navajo” initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENERGY TRANSITIONS INITIATIVE AUTHORIZATION ACT

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my Energy Transitions Initiative Authorization Act to expand resilient and reliable energy for some of our nation's most vulnerable regions—isolated and Tribal communities.

Isolated and Tribal communities often share common energy obstacles, such as limited energy infrastructure, high costs of imported energy and vulnerability to natural disasters. For example, in my home state of Hawaii, which ranks as the state with the most expensive power in the Nation, residential electricity rates average 34 cents per kilowatt, far exceeding the national average by threefold. We are not alone in this problem. For example, in Maine the cost of electricity hovers at 22 cents per kilowatt, coming in at 13 percent higher than the national average, in part due to its many islands and isolated communities.

My colleagues and I representing these communities intimately understand the challenges that isolated and Tribal communities face and are working to address them. In Hawaii, our state leaders launched a clean energy initiative in 2008 to aim to use 100 percent renewable electricity to power our entire state by 2045. We focused on clean energy, which we can self-sustain, and recognizing that good portions of our energy come from overseas and potentially adversarial countries, green energy can also help us advance national security interests. As for my role in this effort, I have focused on supporting federal programs that help advance these goals.

These unique energy resilience challenges in remote and Tribal areas are the focus of the U.S. Department of Energy's Energy Transitions Initiative Program. Since its inception, this program has partnered with over 25 Tribal, coastal, remote and island communities across the Nation to help them secure reliable and affordable energy.

The Energy Transitions Initiative Partnership Program provides customized technical and financial assistance to community projects aimed at accessing reliable and affordable power and increasing energy resilience. Specific community projects include solar power interconnection, analyzing wind energy potential, conducting wildfire preparedness, advancing weatherization retrofits and implementing microgrids and battery storage projects.

The draw of this program is that it doesn't come in and dictate how communities reach their clean energy goals. It is a partnership program that values and appreciates the perspective of local and Tribal communities, actively listening and incorporating community feedback.

In Hawaii, the Energy Transitions Initiative has provided technical assistance to the City and County of Honolulu to conduct microgrid location analyses for regional hybrid microgrids and map designs. Because Hawaii is prone to severe weather conditions that have previously caused long-duration power outages, our islands have identified hybrid microgrids as one method to improve resilience. Microgrids are best suited to areas

prone to prolonged outages during weather events, with clusters of customers and potential availability of renewable energy sources. The product of this partnership was a map identifying potential locations given a set of criteria that stakeholders prioritized in the areas of criticality, vulnerability and societal impact.

This program helps far more than just Hawaii. For example, it helps the Aquinnah and Chilmark Tribes in Massachusetts transition to 100 percent renewable energy by 2040 through retrofits, microgrids and efficiency measures, and Bainbridge Island in Washington analyze the solar and water power options with a goal of transitioning to 100 percent renewable energy by 2040.

Although this program has helped so many across our great Nation, it has never been formally codified. Our bill, the Energy Transitions Initiative Authorization Act, will ensure this program can continue the technical assistance offered to remote, island and Tribal communities that is unique and accommodating to their expertise and deep knowledge of local challenges and solutions.

The bill will authorize \$31 million for each fiscal year from 2026 to 2030 to carry out the bill's objectives. No later than 1 year after the establishment of the bill, the Comptroller General will conduct an audit of the initiative to ensure proper use of the funds. The audit will also result in a report with recommendations to improve the program, which is important because evaluating and improving the initiative is paramount for its continued progress.

I believe the Energy Transitions Initiative Authorization Act can further clean energy advancements in our most vulnerable communities. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and our isolated and Tribal areas across our Nation.

Mahalo.

RECOGNIZING JOUNGHUN BANG

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Jounghun Bang, Vice President of the Dallas Taekwondo Association, whose leadership and mentorship have left a lasting mark on youth and families throughout North Texas.

Through his commitment to training the next generation of athletes, Mr. Bang has fostered excellence on and off the mat. His students' success in national competitions reflects not only technical mastery but the values of perseverance and discipline that he instills.

Mr. Bang's contributions extend beyond the dojang. His support for the 23rd Annual Korean American National Sports Festival exemplifies his broader mission to highlight cultural pride and build community.

For his tireless dedication to sport, culture, and the development of young people, we extend our heartfelt thanks and congratulations.

RECOGNIZING CLINT JACKSON

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Clint Jackson for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity, and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

HONORING DAVID ROMERO AS A DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, David Romero is a U.S. Air Force veteran, LGBTQ+ advocate, and community leader recognized for his dedication to uplifting others through faith, service, and resilience in Florida's Ninth Congressional District.

A longtime resident of Celebration, Florida, David serves on the Orange County Mayor's Veterans Advisory Council as the LGBTQ+ veterans advocate. In this role, he brings forward the needs and perspectives of LGBTQ+ veterans—especially those whose contributions were historically overlooked due to discrimination. David is also an active member of the Veterans Club of Celebration, where he lives openly as a gay veteran and fosters dialogue, visibility, and community support.

In addition to his veteran advocacy, David served in a leadership role on Celebration's Technology Committee, demonstrating his consistent commitment to civic engagement and community betterment. For 14 years, he worked at the Walt Disney Company, where he contributed to multiple DEI platforms and helped shape internal policies around equity and representation. His efforts reflected both professional commitment and personal courage in the face of past trauma related to homophobia and marginalization.

A person of deep faith, David is a member of Community Presbyterian Church in Celebration, where he is open about his sexuality and his relationship with Jesus Christ. Through this openness, he serves as a role model to others navigating the intersection of faith and identity.

David's advocacy work spans mental health awareness, veteran support access, and inclusion for those discharged under unjust military policies. His voice has helped shift perceptions in veteran spaces and beyond, proving that service and identity are not mutually exclusive.

Through his integrity, leadership, and faith, David Romero has made a lasting impact on Central Florida's LGBTQ+ and veteran communities. His story is one of courage, healing, and service.

CELEBRATING THE 75TH BIRTHDAY OF PASTOR JAMES E. GILES

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Pastor James E. Giles' 75th birthday and his dedication to our community. Pastor Giles has been a beacon of hope for so many, and exemplifies what it means to be a true leader. Because of his tireless work, Pastor Giles has made Buffalo and Western New York a better place.

Serving as President and CEO of Back to Basics Outreach Ministries, Pastor Giles provides counseling services and advocates for community members in need throughout Western New York—cementing himself as a strong force of the restorative justice movement within Erie County. He contributes his time to the Northland Workforce Training Center and Youth Visionaries as well as serving a role on the Board of Directors for Catholic Charities and City of Buffalo EMS Board. Beyond his work as a changemaker, Pastor Giles ministers at the Greater Works of Deliverance Fellowship. Earning multiple certificates in Psychology, Sociology, African American History, and in New York State Substance Abuse Counseling—applying each of them in his daily roles to serve his community.

Pastor Giles has been a leader in Buffalo's East Side for more than five decades. His passion for social and economic justice has uplifted his work as a community servant. He credits his success to his beloved wife First Lady Delores Giles, their two children Antonio and Alisha Giles, and his loving grandson Jalen.

Today, we celebrate more than five decades of Pastor Giles' unwavering efforts of commitment made to serve our community and the initiative to transform lives across Western New York. Let us also recognize a the countless lives he has touched and the profound

impact he has made along the way. I congratulate Pastor James E. Giles on this significant milestone. His service is a blessing, and we look forward to many more years of his inspired leadership.

RECOGNIZING JOSE SANTIAGO

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Jose Santiago for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

APPRECIATING DAVE OLSON

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Dr. Dave Olson, President and Program Manager at Savannah River Mission Completion (SRMC), upon retirement after more than 40 years of dedicated work and service.

Before being named President and Program Manager, Dr. Olson served as the president of the former Savannah River Site (SRS) liquid waste contractor. He has years of experience in safety, security, project and risk management, maintenance and engineering in nuclear materials processing, and much more.

SRMC is responsible for the safe reduction of curies in aging waste tanks at SRS. As one of the Department of Energy's largest production sites, SRS performs activities ranging from environmental cleanup and protection to nuclear materials storage and disposition.

Under the leadership of Dr. Olson, SRMC has worked more than 21 million hours without an injury that has caused a missed work day, ensured that all facilities are operating safely and efficiently, and met five key regulatory milestones to remove waste from and clean tanks to prepare them for operational closure.

Dr. Olson has many accomplishments to be proud of and has aided greatly in the success of SRMC.

Best wishes for a wonderful retirement. I am appreciative for all he has done for South Carolina.

RECOGNIZING THE WESTFIELD FIRE DEPARTMENT ON THEIR 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS H. KEAN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Westfield Fire Department as they celebrate 150 years of service to our community. Since its founding as a volunteer fire department in 1875, the WFD has grown into a career department, providing essential fire protection services to the residents of Westfield and the surrounding area. Over the past 150 years, they have answered the call in times of need—often under dangerous and demanding conditions—a true testament to the courage, duty, and selflessness that embody the very best of New Jersey's first responders. I extend my deepest congratulations to the Westfield Fire Department on this milestone anniversary and look forward to their continued growth and commitment to public safety for many years to come.

HONORING MARC ESPESO AS A DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Marc Espeso is a dedicated public servant, skilled communicator, and advocate for the LGBTQ+ community. Since his appointment in August 2019, he has served as special assistant to Orange County Mayor Jerry L. Demings. In addition, he holds the role of digital communications manager for the county. This dual position provides him with a unique perspective that combines executive insight with hands-on communication strategy.

Mr. Espeso values efficient and effective communication to Orange County's 1.5 million residents and 75 million annual visitors. In his first year as special assistant, he played a key role in disseminating critical health and safety information during the COVID-19 pandemic.

By leveraging partnerships among local, state, and federal agencies, he ensured accurate and accessible updates reached LGBTQ+ residents, visitors, and the broader public across the county.

His experience in crisis communication has been an asset to the county's Emergency Operations Center. He has contributed to the development of award-winning communication plans that delivered life-saving information to residents before, during, and after major storms that impacted Central Florida, including Hurricanes Ian and Nicole in 2022 and Hurricane Milton in 2024.

In addition to promoting county programs and services that can benefit LGBTQ+ residents, Mr. Espeso has helped highlight the region's tourism and hospitality industry. When organizations consider where to host events that will ultimately benefit the local economy, he effectively highlights Orange County's ongoing commitment to fostering an environment where all individuals and businesses are treated with dignity and respect.

Beyond his government service, Mr. Espeso serves as vice president of the Board of Directors at the LGBTQ+ Center Orlando. Since 2021, he has helped fundraise to advance the Center's mission of empowering the LGBTQ+ community and its allies through advocacy, education, information, and support.

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 884, H.R. 2056, AND H.R. 2096

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, last week the Republican Majority in the House of Representatives decided that they know better than the residents of the District of Columbia what their local government needs.

All Members of Congress are sent here by our constituents to represent their interests, and to vote on matters of federal importance. We aren't sent here to rule on specific local ordinances or funding decisions made by the cities and counties in any of our districts. Yet Republicans have brought three bills to the floor—H.R. 884, H.R. 2056, and H.R. 2096—to do exactly that. They want to tell the District of Columbia's 700,000 residents that the laws and policies they have voted for, and that were crafted by their local elected officials, are null and void.

Mr. Speaker, none of us ran for or were elected to serve as D.C. Council members. I've been a city council member. It's a very different job, with a direct line of responsibility to the residents who elect you to deal with everything from potholes to public safety. That local representation and local responsiveness is a key part of our democracy, and Republicans are proposing to strip that local self-governance away from the residents of the District of Columbia.

If Republicans want to take steps to address an issue with national importance, they can bring forward a bill that enforces it nationally. I will not vote for these attempts to decide those issues for a single district at the local level, whether in the District of Columbia or in the districts of any Member here.

One of the bills before us last week, H.R. 884, would repeal D.C.'s local law that allows

noncitizens to vote in local elections. I have serious concerns with allowing noncitizens who do not hold a green card to vote in local elections, but this is the wrong way to go about addressing that. I voted present because I can't support repealing a local D.C. law, but I do support having a conversation about how we define voter eligibility nationwide.

I voted No on H.R. 2096, the Protecting Our Nation's Capital Emergency Act, because it would repeal part of a local D.C. law to give the police department increased authority to address incidents of serious misconduct and discipline officers. I voted No on H.R. 2056 because we shouldn't be nullifying a local law to tell an individual police department where they must divert their resources and how they can best serve their community, including residents who are immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the will of D.C. residents to shape their local government through their local elections, and that is why I do not support H.R. 2096, H.R. 2056 or H.R. 884.

RECOGNIZING ZACHARY LADUKE

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Zachary LaDuke for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity, and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

RECOGNIZING MYOUNGSUB CHOI

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Mr. MyoungSub Choi for his exceptional efforts to preserve and share cultural heritage through the practice of Taekwondo.

Mr. Choi understands that Taekwondo is more than a martial art—it is a means of storytelling, cultural connection, and youth empowerment. Through his leadership and mentorship, he has inspired students across North Texas to embrace both the physical and philosophical dimensions of the sport.

By nurturing discipline and pride within a diverse community, Mr. Choi has built a lasting legacy. His work during the 23rd Annual Korean American National Sports Festival is a testament to his enduring commitment to cultural celebration and civic unity.

We commend Mr. Choi for using sport as a bridge across generations and communities.

HONORING ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER PAMELA OTT

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SWALWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Pamela Ott on the occasion of her retirement after more than two decades of distinguished service to the City of Pleasanton, California.

Pamela has dedicated over 22 years to serving Pleasanton with vision, leadership and unwavering commitment to public service. She began her career in Pleasanton as Executive Director of the Downtown Association and joined the city government in 2003 as the Economic Development Director. In 2021, she was appointed Assistant City Manager, a role in which she has excelled in until her retirement on June 20, 2025.

Pamela holds a Bachelor of Science from the University of Florida and a Master's in Organization Development from the University of San Francisco. In addition to her public service, she has given her time to local causes, including the Valley Humane Society Board and the Stanford Health Care Tri-Valley Advisory Board.

Throughout her career, Pamela has played a vital role in shaping Pleasanton's economic development. She led major business recruitment efforts that brought transformative companies such as Workday, 10x Genomics, and Veeva Systems to the city. Her work on the Johnson Drive Economic Development Zone helped deliver a vibrant new commercial hub, including a Costco and two new hotels.

When the COVID-19 pandemic struck, Pamela took swift action to support local businesses by designing and implementing innovative recovery programs that helped them stay afloat and connected to their customers. Her leadership was essential during a time of great uncertainty and change.

As a Pleasanton resident since 2001, Pamela has been more than a public servant, she has been a dedicated neighbor, a compas-

sionate leader, and a steadfast champion for her community. As she steps into retirement, I offer my deepest gratitude for her service and wish her all the best as she is afforded more time with her husband, Jim, and daughters, Melissa and Kelsey.

RECOGNIZING SANGHO KO

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Mr. Sangho Ko, Vice President of the Dallas Taekwondo Association, for his steadfast dedication to Taekwondo as a vehicle for cultural diplomacy and community empowerment.

Mr. Ko has long championed Taekwondo not only as an athletic discipline but as a cultural bridge that fosters mutual understanding and global citizenship. His work has nurtured countless students who carry with them the values of humility, cooperation, and perseverance.

His leadership in the 23rd Annual Korean American National Sports Festival helped showcase the richness of Korean culture and the unifying power of sport.

We thank Mr. Ko for his vision, his commitment to excellence, and his role in bringing communities together through shared purpose.

RECOGNIZING TRAVIS BROWN

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Travis Brown for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity, and the return of future generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a

legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

HONORING JOSHUA COLLINS AS A
DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL
FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Joshua Collins is a passionate entrepreneur, community advocate, and devoted father who has been making a lasting impact through creativity and activism since 2010.

As the founder and owner of Collins Creative Custom Costuming, Joshua has transformed his artistic vision into a thriving business that serves theme parks and cruise lines, as well as other performers, drag artists, theatrical productions, and individuals seeking expressive designs. His attention to detail, craftsmanship, and commitment to authenticity have made him a sought-after designer in Florida and beyond.

Joshua's contributions extend far beyond the stage. He is a longtime leader in LGBTQ+ advocacy, with commitments to creating safer, more inclusive spaces for all. For many years, he has played a key role in organizing Pride events throughout the community, helping to celebrate identity and foster connection. His work has empowered others to live boldly and speak out against injustice. He is known as a founding organizer of the Drag March to Tallahassee, a powerful movement in 2023 that brought together drag performers, allies, and advocates to protest discriminatory legislation and demand equal rights for the LGBTQ+ community. The march has become a symbol of resistance, pride, and solidarity under Joshua's visionary leadership.

In addition to his work in the arts and activism, Joshua serves as the nonprofit director of Adopt with Pride, an organization focused on supporting LGBTQ+ individuals and families throughout the adoption process by offering educational and community-building initiatives.

Joshua is the proud father of a beautiful daughter, who inspires his work every day. His passion for justice, creativity, and family fuels everything he does. Through costume design, advocacy, and leadership, Joshua continues to shape a more vibrant, inclusive, and compassionate world.

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AQUARIUM OF NIAGARA

HON. TIMOTHY M. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate six decades of the

Aquarium of Niagara. An interactive water exhibit that celebrates the natural wonders of our aquatic world and provides a deeper educational understanding of our diverse ecosystems, the Aquarium is a gem of Western New York's cultural and educational institutions.

The Aquarium of Niagara was one of the first of its kind. Founded in 1965 by a small group of chemists and scientists, it served as a successful model for inland aquariums around the world. Upon its opening, it became the first inland aquarium to develop and use artificial seawater to maintain exhibits; this sparked a revolutionary practice now used in most inland aquariums.

Located in Niagara Falls, New York, the Aquarium of Niagara welcomes over 200,000 visitors each year and is the only aquatic museum within 250 miles of the United States. They serve as a hub for educating the community on aquatic life, consisting of two buildings and housing 180 species. Visitors come to see an array of mammals, penguins, and more than 1,200 fish and vertebrae, many of those being rescued species. Additionally, they provide guests with visual experiences to explore all of their marine life exhibits. There is a variety of scheduled programming offered daily as well as hands-on experiences that create inspiring opportunities for visitors.

Today, we honor one of Western New York's one-of-a-kind establishments and its commitment to bringing the wonders of the seas to visitors from around the world while providing the highest quality of animal care possible. Please join me in celebrating the 60th anniversary of the Aquarium of Niagara and their achievements and continued success as they remain an enduring source of connection to marine life for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING THE BRAVERY AND
LIFE-SAVING RESPONSE OF
LIEUTENANT BRANDON HALL OF
BUCHANAN COUNTY, VIRGINIA

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the exceptional courage and service of Lieutenant Brandon Hall of Buchanan County, Virginia.

On May 1st, Lieutenant Hall responded to an emergency in which a camper had filled with dangerous levels of carbon monoxide. Inside the camper were two adults and a child, all unconscious. When faced with an invisible but deadly threat, Lieutenant Hall entered the camper, removed the victims, and quickly administered critical first aid.

In a moment of crisis, Lieutenant Hall was among the first to arrive, and when faced with danger, he did not pause. Lieutenant Hall's bravery and quick thinking saved these lives and stand as a testament to the selfless courage of the public servants in Virginia's Ninth Congressional District.

Today, we recognize Lieutenant Hall for his swift and courageous response. The strength and skill he demonstrated in a time of emergency, reflect the very best of Southwest Virginia. We thank him for his service and are deeply grateful for his dedication.

HONORING SABRA RAYMER AS A
DISTINGUISHED LEADER IN CENTRAL
FLORIDA DURING LGBTQ+ PRIDE MONTH

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, Sabra Raymer is a firefighter paramedic with over six years of experience in emergency response, known for her humility, resilience, and deep commitment to serving others. Like anyone else, she is navigating life's challenges while striving to leave the world better than she found it. She doesn't seek recognition for titles or accolades but takes pride in being someone who will extend a hand when others are down, bring calm to chaos, and offer comfort during life's hardest moments.

Raised with strong values of integrity, respect, and love, Sabra credits her parents for shaping her character and purpose. Her journey hasn't been easy—she put herself through school, experienced personal lows, and worked relentlessly to rebuild and rise. She knows that life will test you, but believes that anything can be overcome with heart and determination.

Her dedication has been recognized with a Community Service Award in March 2021, a Letter of Commendation in August 2021, and her courageous role in Hurricane Ian water rescue operations, for which she received a Campaign Ribbon in February 2024.

With a heart for advocacy and inclusion, Sabra also helped design and launch Pride shirts for her county, raising awareness and fostering a culture of belonging within the department. Through this initiative, she helped raise over \$900 for the Zebra Youth Foundation, supporting LGBTQ+ youth in Central Florida.

Now in the process of becoming a peer support advocate, Sabra is especially passionate about mental health awareness in the fire service—an industry that can sometimes make individuals feel invisible or out of place. With the support of her County and community allies, she proudly stands up for those who need to feel seen, supported, and valued. She continues to serve not only as a first responder but as a voice, a helper, and a source of strength for those in need.

RECOGNIZING THEODORE GOMEZ

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today to recognize Mr. Theodore Gomez for his service at Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative (WREC) and his remarkable role in the Light Up Navajo Project. In May, a courageous team of 16 WREC employees traveled over 1,800 miles to the remote, rugged terrains of Arizona and New Mexico, where they spent two weeks installing vital electrical infrastructure for Navajo families who have lived without power for generations. Their efforts brought light, safety, and hope to communities long overlooked, allowing children to study after dark, families to preserve

food, and elders to live with greater comfort. Despite daunting challenges and limited equipment, the WREC team completed a demanding project in just eight days—far ahead of expectations—demonstrating professionalism, humility, and unwavering commitment to this life-changing mission.

The impact of WREC's work goes far beyond electricity; it represents a bridge to connection, opportunity, and the return of future

generations to their ancestral homes. The emotional moment when power was turned on for the impacted families—bringing tears of joy and renewed hope—is a testament to the profound difference this project made. WREC's participation in the "Light Up Navajo" initiative reflects not only their technical expertise but also their heart and respect for the people they serve. Their dedication has energized ten homesteads and countless lives, creating a

legacy of service that embodies the true spirit of cooperative values. The WREC team's journey inspires us all, proving that with compassion and teamwork, even the most daunting challenges can be overcome to light up lives and communities. I commend the entire team for their efforts on this worthwhile endeavor and for their ongoing service to our local community.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed S. 1582, GENIUS Act, as amended.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3407–S3451

Measures Introduced: Seventeen bills and six resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2086–2102, and S. Res. 281–286. **Pages S3435–36**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled “Report on the Legislative Activities of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions during the 118th Congress”. (S. Rept. No. 119–31) **Page S3435**

Measures Passed:

10th Anniversary of the Mother Emanuel AME Church Shooting: Senate agreed to S. Res. 282, commemorating June 17, 2025, as the tenth anniversary of the Mother Emanuel AME Church shooting. **Pages S3413–14**

GENIUS Act: By 68 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 318), Senate passed S. 1582, to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, as amended. **Pages S3418–32**

DACOR Bacon House Bicentennial Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 284, designating June 10, 2025, as “DACOR Bacon House Bicentennial Day”. **Pages S3440–41**

Glioblastoma Awareness Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 285, designating July 16, 2025, as “Glioblastoma Awareness Day”. **Page S3441**

Recognizing the Life of Former First Lady Barbara Pierce Bush: Senate agreed to S. Res. 286, recognizing the life, achievements, and public service of former First Lady Barbara Pierce Bush on the occasion of her 100th birthday. **Pages S3441–42**

Trusty Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2025. **Pages S3407–12, S3412–13**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 53 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. EX. 315), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S3407–12, S3412–13**

A unanimous consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 11 a.m., on Wednesday, June 18, 2025, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Rodney Scott, of Oklahoma, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security; that notwithstanding Rule XXII, at 12 noon, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Rodney Scott, and following the vote on cloture on the nomination of Rodney Scott, Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2025; and that if cloture is invoked on the nomination of Rodney Scott, all post-cloture time be expired and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at 1:45 p.m. **Page S3442**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 57 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. EX. 316), Gary Andres, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services. **Page S3413**

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 317), Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025. **Page S3418**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 46 yeas to 39 nays (Vote No. EX. 314), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S3407–12**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

- 3 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.
- 2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

7 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

6 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Army, and Coast Guard.

Page S3451

Executive Communications:

Pages S3434–35

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S3436–37

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S3437–42

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S3442

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—318) Pages S3410, S3412–13, S3418–19

Adjournment: Senate convened at 11:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:19 p.m., until 11 a.m. on Wednesday, June 18, 2025. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3451.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a closed hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for the intelligence community, after receiving testimony from Tulsi Gabbard, Director of National Intelligence; and John Ratcliffe, Director, Central Intelligence Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for military construction and family housing, after receiving testimony from Dale R. Marks, Assistant Secretary for Energy, Installations, and Environment, Lieutenant General David Wilson, Deputy Chief of Staff, G–9

(Installations), USA, Vice Admiral Jeffrey T. Jablon, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Installations and Logistics, USN, Lieutenant General Stephen D. Sklenka, Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics, USMC, Lieutenant General Tom D. Miller, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Engineering, and Force Protection, USAF, and Brigadier General Zachary S. Warakowski, Assistant Deputy Chief of Space Operations for Operations, Cyber, and Nuclear, USSF, all of the Department of Defense.

WORLD ANTI-DOPING AGENCY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Technology, and Data Privacy concluded a hearing to examine the World Anti-Doping Agency, focusing on swimming in denial over Chinese doping, after receiving testimony from Travis T. Tygart, United States Anti-Doping Agency, Colorado Springs, Colorado; Rahul Gupta, GATC Health Corporation, Irvine, California; Dionne Koller, University of Baltimore School of Law Center for Sport and the Law, Pottomac, Maryland; and Kathryn McLaughlin, Dana Point, California.

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS FROM SCAMMERS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine scammers exposed, focusing on protecting older Americans from transnational crime networks, after receiving testimony from April Helm, Advocating Against Romance Scammers, Tulsa, Oklahoma; Jilene Gunther, AARP BankSafe Initiative, New York, New York; Joshua M. Bercu, USTelecom-The Broadband Association, Washington, D.C.; and Brady Finta, National Elder Fraud Coordination Center, Oceanside, California.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 37 public bills, H.R. 4017–4053; and 8 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 38; and H. Res. 516–522, were introduced. Pages H2830–32

Additional Cosponsors:

Page H2833

Reports Filed: A report was filed on June 16, 2025 as follows:

H.R. 4016, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September

30, 2026, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 119–162).

A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 275, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to publish on a monthly basis the number of special interest aliens encountered attempting to unlawfully enter the United States, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–163).

Page H2830

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Loudermilk to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H2827

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Daniel Carson, St. Peter's Catholic Church, Washington, DC.

Page H2827

Senate Referral: S. 1467 was held at the desk.

Page H2827

Senate Message: Message received from the Senate appears on page S2827.

Quorum Calls—Votes: There were no Yea and Nay votes, and there were no Recorded votes. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 11 a.m. and adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2026 for the Army, 10:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year

2026 and the Future Years Defense Program for the Department of Defense; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, Freight, Pipelines, and Safety, to hold hearings to examine modernizing America's rail network, 10 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2026 for the Department of Energy, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider the nominations of Jacob Helberg, of Florida, to be Under Secretary for Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment, Andrew Puzder, of Tennessee, to be Representative of the United States of America to the European Union, with the rank of Ambassador, Paul Kapur, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for South Asian Affairs, Howard Brodie, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland, Luigi Rinaldi, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, Nicholas Merrick, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Czech Republic, Arthur Fisher, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, Roman Pipko, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Estonia, and Stacey Feinberg, of California, to be Ambassador to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, all of the Department of State, and Benjamin Black, of New York, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine NATO Summit 2025, focusing on an assessment of transatlantic security cooperation, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jonathan Berry, of Maryland, to be Solicitor, Andrew Rogers, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, and Anthony D'Esposito, of New York, to be Inspector General, all of the Department of Labor, and Andrea Lucas, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine the Biden presidency and the Constitution, 10:15 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Wednesday, June 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Rodney Scott, of Oklahoma, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 12 noon. Following the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Rodney Scott, Senate will vote on confirmation of the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of five years from July 1, 2025. If cloture is invoked on the nomination of Rodney Scott, Senate will vote on confirmation thereon at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Friday, June 20

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E579, E580, E581, E582, E583, E584, E585, E586
Case, Ed, Hawaii, E582
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E586

Kean, Thomas H., Jr., N.J., E584
Kennedy, Timothy M., N.Y., E579, E580, E583, E586
Liccardo, Sam T., Calif., E581
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E580, E582, E584
Soto, Darren, Fla., E579, E580, E581, E582, E583, E584, E586, E586

Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E585
Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E579, E580, E581, E583, E585, E585
Weber, Randy K., Sr., Tex., E579
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E584



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are