



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2026

No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 17, 2026.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2026, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

CELEBRATING SAINT PATRICK'S DAY

(Mr. KENNEDY of New York was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. Speaker, happy Saint Patrick's Day.

Today is a great day across the globe where we celebrate the patron saint of Ireland, and we are reminded of all that the Irish and the Irish diaspora have contributed to humanity and accomplished worldwide.

Here in the United States of America, since 1991, every President, Demo-

crat or Republican, has issued a proclamation declaring March as Irish Heritage Month, until now. For 35 years this longstanding tradition has been honored. This President has failed to do so.

Therefore, I hereby declare on behalf of a grateful nation March 2026 as Irish Heritage Month in the United States of America.

Some may ask: What Congressman has the power to do such a thing?

The answer is easy. I am simply declaring what is inherently true, whether the President of the United States of America continues to be derelict in his duty to officially declare it such or not.

To be Irish is to know the struggle for democracy, liberty, and freedom. From the very beginning of our Nation, the Irish have ensured that these noble aims have persevered.

The American story could not have been written without the contributions made by the intrepid Irish immigrants who came to our shores in pursuit of prosperity and, in turn, made our Nation what it is today.

When George Washington went into battle against the crown forces of England, it was the Irish who stood at his side and fought for victory and independence from the oppressive British Government.

When the Civil War was fought, it was the Irish, fresh off the ships in the harbor, who joined the Union Army and battled the treasonous Confederates to end slavery and preserve the Union.

Many Irish battalions, including the Fighting 69th Irish Infantry led by Thomas Francis Meagher, bled for the soul of our blossoming Nation and proved the fighting Irish were here to stay, build, and thrive.

The Irish have been our war heroes, donning the military uniform and running into battle across the globe in service and sacrifice in every single conflict our Nation has ever seen, of-

tentimes, laying down their lives for the freedoms we hold dear.

Generations of Irish patriots have challenged our Nation to live up to its highest ideals. Their struggle is woven into the fabric of our democracy, and their voices ring like a clarion call to our better angels.

It was the Irish fleeing famine and oppression who worked alongside so many other new immigrants to build our country, our canals, our roads, our bridges, our railroads, our skyscrapers, our subways, and so much more.

The Irish would go on to become integral to every aspect of American society: laborers, nurses, doctors, police officers, firefighters, teachers, lawyers, civil servants, public advocates, businessowners, bankers, entertainers, and, yes, politicians who know what happens when government falls into the hands of those who callously disregard the less fortunate and discriminate based on race, creed, culture, or country of origin.

Countless Irishmen and -women have helped to make the United States what it is today, the greatest Nation in the history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, as Irish Americans, we will march on, as we always have, not just for the Irish but for everyone in this great Nation and future citizens we will never know.

God bless the Irish. God bless the United States of America. Erin go Bragh. Happy Saint Patrick's Day, and happy Irish Heritage Month.

ENDING DHS SHUTDOWN

(Mr. MANN of Kansas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the Department of Homeland Security remains shut down, and the consequences are real for the American people and for the men and women who work every day to keep our country safe.

☐ 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.

H2533

Right now, more than 100,000 DHS employees are working without pay. TSA officers who screen passengers at our airports have now missed another paycheck. These are hardworking Americans who show up every day to do their job, protect travelers, and secure our homeland, even while Washington politics leave them without the pay they have earned.

This isn't some distant issue for Kansans. Families and travelers across the Big First depend on TSA officers every single day. From airports in Manhattan, Salina, Garden City, Dodge City, Liberal, and Hays, TSA agents are on the front lines making sure our skies are safe.

Just down the road in Wichita, the Air Capital of the World, thousands of Kansans build aircraft that carry passengers across the country and around the globe. Aviation is part of who we are in Kansas, and aviation safety is something we take very seriously.

Yet, Senate Democrats have allowed the men and women responsible for securing our airports to work without pay. As spring-break travel picks up, airports across the country are already seeing longer lines and staffing challenges because of this shutdown. These are dedicated public servants who continue showing up for work every day, even while Washington fails to send them a paycheck.

The impacts of this Democrat refusal to support DHS funding reaches far beyond airport security. FEMA training for first responders has been canceled. Cybersecurity personnel defending our networks are being furloughed while foreign adversaries continue probing our systems. Coast Guard training and maintenance have been disrupted. These are not theoretical consequences. They are happening right now.

Mr. Speaker, what makes the situation even more frustrating is that the House has already acted. House Republicans have twice passed full-year funding to keep the Department of Homeland Security fully operational. That legislation reflects a bipartisan framework negotiated by Members of both parties and deserves and ensures the Department has the resources it needs to protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Senate Democrats still continue to block that funding. Instead of allowing the department responsible for protecting our homeland to do its job, they are prolonging a shutdown that harms workers, weakens preparedness, and undermines public safety.

National security should never be used as a political bargaining chip. The men and women who protect our borders, screen our airports, respond to disasters, and defend our infrastructure deserve stability and support, not uncertainty and missed paychecks.

Mr. Speaker, the solution is simple. The Senate should take up the funding the House has already passed and reopen the Department of Homeland Security. The safety of the American peo-

ple, including Kansans across the Big First District, depends on it.

HONORING NEW CASTLE COUNCILMAN PENROSE HOLLINS

(Ms. McBRIDE of Delaware was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. McBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize New Castle County Councilman Penrose Hollins, who was recently awarded the Order of the First State, Delaware's highest civilian honor.

Councilman Hollins is a veteran, lifelong leader, and one of Delaware's most committed public servants, serving on the New Castle Council for the last three-and-a-half decades. During that time, I am proud to have been one of his constituents.

For 36 years, he has worked tirelessly for his neighbors, advancing affordable homeownership, expanding access to libraries and community hubs, supporting programs for youth and seniors, all while promoting workforce diversity and economic development.

Delawareans, and specifically my neighbors and me in District Four, know him as a committed voice for justice, a trailblazer, and a pillar of the greater Wilmington area. Councilman Hollins made history when he served as the first Black president pro tempore of the New Castle County Council. In every chapter of his career, he has sought to expand opportunity for those too often pushed to the margins of society.

His legacy of leadership, courage, and fierce advocacy is an inspiration to all who know him, to his constituents, and to the entire State of Delaware.

Mr. Speaker, we congratulate him on a well-deserved honor, and we thank him for his dedication and service to the First State.

HONORING MICHAELA KURINSKY-MALOS

Ms. McBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I often come to this Chamber to share about the work we get to do, the perspectives our neighbors share with us, and to highlight the struggles and the successes that define this work. Today, I want to uplift one of the behind-the-scenes actors who has helped me deliver for our neighbors during my first term in Congress.

I rise to bid farewell to Michaela Kurinsky-Malos, who joined my team 2 years ago, long before I ever stepped into this Chamber. She has been a critical part of my team ever since.

For the last year, Michaela has served as my deputy chief and communications director, as well as chief vibes enforcer, bringing incomparable guidance, experienced leadership, and unyielding commitment to our team.

Michaela and I first met when she came on board as my campaign manager. While, technically, I was interviewing her for that job, it really felt like she was interviewing me. It was then that I saw her political acumen up close. Michaela is one of the most deci-

sive, incisive, and effective leaders I have ever known.

Through the highs and lows of the campaign trail and my first year in Congress, Michaela's tireless dedication to our mission, to her team, and to public service has always remained her North Star. Her work has shaped my life and our team immensely. She will be sorely missed by me and the entirety of our office.

Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful for her partnership and for all that she has done to make this possible. I wish her all the best in her next exciting chapter. The doors of Delaware will always be open to her, to Dexter, to Bubba, and even to Todd back to the greatest State in the Union.

HONORING ALBERT FIRTH

Ms. McBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Albert Firth of Millsboro, who passed away on February 19 of this year.

For two decades, Mr. Firth served our country in the United States Air Force, dedicating his career to protecting our Nation abroad. After retirement from the Air Force, Mr. Firth continued his commitment to public service right here in D.C., where he joined the U.S. Capitol Police.

Mr. Firth served with the U.S. Capitol Police from the late 1980s until nearly 2000, helping safeguard this institution and the people who work here. This was no small undertaking and far from the typical retirement scene.

During the 1990s, he was entrusted with an especially important responsibility, serving on the personal security detail for then-Speaker Newt Gingrich.

Throughout his career, his work required vigilance, professionalism, and a resolute dedication that Mr. Firth carried with honor, responsibility, and pride.

Mr. Firth's legacy is a reminder that service to our country takes many forms—sometimes in uniform abroad and sometimes here at home, protecting the institutions that sustain our democracy.

Delaware is grateful for his decades of service, and our Nation is stronger because of his selfless contributions to our country. May his memory be a blessing to all who knew him.

CELEBRATING CEREBRAL PALSY DAY

(Mr. LATIMER of New York was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, let me recognize the talented medical research efforts ongoing to combat the scourge of cerebral palsy, an abnormal development or damage to parts of the brain during pregnancy or early in a baby's life, that controls movement, balance, and posture and has a devastating effect throughout that person's life.

There is no known cure for CP. Supportive treatments including physical

therapy, speech therapy, and some medications help, as well. CP is the most common movement disorder in children. Researchers are working every day to identify strategies to address the causes and effects of cerebral palsy.

One such pioneer is Dr. Kathleen Friel, a Westchester resident who herself has battled with CP since birth. She has overcome her own case to achieve master's and doctoral degrees in physiology and neuroscience. She has also written and lectured extensively about the disease and therapies to reduce its impact—all of this personal bravery and effort while this Federal Government blindly and foolishly cuts NIH funding for the very research victims so desperately need.

Mr. Speaker, from the floor of the House of Representatives, we salute Dr. Kathleen Friel for her personal battle with CP and her lifetime commitment to ease the suffering of her fellow individuals who also deal with cerebral palsy.

□ 1015

CELEBRATING ST. THOMAS MAR THOMA CHURCH

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, the congregants of St. Thomas Mar Thoma Church will celebrate their 45th annual parish day, reflecting on their years of heritage and gratitude for parishioners not only from Yonkers, where the church is located, but from those who live across Westchester, the Bronx, and elsewhere in the metropolitan area.

The church dedication dates back to January 25, 1981, with the present house of worship on Morris Street, in Yonkers, established in June of 1990.

This parish has taken on a mission for youth ministry, the Junior Conference for Sunday School Children, and regional activity for youth camps from Connecticut to Pennsylvania.

The church provides its Christian charitable outreach with a community barbecue annually on Memorial Day and clothing drives and giveaways for needy in the neighborhood. Taking their cue from the great apostle St. Thomas, who went from Jesus' side to India to deliver a Christian message of faith, St. Thomas Mar Thoma has delivered a message of service and faith in this current day.

From the floor of the House of Representatives, we salute the clergy and the congregants of St. Thomas Mar Thoma Church on this, the 45th parish day.

BIRTHDAY WISHES TO VANESSA GIBSON

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, I extend happy birthday wishes this week to Bronx Borough President Vanessa Gibson as she celebrates another year of service to her Bronx neighbors and friends.

I had the pleasure of serving with Vanessa as a colleague in the New York State Assembly alongside many former assembly colleagues, JOE MORELLE, ADRIANO ESPAILLAT, PAUL TONKO, CLAUDIA TENNEY, NICOLE

MALLIOTAKIS, GRACE MENG, and Leader HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Vanessa Gibson's service in that chamber, exemplary as it was, was a prelude to her subsequent tenure in the New York City Council, where she was elected in 2013 and 2017, and now her historic election as the first female and the first African American to serve as Bronx borough president in 2021, re-elected in 2025.

As she celebrates her birthday this Thursday, March 19, we give her a happy birthday shout-out from the floor of the House of Representatives.

Happy birthday to Vanessa Gibson.

HONORING SHANE DIGIOVANNA

(Mr. LANDSMAN of Ohio was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a friend and a constituent, Shane DiGiovanna.

Shane was born with EB, a rare and painful disease that makes the skin incredibly fragile. There is currently no cure. It is sometimes referred to as the worst disease you have never heard of.

Shane has bandages across most of his body. This disease, because of what happens to the skin, leads to infection, illness, and the kind of cancer he is fighting now.

Over the course of his life, Shane has had over 150 surgeries. Yet, he is one of the kindest, most spirited human beings I have ever met in my entire life. He is a remarkable person and, truly, one of the best people who I know.

Shane is brilliant. He is funny, curious, deeply empathetic, and full of joy. He graduated from college at Rice University, even though it is not something people expected of a child with EB. Yet, if you know Shane, it is not surprising. He was already reading, I think at college level, in the second grade.

Shane sends me pages of ideas and notes about history, politics, and why he believes the country can always be better. Shane has already lived longer than just about anyone with EB. He has used that time to make the world better for others, and his advocacy began when he was just a child.

After one of his first surgeries, Shane brought a stuffed animal named "Doggie" with him to the hospital. It made such a huge difference for him, so he created Doggie's Friends, Shane's charity at Cincinnati Children's Hospital, to provide a stuffed animal to kids who are undergoing surgery. He saw something that he knew would help, and he got it done. It is just who Shane is.

I met Shane as an advocate. I had just gotten elected to the United States Congress, and he had reached out to say that he wanted to talk about rare disease work, and he invited me over. I went to Shane's house and sat in his kitchen, and we went through all of the legislative priorities for the rare disease community.

I was all in immediately not just because the policy moved me, but Shane was so compelling, charismatic, and convincing. Since that day nearly 4 years ago, we have texted just about every day. We talk about politics, books, history, shows, life, and what else I should be doing to help families dealing with rare diseases.

Some of that work has already led to real progress. Congress reauthorized the Rare Pediatric Disease Priority Review Voucher Program. The program helps to speed up treatment development for nearly 15 million children who are living with rare diseases.

Congress also passed the Accelerating Kids' Access to Care Act. The law helps children to get specialized care across State lines without delays or higher costs. Of course, there is also the funding for research. Rare disease research is a good idea for some. It is life or death for these families.

That is why Congress has to step up to fund this research and make sure that the research we have funded reaches the people who will turn that research into treatment and care, to support its innovation, and to keep families healthy, which leads me to Shane's bill.

We introduced Shane's bill just last week, a bill that would require the Department of Health and Human Services to study the impact of fully covering bandages for people who are living with EB.

Believe it or not, these families have to pay hundreds of thousands of dollars for their bandages, even though the bandages help to ensure that these kids, young people, are less likely to go to the hospital, less likely to get an infection, and less likely to cost more.

The bill ensures access to these supplies to improve care, reduce hospital visits, and ease the enormous financial burden that families already face. This is Shane's bill, a bill inspired by his life and the families he has spent years fighting for.

Mr. Speaker, when you meet someone like Shane—someone who is curious, compassionate, and brilliant—you want to do more and be better.

I saw Shane's impact most clearly at his celebration of life, a room filled with people from across the country who have been touched by his kindness.

He is a funny, social, and gifted person, and his legacy is the life he lived, the people who he touched, and the work we will keep fighting to do, including this bill.

HONORING AIRMEN LOST IN KC-135 CRASH

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor six heroic Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice and gave their lives in defense of the United States.

On March 12, 2026, six American airmen were tragically killed when a KC-

135 refueling aircraft supporting U.S. military operations in Iran crashed in western Iraq.

Today, we remember them by name: Major John “Alex” Klinner, Captain Ariana Savino, Captain Seth Koval, Captain Curtis Angst, Technical Sergeant Ashley Pruitt, and Technical Sergeant Tyler Simmons.

Three of these brave airmen were members of the 99th Air Refueling Squadron, which operates in Birmingham, Alabama, in my district.

I will take a moment to talk about the lives and legacies of these three airmen.

Major Alex Klinner was 33 years old, a native of Auburn, Alabama. He entered the Air Force through the ROTC program at Auburn University in 2017.

Major Klinner deployed in 2019, 2020, 2022, and 2026, and he served as chief of the squadron’s standardization and evaluation at the 99th Air Refueling Squadron since 2024. He was promoted to major in January.

A devoted husband and father, Major Klinner is survived by his wife, Libby, their 2-year-old son, and a 7-year-old set of twins.

Captain Ariana Savino was 31 years old. Captain Savino was a native of Covington, Washington. She entered the Air Force through the ROTC program at Central Washington University in 2017. Captain Savino deployed in 2020 and in 2026 and had served as the chief current operations pilot at the 99th Air Refueling Squadron since 2024.

Captain Savino was passionate about serving and supporting Latin women in aviation.

A dedicated friend and sister, she is survived by her parents, siblings, and pets.

Technical Sergeant Ashley Brooke Pruitt was 34 years old and a native of Bardstown, Kentucky. She entered the Air Force in 2017, deploying overseas three times and serving as an assistant flight chief of operations at the 99th Air Refueling Squadron.

Technical Sergeant Pruitt is remembered as a selfless servant and a radiant mother by those in her community. She is survived by her husband, Gregory, 3-year-old daughter, and a stepson.

The loss of all six of these brave American patriots is devastating, and my prayers are with their families as they grieve.

I know I speak for all of us in expressing our deep sorrow and immense gratitude for their service to the United States.

On behalf of Alabama’s Seventh Congressional District and a grateful nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering the lives of six airmen who paid the ultimate price. May they rest in peace, and may we never ever forget their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence.

HONORING CAPTAIN ARIANA SAVINO

(Mr. BAUMGARTNER of Washington was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Captain Ariana Savino of Covington, Washington, who tragically lost her life in the KC-135 crash over Iraq during Operation Epic Fury.

Captain Savino was one of our Nation’s heroes, someone who made the ultimate sacrifice in service of our country.

We celebrate and mourn all of America’s heroes who lose their lives in combat operations or in training, but this loss hits especially close to home for those of us from Washington State.

While she was not based at Fairchild Air Force Base, the Fairchild Air Force Base community and all who serve the tanker mission exemplify extraordinary courage and quiet professionalism. Their work of keeping our aircraft fueled and our operations moving is essential to every mission that our Nation undertakes around the world. We are heartbroken by this tragedy.

Eastern Washington stands with Captain Savino’s family, friends, and the brave airmen and -women of Fairchild. May her memory continue to shine brightly, and may her loved ones find comfort in knowing that she served with honor and deep devotion to the United States of America.

HONORING AIRMAN 1ST CLASS KIMBERLYNN BLOOD

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Airman 1st Class Kimberlynn Blood of Fairfield, Washington, a shining example of the proud tradition of service that defines eastern Washington.

Airman Blood is the third generation of her family to serve the United States Air Force, following her great-grandfather and her grandfather. Her father also served in the United States Navy from 2003 to 2008, and several members of her family are veterans or currently serving.

Each week, when I come to the floor, I try to recognize one of the bright lights of eastern Washington, and Airman Blood is certainly one of those bright lights.

A former Civil Air Patrol member, Airman Blood graduated basic military training at Lackland Air Force Base on December 4, 2025, with honors, ranking in the top 10 percent in her class and as the only female in her squadron.

She went on to earn the prestigious Flight Chief Air Award at Sheppard Air Force Base, placing among the top 5 percent of her aircraft fuel systems class. Her first duty assignment will be at RAF Lakenheath in the United Kingdom.

Airman Blood’s achievement reflects the patriotism and dedication that run deep in eastern Washington, and her community is incredibly proud of her commitment to serve our Nation.

□ 1030

CELEBRATING NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Agriculture Week.

Agriculture is the backbone of eastern Washington, the heart of our economy, our culture, and our communities. In spite of escalating production costs and other challenges, our farmers and ranchers remain dedicated to feeding our families and strengthening our Nation.

From wheat and apples to some of the finest chickpeas and lentils in the world, eastern Washington’s producers help feed a hungry planet while building healthy soils and strong rural communities. Their resilience, innovation, and work ethic embody the best of the American spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of our hardworking farmers and ranchers across the Nation for all they do and wish all of America a happy National Agriculture Week.

RECOGNIZING CITY RESCUE MISSION

(Mr. BEAN of Florida was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what does it take to change a city? Sometimes it starts with a cup of soup.

Eighty years ago, in Jacksonville, Florida, three businessmen did exactly that. They walked the streets handing out soup to men who had nowhere else to turn—no fanfare, no program, just compassion in action.

From that small act in 1946 grew the City Rescue Mission, an institution that has spent eight decades restoring hope to men, women, and families facing homelessness, addiction, hunger, and hardship.

What began as a small ministry has grown into a comprehensive network of services that provides emergency shelter, recovery programs, job training, medical care, and lifelong transformation for thousands of people in northeast Florida.

For 80 years, the mission has reminded our community of a simple truth: The strength of a city is measured not by the buildings or the economy but by how it cares for those struggling the most.

On May 7, the City Rescue Mission will celebrate—how about this, Mr. Speaker—its 80th anniversary with a dinner honoring its legacy and looking toward the future.

The real story isn’t the anniversary. It is the thousands of lives changed because someone cared enough to act.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless the men and women who have been a part of the mission and continue to this day to be a part of that mission. To think, Mr. Speaker, it all started with three people walking through the streets of Jacksonville, carrying nothing but soup. Sometimes the smallest acts of service create the biggest change.

HONORING GREEN BERETS

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, across the world today, brave men and women servicemembers are standing watch, protecting our freedoms, and defending the liberties we all hold dear.

Among them is a group of soldiers whose mission is often carried out far away from the spotlight, and they would prefer it that way. They are known as the Quiet Professionals.

They are the men and women of the United States Army Special Forces, the Green Berets. They serve in some of the most demanding environments on Earth, often behind the scenes, carrying out difficult missions that protect American interests and defend freedom for the people they probably will never meet.

This April, the northeast Florida community will gather at the Jacksonville National Cemetery to unveil a memorial honoring these extraordinary soldiers. Many Green Berets from units such as the 7th Special Forces Group, who have lived, trained, served, and now, in some cases, rest there, are among the patriots who answered our Nation's call. This monument will stand as a lasting tribute to their courage, their sacrifice, and the families who carry the burdens of service alongside them.

Mr. Speaker, the Green Berets live by a simple motto: De Oppresso Liber, To Free the Oppressed. They have never sought recognition, but now it is our honor to give it to them.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOTT). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

God of the ages, we recall the words of Saint Patrick's breastplate, when we too bear witness to the strength of Heaven revealed in the light of the Sun, in the speed of the lightning, in the swiftness of the sea, in the stability of the Earth, and in the firmness of the rock.

This is the strength that You have provided us to face this day. And You, O Lord, alone are the source of that strength.

From You and through You and for You are all things. Deep are the riches of Your wisdom and knowledge.

And it is Your omniscience that directs us, Your might that upholds us, and Your spirit that inspires us to serve You. May we live up to the responsibility You have entrusted to us as we labor in these Halls.

To You, God Almighty, be all praise and honor. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House the approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOLDMAN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER MERIWETHER DEMM

(Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Christopher Meriwether Demm as he prepares to retire later this month.

A true legend of his craft, morning talk radio will never be the same.

Chris Demm of the "2 Guys Named Chris" show has been a fixture on radios across my district for the better part of three decades.

To the loyal PIs who listened to him every day, he is more than just a morning show host. He is a trusted source for a solid deep cut. He is a reliable bet for a laugh. He is the Michael Jordan of rock-and-roll trivia and the king of thoughtful interview questions.

Every morning thousands of people across North Carolina start their day listening to Chris Demm: people on job sites, folks on their morning commute to the office, or kids who got their start, like me, listening with my dad in the car on the way to school.

Mr. Speaker, while we prepare for our mornings to sound a little different, I speak on behalf of thousands of listeners in saying thank you to Chris for 27 years. We all enjoyed it. I extend congratulations to Chris on his retirement. His poor back has earned it by

carrying Chris Kelly for all of these years.

END HUNGER NOW

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a key ingredient for making America healthy is better access to cooking classes to teach people how to prepare nutritious meals.

As part of my End Hunger Now tour across Massachusetts, I joined my friend Representative SETH MOULTON on a visit to the Phoenix Food Hub at Greater Lynn Senior Services. We participated in cooking classes where we learned how to make carrot muffins.

We talked with the CEO of Lynn Senior Services, Kathy Burns, and clients of the food hub who shared how important these classes are to their ability to eat nutritiously. We heard firsthand how Trump's reckless cuts to SNAP and other nutrition programs such as SNAP education, which was eliminated in the big, ugly bill, are making it even harder for them to put nutritious food on the table for their families.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that Republicans are taking away money for food and tools to help improve nutrition. If we want to make America healthy again and end hunger now, Congress must reverse these cuts now.

CONDEMNING WEALTH INEQUALITY

(Mr. GOLDMAN of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOLDMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to condemn the skyrocketing wealth inequality in this country.

Over the last couple of decades, the rich have gotten richer while working families have been left behind. The very wealthiest of Americans pay an average effective tax rate of 3.4 percent. Elon Musk pays 3.3 percent. Jeff Bezos pays 1 percent. Yet, wage-earning Americans pay nearly 30 percent.

Put simply, our tax system is rigged. That is why I introduced the ROBINHOOD Act, to make these billionaires pay their fair share so that we can deliver universal childcare and Medicare for all.

These billionaires avoid paying taxes because their assets and money is in stock. They don't sell their stock. Instead, they take out loans against their stock, and they don't pay taxes on their loans.

Put simply, this bill would tax those loans and would generate nearly \$30 billion of revenue. This is the right way to tackle our wealth inequality and to make the wealthy pay their fair share.

RECOGNIZING MYHOMETOWNBRONXVILLE

(Mr. LATIMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, let me salute the excellent online news outlet, MyHometownBronxville, which has provided a bedrock of local news and information about the comings and goings of the village of Bronxville since 2007.

Under the leadership of editor and publisher Sarah Thornton Clifford and the original leadership of Marcia Lee, MyHometownBronxville provides the latest news, sports, events, and information about the Bronxville community.

The team in charge attends village meetings and events at the library, schools, houses of worship, and the business community to give a firsthand view of the people and the activities that drive the cultural and community life of Bronxville.

Editor Clifford, a graduate of Princeton and Yale with professional media experience at Time Inc. and Sports Illustrated, is ably abetted by Neely Bower, Sue DeJoy, Jeannie Murrer, and others, and we recognize the past contributions of Allaire Warner in providing the hometown connection that is sadly lacking in so many other places.

From the floor of the House of Representatives, we acknowledge the outstanding work of MyHometownBronxville and its dedicated team.

SPENDING HABITS OF DEMOCRATS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to say anything during 1-minute speeches today, but I really get irritated when people stand up on this floor and tell half-truths to the American people.

One of our colleagues just talked about the fact that wealthy people pay small percentages of their income on taxes, but what he didn't say is that they pay over 50 percent of all the taxes paid in this country and that working-class people don't pay nearly as much as they do.

Mr. Speaker, don't buy the empty rhetoric of congressional Democrats. They ran on affordability in the Commonwealth of Virginia, but they just recently slapped on a regressive payroll tax that will squeeze billions of dollars out of workers' paychecks.

Congressional Democrats are on record voting against tax relief for tipped workers, Social Security recipients, working moms, and the working class, when they voted against the Working Families Tax Cut Act.

Don't listen to what they say. Watch what they do. They are lying in wait to

vote for higher taxes on working families yet again if they have the opportunity, but what they don't understand is that the government doesn't have a tax flow problem. We have a spending problem.

□ 1210

DELIVERING FOR EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA

(Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for those who may not follow my work closely, they may ask: What have you done for eastern North Carolina?

The answer is straightforward. Because of my work in Congress and, most importantly, my vote on key appropriations bills, I have secured 15 projects, totaling nearly \$54 million.

Traveling across the region and meeting and connecting with local leaders and community members, I have seen firsthand that Federal investments are delivering real results.

In rural communities where resources are already stretched thin, investments such as a new fire truck in Williamston, a sewer infrastructure project in Sharpsburg, and a public safety project in Ahoskie are making real differences by addressing long-standing needs.

I am putting all political divisions aside to make a difference for our families. These are not Democratic or Republican issues. They are eastern North Carolina issues.

It is always good to be back home. To be clear, I come to Washington, D.C., to fight for eastern North Carolina.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 556, PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1958, DEPORTING FRAUDSTERS ACT OF 2026; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4638, BILL TO OUTLAW WOUNDING OF OFFICIAL WORKING ANIMALS ACT OF 2025; AND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1115 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1115

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 556) to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the

bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1958) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that aliens who have been convicted of defrauding the United States Government or the unlawful receipt of public benefits are inadmissible and deportable. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4638) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an alien who has been convicted of harming animals used in law enforcement is inadmissible and deportable, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Debate on motions that the House suspend the rules, under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring a balanced budget for the Federal Government, shall be extended to one hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 1115, providing for the House's consideration of H.R. 556, H.R. 1958, and H.R. 4638.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 556, the Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of H.R. 1958, the Deporting Fraudsters Act of 2026, and H.R. 4638, the Federal Working Animal Protection Act, both under closed rules. The rule provides each 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees and provides for one motion to recommit for each bill.

Additionally, when considered under suspension of the rules, the rule provides additional debate time to 1 hour of general debate for H.J. Res. 139, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring a balanced budget for the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the three measures that underpin this rule all share a singular, defining characteristic: They are in alignment with the priorities and demands of the American people.

What do the American people want, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you what they want. They want a restoration of law and order so that illegal aliens are deported, especially when they are convicted of having committed criminal acts.

Republicans are answering that demand by putting forth H.R. 1958 and H.R. 4638. These two pieces of legislation zero in on criminal aliens who have defrauded the government and criminal aliens who commit violent acts against law enforcement working animals in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, when I say that we back the blue, I am talking about the men and women of law enforcement and the trained animals that stand alongside them in the line of duty.

Those who choose to oppose this legislation, I can guarantee, are members of the same party that has voted to keep the Department of Homeland Security shut down and has voted in the past to defund the police. You and I both know, Mr. Speaker, which party it is that I am referring to here. It is obvious.

Americans want a Federal Government that respects consumer choice

and the exercising of our freedoms, not a Federal Government that seeks to regulate every single aspect of our lives. That is why Republicans are putting forth H.R. 556, which would tear down regulations that have dictated how men and women across the Nation can hunt and fish on select pieces of land under the control of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, respectively.

These are two essential parts of life that Americans are incredibly fortunate to engage in and enjoy. I believe all should respect that, but the Federal Government, under Democratic control, has time and again viewed these activities as nothing more than a target to overregulate. Is anyone surprised by this? I don't believe so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will guarantee that our colleagues across the aisle won't spend their time debating this slate of bills with us today. I would be pleasantly surprised if they actually chose to do that. Instead, they will do the same thing they always do: stomp their feet, huff and puff, and yell about unrelated things until they are blue in the face. It is like muscle memory for them at this point.

Meanwhile, Republicans will be focused on the task at hand, like they always are. They stand ready to deliver, and they intend to do so, yet again, with these three pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1220

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, happy St. Patrick's Day to everybody. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, the distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee, for whom I have much admiration and respect, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what on Earth are we doing here? Yesterday, the President of the United States spent an hour at lunch talking about the Kennedy Center—you know, the place he slapped his name on before basically running it into the ground.

Today, the Congress of the United States is spending an hour debating messaging bills that totally ignore the realities of what is going on in people's everyday lives.

Does anyone on the other side of the aisle realize that the United States of America is at war right now? Does anyone in the Republican Conference want to acknowledge that costs are up, corruption is running rampant, and everyday people are getting screwed?

They promised lower costs on day one. That is what Donald Trump promised. Guess what. Gas is up, thanks to the war in Iran. Groceries are up, thanks to the tariffs. Rent is up. Childcare is up. Healthcare is up, with millions of Americans paying double and triple for their health insurance and over a million losing it altogether because of Republican inaction.

Do Republicans plan to do anything about any of that? No.

This is what they did instead. They jammed through a big, ugly bill to help billionaires. They defend Trump's tariffs that are raising costs on working people. They continue to cover up for the predators in the Epstein files. Now, they are backing another illegal war in the Middle East that is costing over a billion dollars a day in taxpayer money.

But they are not talking about any of that. They keep bringing distraction after distraction to the House floor, bills meant to waste time, divide people, and shift the blame from billionaires onto immigrants. That is their whole playbook.

Don't look over here at Epstein elites and billionaire corporations who are ripping us off, breaking the law, and getting away with it. No, no, no. Blame the immigrants. Blame trans kids. Blame Joe Biden. Blame everybody but the President and his billionaire buddies. It is getting old, and I, for one, am sick and tired of it.

This President and my friends on the other side, who are refusing to rein him in because they are all afraid of him, are burning a billion dollars a day of American taxpayer money on a war halfway around the world. That is \$1 billion a day. Let me repeat that: \$1 billion a day.

There is no more money to help seniors heat their homes. They say we don't have it. There is no money to help kids get healthy breakfasts in school. There is no money to restore SNAP benefits to help seniors and veterans afford groceries. There is no more money to help working families breathe easier or sleep better at night.

I am just sick and tired of this, Mr. Speaker. There is always money for war. There is always money for another tax break for multimillionaires, billionaires, and giant corporations. There is always time to debate silly bills that try to shift the blame onto immigrants and trans kids, but there is never the time or the money to address the real and pressing issues that the American people are begging Republicans to help them with.

This is an embarrassing debate. This is an embarrassing moment for this Congress. While everybody in this country is in an uproar over rising costs, people are begging us to address that issue, to lower costs, and to help make their lives easier. While that is what is on the minds of the American people, Republicans can't bring themselves to bring legislation to the floor to address those issues. It really is sad. It really is sad.

Again, I think that my friends are going to realize come the midterm elections that people have had enough of this. But really people can't wait until the next election. People need us to address these concerns now.

This is an embarrassing debate, I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his kind comments. I send them back to him and wish him a happy St. Patrick's Day. I appreciate him making my prediction in my opening remarks come true.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McDOWELL).

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, from the massive fraud uncovered in Minnesota to schemes across this country, criminal networks are targeting American programs and treating taxpayers like an ATM.

These are hard-earned American tax dollars. These are the earned benefits of our seniors. These are young families' grocery budgets.

My colleague across the aisle has said that we don't have money for these programs. We don't have money for these programs because you let fraudsters take all of it.

Yet, we are watching criminal aliens exploit our neighbors and the programs meant to help our communities, draining billions from the American people.

Every dollar stolen by a foreign fraudster is a dollar that is taken from an American family who actually needs these programs and their hard-earned money where it belongs, with them.

The Deporting Fraudsters Act puts the American taxpayer back in the driver's seat. This bill makes non-U.S. citizens who steal from Federal programs deportable. It is crazy that that wasn't already the case. It makes sure that far-left prosecutors do not sidestep Federal law by dragging out a case to avoid a conviction.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is really just common sense. If you come here to scam the American people, you will be held accountable, and you will go home.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am just going to respond to the gentlewoman because she wants me to address some of the underlying bills. One of them, H.R. 4638, is the so-called BOWOW Act of 2025. We are debating something and saying that it should be illegal when it already is illegal. It is kind of redundant.

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, a noncitizen who is convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude is subject to removal. In 2018, the Board of Immigration Appeals found that the crime of animal fighting is a crime involving moral turpitude because there is a clear intent to harm an animal.

Let me read to you how this bill we are talking about came to be. On June 24, 2025, canine detective and U.S. Customs and Border Protection Beagle Brigadier Freddie and his handler were inspecting baggage from Cairo, Egypt. Beagle Brigadier Freddie's job is to sniff out prohibited agriculture products at the border that could threaten vital agricultural industries.

Beagle Brigadier Freddie alerted to one of the suitcases being transported by Hamed Ramadan Bayoumy Aly Marie, an Egyptian national. As Beagle Brigadier Freddie continued his investigation, his handler began questioning Mr. Marie who abruptly and violently kicked the canine detective. The kick was of such force that it launched Beagle Brigadier Freddie, a 25-pound beagle, off the ground. After examination by a veterinarian, it was determined that Beagle Brigadier Freddie suffered contusions on his right ribs following the attack.

Mr. Marie was taken into custody and charged with harming animals used in law enforcement under the law. He pleaded guilty. He was ordered to pay Freddie's vet bill, and he was deported back to Egypt. That is the law.

What the hell are we doing here? I mean, we are repeating what was already in the law.

I guess the difference would be if the bill that the gentlewoman is advocating actually became law, then Mr. Marie would escape any kind of financial responsibility of paying Freddie's vet bill. I don't think we want that. But this was a deportable act, and this gentleman was deported.

When I say that this is a distraction, this is what I am talking about. Again, we are spending a billion dollars a day, my friends, on this war in Iran, and nobody knows what the hell is going on.

Gas prices are through the roof. The cost of everything is going up. We are here on the floor basically trying to bring bills that restate current law?

□ 1230

I would even say that in this case it weakens current law.

I have got to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I think things are screwed up around here when our focus is on the stuff that we are bringing to the floor today and not on trying to lower the costs for the American people.

Life is hard. I don't know whether my friends go home and talk to their constituents or do townhalls or do town meetings, but if they do, they are hearing what I am hearing: Life is too damn expensive.

People want us to address the high costs, and we are not doing that. We are not doing that, and Republicans refuse to bring legislation to the floor to address that issue. Instead, we do this.

Mr. Speaker, I am a huge animal rights advocate, and so I want people who abuse animals to be deported. I don't have any problem with that, but that is the law. We are bringing this to the floor, and we are not doing a damn thing about addressing the high costs that Americans are facing each and every day. Something is wrong with this place.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am a huge animal rights lover too, and I have a dog I say that owns me.

My colleague just talked about one example that worked out well, but we know lots and lots of examples where these things don't work out well, and that is why we need this legislation. It is because acts of cruelty toward animals who are working often fall between the cracks.

My colleague also just said that no one will see any benefits from the Working Families Tax Cut, yet thanks to this important legislation, Americans could receive nearly a \$4,000-tax refund this year. The average take-home pay boost is \$10,900, and the average tax cut for middle-income Americans is 15 percent.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairwoman Foxx for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule which provides consideration of my bill, the Deporting Fraudsters Act.

A few weeks ago during the State of the Union Address, Democrats confirmed to the American people who they really are and whom they really work for. When President Trump asked Congress to stand and reaffirm the fundamental principle that the first duty of the American Government is to protect American citizens and not illegal aliens, every single Democrat remained seated, every single one.

Now, Madam Speaker, with this bill, we have the chance to see who will stand with criminal illegal aliens and against the American people.

This bill should be common sense: Any person who defrauds the United States or steals money from Americans who need it most should not be able to walk freely in this country.

This seeks to fix the numerous examples of criminal aliens stealing Social Security benefits or cloning SNAP cards and not facing any immigration consequences. It is time for that to change.

This bill in front of us, the Deporting Fraudsters Act, will make it explicitly clear, Madam Speaker, that if you are not a citizen and you are defrauding law-abiding Americans, then you should be deported.

Again, it should be common sense. It is a privilege to live in this country, and our laws should reflect that.

To the American people: You should remember this vote. You should remember that those who vote against this bill are voting to support illegal alien fraudsters over the American people.

To the elderly couple who has paid into Social Security their entire life, or to the working mother who is just trying to get by for her children but needs some assistance, this should be an eye-opening vote.

That is because this vote provides a binary choice: Either they support the American people and their benefits, or they support illegal alien fraudsters.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" to support this bill.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me read for my colleagues a statement from the national director of the National Economic Council, Mr. Hassett, who works for President Trump.

This is his quote: "If the war were to be extended, it wouldn't really disrupt the U.S. economy very much at all. It would hurt consumers, and we'd have to think about what we'd have to do about that, but that's really the last of our concerns right now."

This is from Trump's top economic adviser. This is a direct quote from him.

He says that hurting consumers is the last of our concerns right now.

This guy should be fired. This is outrageous. We all should be worried about consumers. Those are our constituents. When prices are going up, people cannot make ends meet. They can't afford their rent, they can't afford their healthcare, and they can't afford their groceries.

Madam Speaker, they can't afford a damn thing, and this is what Trump's top economic adviser says: The consumers are really the last of our concerns right now?

Does anything outrage my Republican colleagues?

Can anybody in the Trump administration say anything that might give them pause and that might cause them concern?

This is outrageous. Three out of four Americans say that groceries are so expensive that they have been forced to cut down on other spending.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from *Fortune* titled: "Three in four Americans say groceries are so expensive they've been forced to cut down on other spending."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MALOY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From *Fortune*, Dec. 27, 2025]

THREE IN FOUR AMERICANS SAY GROCERIES ARE SO EXPENSIVE THEY'VE BEEN FORCED TO CUT DOWN ON OTHER SPENDING

(By Andrew Adam Newman and Retail Brew)

Echoing its data throughout the year, *Toast* found that menu prices continued to climb in November, often exceeding the current inflation rate of 2.7 percent.

If you like your (retail) brew steeped, the increase is steep, too, with the median price of cold brew in November up 4.5 percent YoY, to \$5.54, while regular coffee was up 3.5 percent, to \$3.59, per *Toast*. Burrito prices were up 3 percent YoY, to \$13.43, while burgers also rose 3 percent YoY to \$14.57.

As for the key ingredient in those burgers, despite its consistently high prices at supermarkets, beef sizzled among home cooks this year, according to new data from *Tastewise*, which tracks factors including social media conversations and online recipe engagement.

Tastewise credited the country's high-protein craze for beefing up interest. For the first 11 months of 2025, there was an 11.8 percent YoY increase in mentions of beef on social media and in recipes, and an 11 percent

increase in the beef recipes used by home cooks.

But thanks to high prices and economic challenges, it's the cheaper cuts that really got cooking, with mentions up for chuck roast (+12.4 percent), ground beef (+9.6 percent), and sirloin (+3.1 percent), and decreases for filet mignon (-6.8 percent) and ribeye (-4.1 percent).

Based on its receipts data, rewards app Fetch also had some takes on Americans' spending in 2025, noting sales of products that promoted protein content on their labels were up over 2024, including protein-hyping cereal (69.8 percent), granola (45.9 percent), and dry pasta (35.4 percent).

But whatever their preferences, many shoppers still fretted about how to pay for their groceries. More than 2 in 3 respondents (67.6 percent) said that they're struggling to pay grocery bills because of inflation and rising food prices, according to a survey by *Swiftly*, which provides digital and media solutions for brick-and-mortar supermarkets.

More than 3 out of 4 (75.2 percent) responded that they've reduced spending in other areas to afford groceries, and in a follow-up question selected what areas they've cut spending in the most to pay grocery bills, with entertainment spending the most likely to be cut, followed by spending on travel, clothing, and going out to eat or drink.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from CBS8 titled: "National average gas prices now nearly 90 cents higher than one month ago."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From CBS8, Mar. 17, 2026]

NATIONAL AVERAGE GAS PRICES NOW NEARLY 90 CENTS HIGHER THAN ONE MONTH AGO

(By TEGNA Digital)

Gas prices continued to rise again Tuesday, with the national retail average reaching nearly 90 cents higher than last month.

The national retail average for a gallon of regular gasoline Tuesday was \$3.79, according to AAA. That's up more than 7 cents from Monday's average of \$3.718 and a nearly 90-cent increase from one month ago, when a gallon averaged \$2.917.

California remained the only state with a retail average above \$5. The per-gallon price Tuesday for regular gas was \$5.542. Washington, Hawaii, Nevada and Oregon rounded out the top five states where gas prices were highest.

The lowest per-gallon price for regular gasoline Tuesday was in Kansas at \$3.209, according to AAA data.

The national retail average for a gallon of diesel crossed the \$5 threshold Tuesday at \$5.044. That's up from \$4.988 per gallon on Monday and up from \$3.651 one month ago.

The highest recorded average price of regular unleaded gasoline was \$5.016 on June 14, 2022, and the highest recorded average price per gallon of diesel was \$5.816 in June 19, 2022, according to AAA.

Why are gas and diesel prices rising?

Gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel are all derived from crude oil. When the price per barrel of crude oil fluctuates, it has a direct impact on consumers. Higher prices for crude oil typically mean a higher price at the pump.

The conflict in the Middle East has disrupted vital global oil infrastructure and trade routes. The Strait of Hormuz, where roughly 20 percent of all oil passes, has been effectively closed. The strait, located at the

mouth of the Persian Gulf, cuts between Iran and Oman.

Crude oil has surpassed \$100 per barrel several times in recent weeks. The U.S. benchmark for crude oil dipped to about \$93 on Monday, which is only the second decline since the Iran war began.

Gas prices aren't the only challenge consumers are expected to face with the rising oil costs, though. Air travel and supply chains that rely on diesel or jet fuel to transport goods are also expected to drive up prices.

Actions are underway in the U.S. and globally to attempt to offset costs.

The U.S. announced plans to release more than 170 million barrels of oil from its strategic reserves over the course of four months as part of the International Energy Agency's plan to release a total of 400 million barrels of oil, which AAA reports is the largest emergency release in its history.

Demand for gas is higher this time of year, when the weather begins to warm up and more travelers hit the road for spring break, according to AAA.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I hate to tell my Republican friends this, but here is a news flash: The American people are struggling. They are desperately looking for us to take action to make their lives easier, to help them be able to afford groceries, to be able to afford gas prices, and to be able to afford to support their families.

While we are spending \$1 billion a day on a reckless and illegal war in Iran and the President with no end in sight has money for that, my friends on the other side can't bring themselves to bring legislation to the floor that will address the high cost of living.

Madam Speaker, when you have people in the administration saying that consumers are the last of their concerns, I mean like, I am just like every time I think this administration can't say something that will shock me even more, they do. This is one of the more outrageous comments coming from one of the President's top advisers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I will point out to my colleague that, yes, gas jumped in the last month, but it is still a lot less expensive than it was under President Biden.

Thankfully, under President Trump, gas prices were cut almost in half. The number one role of the Federal Government, Madam Speaker, as we all know on our side of the aisle, is defense of this Nation.

Madam Speaker, the need for legislation like H.R. 1958 is not hypothetical. Fraud is a serious crime, and it is essential we ensure foreign national fraudsters cannot continue to exploit the American taxpayers.

While my colleagues will argue that there is no fraud currently, here are just a few recent examples: "A 3-year-old girl's Social Security number had been used for 'two credit cards and two auto loans, with an outstanding balance of more than \$25,000.'"

The second example is: "Fraud by illegal immigrants destroying children's

lives.” These are quotes, Madam Speaker. Including the life of: “A 9-year-old boy who was denied Medicaid because wages were reported on his Social Security number. A 13-year-old girl who was denied as a dependent on her family’s tax return because she supposedly made too much money.”

These are because illegal aliens are stealing Social Security numbers and using them.

□ 1240

In 2019, the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of Mississippi announced the prosecution of 119 illegal aliens for crimes, including “misusing Social Security numbers of American citizens.”

I have the sources for all of these, Madam Speaker.

In June 2020, the Justice Department announced that an illegal alien from Guatemala was sentenced to 3 months’ imprisonment for “[using] another person’s Social Security number to get a job and for tax purposes.”

In October 2023, an illegal alien who was arrested by the U.S. Border Patrol near Hidalgo, Texas, in September 2022 and then released by the Biden administration, pleaded guilty to illegal use of a Social Security number.

In November 2025, The New York Times highlighted the case of Daniel Kluver, a Minnesota man whose identity was stolen by a Guatemalan illegal alien with a criminal history and multiple deportations. Because of the identity theft, Kluver lost thousands of dollars through garnished wages and increased taxes. He spent years unsuccessfully trying to untangle the mystery of his stolen identity.

The stories go on and on, Madam Speaker, so there is a real reason for this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say the gentlewoman is doing exactly what I predicted she would do: blaming immigrants so that people who are watching this debate don’t focus in on the fact that prices are going through the roof and everything is more expensive than ever.

She said that Trump is doing better than Biden in terms of gas prices. Well, when Biden left office, the average gallon of gas was \$3.11. It is now close to \$3.80. It is creeping up to nearly \$4. I mean, that is just the reality. People can google that. Don’t take my word for it. You can google it.

The other fact is that, if I remember correctly, Donald Trump said that when he became President, he and Republicans would lower costs on day one and everything would go down. What a crock. Everything has gone up. Everything has skyrocketed. Gas, rent, the price of food—everything has gone way up.

I am going to read this again because I can’t get this out of my head that

somebody in this administration would say this out loud. Again, this is what the chair of the Council of Economic Advisers, Kevin Hassett, said: If the war “were to be extended, it wouldn’t really disrupt the U.S. economy very much at all. It would hurt consumers, and we would have to think about . . . what we would have to do about that, but that is really the last of our concerns right now. . . .”

This is one of the President’s top economic advisers telling the American consumer: The hell with you. You don’t matter. You are at the bottom of our list.

That tells you everything you need to know.

I heard the gentlewoman’s 1-minute speech before we got into this debate, when she kind of defended the tax cuts for the rich and basically said that we have a spending problem in this country.

Okay, we have a spending problem. We are spending a billion dollars a day on a reckless, illegal war in Iran, and nobody on the other side seems to give a damn about that. We don’t have money to help make sure that we can lower energy costs for senior citizens. We don’t have money to make sure our kids get nutritious breakfasts and lunches in schools. We don’t have money for anything, for childcare, eldercare, our veterans, or our healthcare in general.

We are told we don’t have the money, but no debate and no concern about a billion dollars a day on Iran? Come on. I mean, enough is enough.

The focus of Congress, the focus of government, should be about helping people, not screwing them over, not hurting them. The focus of our government should not be about enriching the rich, protecting the Epstein class, the people who are well-off and well-connected and who have tons of money.

The focus ought to be on how to lift up working families in this country. That is what Democrats have been fighting for. That is what we stand for. There is a difference here.

Again, going back to Kevin Hassett, his comment today. He says the quiet part out loud. The consumers, according to him, are the last of our concerns right now.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me say, we know what the role of the Federal Government is. It is outlined in the Constitution of the United States. Many of the things that my colleague wants us to be involved in—and we have been involved in—are the things that have caused us to have a \$38 trillion debt at the Federal level, and so doing everything that we can to reduce fraud is really very important.

Let me say, if we have people who are here legally, as Americans have done for Americans, we will do for them. But those who come here illegally—and the term is illegal alien—then we do not

have any truck with them. We want them to obey the law, just like we want everybody else to obey the law.

If they commit fraud, then we want them gone, out of this country. They shouldn’t be here to begin with because they come in illegally.

If we want to address the high cost of living in this country, we must confront fraud. We must confront fraud. Democrats should be joining us, not opposing the commonsense effort.

Let’s talk about the rhetoric from our colleagues on our record of fiscal soundness this Congress and the Democrats’ record of spending addiction. We just finished the FY26 appropriations package—of course, minus the funding for Homeland Security. We saved nearly \$14 billion compared to last year’s appropriated levels. Let’s not forget that comes on the heels of cutting \$9 billion of waste and fraud through a rescissions package just months earlier, and that came on the heels of cutting \$1.4 trillion of waste, fraud, and abuse through Republicans’ reconciliation effort.

Democrats are lying in wait to vote for higher taxes on working families yet again if they have the opportunity. What they don’t understand is that the government doesn’t have a tax flow problem. We have a fundamental spending problem in Washington. Again, that spending is not on what the Federal Government should be spending it on, which is the defense of this Nation, but is on spending on things that are not outlined in the Constitution for us to be doing.

When Democrats had full control of the levers of power and passed their reconciliation packages, they expanded the Federal Government with an unprecedented \$11 trillion in spending. Yes, Madam Speaker, I said \$11 trillion in additional spending, \$6 trillion of which has been added to the national debt.

There is simply no comparison between what Republicans have accomplished this Congress and the Democrats’ spending addiction. We have lowered the deficit. We have cut trillions in waste. We have secured tax relief for working families. Democrats opposed us on every front.

Guess what. Our deficit is finally being addressed. The Federal Government’s cumulative deficit for fiscal year 2026 at the end of November was 19 percent lower than the year prior under Biden.

Be it by reconciliation, rescission, or through the regular-order annual appropriations process, this Congress is cutting spending, driving down inflation, and returning money to taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, that is really the fundamental difference between Democrats and Republicans. We believe that the public should hold on to as much of its money as possible, not turn that money over to bureaucrats to spend.

Don’t buy the empty rhetoric of congressional Democrats. They ran on affordability in the Commonwealth of

Virginia, but just recently, they slapped on a regressive payroll tax that will squeeze billions out of workers' paychecks.

□ 1250

Congressional Democrats are on record voting against tax relief for tipped workers, Social Security recipients, working moms, and the working class when they voted against the Working Families Tax Cut Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am almost at a loss for words. I don't even know how to respond to that. That gets like five Pinocchios. I don't know what the gentlewoman is talking about. She talked about the debt and reducing the debt. My friend, who I respect and enjoy working with, voted for a reconciliation bill that added nearly \$5 trillion to the debt.

Let me say that one more time: It added nearly \$5 trillion to the debt. Most of that additional cost to the debt were in the form of tax cuts for multimillionaires and billionaires.

She talks about the Republicans trying to cut fraud, waste, and abuse. They cut programs like SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, to help senior citizens and veterans and low-income families be able to put food on the table, a benefit, by the way, that is on average about \$2 per person per meal. That is what SNAP is.

They cut money for child nutrition programs. They cut money for school nutrition programs. They cut money for environmental protection, for infrastructure. I go right down the list, economic development for our farmers, everything.

They had Elon Musk come in with DOGE, and they claim they saved all this money. Guess what. All of the cuts that they made, by the way, I think we are going to pay for down the road because they are going to add costs in a whole bunch of other ways. All of that so-called savings has just been eliminated by what has been spent on the war in Iran, a billion dollars a day. We are at \$22, \$23 billion already on that war.

We are not anywhere near done. They tell you that we can't deal with the fact that we have so many senior citizens in this country who can't afford to put food on the table. We can't do anything about that. Then they say nothing about the billion dollars a day on an illegal and reckless war in Iran.

For the record, I will include the CBO score, that is the Congressional Budget Office, on their reconciliation bill in the RECORD because I want the RECORD to reflect that what I am saying here is backed up by facts. This is a non-partisan Congressional Budget Office. Both Democrats and Republicans rely on the CBO for scores on how much things are going to cost.

This is crazy that we are having this debate, all the while the cost of living for every person in this country, who is not a multimillionaire or billionaire who is not part of the Epstein class, is going through the roof.

By the way, when you talk about taxes on people, what my friend didn't mention was the tariffs. That is a tax on every American. We are now told that these tariffs are costing the average citizen of this country an additional \$1,700 per person per year. I don't know who is asking for this stuff, but it is certainly not the people that I talk to.

Madam Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 7481, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act 2026, sponsored by Ranking Member ROSA DELAURO of Connecticut, a bill which only funds law-abiding agencies under the Department of Homeland Security and not the unlawful actions of ICE and CBP.

Madam Speaker, House Republicans are trying to use President Trump's illegal war in Iran as pretext to force Congress to fund ICE and CBP without any reforms, even though these agencies are harassing, detaining, beating, and killing American citizens. This is a cheap trick to score political points, and we are not buying it. I don't think anybody in the country is buying it.

You can't make this up. The President's own National Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, who Trump himself appointed and basically every single Republican in the Senate voted to confirm this guy, resigned this morning stating that he cannot in good conscience support the ongoing war in Iran and that "Iran posed no imminent threat to our Nation."

Also, Republicans already funded ICE and CBP in their big, ugly bill so why are they holding up funding for TSA, the Coast Guard, and FEMA? Republicans should allow a vote to fund the law-abiding components of DHS while negotiations on critical reforms to ICE and CBP continue.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and the sponsor of this bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Madam Speaker, last Friday, workers across the Department of Homeland Security missed a full paycheck. Reports have shown that a number of

TSA agents have had to find new jobs or to take up additional work to make ends meet while their pay is frozen.

This is wrong. No Democrat wants this, but my Republican colleagues want it. Republicans insist on conditioning funding for TSA workers on more money for ICE. ICE is a lawless and reckless agency, which is terrorizing our community, masked and armed and marauding and roving through our communities nationwide.

The Republicans will only agree to pay TSA officers, FEMA employees, cybersecurity experts, and Coast Guard servicemembers if we also provide another \$28 billion for ICE and CBP on top of the \$140 billion that they already have from the big, beautiful bill.

If we defeat the previous question, I will move to bring up my bill, which will fully fund TSA workers. It will fully fund FEMA, including the Disaster Relief Fund. It will fully fund the Coast Guard, the Secret Service, and our cybersecurity efforts. In short, it will fund everything except ICE and CBP. I am tired of the crocodile tears on the other side of the aisle talking about TSA workers and cybersecurity and the Coast Guard.

They have a chance to fund these efforts so that people can get paid. They refuse to do it. The Republican leadership blocks this bill. Their approach is all or nothing. It is not enough for them if we fund the vast majority of Homeland Security, if we pay workers who follow the law, people who keep us safe, who do not harass us, do not detain us, do not beat us up, do not abuse our constituents at whim, or kill American citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. No, they will not support any measure unless it gives ICE and CBP more money without any of the protections our communities need and the American people demand. If Republicans allow my measure to come to a vote, we could end the impasse today. Hardworking Americans will get paid. Have the courage to stand up and do it. I encourage them to do so.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is not a serious proposal.

Madam Speaker, it is really rich. Now, it is the fault of Republicans that the Department of Homeland Security is not funded. It is just too rich.

Crime is down in this country because we have shut down our border and denied people coming in illegally.

□ 1300

Madam Speaker, we need to fund all of Homeland Security so that we can keep the border closed. Obviously, our colleagues want to open the border again just like President Biden did. There were people waiting at the border when President Biden was elected

with shirts on that said: Thank you, Biden. We can't do that. We need to fund all of Homeland Security at the same time.

By the way, Madam Speaker, it was the Bipartisan Policy Center that said that the 19 percent reduction in deficit had occurred.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, nobody disagrees that we should have a secure border. That is not the debate.

Where there is disagreement and, quite frankly, where there is outrage is when we have a Federal agency that goes into our communities and kills American citizens. This is not at the border but in our heartland. That is where we believe there is a line that has been crossed. We are outraged over that.

I am sorry that my friends on the other side are not. They control the House. They control the Senate. They control the White House. They are in charge. If they want our votes, we are not going to vote to continue to fund agencies and departments within agencies that are rogue, where there is no accountability and where there is no transparency. We are not going to do that.

We support TSA, the Coast Guard, and FEMA. We will vote to support them, but don't ask us to fund agencies that do harm to our constituents.

By the way, is there any end to what my Republican colleagues want for CBP and for ICE? They have got money in the big, ugly bill for them, billions and billions of dollars for them. I don't understand what the deal is.

In any event, for whatever reason, they have a problem with TSA. They have a problem with FEMA. They have a problem with the Coast Guard. I don't understand why. We don't. We support them.

Madam Speaker, the pattern here is obvious. It is broken promises, higher costs, more war, more hate, alternative facts, and unbelievable corruption. That is what is happening in this country right now because of Republican leadership.

Republicans said they would fight for ordinary people. Instead, they helped billionaires. They said they would keep us out of war. Instead, they dragged us into another one. Madam Speaker, 13 American troops are dead. Over 140 are wounded. Our Nation is, once again, sending \$1 billion a day over to the Middle East on another reckless, illegal war of choice.

They said they would tell the truth. Instead, they protect the Epstein elites and peddle distraction after distraction after distraction, hoping it will all go away.

At the center of it all is a President so hollow, so unwell, and so morally lost that he is fundraising off of dead American troops. I can't believe I am saying that sentence out loud.

The President of the United States went to a dignified transfer of remains ceremony. He refused to take off his ball cap. Then he took a photo of himself standing behind an American servicemember in a casket coming home from war in the Middle East. He slapped it on a fundraising email, asking people to donate money to his campaign. Let me say that again.

The President used a dead American servicemember as a photo op for his campaign fundraising. When he was asked about it yesterday, he said he saw nothing wrong with that.

Can anyone imagine if Bill Clinton, Barack Obama, or Joe Biden had done that? My Republican colleagues' heads would explode. That is what happened after Joe Biden checked his watch during one of these ceremonies. Yet, there was not a word after this disrespectful President dishonored our troops in the most outrageous way by using them as a prop for his own personal benefit.

I challenge any Republican, any single one, to come down here and defend this. Come down here and explain to their constituents why the leader of their party is fundraising off of dead American servicemembers.

I think it is one of the most disrespectful, inappropriate, awful things I have ever, ever seen in all my time in Congress. I doubt a single Republican will have the guts to say it was wrong.

The American people deserve a hell of a lot better than this chaos and cruelty. They deserve better than this President. They deserve better than this Republican majority. They deserve elected officials who care about them and who want to fight to lower the cost of living, who want to make their lives better and easier and more manageable. That is not what is happening here.

With all that is going on—\$1 billion a day on a reckless illegal war in Iran, gas prices creeping up to nearly \$4 a gallon, and the price of groceries going up because of these stupid tariffs that my friends don't want to deal with—I can go on and on and on about how the Republican policies are making life more miserable for average Americans. With all that is going on, they can't be bothered to come down here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle said that they want to keep the border closed. If they are serious about keeping the border closed and safe, then how are they going to do it without funding border patrol and they don't want to fund border patrol?

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues across the aisle have spent their time during this debate drawing caricatures, weaving a tapestry of tangential state-

ments, and engaging in theatrics. This is unserious behavior, Mr. Speaker.

Might I remind them we are here debating substantive legislation that aligns with the priorities of the American people. Our colleagues across the aisle are welcome to join us in supporting them, standing for law and order, and returning freedom and choice back to the custody of the American people where they belong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1115 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 7481) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and Clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7481.

SEC. 7. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 7481 no later than three calendar days after passage.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1500

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCDOWELL) at 3 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

H.R. 4294; and
S. 3971;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1115; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1115, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

MITIGATION ACTION AND
WATERMEN SUPPORT ACT OF 2026

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4294) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a pilot program with respect to the sale of blue catfish caught within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 320, nays 66, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—320

Adams	Castor (FL)	Fields
Aderholt	Castro (TX)	Figures
Aguilar	Cherfilus-	Fine
Alford	McCormick	Finstad
Allen	Chu	Fischbach
Amo	Ciscomani	Fitzgerald
Amodei (NV)	Cisneros	Fitzpatrick
Ansari	Clark (MA)	Fleischmann
Babin	Clarke (NY)	Flood
Bacon	Cleaver	Fong
Baird	Clyburn	Foster
Balint	Cohen	Foushee
Barragán	Cole	Fox
Baumgartner	Comer	Frankel, Lois
Beatty	Conaway	Friedman
Bell	Costa	Frost
Bentz	Courtney	Garamendi
Bera	Craig	Garbarino
Bergman	Crank	Garcia (TX)
Beyer	Crockett	Gillen
Bice	Crow	Gimenez
Bilirakis	Davis (NC)	Golden (ME)
Bishop	De La Cruz	Goldman (NY)
Bonamici	Dean (PA)	Goldman (TX)
Bost	DeGette	Gomez
Boyle (PA)	DeLauro	Gonzales, Tony
Bresnahan	DelBene	Gonzalez, V.
Brown	Deluzio	Goodlander
Brownley	DeSaulnier	Gottheimer
Buchanan	Dexter	Graves
Budzinski	Dingell	Gray
Bynum	Dunn (FL)	Green, Al (TX)
Calvert	Elfreth	Griffith
Carbajal	Ellzey	Grijalva
Carson	Emmer	Guest
Carter (GA)	Escobar	Guthrie
Carter (LA)	Espaillat	Harder (CA)
Carter (TX)	Evans (CO)	Haridopolos
Casar	Evans (PA)	Hayes
Case	Ezell	Hern (OK)
Casten	Feenstra	Hill (AR)

Himes	McGovern	Scholten
Hinson	McGuire	Schrier
Horsford	McIver	Scott (VA)
Houchin	Meeks	Scott, Austin
Houlihan	Menefee	Scott, David
Hoyer	Menendez	Sessions
Hoyle (OR)	Meng	Sewell
Hudson	Messmer	Sherman
Huffman	Meuser	Shreve
Hurd (CO)	Mfume	Simon
Issa	Miller (OH)	Simpson
Ivey	Miller (WV)	Smith (MO)
Jack	Min	Smith (NE)
Jacobs	Moolenaar	Smith (WA)
James	Moore (NC)	Sorensen
Jayapal	Moore (UT)	Soto
Jeffries	Moore (WI)	Stansbury
Johnson (GA)	Moran	Stanton
Johnson (SD)	Morelle	Staubert
Johnson (TX)	Morrison	Stefanik
Joyce (OH)	Moskowitz	Steil
Kamlager-Dove	Moulton	Stevens
Kaptur	Mrvan	Strickland
Keating	Mullin	Stutzman
Kelly (MS)	Murphy	Subramanyam
Kelly (PA)	Nadler	Suozzi
Kennedy (NY)	Neal	Sykes
Khanna	Neguse	Takano
Kiggans (VA)	Newhouse	Thanedar
Kiley (CA)	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Kim	Nunn (IA)	Thompson (MS)
Kustoff	Oberholte	Thompson (PA)
LaHood	Olszewski	Timmons
LaLota	Omar	Titus
Landsman	Owens	Tlaib
Langworthy	Pallone	Tokuda
Larson (CT)	Panetta	Tonko
Latimer	Pappas	Torres (CA)
Latta	Patronis	Torres (NY)
Lawler	Perez	Trahan
Lee (FL)	Peters	Tran
Lee (NV)	Pettersen	Turner (OH)
Lee (PA)	Pfleger	Underwood
Levin	Pingree	Valadao
Liccardo	Pocan	Van Deyne
Lieu	Pou	Van Epps
Lofgren	Pressley	Vargas
Loudermilk	Quigley	Vasquez
Lucas	Randall	Veasey
Mackenzie	Raskin	Velázquez
Magaziner	Reschenthaler	Vindman
Malliotakis	Riley (NY)	Wagner
Maloy	Rivas	Walberg
Mann	Rogers (AL)	Walkinshaw
Mannion	Ross	Waters
Matsui	Rouzer	Watson Coleman
McBath	Ruiz	Weber (TX)
McBride	Rulli	Webster (FL)
McCaul	Rutherford	Westerman
McClain	Ryan	Whitesides
McClain Delaney	Salinas	Williams (GA)
McClellan	Sánchez	Williams (TX)
McCollum	Scalise	Wittman
McDonald Rivet	Scanlon	Womack
McDowell	Schmidt	Yakym
McGarvey	Schneider	Zinke

NAYS—66

Balderson	Fallon	Letlow
Barrett	Fedorchak	Luna
Bean (FL)	Fletcher	Luttrell
Begich	Franklin, Scott	Massie
Biggs (AZ)	Fry	McClintock
Biggs (SC)	Fulcher	McCormick
Boebert	Gill (TX)	Miller (IL)
Burchett	Gooden	Miller-Meeks
Burlison	Grothman	Mills
Cammack	Hageman	Moore (AL)
Carey	Hamadeh (AZ)	Moore (WV)
Cline	Harris (MD)	Onder
Cloud	Harris (NC)	Palmer
Clyde	Harshbarger	Perry
Collins	Higgins (LA)	Schweikert
Crane	Huizenga	Self
Crawford	Hunt	Smith (NJ)
Davidson	Jackson (TX)	Smucker
Donalds	Jordan	Spartz
Downing	Joyce (PA)	Taylor
Edwards	Kennedy (UT)	Tenney
Estes	Knott	Van Drew

NOT VOTING—45

Dauids (KS)	Gosar
Davis (IL)	Harrigan
DesJarlais	Jackson (IL)
Diaz-Balart	Kean
Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Garcia (CA)	Krishnamoorthi
García (IL)	Larsen (WA)

Leger Fernandez	Ramirez
Lynch	Rogers (KY)
Mace	Rose
Mast	Roy
Nehls	Salazar
Norman	Schakowsky
Ocasio-Cortez	Steube
Ogles	Strong
Pelosi	Swalwell

□ 1536

Messrs. FALLON, SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, BALDERSON, SMUCKER, DONALDS, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, and Mr. LUTTRELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION
AND ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3971) to extend the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. VAN DUYNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 41, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—345

Adams	Carter (GA)	Elfreth
Aderholt	Carter (LA)	Ellzey
Aguilar	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Alford	Casar	Escobar
Allen	Case	Espaillat
Amo	Casten	Estes
Amodei (NV)	Castor (FL)	Evans (CO)
Ansari	Castro (TX)	Evans (PA)
Arrington	Cherfilus-	Ezell
Babin	McCormick	Fallon
Bacon	Chu	Fedorchak
Baird	Ciscomani	Feenstra
Balderson	Cisneros	Fields
Balint	Clark (MA)	Figures
Barragán	Clarke (NY)	Finstad
Barrett	Cleaver	Fischbach
Baumgartner	Clyburn	Fitzgerald
Beatty	Cohen	Fitzpatrick
Begich	Cole	Fleischmann
Bell	Comer	Flood
Bentz	Conaway	Fong
Bera	Costa	Foster
Bergman	Courtney	Foushee
Beyer	Craig	Fox
Bice	Crank	Frankel, Lois
Bilirakis	Crawford	Franklin, Scott
Bishop	Crockett	Friedman
Bonamici	Crow	Frost
Bost	Davis (NC)	Garamendi
Boyle (PA)	De La Cruz	Garbarino
Bresnahan	Dean (PA)	Garcia (TX)
Brown	DeGette	Gillen
Brownley	DeLauro	Golden (ME)
Buchanan	DelBene	Goldman (NY)
Budzinski	Deluzio	Goldman (TX)
Bynum	DeSaulnier	Gomez
Calvert	Dexter	Gonzales, Tony
Cammack	Dingell	Gonzalez, V.
Carbajal	Downing	Gooden
Carey	Dunn (FL)	Goodlander
Carson	Edwards	Gottheimer

Graves
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Harder (CA)
Haridopolos
Hayes
Hill (AR)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houchin
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Ivey
Jack
Jackson (TX)
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Landsman
Langworthy
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Letlow
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luttrell
Mackenzie
Magaziner
Malliotakis
Mann
Mannion
Mast
Matsui

McBath
McBride
McCaul
McClain
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
McGarvey
McGovern
McGuire
McGuire
McIver
Meeks
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Messmer
Meuser
Mfume
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Min
Moolenaar
Moore (UT)
Moore (WI)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Murphy
Nadler
Neguse
Newhouse
Norcross
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Olszewski
Omar
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pappas
Patronis
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Pfluger
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Randall
Raskin
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rouzer
Ruiz
Rulli
Rutherford
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Scalise

Scanlon
Schmidt
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shreve
Simon
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stevens
Strickland
Stutzman
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)
Underwood
Valadao
Van Epps
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg
Walkinshaw
Waters
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—41

Bean (FL)
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Boebert
Burchett
Burlison
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Collins
Crane
Davidson
Donalds
Fine

Fletcher
Fry
Fulcher
Gill (TX)
Griffith
Grothman
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hunt
Kennedy (UT)
Luna

Maloy
Massie
McClintock
Miller (IL)
Mills
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Onder
Owens
Perry
Self
Spartz
Van Drew

NOT VOTING—45

Auchincloss
Barr
Brecheen
Correa
Crenshaw
Cuellar

Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Garcia (CA)

García (IL)
Gimenez
Gosar
Harrigan
Jackson (IL)
Kean

Kelly (IL)
Krishnamoorthi
Larsen (WA)
Leger Fernandez
Lynch
Mace
Nehls
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Ogles

Pelosi
Ramirez
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Roy
Salazar
Schakowsky
Steube
Strong
Swalwell

□ 1544

Mr. GROTHMAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 556, PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1958, DEPORTING FRAUDSTERS ACT OF 2026; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4638, BILL TO OUTLAW WOUNDING OF OFFICIAL WORKING ANIMALS ACT OF 2025; AND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1115) providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 556, to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 1958, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that aliens who have been convicted of defrauding the United States Government or the unlawful receipt of public benefits are inadmissible and deportable; and providing consideration for the bill H.R. 4638, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an alien who has been convicted of harming animals used in law enforcement is inadmissible and deportable, and for other purposes; and relating to consideration of motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 196, nays 192, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—196

Aderholt
Alford

Allen
Amodei (NV)

Arrington
Babin

Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Davidson
De La Cruz
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)

Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaull
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser

Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Murphy
Newhouse
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rouzer
Rulli
Rutherford
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Epps
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—192

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Balint
Barragan
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn

Cohen
Conaway
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Elfreh
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez

Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Landsman
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu

Lofgren	Pallone	Stansbury	Garbarino	LaLota	Pfluger	Sherman	Takano	Underwood
Magaziner	Panetta	Stanton	Gill (TX)	Langworthy	Reschenthaler	Simon	Thanedar	Vargas
Mannion	Pappas	Stevens	Gimenez	Latta	Rogers (AL)	Smith (WA)	Thompson (CA)	Vasquez
Matsui	Perez	Strickland	Goldman (TX)	Lawler	Rouzer	Sorensen	Thompson (MS)	Veasey
McBath	Peters	Subramanyam	Gonzales, Tony	Lee (FL)	Rulli	Soto	Titus	Velázquez
McBride	Petterson	Suozi	Gooden	Letlow	Rutherford	Stansbury	Tlaib	Vindman
McClain Delaney	Pingree	Sykes	Graves	Loudermilk	Scalise	Stanton	Tokuda	Walkinshaw
McClellan	Pocan	Takano	Griffith	Lucas	Schmidt	Stevens	Tonko	Walters
McCollum	Pou	Thanedar	Grothman	Luna	Schweikert	Strickland	Torres (CA)	Watson Coleman
McDonald Rivet	Pressley	Thompson (CA)	Guest	Luttrell	Scott, Austin	Subramanyam	Torres (NY)	Whitesides
McGarvey	Quigley	Thompson (MS)	Guthrie	Mackenzie	Self	Suozi	Trahan	Williams (GA)
McGovern	Randall	Titus	Hageman	Malliotakis	Sessions	Sykes	Tran	
McIver	Raskin	Tlaib	Hamadeh (AZ)	Maloy	Shreve			
Meeks	Riley (NY)	Tokuda	Haridopolos	Mann	Simpson	Auchincloss	Jackson (IL)	Rose
Menefee	Rivas	Tonko	Harris (MD)	Massie	Smith (MO)	Barr	Kean	Roy
Menendez	Ross	Torres (CA)	Harris (NC)	Mast	Smith (NE)	Brecheen	Kelly (IL)	Salazar
Meng	Ruiz	Torres (NY)	Harshbarger	McCauley	Smith (NJ)	Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Mfume	Ryan	Trahan	Hern (OK)	McClain	Smucker	Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Steube
Min	Salinas	Tran	Higgins (LA)	McClintock	Spartz	Cuellar	Leger Fernandez	Strong
Moore (WI)	Sánchez	Underwood	Hill (AR)	McCormick	Staubert	Davids (KS)	Lynch	Swalwell
Morelle	Scanlon	Vargas	Hinson	McDowell	Stefanik	Davis (IL)	Mace	Tiffany
Morrison	Schneider	Vasquez	Houchin	McGuire	Steil	DesJarlais	Nehls	Van Orden
Moskowitz	Scholten	Veasey	Hudson	Messmer	Stutzman	Diaz-Balart	Norman	Wasserman
Moulton	Schrier	Velázquez	Huizenga	Meuser	Taylor	Doggett	Ocasio-Cortez	Schultz
Mrvan	Scott (VA)	Vindman	Hunt	Miller (IL)	Tenney	Garcia (CA)	Ogles	Wied
Mullin	Scott, David	Walkinshaw	Hurd (CO)	Miller (OH)	Thompson (PA)	Garcia (IL)	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Sewell	Waters	Issa	Miller (WV)	Timmons	Gosar	Ramirez	Wilson (SC)
Neal	Sherman	Watson Coleman	Jack	Miller-Meeks	Turner (OH)	Harrigan	Rogers (KY)	
Neguse	Simon	Whitesides	Johnson (TX)	Mills	Valadao			
Norcross	Smith (WA)	Williams (GA)	James	Moolenaar	Van Drew			
Olshewski	Sorensen		Johnson (LA)	Moore (AL)	Van Dwyne			
Omar	Soto		Johnson (SD)	Moore (NC)	Van Epps			
			Jordan	Moore (UT)	Wagner			
			Joyce (OH)	Moore (WV)	Walberg			
			Joyce (PA)	Moran	Weber (TX)			
			Kelly (MS)	Murphy	Webster (FL)			
			Kelly (PA)	Newhouse	Westerman			
			Kennedy (UT)	Nunn (IA)	Williams (TX)			
			Kiggans (VA)	Obernolte	Wittman			
			Kiley (CA)	Onder	Womack			
			Kim	Owens	Yakym			
			Knott	Palmer	Zinke			
			Kustoff	Patronis				
			LaHood	Perry				

NOT VOTING—44

Auchincloss	Harrigan	Rogers (KY)
Barr	Jackson (IL)	Rose
Brecheen	Kean	Roy
Correa	Kelly (IL)	Salazar
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Steube
Cuellar	Leger Fernandez	Strong
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Swalwell
Davis (IL)	Mace	Tiffany
DesJarlais	Nehls	Van Orden
Diaz-Balart	Norman	Wasserman
Doggett	Ocasio-Cortez	Schultz
Garcia (CA)	Ogles	Wied
Garcia (IL)	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Gosar	Ramirez	Wilson (SC)

□ 1551

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 193, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

AYES—196

Aderholt	Buchanan	Dunn (FL)
Alford	Burchett	Edwards
Allen	Burlison	Ellzey
Amodei (NV)	Calvert	Emmer
Arrington	Cammack	Estes
Babin	Carey	Evans (CO)
Bacon	Carter (GA)	Ezell
Baird	Carter (TX)	Fallon
Balderson	Ciscomani	Fedorchak
Barrett	Cline	Feenstra
Baumgartner	Cloud	Fine
Bean (FL)	Clyde	Pinstad
Begich	Cole	Fischbach
Bentz	Collins	Fitzgerald
Bergman	Comer	Fitzpatrick
Bice	Crane	Fleischmann
Biggs (AZ)	Crank	Flood
Biggs (SC)	Crawford	Pong
Bilirakis	Davidson	Foxo
Boebert	De La Cruz	Franklin, Scott
Bost	Donalds	Fry
Bresnahan	Downing	Fulcher

NOES—193

Adams	Fields	McClain Delaney
Aguilar	Figures	McClellan
Amo	Fletcher	McCollum
Ansari	Foster	McDonald Rivet
Balint	Foushee	McGarvey
Barragán	Frankel, Lois	McGovern
Beatty	Friedman	McIver
Bell	Frost	Meeks
Bera	Garamendi	Menefee
Beyer	Garcia (TX)	Menendez
Bishop	Gillen	Meng
Bonamici	Golden (ME)	Mfume
Boyle (PA)	Goldman (NY)	Min
Brown	Gomez	Moore (WI)
Brownley	Gonzalez, V.	Morelle
Budzinski	Goodlander	Morrison
Bynum	Gottheimer	Moskowitz
Carbajal	Gray	Moulton
Carson	Green, Al (TX)	Mrvan
Carter (LA)	Grijalva	Mullin
Casar	Harder (CA)	Nadler
Case	Hayes	Neal
Casten	Himes	Neguse
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Norcross
Castro (TX)	Houlahan	Olshewski
Cherfilus-	Hoyer	Omar
McCormick	Hoyle (OR)	Pallone
Chu	Huffman	Panetta
Cisneros	Ivey	Pappas
Clark (MA)	Jacobs	Perez
Clarke (NY)	Jayapal	Peters
	Jeffries	Petterson
	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
	Johnson (TX)	Pocan
	Kamlager-Dove	Pou
	Kaptur	Pressley
	Keating	Quigley
	Kennedy (NY)	Randall
	Khanna	Raskin
	Landsman	Riley (NY)
	Larson (CT)	Rivas
	Latimer	Ross
	Lee (NV)	Ruiz
	Lee (PA)	Ryan
	Levin	Salinas
	Liccardo	Sánchez
	Lieu	Scanlon
	Lofgren	Schneider
	Magaziner	Scholten
	Mannion	Schrier
	Matsui	Scott (VA)
	McBath	Scott, David
	McBride	Sewell

NOT VOTING—43

Auchincloss	Jackson (IL)	Rose
Barr	Kean	Roy
Brecheen	Kelly (IL)	Salazar
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Schakowsky
Crenshaw	Larsen (WA)	Steube
Cuellar	Leger Fernandez	Strong
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Swalwell
Davis (IL)	Mace	Tiffany
DesJarlais	Nehls	Van Orden
Diaz-Balart	Norman	Wasserman
Doggett	Ocasio-Cortez	Schultz
Garcia (CA)	Ogles	Wied
Garcia (IL)	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Gosar	Ramirez	Wilson (SC)
Harrigan	Rogers (KY)	

□ 1557

Mrs. McCLAIN DELANEY changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CORPORAL TIMOTHY O'CONNOR, JR.

(Ms. HOULAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, joined by my colleagues from the Pennsylvania delegation, to honor the life and the service of Corporal Timothy O'Connor, Jr., a Pennsylvania State trooper and a proud member of our Chester County community.

Corporal O'Connor wore the uniform of the Pennsylvania State Police for 15 years, serving the people of our Commonwealth. He was part of the brotherhood and sisterhood of troopers who run toward danger so that others can live in safety.

Two weekends ago, while conducting a traffic stop in the line of duty, Corporal O'Connor was tragically shot and killed.

Today we stand here together to honor his courage, his sacrifice, and his service. We hold his wife, Casey, their young daughter, and the entire Pennsylvania State Police family in our hearts.

Mr. Speaker, please do join us for a moment of silence to honor the life of Corporal Timothy O'Connor.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR THE VICTIMS OF THE SHOOTING AT OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

(Mr. SCOTT of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as dean of the Virginia congressional delegation and Representative of Norfolk, Virginia, we are gathered here

today with my colleagues across the Commonwealth with a heavy heart as we honor the victims of the recent shooting at Old Dominion University. This was an act of terrorism, and like all mass shootings, this has become far too commonplace.

On Thursday, as students and faculty gathered for their classes, just like every other day, tragedy struck Old Dominion's campus when a gunman opened fire on Constant Hall, targeting an ROTC class.

The gunman took the life of Lieutenant Colonel Brandon Shah and injured two others before he was stopped by a brave group of students. Brandon Shah graduated from ODU in 2007 and returned a few years ago to oversee the Army ROTC Monarch Battalion.

As we reflect on his extraordinary life of service, our hearts are with his family and loved ones, as well as the two injured students, and we pray for their swift recovery.

Our hearts are also with the entire Old Dominion community. Today, we are all Monarch strong.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a moment of silence to mourn the loss and honor the life and service of Lieutenant Colonel Shah and demonstrate support for the entire Old Dominion University community.

RECOGNIZING AND CONGRATULATING WYOMING HIGHWAY PATROL ADMINISTRATOR COLONEL TIM CAMERON

(Ms. HAGEMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Wyoming Highway Patrol Administrator Colonel Tim Cameron on his retirement after nearly five decades of serving in law enforcement.

Administrator Cameron capped his dedicated tenure in public service with 3 years at the helm of the force, keeping Wyoming's highways safe.

The high-elevation freeways of Wyoming are unlike many in the rest of the lower 48. Our windswept State has the least amount of people but the highest rate of deadly truck accidents.

Our unique challenges require the kind of unique leadership that has long defined the character of the Cowboy State. Wyoming's first responders are true public heroes who work around the clock to keep our drivers safe.

Administrator Cameron is now part of that proud legacy as a watchman on the road. We appreciate his service and wish him well in retirement.

CONGRESS' BETRAYAL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call out this body's betrayal of the American people.

The same week we learned that the Trump administration spent more than \$11.3 billion on the first 6 days of the war in Iran alone, a survey found that one in three Americans are skipping meals, rationing medications, and delaying buying a home or having children because of the cost of healthcare in this country.

The United States of America is the richest country in the world. These are not decisions people should have to make, but they are the decisions people are being forced to make because the unchecked party in power is prioritizing spending billions of dollars on dropping bombs in foreign wars that no one asked for instead of doing anything to make life better or more affordable here at home.

In the richest country in the history of the world, Mr. Speaker, you should be able to afford to eat, to have kids, to have housing, and to get healthcare.

The people deserve a Congress who will fight for them.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF CALVIN UNIVERSITY

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the founding of my alma mater, Calvin University.

Today's Calvin University began in 1876 as a small theological school for seven students, and it grew into a Christian liberal arts institution, becoming a 4-year college in 1920 as its academic programs expanded beyond ministry training.

Calvin first welcomed my father, Gerald, in 1939, and when his education was interrupted by World War II and an injury he sustained in a B-24 crash, he then graduated in 1950. Calvin was there for him and many of those returning vets like him.

Now Calvin is not just my alma mater, it is my family's alma mater. My wife went there. I have a son who is currently attending there as well, and it is the place that has shaped our minds. It has deepened our faith, and it has instilled a lifelong commitment to serving God and our community.

Calvin upholds dedication to its neighbor and excellence in education. We have been well-equipped with the tools we need to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the 150th anniversary of my alma mater, Calvin University.

Go Knights.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AVEL GORDLY

(Ms. BYNUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a mentor and

a true friend, Oregon State Senator Avel Gordly.

Senator Gordly, the first Black woman to serve in the chamber, brought a presence that was regal and distinctive. I knew I was standing on the shoulders of a giant because she was not only a mentor to me but a true friend. It was an absolute privilege getting to know her over the last 10 years.

Sadly, her tenure as an elected Black Oregonian was so rare that when she came to the chamber of the house floor in the State legislature, many people thought that she was a relative of mine rather than the esteemed public servant that she was.

She had dedicated and delivered so much to Oregon. It is because of women like Senator Gordly that I am standing here today. I will miss her phone calls, her inspirational texts, and, most of all, her high expectations of me.

Her legacy will continue to inspire generations of women like me to lead, serve, and break barriers.

SABLE PIPELINE

(Mr. KILEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILEY of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Defense Production Act was invoked to restart production along the Sable pipeline off the California coast.

While I am absolutely understanding of the dire need for more supply and production for California's citizens, I do share some of the concerns that have been raised by California officials about the impact that this could have on our coast, on tourism, and the risks that it can impose from an environmental perspective.

I would, however, urge our State lawmakers and Governor not merely to complain about this action but to take concrete steps that can be taken right now to increase production and lower prices in California by easing regulations and by relaxing restrictions on our fuel mix.

Right now Californians are paying over 50 cents more per gallon than people are in Hawaii, which is an island State. We can lower the price of gas, and we can protect our coast at the same time.

□ 1610

HONORING JOHN J. CARNEY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as people everywhere celebrate St. Patrick's Day, I rise to honor the life and legacy of John J. Carney, an Irish-American son of northern Ohio. His vision, heart, and integrity helped shape the future of his beloved Cleveland.

John was a devoted family man and a real estate developer, but really he was so much more. He was a father for his community. He was a builder, a steward of civic renewal, and a tireless champion for the city he loved so deeply.

Through his decades of service from the Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority to Playhouse Square and the Downtown Cleveland Alliance, John believed in Cleveland's promise and gave his life to helping it rise.

He brought people together with warmth, humility, and that ever-present Irish sparkle in his eye. Whether hiking in the Alps, collecting rare books, or laughing with his grandchildren, John reminded us all to live fully and give generously.

Ohio is stronger, more vibrant, and more hopeful because John Carney walked among us. May his memory be a blessing, and may the Sun shine warmly upon his face.

CELEBRATING BRITTA CURL-SALEMME

(Mrs. FEDORCHAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a proud North Dakotan, Britta Curl-Salemme, and the entire USA women's hockey team on their thrilling overtime victory against our neighbors to the north.

North Dakotans know Britta well. She represents the very best of our State: hard work, grit, and team spirit. From the rinks of North Dakota to the world stage, she has carried those values with pride.

Britta's dedication and leadership helped deliver a gold medal moment our country is still celebrating.

I recognize the people who helped make this moment possible: her parents, Bill and Gretchen, and her siblings who have supported her every step of the way. North Dakota could not be more proud of Britta. We know she is gold through and through.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CAPTAIN SETH KOVAL

(Mr. BAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express profound sadness on the passing of Captain Seth R. Koval of Mooresville, Indiana, and my gratitude for his service to our Nation. Captain Koval died during a refueling accident while supporting Operation Epic Fury.

Captain Koval was a KC-135R Stratotanker instructor pilot for the 166th Air Refueling Squadron. He enlisted as a machinist in the Indiana Air National Guard in 2006 and graduated in 2011 from Purdue with a bachelor's degree. He joined the Ohio National

Guard in 2017 and was commissioned on November 9, 2018.

He eventually became advanced trained as an instructor pilot. He deployed multiple times over the past 12 years, including in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, Spartan Shield, and Epic Fury. Captain Koval ultimately accumulated over 400 hours of flight in combat.

Captain Koval was married for 19 years and was the father of a young son.

I thank Captain Koval for his selfless service. My prayers are with his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 2026, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-3012. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementing Statutory Addition of Certain Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) to the Toxics Release Inventory Beginning with Reporting Year 2026 [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2024-0044; FRL 9427.3-02-OCSPF] (RIN: 2070-AL34) received February 26, 2026, 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-3013. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pesticide Tolerances; Implementing Registration Review Decisions for Certain Pesticides; Maleic hydrazide, et al. [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0418; FRL-6704-03-OCSPF] (RIN: 2070-ZA16) received February 26, 2026, 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-3014. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Moderate Attainment Plan Elements for the Allegan County, Berrien County, and Muskegon County Areas for the 2015 Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2023-0515; EPA-R05-OAR-2023-0516; EPA-R05-OAR-2023-0517; FRL-12810-02-R5] received February 26, 2026, 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-3015. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Connecticut; State Implementation Plan Revisions Required as a Result of a Definition Change Due to the Ozone Reclassification [EPA-R01-OAR-2025-0196; FRL-12890-02-R1] received February 26, 2026, 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-3016. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Reporting Emission Data, Emission Fees, and Process Information [EPA-R07-OAR-2025-2830; FRL-13059-02-R7] received February 26, 2026, 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-3017. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyridate; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0554; FRL-13184-01-OCSPF] received February 26, 2026, 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-3018. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Regulatory Management Branch, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Extending the Reporting Deadline Under the Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule for 2025 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2025-0186; FRL-12720.1-02-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AW76) received February 26, 2026, 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-3019. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-098; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3020. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-142; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3021. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-124; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3022. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 25-098; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3023. A letter from the Acting Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [CPCLD Order No.: 01-2026] received March 5, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3024. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, 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.: 31647; Amdt. No.: 4203] received February 24, 2026, 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-3025. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation, Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2025-5037; Project Identifier AD-2025-00212-A; Amendment 39-23255; AD 2026-03-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2026, 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-3026. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Beeville, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2025-5106; Airspace Docket No.: 25-ASW-12] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 24, 2026, 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-3027. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes Q-190 and T-497, and Amendment of Domestic Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Federal Airways V-1, V-70, and V-194; Eastern United States; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2025-0668; Airspace Docket No.: 24-ASO-34] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 24, 2026, 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-3028. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment and Amendment of Class E Airspace; South Bend, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2025-5136; Airspace Docket No.: 25-AGL-18] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 24, 2026, 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-3029. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Miami, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2025-1183; Airspace Docket No.: 25-ASO-12] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received February 24, 2026, 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-3030. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2026-1327; Project Identifier MCAI-2025-00042-T; Amendment 39-23263; AD 2025-14-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 24, 2026, 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-3031. A letter from the Manager, Legal Litigation and Support, AGC-010, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — 25-Hour Cockpit Voice Recorder (CVR) Requirement, New Aircraft Production [Docket No.: FAA-2023-2270; Amdt. Nos. 91-382, 121-395, 125-77 and 135-149] (RIN: 2120-AL92) received March 4, 2026, 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.

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. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 7953. A bill to accelerate patient access to innovative medicines and clinical trials for life-threatening diseases by establishing a reciprocal approval mechanism with trusted international regulatory authorities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HURD of Colorado (for himself, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. FEDORCHAK, and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 7954. A bill to assist Tribal governments in the management of buffalo and buffalo habitat and the reestablishment of buffalo on Indian land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASAR (for himself, Mr. AMO, Ms. ANSARI, and Ms. TLAIIB):

H.R. 7955. A bill to prohibit any person from placing, accepting, or facilitating the placement or acceptance of a wager regarding a specified event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Financial Services, 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. FEDORCHAK (for herself and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 7956. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the State offices of rural health program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIJALVA (for herself, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 7957. A bill to preserve the Traditional Cultural Place of Ch'chil Bildagoteel Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HARRIGAN:

H.R. 7958. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 7959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements with respect to the treatment of whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. MAGAZINER, and Ms. TLAIIB):

H.R. 7960. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits excise tax on crude oil and to rebate the tax collected back to individual taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAWLOR (for himself, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. SALAZAR, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 7961. A bill to exempt H-1B health care workers from the restriction under the Presidential Proclamation entitled "Restriction on Entry of Certain Nonimmigrant Workers", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMICK:

H.R. 7962. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 relating to the review of the interagency dispute resolution process; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.R. 7963. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate regulations to improve the Lifeline program of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OGLES (for himself, Mr. FINE, Mr. DONALDS, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER):

H.R. 7964. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit the admission of aliens from certain countries where the United States cannot reliably verify the identities or backgrounds of individuals seeking entry, building upon the framework established by Presidential Proclamation 9645 and upheld by the Supreme Court in *Trump v. Hawaii*, 585 U.S. — (2018), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Ms. NOR-TON):

H.R. 7965. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized possession of a firearm at a Federal election site; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.R. 7966. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of hospice care furnished under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; 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 Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7967. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to revise the Mandatory Guidelines for Federal Workplace Drug Testing Programs to include testing for methadone use and to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to include testing for methadone use in Department of Transportation drug tests; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SUBRAMANYAM (for himself, Mr. OBERNOLTE, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 7968. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to carry out a study on challenges faced by United States small artificial intelligence businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TRAN (for himself, Mr. BACON, Ms. STRICKLAND, and Mr. HARRIGAN):

H.R. 7969. A bill to direct the Director of National Intelligence to assess the national security implications of increased foreign malign influence by the Chinese Communist Party; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. MACKENZIE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 1118. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the third week of March as "National CACFP Week"; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania (for herself, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. MIN, Ms. TLAIIB, and Ms. DEXTER):

H. Res. 1119. A resolution impeaching Pamela Bondi, Attorney General of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, and Ms. UNDERWOOD):

H. Res. 1120. A resolution supporting the recognition of March 14, 2026, as "Black Midwives Day" and the longstanding and invaluable contributions of Black midwives to maternal and infant health in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. MOORE of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. MACKENZIE, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 1121. A resolution honoring the extraordinary contributions of Irish Americans to the American War for Independence on

the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-53. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution 244, urging the United States Congress to enact legislation requiring documentary proof of United States citizenship to register to vote in federal elections, such as House Bill 22 of the 119th Congress, also known as the "Save Act."; which was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

ML-54. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 13, urging Congress to designate the Buckeye Trail as a National Scenic Trail.; which was referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ML-55. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, relative to Concurrent Resolution No.: H. 3007, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-56. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 92, urging the United States Congress to restore and strengthen oversight and accountability mechanisms for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the United States Department of Homeland Security in light of recent events nationwide; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ML-57. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa, relative to House Resolution 106, urging the members of Congress to support the Major Richard Star Act to allow medically retired service members to receive full access to their much-deserved retirement pay and benefits.; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 7953.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HURD of Colorado:

H.R. 7954.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 ("The Commerce Clause"), and Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 ("The Territorial Clause") of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CASAR:

H.R. 7955.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. FEDORCHAK:

H.R. 7956.

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

The Commerce Clause (Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the US Constitution)

By Mrs. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 7957.

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

Article I, §1 and §8

By Mr. HARRIGAN:

H.R. 7958.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 4 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7959.

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

Sixteenth Amendment provides Congress with the power to "lay and collect taxes on incomes."

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 7960.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. LAWLER:

H.R. 7961.

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

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MCCORMICK:

H.R. 7962.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of United States Constitution

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.R. 7963.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. OGLES:

H.R. 7964.

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

Article I Section VIII

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 7965.

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

Article I, section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution, to provide for the general welfare and make all laws necessary and proper to carry out the powers of Congress.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.R. 7966.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 7967.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. SUBRAMANYAM:

H.R. 7968.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TRAN:

H.R. 7969.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 569: Mr. SCHMIDT and Mr. VAN EPPS.

H.R. 645: Mr. TIMMONS and Mr. FULCHER.

H.R. 722: Mr. HUNT.

H.R. 1038: Mr. SORESENSEN.

H.R. 1111: Ms. ESCOBAR.

H.R. 1329: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1443: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1505: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1521: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1548: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 1965: Ms. BYNUM and Ms. MCBRIDE.

H.R. 1993: Ms. PETTERSEN.

H.R. 2089: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 2257: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2385: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 2411: Mr. DELUZIO.

H.R. 2457: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2547: Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. KIM, and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 2586: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 2729: Mr. CISCOMANI and Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2766: Mr. LICCARDO.

H.R. 2767: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2881: Ms. SALINAS and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 2910: Ms. BROWNELEY.

H.R. 2941: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ROSS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3184: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MANN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3197: Mr. MOORE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3199: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 3277: Ms. MENG, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CISCOMANI, Mr. CORREA, and Ms. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 3401: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3413: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 3418: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 3447: Mr. FINE.

H.R. 3526: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 3719: Mr. FULCHER.

H.R. 3740: Ms. SCHOLTEN.

H.R. 3774: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 3821: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 3864: Mr. HARRIS of Maryland.

H.R. 3871: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 4032: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 4290: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 4662: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4733: Ms. CHU and Mr. LATIMER.

H.R. 4768: Mr. TONKO, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4840: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.

H.R. 4852: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 4936: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CORREA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LAWLER, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 4966: Mr. SORESENSEN.

H.R. 5011: Mr. KEAN.

H.R. 5221: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 5267: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 5271: Ms. SCHOLTEN.

H.R. 5309: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 5435: Ms. ANSARI.

H.R. 5470: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 5536: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 5621: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 5622: Ms. SALINAS.

H.R. 5688: Mr. MESSMER and Mr. HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 5913: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 6160: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 6284: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 6293: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 6509: Mr. BEAN of Florida.

H.R. 6621: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WALKINSHAW, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 6677: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 6786: Mrs. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 6797: Mr. CARBAJAL and Mr. FINE.

H.R. 6806: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 6825: Mr. BERA.

H.R. 6845: Mr. RILEY of New York.

H.R. 6961: Mr. MCDOWELL.

H.R. 7066: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 7137: Mr. LICCARDO and Mr. KENNEDY of New York.

H.R. 7206: Ms. McBRIDE.
H.R. 7230: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 7235: Mr. DUNN of Florida.
H.R. 7247: Mr. BACON and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 7265: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 7368: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 7378: Mr. PATRONIS.
H.R. 7380: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 7391: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 7398: Mr. McDOWELL.
H.R. 7417: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 7443: Ms. FEDORCHAK.
H.R. 7481: Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 7543: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 7576: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 7594: Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 7601: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 7622: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 7678: Mr. FITZGERALD.
H.R. 7703: Mr. FULCHER and Mr. MCGUIRE.
H.R. 7817: Mr. BURCHETT.
H.R. 7858: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 7863: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 7874: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 7877: Mr. SCHNEIDER and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 7892: Mr. KILEY of California and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 7906: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 7925: Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. FULCHER, and Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 7941: Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mr. BARRETT, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. NUNN of Iowa.

H. Res. 925: Mr. PAPPAS.
H. Res. 994: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 1116: Mr. CASE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

PT-8. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Village of Hastings-On-Hudson, relative to Resolution 14:26, Petitioning the U.S. Government to End ICE and CBP Abuses; Security, and Ways and Means.; which was referred jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Ways and Means.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2026

No. 48

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, who knows every one of our deepest desires, even our hurts are not hidden from You. We rejoice that we are Your children. Thank You for saving us from unseen traps and dangers. Help us to live so that we will inspire generations yet to come.

As Senators do the work of freedom today, may they work with a sense of history. Give them the courage to make decisions that will strengthen our Nation for the storms ahead.

Lord, keep them from the pitfalls that nurture divisions and unite them in their efforts to find common ground.

And, Lord, comfort all who mourn throughout our world.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor before to speak about the value of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement and the value to all three countries, but most importantly the United States. I am here again in honor of National Agriculture Week.

I would like to continue my review of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA for short, and I do it today by thanking President Trump for what he called “the largest, fairest, most balanced, and modern trade agreement ever achieved.”

I hope that President Trump remembers those words—and they were very appropriate words—as he leads the reconsideration of USMCA today.

One little provision, but an important provision in the USMCA, in 2020, when the agreement was signed, it may have been difficult to see just how big an impact the first ever biotechnology provision in a trade agreement would make and how important the dispute settlement piece would be for that agreement, and, in this particular case, helping American farmers.

It happens that in 2022, Mexico tried to ban genetically modified corn. In Iowa language, we say GMO product. This could have led to more bans and shutting off billions of dollars in markets for U.S. ag products.

After a significant push by this Senator and the junior Senator from Iowa, the U.S. Trade Representative filed a successful dispute settlement in the process that was laid out in the USMCA, and that dispute settlement resulted in Mexico reversing its ban on GMO corn. It was a win for U.S. farmers, processors, and the very large, fair, balanced, and modern United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

Now, that is a very small part of this agreement because, overall, the big picture is that USMCA has been a success throughout and for all of our economy, but especially for agriculture.

Now, this agreement—and it is under the agreement—is going through a review process that was called for in that agreement, and the big question is: Will the United States lead Mexico and Canada to continue this agreement to the year 2036?

I am urging this administration that the first few years of the USMCA has been so beneficial to all three countries that it is a no-brainer to continue the USMCA through 2036.

Along this line, I will be meeting with Canadian Senators to talk about how they feel this agreement is going and how successful they think it might be getting it continued.

I hope that it will be continued, and that is what I am urging the Trump administration to see through because, like I say, it is a no-brainer. It should be continued.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1059

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today is day 32 of Democrats' shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. On Thursday, Democrats, once again, blocked the Senate from proceeding to a DHS funding bill—a bill, I should note, that already includes a number of reforms to immigration enforcement: more money for body cameras, deescalation training, and additional oversight of immigration enforcement activities. And getting on this bill would not have precluded additional reforms from being added. But for the fourth time now, Democrats stopped the Senate from proceeding to consideration of this legislation.

For weeks, Democrats have spoken about the urgent need for reforms to immigration enforcement, but it has been Democrats who have been the biggest obstacle to getting those reforms enacted. The Trump administration took a number of steps on its own, I might add, to reform immigration enforcement, and on top of that, the White House made two substantial and serious offers to Democrats to legislate reforms, the most recent of which was sent more than 2 weeks ago.

But Democrats couldn't even be bothered to respond to the White House's latest offer until late last night, 18 days for Democrats to even bother replying. And that offer—Democrats' third—was basically the same as their first two offers: no compromise and still filled with a number of non-starters that would make it more dangerous for law enforcement officers to do their jobs. Meanwhile, on the Senate floor, the best Democrats have been able to offer is funding some DHS Agencies and leaving others unfunded. It is really pretty remarkable.

Last summer, Democrats threw a fit over Republicans' rescissions package that cut just \$9 billion in Federal spending, a fraction of a fraction of a percent of the entire Federal budget. Now, to hear Democrats talk, they seem to think that entire Agencies—especially the Agencies that secure our border and enforce immigration laws—are dispensable.

The Democrat leader had the audacity to call this a "moderate" plan last week. When did defunding law enforcement become a mainstream position in this country? Now, this might be considered moderate for Democrats, but I think the average American would view it as extreme.

We are now a month into Democrats' second shutdown since October. And like their record-long shutdown in the fall, the victims of this shutdown are beginning to pile up. TSA agents are working without pay. A significant number of agents are calling out sick, leading to long wait times and lines stretching into airport parking garages.

CBS reports that 300 TSA agents have quit since this shutdown began, and that is on top of the 1,100 agents who quit after Democrats' shutdown in

the fall. It is pretty darn understandable if you think about it. What do you do when, for 2 out of the last 6 months, you have to work without pay? Well, that is what Democrats have put these people through. So it is more than understandable that they might be thinking that there has got to be an easier way to earn a living.

I heard from one TSA agent in South Dakota who was at the end of her rope. She writes:

It is very hard to live without getting paid. . . . I do not know how long I can keep doing this.

Well, that is what happens in a shutdown: real people get hurt.

But if you ask the senior Senator from Hawaii, a Member of the Democratic leadership, he says:

We are very serene with what is going on.

"Very serene." I suppose that is not a surprising statement considering the Democratic leader characterized Democrats' last shutdown in the fall by saying:

Every day gets better for us.

"Very serene." "Every day gets better for us." For Democrats, a government shutdown is just fine as long as it seems to be working for them politically, no matter whether it is hurting hard-working Americans, no matter if it is jeopardizing public safety and national security. Make no mistake, Democrats' shutdown is harming hard-working Americans and putting national security in jeopardy.

Our country is facing a heightened threat environment right now. There are a few examples of that. Stryker, a medical tech company, was the victim of an Iran-linked cyber attack last week. ISIS-inspired individuals attempted to detonate bombs targeting protesters outside of the home of the mayor of New York City last weekend. And on Thursday, we saw two tragic attacks take place. One of those, in Virginia, was perpetrated by an individual who was arrested in 2016 for attempting to provide materiel support to ISIS. The other, an attack on a Detroit-area synagogue, was perpetrated by an individual who was reported to have had connections to known or suspected Hezbollah terrorists.

This is no time for Democrats' political games. Republicans are at the table and ready to work whenever Democrats are done playing.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. President, today, we are kicking off an extended debate on the SAVE America Act, a package of commonsense measures united around two themes: protecting our elections and protecting our youth.

You are going to hear me use the adjective "commonsense" a lot in this debate because if there is any word that is suitable to describe the measures we are considering, it is that. If there is anything essential to the integrity of elections, it is ensuring that those who are registered to vote are eligible to vote and that those who show

up to vote at polling places are who they say they are.

And how do you do that? Well, by requiring that Americans show proof of citizenship when they register to vote and that they show photo ID at polling places. That is what the SAVE America Act would do. It is just common sense. And polls show that the American people overwhelmingly agree. But to hear Democrats talk, you would think that demonstrating citizenship or showing a photo ID is an intolerable burden.

And yet I haven't heard Democrats complaining about the thousand other circumstances in which we require photo ID in this country. Democrats are aware that Americans have to show photo ID to get on a plane—right?—and to start a new job and when they head to the doctor's office and to rent a car and to stay in a hotel. Heck, if you want to get a library card, you have to show a photo ID. Do Democrats remember their 2024 convention, when attendees had to show a photo ID to get in? The senior Democrat Senator from Georgia required photo ID to get into his recent rally.

Do Democrats hear themselves? Are they going to start boycotting libraries and airplanes and hotels for requiring a photo ID? Are they going to explain why they are perfectly justified in requiring photo ID for their political rallies while it is somehow an intolerable burden to ask people to show their photo ID when they go to vote?

I expect they won't. They will simply continue with their mindless partisan opposition to commonsense ID requirements for Federal elections.

But let's hit pause on that topic for a minute and go to another issue where common sense and the Democrat Party have parted ways, and that is on the subject of transgender ideology. In their haste to embrace medical transgender ideology, Democrats have put themselves in the absurd position of supporting the hijacking of women and girls' sports by biological males. Yep; that is right. The party that would portray itself as a defender of women has put itself on the record as willing to sacrifice women's athletic opportunities for the sake of biological males.

Now, no one should need an explanation of what the presence of biological males in women's sports costs women. At the most basic level, women are losing out on a slot on the team. Every roster place that goes to a male is a roster place that doesn't go to a female. And for women who are on the roster, well, the presence of a biological male can and frequently does rob them of opportunities to excel.

Biologically, men possess physical advantages when it comes to sports—things like greater muscle mass and greater aerobic power—which means that, by and large, men are likely to dominate in women's sports, taking wins and medal opportunities away from women.

In an August 2024 United Nations report on violence against women and girls, they had this to say about the results of men participating in women's sports:

According to information received, by 30 March 2024, over 600 female athletes in more than 400 competitions have lost more than 890 medals in 29 different sports.

Over 600 female athletes in more than 400 competitions have lost more than 800 medals in 29 different sports.

The SAVE America Act would ensure that men are not allowed to hijack women's sporting opportunities. Yet, once again, we expect my Democrat colleagues to oppose keeping women's sports for women.

The idea that a female high school athlete might lose out on a college scholarship because her achievements were overshadowed by those of a biological male on her team is bad enough, but an even more dangerous consequence of the embrace of transgender ideology is the children who have become victims of irreversible gender transition procedures. And when I say "children," I mean children: young men and women who are not old enough to vote, who are years away from being able to legally drink, who still need parental permission to take medicine at school.

The New York Times reports:

A review of hospital data from 2016 through 2020 identified about 3,600 patients aged 12 to 18 who had received gender-related surgery.

Aged 12 to 18. Can the Presiding Officer imagine that? Can the Presiding Officer imagine allowing a child not yet out of middle school to receive a medical procedure that will result in permanent mutilation of part of her body?

This madness has to end. Multiple European countries have acted to rein in gender transition procedures for minors and so have a number of U.S. States. The SAVE America Act would extend protection from these procedures to all children, whatever State they live in.

Commonsense measures: require proof of citizenship to register to vote, require a photo ID at the polls, protect women's sports from being hijacked by biological males, and protect teenagers from life-altering, irreversible gender transition procedures—measures, I might add again, supported by a majority of Americans and measures we expect my Democrat colleagues to oppose.

It is unfortunate that common sense is not very common anymore in the Democratic Party.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The majority whip.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the SAVE America Act. I support the SAVE America Act. I believe that anybody that votes in an American election needs to be an American citizen, and I believe that anyone who shows up to vote needs to present a photo ID to prove they are who they say they are.

Free and fair elections are the foundation of our Nation. It is the 250th anniversary this year of our founding. Voting here is about American citizens voting. And without strong protections, this foundation of 250 years will crumble.

The American people are clear. They believe American elections should be decided by American citizens, not by illegal immigrants.

Listen to the Democrats talk. They think it is fine, let any illegal immigrant vote. You heard from the minority leader yesterday in terms of what we want to do to protect the rights of American citizens to make sure the elections are free and fair. When illegal immigrants vote, the voice of American citizens is undermined.

The fact is, Joe Biden's open border policies undermined elections in this country. Under Joe Biden and the Democrats, over 10 million illegal immigrants flooded into our country, to communities all across the State. Now, Democrats want to make it possible for illegal immigrants to decide the outcome of elections in this Nation.

Democrats are once again prioritizing illegal immigrants and illegal immigrant criminals over American citizens, and that is what they have been doing. That is why we are in the situation we are in, with a shutdown at the Department of Homeland Security and why, specifically, today we are on the floor to talk about the SAVE America Act.

Many far-left sanctuary cities already make it easier for illegal immigrants to vote. They have set it up that way because in 19 States and in the District of Columbia, illegal immigrants can get a driver's license with no proof of citizenship whatsoever.

I am against it. I have opposed it from the beginning when the first State proposed it, and now, 19 States and the District do it. In California, in Maryland, Vermont, and Washington, DC, noncitizens are allowed to vote in local elections. I think that is wrong.

It is a felony for illegal immigrants to vote in Federal elections; yet we know it is happening.

Last week, the Department of Homeland Security arrested a criminal illegal immigrant from Africa. He entered the Nation illegally over 20 years ago. He was ordered to be deported in 2002. He first registered to vote in 2005, and he has been voting in Federal elections since 2008.

Most recently, this illegal immigrant voted in the 2024 election. He voted in the State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is a swing State. It was won by

tight margins in both the Presidential and the Senate races.

He should have never been allowed to vote in the United States, and this should never be allowed to happen.

Now, the SAVE America Act protects the vote of every single American citizen. What it says is simple: If you want to vote in the United States of America, you need to be a citizen of the United States of America, and you need to show a photo ID at the poll in order to vote. It is common sense.

Americans show ID every single day. You want to buy a beer? You need to show an ID. You want to get on a plane? You need to show a photo ID.

I have people here in the Gallery from Wyoming—students from Burlington and their teachers, optometrists from around the State of Wyoming. They are all flying back to Wyoming. Every one of them is going to have to show a photo ID to get on the plane.

If you want to cash a check, you need to show a photo ID. Voting should be equally important to show a photo ID.

It should be no different than all these other things. Photo IDs protect against voter fraud, and they prevent illegal immigrants from voting.

Most importantly, it tells each American citizen that their vote counts and their vote matters, and it is not going to be watered down by people who are not citizens of the United States.

American voters in 36 States, including Wyoming, already show an ID in order to vote in elections. We do have voter ID laws in Wyoming. And getting a voter ID is actually free, no cost involved.

So the SAVE America Act that we are going to be discussing and voting on today builds on current, commonsense laws that work in so many States. It makes it easy to vote, and it makes it harder to cheat in every State across the country.

Every Democrat ought to be supporting this, but none of them do. Why do Democrats in this Chamber oppose showing an ID to vote? I think the minority leader is opposed because—in his words—he says it "allows ICE to kick tens of millions of people off the voter rolls." That is who the Democrats are fighting for—illegal immigrant voting. Not for American citizens, not for the rights of the American people to govern our own Nation—no, he is talking about tens of millions of people off the voter rolls.

How did they get on the voter rolls in the first place if they are not citizens? Well, it is automatic voter drives and when people sign up for a motor vehicle license, a driver's license. A number of States have automatic voter registration connected to it. So you get a license, and even if you are illegal, you can be signed up to vote. Certain States are in the process of having to try to figure out how they went wrong and what they need to do to correct it for Federal offices. Oregon State is in the middle of it right now.

If it is true that there are tens of millions of people on the voter rolls that CHUCK SCHUMER talked about that ICE would remove because they are not citizens on the voter rolls, how bad does it have to get? If that is the case, this situation is much worse than most Americans fear.

What we hear from the minority leader saying that this is Jim Crow 2.0—that is fearmongering, and he knows it.

One of our Democratic colleagues will be on this floor later today from the State of Georgia. He requires anybody that wants to show up at one of his campaign rallies to show a photo ID to get in. Apparently, you need to show a photo ID to get into a Georgia campaign rally for a Democrat, and he doesn't want you to have to show one to vote. I guess he doesn't want illegal immigrants at his rallies, but it is OK if they vote for him.

It is astonishing. Why do Democrats support showing a photo ID to attend a political rally and oppose it to vote in an election?

Look, what is clear to all of us is that Democrats oppose elections that limit participations to just American citizens. They don't like that idea. And they are likely to line up one after another today to vote to say: Nope, don't check the ID with a photo on it in order to vote because we want to cram as many people as we can with their ballots into the ballot box to be counted, no matter where they are from.

Democrats said the same thing after the State of Georgia enacted voter ID laws in 2021. What were the results? Well, more people actually voted, not fewer. Turnout hit record levels. The lines moved faster than ever before. The Democrats say it was an impediment.

Voter ID is important.

Democrats' voter suppression lies have been thoroughly debunked time and time again. Yet they continue to repeat them. Voter ID and citizenship proof are safeguards for our elections; they are not restrictions.

The SAVE America Act is how we make elections safe, secure, and a true reflection of the American people. Every American should desire that American elections be decided by American citizens. Who wouldn't? Well, somebody that wants to load up the ballots with people who may vote for them, whether they are citizens or not.

Every Member of the Senate should support the SAVE America Act. By opposing this bill, Democrats are once again putting illegal immigrants ahead of American voters, and Republicans are going to make sure that every voter in America and every citizen voter in America knows which side of that issue people stand on—photo ID and citizenship or not.

The Republicans are here to say it is important that only citizens vote and people prove who they are by showing a photo ID when they go to the ballot box.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, soon, the Senate will debate a bill. The bill is called the SAVE America Act.

The policies in this bill have the support of more than 80 percent of Americans. Some of my colleagues say that the SAVE America Act isn't necessary. They are wrong. There are two fundamental, commonsense reasons as to why 80 percent of Americans support the policies of this legislation.

No. 1, only U.S. citizens are eligible to vote in our elections. So this bill simply requires Americans to show proof of citizenship when they register to vote.

No. 2, it requires a photo ID when voting. This helps to ensure the person who is registered to vote in that election is the person who is actually casting that ballot.

The SAVE America Act would give voters peace of mind that Federal elections are conducted fair and square. It would give voters peace of mind that their vote isn't diluted by people who are not eligible to vote.

I am a cosponsor of the SAVE America Act. I support free, transparent, and accurate elections. Every American deserves the absolute confidence that there is no funny business distorting election outcomes.

Let me tell you about the track record in my home State of Iowa.

Voter ID laws in my State have been successful and well received since the passage in 2017. Iowa's voter turnout increased in the 2018 mid-term elections, and turnout has continued to remain very strong. So the proof is in the pudding.

Iowa's track record demonstrates voter ID improves the integrity and security of our elections. It also enhances voter turnout and boosts public confidence in the outcomes of elections.

Nearly a century ago, a Supreme Court Justice said that States are the "laboratories of democracy." Guess what. Iowa has shown voter ID laws work. They don't impede voter turnout, as Iowa has shown. Voter ID boosts the public trust. In fact, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 36 States have voter ID laws on the books. This bill would apply a minimum Federal standard much like other Federal voting laws.

Partisan critics of this commonsense bill are misleading the public with bad information. This bill would not make it harder to vote. Americans ought to be insulted by the arguments being made on the other side of the aisle.

I am confident Americans are capable of bringing a photo ID with them to vote. That happens to be no different than when they drive, when they open a bank account, when they board an airplane, when they buy cold medicine, or sign up for government benefits. These are all examples of people showing ID.

Another argument claims it is unfair to require people to provide proof of citizenship to register to vote. That is even more revealing in coming from the other side because it makes the Biden administration's open border policy even more alarming.

After President Biden allowed more than 12 million people to illegally enter our country, protecting the right to vote for American citizens is top of mind to the millions of law-abiding citizens throughout America. Because of the influx of illegal immigrants streaming into our country during Biden's border crisis, it is not surprising Americans want to suppress voter fraud and ensure every ballot is legitimate.

The bill gives voters five different ways to show proof of citizenship, and it gives States the flexibility to create other pathways to show proof of citizenship. For example, for those whose current name doesn't match their birth certificate, they can provide a marriage certificate or other name change verification.

I have been honored to serve in my elective office for many decades. I have worked hard to earn every vote at the ballot box. Public trust in elective officeholders requires public trust in our elections.

Voting rights have a long history in America's march to a more perfect Union. They are enhanced by the 15th Amendment to the Federal Constitution and by the 19th Amendment to the Federal Constitution.

My mother was one of the very first women to cast a ballot after the ratification of the 19th Amendment. I have shown proof of that with placards here on the floor of the U.S. Senate in a speech that shows her picture in the Des Moines Register newspaper and the Waterloo Courier newspaper.

The SAVE America Act doesn't infringe on these hard-fought voting rights. It would preserve the integrity of every vote cast in a Federal election. Election integrity is sacred to our system of self-government.

Losing public trust in the outcome of elections would be a death knell for our fragile American experiment, even though it is 250 years long.

For our Nation's 250th birthday, the SAVE America Act is a gift to current and future generations to strengthen our system of self-government.

This brings me to more commonsense policies included in the bill, as well as the voting issues.

Like many Americans, I am alarmed by the prevalence of gender mutilation surgeries being performed on minors. Protecting children makes our society

stronger. Irreversible damage from gender reassignment surgery should not be conducted on kids. This bill would put an end to this reckless practice on American children. The SAVE America Act would make this policy the law of the land this very week.

On another issue in the bill, America is in the thick of March Madness. Filling out brackets, watching buzzer-beaters, and cheering on Cinderella contenders is a rite of passage during the month of March. I am thrilled to cheer on our Iowa teams in the NCAA Tournament, including two women's teams—the Iowa Hawkeyes and the Iowa State Cyclones—as well as three men's teams—the Hawkeyes, the Cyclones, and my alma mater, the University of Northern Iowa Panthers.

Earlier this month, the Iowa high school basketball tournament brought the best of 32 girls teams and 32 boys teams from across the State to compete in 4 divisions. These young athletes deserve to compete on a level playing field—girls against girls, boys against boys. This is a matter of fairness.

Our bill would guarantee a level playing field for young athletes. Title IX was enacted a few years before I became a Member of Congress. It has been a game changer for women's sports.

Just think of Iowa University's Caitlin Clark. She has blazed a trail for women's sports for generations to come.

The SAVE America Act delivers commonsense government to the American people. As a student of history, I would prophesize that Americans looking back at this debate, 250 years from now, will scratch their heads, because protecting election integrity and protecting women's sports are as American as motherhood and apple pie.

In fact, 80 percent of Americans are able to see eye to eye on these issues. When it comes to elections, 80 percent of the American people support voter ID. I have even seen polls that say that 71 percent of the Democrats support voter ID.

I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to join us and pass the SAVE America Act without delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this afternoon, Republicans will move to bring a pernicious, radical bill before the Senate, the so-called SAVE America Act. At a moment when war is consuming the Middle East, when costs are

rising, when ICE agents are terrorizing our communities, and when job growth in America is weakening, MAGA Republicans have chosen to focus on voter suppression.

We all know why Donald Trump wants this bill. He is afraid Republicans will lose in November. Trump says: Pass the SAVE Act, and it will "guarantee the midterms." Imagine manipulating the electoral process to try to make himself the winner when he thinks he is going to lose—not surprising, I suppose, from Donald Trump.

The senior Senator from Utah says:

Republicans will lose power—likely for a long time—if we don't get SAVE America passed.

It is funny. I don't remember MAGA Republicans screaming about stolen elections and voter fraud after the 2024 election that they won. Well, the same rules that governed the 2024 election are going to be the ones that govern the 2026 election. The only difference is that this time, MAGA Republicans know they are in trouble politically, so now they are suddenly saying that the system is compromised and broken and that it needs to be changed.

It is all lies—all lies. And they want to drag down the entire Senate for who knows how long in a vain attempt to pass this bill.

Let's be clear. Senate Democrats will never allow the SAVE Act to pass this Chamber. If a small band of MAGA Senators wants to drag this out on the Senate floor, keep us here through the night, through days, or longer, while stalling all other important business, they can try. It will not work.

MAGA Republicans, Senate Democrats will hold the line as long as necessary because with this bill, democracy is at stake.

I want to be very clear. The SAVE Act is not about voter identification; it is about voter suppression. Under the SAVE Act, every single State would be required to share its voter rolls with the Department of Homeland Security—something even many Republican States do not want to do.

Those rolls would be reviewed by a system designed by none other than Elon Musk and his DOGE, using an algorithm that has already been shown to be deeply flawed.

Millions would be kicked off the rolls for no reason. This means American citizens—many, millions—would be booted off the rolls wrongly. If you are kicked off the rolls, you may never be told. There is no requirement to let you know. Then when you show up on election day ready to vote and a poll worker tells you "Sorry, you are not registered; you are not in the system," what do you do? You can't reregister that day, especially with the onerous requirements for registration in the SAVE Act.

As I said, it is not just as simple as reregistering. Under the bill, Americans would have to run through an obstacle course of redtape unlike anything we have ever seen in voter reg-

istration. A driver's license would no longer be enough. A military ID would no longer be enough. You would need something like a passport, which most Americans do not have, or a birth certificate, which many Americans cannot easily find. If you cannot produce these documents, you could be out of luck, even if you are an American citizen with every right to vote. That is almost certainly the majority—the vast majority—of who would be thrown off the rolls.

Meanwhile, say goodbye to some of the safest, most convenient, and most effective ways to register to vote. No more registering online. No more registering in churches. No more registering at college campuses. No more registering at the DMV. No more registering by mail. No more vote-by-mail. Many red States love vote-by-mail. Yet MAGA radicals want to eliminate it almost entirely.

I ask my Republican colleagues: How does it protect our elections to stop people from registering at church or at the DMV? How does it make our democracy safer to tell seniors, people with disabilities, or working Americans they cannot register online and must find their way to an election office, which is something only a fraction of Americans do today—5.9 percent, to be more precise. How does getting rid of vote-by-mail—something red States do, something blue States do—strengthen democracy? The answer is, it does not.

The SAVE Act is not about election integrity; it is about voter suppression, plain and simple. MAGA Republicans would rather take democracy down than back away from their own right-wing, extreme policies that have killed jobs, started wars, and exploited working people to benefit the ultrarich. Senate Democrats will not let them succeed.

I tell my Republican colleagues: Hear me—we will hold the line for as long as it takes.

IRAN

Mr. President, on Iran, each day brings more evidence that Donald Trump has no idea what he is doing in Iran. Yesterday, the President effectively admitted his administration badly miscalculated Iran's responses to his attacks.

As he put it:

They hit Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the UAE, and Kuwait. Nobody expected it. We were shocked. They fought back.

Comments like that show that Donald Trump is in over his head.

The old saying goes: If you break it, you buy it.

Well, Donald Trump, you broke it badly, and now you are trying to get out of paying the price.

The Strait of Hormuz is effectively shut down. Oil prices continue to rise. Yesterday, we learned that about 200 American troops have now been injured in this conflict. Thirteen servicemembers have made the ultimate sacrifice. We pray for them, their families, and for everyone in harm's way.

But, again, I repeat to Donald Trump: If you break it, you buy it.

Donald Trump broke it badly, and now he is trying to get out of paying the price.

Donald Trump promised this would be over in a matter of days or weeks. Well, we are now in week 3. There is still no sign this war is close to ending. In fact, despite severe blows, most reporting suggests Iran's regime remains intact and has hardened rather than collapsed.

This war needs to come to an end. In the meantime, I repeat what I said last week: Donald Trump's Cabinet must come before the Senate. We need public hearings. We need to hear from Secretary Rubio, Secretary Hegseth, and others under oath, and answer tough questions. They need to answer some very basic questions: Why are we at war? What is the objective? Will there be American boots on the ground? How exactly do they plan to reopen the Strait of Hormuz? What is the exit strategy?

Right now, we do not have answers to questions that should be easy for any competent administration to answer, and that should alarm every one of us.

ENERGY COSTS

Mr. President, finally, on energy costs, later today, Senators HEINRICH, WHITEHOUSE, and I will release the most comprehensive Senate report to date on Donald Trump's broken promise to lower energy costs. This is the third major pillar in Democrats' year-long effort to present a lower cost agenda to the American people. Lowering costs will remain our North Star all year long.

Donald Trump might think affordability is a hoax. He might be fixated on foreign wars. But Democrats understand that the cost of living is the No. 1 issue on people's minds.

When it comes to energy prices, the story is very simple: Donald Trump promised he would cut the price of energy in half in his first year. Well, 14 months have passed, and not only are energy prices up, they are rising roughly three times the rate of inflation, and that is not sustainable.

Our report explains in detail why this is happening. Donald Trump chose to help his friends in Big Oil out instead of helping American families lower their energy bills. He has waged war on clean energy—the cheapest and fastest source to build and get electrons on the grid—and now Americans are paying the price.

He cut clean energy because many contributors—Harold Hamm—hate clean energy because they know it is the future, not the oil and gas that they claim should be the only route to go. When he was running for office, Donald Trump promised oil executives at Mar-a-Lago—Harold Hamm among them—that if they gave him \$1 billion for his election, he would give them a great deal in return. Now he is making good on that bargain.

His so-called Big Beautiful Bill has destroyed clean energy jobs across the

country and raised taxes on clean energy. He has weaponized the Federal Government to undermine 35 clean energy projects that could have powered 14 million homes and supported 170,000 jobs. At the same time, Trump's war with Iran has pushed up the cost of gasoline and diesel. His tariffs have raised the cost of material needed to produce energy here at home.

So after more than a year, the pattern is very clear: Donald Trump has systemically destroyed investments in energy production, favored Big Oil over working families, and raised costs on households by killing the cheapest and fastest sources of new energy—solar, wind, and battery storage.

The American people are paying the price for Trump's broken promises.

I thank Senators HEINRICH and WHITEHOUSE for their tremendous work on this report. We will have more to say later today and in the weeks ahead. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the St. John nomination.

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

NEBRASKA WILDFIRES

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, my home State of Nebraska is currently experiencing a natural disaster of unprecedented proportions for our State. We are experiencing the largest wildfires since Nebraska became a State. It started last week. We have a number of fires burning across the State that have burned up to 750,000 acres of Nebraska. That is over 1 percent, approaching 2 percent of the total land area of my State.

We have had one fatality. Rose Mary White, a grandmother of 12, died at her ranch near Arthur, NE. We have also had hundreds, if not thousands, of people impacted by these fires.

I ask all Nebraskans and all Americans to pray for the victims of these terrible fires.

I had the opportunity, with Governor Pillen and Congressman SMITH, to tour the areas that were burning on Saturday.

Thank you to all of the firefighters, our volunteer firefighters who are first responders on the scene, who worked tirelessly to be able to control this fire.

By the time we arrived on Saturday, they had had little sleep over the past several days and were exhausted. At 6 o'clock that night, a Federal firefighter team came in to provide relief, and I thank those firefighters as well.

Thank you to our Nebraska National Guardsmen. We have two Black Hawk helicopters with Bambi baskets that

are on site helping to control the fire by dumping water on it from the air. I thank Iowa as well because they have also loaned us two helicopters to be able to help out. The Governor was calling the fire departments of Omaha and Lincoln and Columbus, seeking to get additional firefighter help to be able to relieve the volunteers that are working so hard around the clock.

Nebraska is a great place. We have great community spirit. We saw it on full display as people pitched in to be able to help combat these fires. But we have a lot of work to be able to do.

The Morrill fire has burned over 572,000 acres and is only 18 percent contained. The Cottonwood fire has burned over 131,000 acres, and it is only 40 percent contained. The Road 203 fire has burned 35,000 acres, and it is 36 percent contained. And the Anderson Bridge fire has burned 17,000 acres and is only 60 percent contained.

I know that Nebraskans will continue to work hard to preserve life and property and take care of their neighbors during this time. We are no stranger to disasters. Nebraskans always pitch in to be able to help.

I do want to say to my fellow Nebraskans that if you get the evacuation order, be prepared because this fire has moved fast. We got some relief from the winds on Sunday, but they kicked up again on Monday. Those winds can drive that fire very, very fast. So be prepared to evacuate. Please don't stay. If you stay too long, you are putting yourself and the firefighters at risk who are trying to put out this fire and protect you. And when it is safe, please make sure you are documenting the damage that you have incurred.

The USDA Farm Service Agency has Disaster Assistance Programs. After you are safe and you have had a chance to document your damage, you can go to them to see what sort of programs are out there. The Nebraska Cattlemen, nebraskacattlemen.org, has the ability for people to donate to be able to help out those impacted by this fire, so do the Red Cross and Salvation Army.

In talking with our ag director Sherry Vinton, over 30,000 cattle may be displaced because of this fire. And certainly, there will be cattle losses because of it. We just don't know the magnitude yet. It has been very dry this winter in Nebraska, and this fire has burned out of control. But we have many brave Nebraskans—volunteers, firefighters, the National Guard—who are working to be able to get this fire under control.

As a Federal delegation, we will continue to support the local efforts and the State's efforts to control this fire and to help those impacted recover. And again, I ask for the prayers of Nebraskans and all Americans to be able to help us out in this terrible tragedy.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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 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. 673, Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

John Thune, Bill Hagerty, Tim Sheehy, Jim Banks, Ted Budd, Katie Boyd Britt, Bernie Moreno, Tommy Tuberville, John R. Curtis, Mike Rounds, Pete Ricketts, John Barrasso, Kevin Cramer, James Lankford, Ted Cruz, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Crapo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, 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 Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "Yea" and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "Yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Ex.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Hassan	Ossoff
Bennet	Heinrich	Padilla
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Rosen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Coons	Kim	Schatz
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Schiff
Duckworth	Lujan	Schumer
Durbin	Markley	Shaheen
Fetterman	Merkley	Slotkin
Gallego	Murphy	Van Hollen

Warner
Warnock

Warren
Welch

Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Cotton
Graham
King

Lankford
Scott (SC)
Smith

Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 45. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled recess.

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

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, there are some things in the world that are so obvious that there is really no use in debating them. There are things in this world that really "go without saying," and voter ID laws are one of those things.

Voter ID laws are so obvious, they are so commonsense, that it is shocking that we are even having a debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate this week about it. It is hard to see that there are even two sides to this issue, unless, of course, you believe that it really is OK for illegal immigrants to vote in our elections.

But how is that even a debate? The Constitution is very clear that only citizens of the United States of America are eligible to vote in our elections. So that debate is already settled.

Indiana already has voter ID laws. Hoosiers have to show an ID when they show up to vote on election day, and they have to prove that they are who they say they are when they register to vote in the first place.

But it is not fair to Hoosiers when other States don't require voter ID. It is not fair to law-abiding Americans throughout the country because, when we allow noncitizens to vote in our Federal elections, we dilute the power of the American voter, and that should never be allowed to happen in the United States of America. American elections are for Americans, period.

Even with voter ID laws, there are still illegals who show up and try to vote. In fact, our Secretary of State in Indiana Diego Morales just audited our voter rolls in our State to find every noncitizen that voted in our elections to clean up the process and he actually found some, and the Secretary of State and our Attorney General Todd Rokita are prosecuting those voters who voted illegally.

So it is obvious that even in the State of Indiana, where we take election integrity very seriously, that we need to do more to protect our elections, and the SAVE America Act goes a long way to doing that.

It is also obvious that we need to pass the SAVE America Act for very practical reasons, to have voter ID nationwide in Federal elections.

Under Joe Biden, illegal immigrants invaded and flooded into our country,

tens of millions of them. Joe Biden and the Democrats allowed this invasion to happen. Democrats defended the flood of illegal immigrants into this country on this floor, and that is why they are so bothered today by the SAVE America Act, a simple bill that is common sense to protect the integrity of our elections.

Voter ID laws are the only way that we can prevent tens of millions of illegals from voting in our elections.

America is about to turn 250 years old. There is so much that we have to celebrate in this great country, the greatest country in the history of the world. But it is crazy to think that we are gearing up for this epic birthday by debating voter ID laws.

The SAVE America Act is common sense. Voter ID is common sense. We have an opportunity this week to pass maybe the most commonsense bill ever passed by the U.S. Senate to protect our elections. I hope we do that. I hope we pass the SAVE America Act now. It is fundamental. I beg my colleagues to join me in supporting it this week.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF ANNA ST. JOHN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Anna St. John to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Ms. St. John's record reflects her partisan ideology and raises serious questions about her ability to impartially administer justice if she is confirmed. Her practice largely consists of challenging class-action settlements, and she has also made time to file amicus briefs in politically charged cases, in which she demeaned LGBTQ Americans and opposed diversity initiatives.

Her public commentary is also troubling. She has criticized what she calls "woke ideology." She has challenged First Amendment protections guaranteed by the Supreme Court more than 60 years ago in *New York Times v. Sullivan*.

In November 2021, Ms. St. John testified against bipartisan legislation ending forced arbitration in cases of workplace sexual assault and harassment. The legislation—the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act—enjoyed broad support among lawmakers from both parties.

Former Fox News host Gretchen Carlson was one of the leading advocates for the legislation. She is speaking out about Ms. St. John's nomination, including in an article in which she wrote: "While women around the country bravely shared the urgency of eradicating forced arbitration, St. John used her power and influence to gaslight these women and the public. She downplayed their stories and minimized their pain."

I oppose Ms. St. John's nomination. I ask my colleagues to join me.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. BRITT).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON ST. JOHN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the St. John nomination?

Ms. ERNST. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—4

Gillibrand	Smith	Tillis
Lankford		

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 action.

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if MAGA Republicans want to bog down the Senate over a debate on voter suppression, Democrats are ready. We are ready to be here all day, all night—as long as it takes—to ensure the powers of voter suppression do not win the day.

Let me be very clear: The SAVE Act is not a voter ID bill. It is, in every sense, a voter suppression bill. It could purge millions of American citizens from the voter rolls through a screening algorithm designed by Elon Musk's DOGE squad. It could disenfranchise over 20 million American citizens. It would kill online voter registration. It would kill vote-by-mail. It would kill voter motor registration.

What does any of that have to do with election security? It doesn't. It is a naked attempt to rig our elections.

The SAVE Act also rejects the most common forms of ID for anyone trying to register.

The way this works is that you don't have to be notified if you are kicked off the rolls. You show up on election day. They say: We are sorry, Mr. Smith or Ms. Jones. You are not on the rolls anymore.

Then they make it impossible to re-register. Certainly, on that day, you would lose your right to vote.

Driver's licenses are no longer enough. The most common ID forms for anyone to register are rejected in the SAVE Act for the first time in just about every State. Not even military IDs would be enough.

Can you believe that? That would be radical. It would force Americans to register only in person—something only 5 percent of Americans do today.

It punishes married women who change their last names.

The SAVE Act is not about protecting the vote. It is about making it harder to vote and easier to steal an election.

We know what the deal is here. Donald Trump said, if Republicans pass the SAVE Act, it will guarantee his midterm. The senior Senator from Utah said Republicans will lose power, likely for a long time, if they don't get the SAVE Act passed.

That is the whole game. It is cynical. It is beneath the Senate. It is beneath democracy.

Senate Democrats will never let this rotten bill move through this body.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany S. 1383.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message to accompany S. 1383.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 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 North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—48

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

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1383) entitled "An Act to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 1383.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 1383.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask the reading be dispensed with.

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

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4420

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. THUNE. I move to concur in the House amendment with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] moves to concur in the House amendment with an amendment numbered 4420.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask the reading be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4421 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4420

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk to the motion to concur with amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], for Mr. TUBERVILLE and Mrs. BLACKBURN, proposes an amendment numbered 4421 to amendment No. 4420.

Mr. THUNE. I ask the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect women and girls in athletics)

Strike title II and insert the following:

TITLE II—SAVE AMERICAN SPORTS**SEC. 201. AMENDMENT.**

Section 901 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d)(1) It shall be a violation of subsection (a) for a recipient of Federal funds who operates, sponsors, or facilitates athletic programs or activities to permit a person whose sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for women or girls.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth."

SEC. 202. DATE.

This title takes effect 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4422

Mr. THUNE. I move to refer the House message on S. 1383 to the Com-

mittee on Rules and Administration with instructions to report back forthwith with amendment No. 4422.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] moves to refer the House message to accompany S. 1383 to the Committee on Rules and Administration, with instructions to report back forthwith an amendment numbered 4422.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4423

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] proposes an amendment numbered 4423 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

Mr. THUNE. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4424 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4423

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE] proposes an amendment numbered 4424 to amendment No. 4423.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

Strike "2 days" and insert "3 days"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to say I support the SAVE America Act. And, yes, even if that means ending the only barely more than 100-year-old filibuster, the silent filibuster, I am still in favor of the SAVE America Act.

As we just voted to get on this bill, the Senate now begins a long and necessary process to advance the SAVE

America Act. It is a straightforward bill that provides proof of citizenship to register to vote in our Federal elections, along with voter ID, and validating mail-in ballots.

The purpose of this bill is about one simple thing: making sure only duly registered American citizens cast ballots in American elections. It is about making sure our elections are secure. Now, this shouldn't be controversial. Voter ID is supported by the vast majority of Americans—Republicans, Independents, and Democrats alike. Polls show that even around 70 percent of Democrats believe voter ID is common sense and essential for fair elections.

It is something most of us do every day. Show an ID to board a plane, to open a bank account, to buy alcohol, to get a hotel room, to purchase some prescriptions. Why should voting, the most sacred act in a Republic, be the only place where we don't ask for basic proof that you are eligible, that you are who you say you are?

Yet here we are, instead of passing this with overwhelming bipartisan support, maybe even by unanimous consent, we are forced into a drawn-out battle because no one on the other side will join us.

I thought a lot about this. You know what the real question should be? The real question that America should be asking their Senator: Why won't just 10 Democrat Senators cross the aisle and support simple voter ID?

We shouldn't be having to have filibustering debates or a thousand other rabbit holes we are about to go down. I would challenge those who, as Mark Twain once said, those who "buy ink by the barrel," to ask my colleagues across the aisle: Why won't you support voter ID?

Now, my colleagues across the aisle, they are clever. They won't answer that question. They won't answer the simple question: Do you support voter ID? They won't commit to that one issue.

Instead, they are going to pivot, and they will tell you what other part of the bill they don't like. They will want to dive into Parliamentary procedures and Senate lore and traditions, but they won't answer that one simple question: Do you support voter ID, just like 70 percent of your Democrat supporters do?

And if we can start there, if we start there that we both agree that we need voter ID, agreeing on that one issue, then maybe we could piece together a compromise on the rest of the bill. But when you reject even something as simple as voter ID, we should continue to ask them: Why won't you stand with the American people who want secure elections? Why won't you stand up and listen to the over 60 percent of Americans who are concerned about the integrity of our elections?

Now, we all know that noncitizens aren't supposed to vote. It is already illegal. But without proof of citizenship

at registration, we have no real safeguard. I could even hear President Reagan now, if he were here, talking to the American people: Trust but verify.

And that is what we want to do. That is what the SAVE America Act is all about. It fixes all these challenges. It requires documents like a passport, a birth certificate with ID, documents millions of Americans already have or can easily obtain. It protects our elections without disenfranchising a single eligible citizen.

Now, oh, by the way, to my colleagues across the aisle, if you have a concern or a better way to make our elections more secure and more fair let's move forward, and if that encourages and empowers every legal citizen the opportunity to vote, then I am with you. Let's work together to make our elections safe and secure.

This isn't, to me at least, about politics; it is about principles. It is about fighting for the American people who deserve elections they can trust. It is about making sure that my vote counts and isn't canceled by an illegal vote.

Our Republic depends on it. When the people lose faith that their vote counts and only citizens decide our future, we risk everything our Founders built.

I will wrap up by saying: I urge my colleagues across the aisle, listen to your constituents, listen to the 70 percent of Democrats who support voter ID. Come across the aisle. Let us pass the SAVE America Act quickly and get back to the people's business.

The American people are watching. They want secure elections. They want us to protect this Republic. Let's show them we can still work together on something so basic and so important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am going to have some comments on the SAVE America Act, and I think it is appropriate that we move forward on that legislation.

First, I want to talk a little bit about what has happened with the Department of Homeland Security. We are 32 days into a shutdown at the Department of Homeland Security. That is an unpleasant thought for a lot of our citizens in this country. Think about our TSA workers and our Secret Service agents who are out there working without a paycheck. FEMA, the emergency management response, FEMA has been suspended as communities in Tennessee, I know Michigan, the East Coast, places where we have had these storms, they are needing FEMA and the help that is there. But nope, because of the Democrats, the DHS is not funded.

Now, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, CISA, is facing staff shortages, increasing risk of cyber attacks from foreign adversaries like Iran, or the rest of the "axis of evil," Russia, China, North Korea,

and Iran. In that Agency, people are not showing up for work.

The Coast Guard, core operations of the U.S. Coast Guard, have been disrupted, maritime search and rescue, port security, patrols that stop drug traffickers, that has been disrupted. Why? Because our colleagues are refusing to fund the Department of Homeland Security. They have voted repeatedly to keep DHS shut down.

Now, I think it is irresponsible at any time to block these programs and this Department, but especially now. It is so reckless because of the elevated terror threats that we are seeing, especially from Iran, which, by the way, Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

Now, you can look at what has happened since Operation Epic Fury started. You had the shooting at a bar in Austin, TX. The attacker wore an undershirt displaying an Iranian flag. The FBI is looking at that as terrorism. On Thursday, a man from Lebanon plowed a truck strapped with explosives through a synagogue in Michigan.

Same day, you had an immigrant from Sierra Leone who opened fire on an ROTC class at Old Dominion University, killing one person, injuring two others, and we had some students who were able to apprehend this individual.

And the suspect was previously convicted of providing materiel support to ISIS, but he was released early in 2024 under the Biden administration.

Now, last Monday, the Justice Department charged two men for allegedly igniting homemade bombs outside the mayor's residence in New York City, and that was an ISIS-inspired attack.

Late last month, a Federal trial started against a Pakistani national who was allegedly recruited by Iran to kill a United States politician ahead of the 2024 election. President Trump was a potential target.

Now, it is important to note these are not isolated incidences; they are part of what we are seeing as a very unfortunate trend.

Over the course of his administration, Joe Biden and his administration allowed at least 18,000 known or suspected terrorists to enter our country. They had that open border. They liked that open border. They were working overtime trying to make illegal legal. And along the way, they let in 18,000—18,000—known or suspected terrorists. This does not include the more than 2 million "got-aways" that also came across that border without being apprehended.

I know that Homeland Security Investigations is working overtime to find these individuals to apprehend, detain, prosecute, and deport them, to get them out of this country, but there again, Homeland Security Investigations has a limited capacity to work on these threats because the Democrats have chosen yet again to shut down the Department of Homeland Security.

Now, one would think that addressing this issue would be important to

them, but we think that they continue to say they want more restrictions on ICE.

What this is really about, Mr. President, is our friends across the aisle have promised their base—promised them: Look, we are going to defund Federal law enforcement. You leave it to us; we are going to abolish ICE. You leave it to us; we have got a plan.

Their plan, it turns out, is to use not only the American people but TSA agents, FEMA personnel, Homeland Security investigators, the Secret Service, and the Coast Guard as pawns in their political game—pure pawns.

The President has tried to work with them. They had agreed to a funding bill, and then they changed their mind.

The thing that is so interesting about this is they keep talking about "Defund ICE. We need to defund ICE." ICE is funded through 2029. We did that in the Working Families Tax Cut.

What we have to look at is what the Democrats are doing is saying they would rather abolish ICE, open up our borders, and defund Federal law enforcement than actually provide for the security of our homeland—give paychecks that are earned, give these paychecks to the TSA, to FEMA, the Coast Guard, and CISA.

So I would encourage our colleagues to think about this and think about the danger and the risk they are causing to our homeland, the stress they are placing on TSA agents as they are trying to screen luggage to make certain that the flying public is safe, the inconvenience and the harm that are being caused to communities that really need FEMA to step in right now. They need to think about the work that is being done in communities all across this country by Homeland Security Investigations to apprehend drug traffickers, child predators, and to keep our communities safe.

S. 1383

The other thing that—and my colleague from Kansas had mentioned the SAVE America Act, and I am delighted we are finally on this bill. This is another area where we are watching the Democrats come full display of their loyalty to illegal aliens that are in this country. I mean, they are on it. Give them a choice between protecting the rule of law and protecting U.S. citizens, and they are going to choose somebody illegally in the country every single time. That is really a disappointment to me because the SAVE America Act is something that 83 percent of the voters in this country support—83 percent. These are not my numbers; these are numbers from public polls. Anyone can go and look these up.

It is common sense that you are going to show a photo ID many times a day to prove that you are who you are, and it is common sense that everyone should show a photo ID when they go to the ballot box to cast that vote. Indeed, they should be a citizen and prove they are a citizen if they are going to register to vote, thereby protecting "one person, one vote," protecting the integrity of our election system. This is a way that we help ensure that we preserve the system.

You know, in Tennessee where I reside—my State, my wonderful State is ranked No. 1 when it comes to election

integrity. We make certain that our voter rolls are cleaned up. We make certain that voter ID is enforced. We have accurate registration lists and verification of citizenship—all common sense.

If you are going to cast a ballot in our elections, be a citizen. Let's prove that you are the person showing up to cast that vote. And be respectful of the situation.

You know, Mr. President, we have said: Let's make it easier to vote and harder to cheat so that we protect the integrity of the system, so that we eliminate fraud, and so we preserve confidence in our election results.

Well, it is just nonsensical that our colleagues across the aisle oppose this. Can you imagine that? Eighty-three percent of the American people say: You are right. Let's show an ID. Let's be a citizen if we are going to vote.

But, no, our Democrat colleagues oppose it. They want to make it easier for noncitizens to cast ballots.

In fact, 14 States in this country—and by the way, these are overwhelmingly blue States—14 States do not require any documentation whatsoever to go cast your vote. Can you imagine that? You just walk up, claim to be somebody, and you vote.

You look at States like California and New York, which are home to more than 3½ million illegal aliens combined, and that is what you are seeing—making it easier to cheat, making it easier for noncitizens to vote.

You know, I think that you look at these issues, and you realize that our friends across the aisle, Mr. President—they might have been picking the wrong fight. People want DHS funded. They want the SAVE America Act passed. They want the integrity of our elections to be protected. And I think it is imperative that we come together on this floor and that we pass the SAVE America Act and make certain that we know who is voting and that they are a citizen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, later this year, American citizens across the country will exercise one of their most valuable and sacred rights: the right to vote—a right that has been hard-earned and fought for from the founding generation of our Republic to today.

How was the right to self-government, the right to vote secured? It was secured by American colonists who rejected the royal edict and hurled tea into Boston Harbor, declaring “no taxation without representation.” It was secured by ordinary men who seized their muskets and fired the shot heard around world at Lexington and Concord. It was secured by Continental troops who marched to the fields of Saratoga and the coastline of Yorktown, repeating those immortal words of Patrick Henry: “Give me liberty or give me death.”

For nearly 250 years, Americans have cast their votes for leaders at every level—from local officials, to State representatives, to the President of the

United States. Every Member of this body is here today because we were elected fairly and honestly and given a mandate by our constituents to serve them here in Washington and to protect the liberties and freedoms our Founders fought to preserve.

The power of the ballot box determines the course of our Nation, the history we are writing, and the freedoms we continue to defend. And while no single ballot in isolation may seem decisive, together, the votes of the American people shape the course of our Nation and the course of history.

But it is worth remembering that our voting system did not begin as it exists today. When this Nation was founded, the right to vote was limited, and over time, through debate, sacrifice, a bloody Civil War, and constitutional amendment, the right to vote was quite properly expanded. The 15th Amendment prohibited denying the vote based on race. The 19th Amendment guaranteed women the right to vote. The 26th Amendment lowered the voting age to 18. At every stage of our constitutional amendment process, the goal was the same: to ensure that the right to vote belonged to American citizens and that it was exercised with integrity.

While our system has evolved, one principle has remained constant: Elections reflect the will of the American people. For a right so sacred, for a privilege so hard fought, it is shocking, it is tragic how neglected and vulnerable the protection of our elections has become.

That is why I am here today on this very floor urging the Members of this body to pass the SAVE America Act. It says that when you register to vote in a Federal election, you must provide proof that you are a citizen of the United States and you must provide photo ID to vote. In simple terms, that is it.

This is not some radical, politicized, or weaponized piece of legislation designed to restrict Americans from voting; it is a commonsense measure that protects the integrity of our elections by ensuring that American citizens and only American citizens are voting in them.

Legitimacy in a democracy rests on two pillars: first, the mechanical integrity of the system to produce a valid result, and second, the public's confidence in that system. If either one fails, the system falters. If both fail, the system collapses. A system that cannot be trusted is a system that cannot govern.

If you look around the world, between two-thirds and three-quarters of countries require some form of identification to vote. Why? Because it safeguards the integrity of their elections and reinforces public trust in their system.

So it begs the question: Why hasn't the United States fully embraced this standard?

Well, for the last several months, we have heard claim after claim about

how this legislation would somehow inhibit people from voting, that requiring identification is discriminatory, and that the American people do not support voter ID.

Our Democrat colleagues are fond of bellowing into the TV cameras that photo ID to vote is Jim Crow—they tell us with mock earnestness. Now, I will admit our Democrat colleagues should be experts in Jim Crow because it was Democrat politicians who passed the Jim Crow laws. It was Democrat politicians who founded the Ku Klux Klan. It was Democrat politicians, decade after decade, who enforced discrimination, separate-but-equal poll taxes, and a host of other laws designed to prevent African Americans from voting.

But do you know who has rejected their disingenuous claim that a photo ID to vote is Jim Crow? The Supreme Court of the United States—the Supreme Court of the United States.

The State of Indiana passed a photo ID law requiring that you show a photo ID to vote, and a group of leftwing plaintiffs filed litigation challenging that. The case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

At the time, I was the solicitor general of the State of Texas. I led a coalition of States before the Supreme Court defending photo ID to vote, and the leftwing plaintiffs made the same argument that our Democrat colleagues make today—that requiring a photo ID to vote would somehow disenfranchise minorities.

The Supreme Court, by a vote of 6 to 3, rejected their argument. The author of the majority opinion was John Paul Stevens. John Paul Stevens was one of the great liberals on the Court. He was not a conservative. He was not of the rightwing. He was the leading liberal for years on the U.S. Supreme Court. He rejected that claim, and he pointed out that when someone votes illegally, they are stealing the votes of legal voters; they are stealing the votes of American citizens. The Supreme Court explained that when photo ID laws have been implemented, minority participation in the election goes up, not down, and the Supreme Court explained that requiring photo ID enhances the integrity of an election and the integrity of democracy.

Now, our Democrat colleagues don't want to acknowledge any of those facts, and I guess it is understandable because the American people have heard their specious arguments, and they have rejected them. Eighty-one percent of Americans support requiring a photo ID to vote.

But my Democrat colleagues might say: What about African Americans? Well, about three-quarters of African Americans in the United States support requiring a photo ID to vote.

How about Hispanics? More than 80 percent of Hispanics in America support requiring a photo ID to vote.

How about Democrats? Here is an astonishing statistic: If you get out of elective office and you ask a Democrat

on the street, 70 percent of Democrats in America support requiring a photo ID to vote.

The one group that doesn't is elected Democrats in the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House.

By the way, the premise of their argument that minorities, if you require a photo ID to vote, are not going to be able to vote is, frankly, insulting.

I am proud to be an Hispanic American. I have been Hispanic all my life. Do you know what I have in my wallet? I have a driver's license. I look at my colleagues across the way, and I feel confident they have driver's licenses in their wallets as well.

Hispanics are not morons. African Americans are not morons. When you claim minorities can't figure out how to get a driver's license—well, gosh, what do you need a photo ID to do right now in America? You need a photo ID to purchase alcohol or to purchase tobacco. You need a photo ID to gamble or to purchase lottery tickets. You need a photo ID to go into a bar. You need a photo ID to get on a plane. You need a photo ID to rent a car. You need a photo ID just to drive a car—not even to rent a car but to drive a car. You need a photo ID to apply for government benefits. You need a photo ID to enroll in college. You need a photo ID to open a bank account. You need a photo ID to check into a hotel. And—I have to admit this is my personal favorite—you need a photo ID—actually two photo IDs—to shovel snow in New York City. These are routine, everyday activities.

The Gallery is full. I feel confident everyone in the Gallery who is not a child has a driver's license. By the way, you wouldn't be admitted to the Gallery if you didn't. And I feel confident every Member of this Chamber has done just about anything I listed—well, except shoveling snow. I am not convinced many of my colleagues have shoveled snow, although they do shovel other things.

The question is not whether Americans are bright enough to obtain a photo ID. We know they can, and we know they do. The real question is, Why would we not require the same level of verification for something as consequential and vital as voting? Are our Democrat colleagues saying voting doesn't matter or is it something else?

Voting is not just another everyday activity; it rolls around every year or few years, and it is the vehicle that protects the principles of our Republic. It is safeguarding what matters.

This legislation is necessary because there are individuals and systems that can undermine confidence in our elections if proper safeguards are not in place. One of the most apparent ways that we have seen is through the masses of illegal immigrants that our Democrat colleagues let in through open borders for over 4 years.

During the Biden administration, more than 12 million illegal immigrants flooded into this country—the

vast majority through my home State of Texas. Now, understand that was not an accident. That was not something the Democrats could not stop. That was their desired outcome. How do we know that? Because the instant President Trump was sworn into office for his second term, illegal border crossings plummeted 99 percent overnight.

The Democrats said: No, Joe Biden can't secure the border. He needs new legislation.

We now know that was a lie. It was objectively false, and they knew it was false.

Well, if they could have secured the border for 4 years, they chose not to. They chose to let murderers into this country. They chose to let rapists into this country. They chose to let child molesters into this country. They chose to let gang bangers into this country. They chose to let terrorists into this country. We have had four radical Islamic terror attacks in the last 2 weeks.

Why would the Democrats choose to allow more than 12 million illegal aliens to invade this country? I am going to suggest the obvious reason: because the Democrats look at those illegal aliens and they want them to cast a vote for Democrats in Federal elections.

Why are the Democrats lined up and saying: No. No. No. Under no circumstances should we test to see if you are an American citizen. Under no circumstances should we require photo IDs.

There was one activist a few years ago who filmed himself going into a DC polling place.

The DC polling place said: Sir, what is your name?

He said: My name is Eric Holder.

Now, this activist was not the Attorney General of the United States at the time, but yet DC handed him a ballot and said: Mr. Holder, please cast your vote.

The Democrats are lined up in this Chamber because they want our elections to be insecure; they want voter fraud to be rampant and to be easy.

Ask yourself: Do the American people have a difficult time buying a beer? Do they have a difficult time getting into an R-rated movie? Do they have a difficult time getting on an airplane? Well, yes, because the Democrats have refused to fund the TSA, so there are long lines right now. But the lack of a photo ID is not an impediment that stops people from flying.

This debate is about something very simple: Do our elections matter? Does our democracy matter?

And, boy, I have got to say that that is a phrase the Democrats love—that they are defending democracy. It is interesting that their voices usually drop an octave when they say that. They clutch their pearls—and that is just the men. "Defending democracy" is what they say.

Ask yourself: Why are they not concerned at all about the 12 million

illegals whom they let into this country voting illegally? I will submit that Occam's razor provides that the simplest solution is usually the right one. The simplest solution is very clear: The Democrats in this body want illegals to vote. They want power enough that they are more than happy to undermine democracy to try to seize power. I get that from their personal self-interest, but it is not in the interest of the men and women they represent; it is not in the interest of the people of America.

This bill is rightly called the SAVE America Act. If we were voting on the merits of what was good for America, what was good for democracy, and what was good for American citizens, the vote would be 100 to nothing.

Although I would note that on the other side of this building, at the State of the Union Address that the Presiding Officer was at and that I was at, we saw why our Democrat colleagues are so adamantly opposed to this bill. President Trump turned to the Democrats on the right side of the floor of the House, and he gave them an opportunity to demonstrate with absolute clarity.

He said: If you agree our first priority should be to fight for American citizens and not for illegal aliens, please stand.

Every single Democrat in Congress remained seated.

I would note, as we are on the floor today, of the 47 Democrats in this body, only 1 is here on the floor, but a whole lot more were on the floor during the State of the Union, and every one of them chose to remain seated because they could not support the statement that we need to support American citizens and not illegal aliens. That is why they oppose the SAVE America Act. It is because they want to be handed power over this country by the illegal aliens they let into this country.

That is why we need to save America, and it is why I urge every Member of this body to pass the SAVE America Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about something that unifies our country.

Here in the Senate, often, we talk about things we disagree on. We are going to talk today about something Americans agree on. The American people overwhelmingly want election security. They want our border to be secure. They want our elections to be secure. They want to feel that their government is acting with integrity and fairness and to have a representative government that protects its people.

I rise in support of the SAVE America Act. For many of us, this isn't a new fight. My good friend Senator LEE and I have been working to pass the SAVE America Act for years because

we know this isn't just about election security; it is about protecting the future of our Nation for all American families.

The SAVE America Act is very simple. First, you need an ID to vote. Second, you need proof of citizenship to register in our elections. These aren't controversial ideas. In fact, a vast majority of Americans, no matter their party affiliation, their race, their gender—you name it—support these ideas. Why wouldn't they? Americans want to know that our elections are both free and fair and that our democracy is safe. They believe in our country and that citizens can make good decisions. They want to know that their votes count and are not diluted by someone who is not a U.S. citizen.

Americans deserve that because this question cuts to the very core of who we are as a country. To survive, a republic needs its citizens to know and trust that their vote is secure, that their vote matters, and that they can trust the outcome. People have died for the sacred right to vote, and that sacred right should not be diluted by non-U.S. citizens.

And if Americans can't trust their elections or who is legally allowed to vote in them, then they can't trust that their elected officials actually represent them.

Yet, somehow, congressional Democrats, funded by George Soros and forever cowering to the radical left, are ignoring—they are ignoring—the will of the American people. The minority leader tried to say this bill was a “dagger at the heart of our democracy,” even though the mayor of the largest city in the State he represents requires not one but two forms of ID just to shovel snow. I would say not passing this bill and allowing illegals to vote and the integrity of the election to be undermined is the real dagger.

That is why the SAVE America Act is crucial. The fact is, so much of what Democrats are saying about this bill simply—it is not true. Democrats are lying to all of us, and they know it. It is the same tired playbook they have tried time and time again.

So let's unpack their arguments. You are going to hear them say this is “Jim Crow 2.0.” Yep, that is right. We have once again reached the point where Democrats claim the thing that they don't like is racist.

It is wrong, it is insulting, and the Democrats know it. Everyone knows it, but they hope the American public won't notice. And here is why this is so wrong: What Democrats are really saying is that the 83 percent of Americans who support voter ID laws are all racist.

And let's remember, it was the Democrats who passed Jim Crow law, not Republicans.

Everyone who is paying attention can see what they are doing. Democrats are openly calling most of America racist, and the mainstream media acts like that is normal.

But the Democrat attacks on hard-working Americans aren't done. After they call us all racist, they double down and say: The SAVE America Act is an attack on married women.

There has been a lot of talk recently about what is fair to women in America. The Democrats have said that the SAVE America Act is bad for married women. Liberals have also claimed that biological women need to shut up and accept that biological men can compete against them, shatter their dreams—sometimes their bodies—and steal their championships. Democrats somehow say that is fair, but it is sure not fair to biological women.

And the most deranged members of the radical left have now convinced Democrats in Congress it is OK to tell little girls that God made them wrong and allow the mutilation of their bodies before these children can truly comprehend or consent to the consequences of hormone therapy or gender reassignment surgery.

Now, I am not a woman. I can confidently say that because, unlike the Democrats, I know what a woman is. And I am married to an amazing woman. We have raised two incredible, smart, and strong women who now have families of their own. They are independent and can make decisions for themselves. They don't need anyone to tell them how to run their lives. And I am lucky enough to have one little girl in my life who calls me grandpa. Even at 5, she is very comfortable telling me what to do.

While I am not a woman, I do have pieces of advice for the Democrats: One, stop telling Americans that women can't figure out how to register to vote because you want to keep illegals voting. Women are smarter than Democrats think they are, much smarter. And, two, stop destroying women's sports by telling Americans that women can physically compete with biological males.

Stop telling Americans that just because a little girl wears shorts instead of dresses and wants to hang out with the boys instead of the girls that it is OK to permanently disfigure her. It is disgusting, and every Democrat here knows it, but they are too cowardly to tell the truth to the radical lunatics running their party.

Thankfully, when we pass the SAVE America Act, we will end these dangerous attacks on women by Democrats for good.

Look around and acknowledge what the Democrats are doing. They are saying to women: Don't support the SAVE America Act. You will never figure out how to register to vote again.

Do you realize how insulting that is? Do you think I would ever look at my wife or my daughters and granddaughter and think they aren't smart enough or, in the case of my granddaughter, won't be smart enough to do what they need to do?

Now, I am not going to stand here and let Democrats in Washington claim

that these amazing, strong, smart women cannot figure out how to register to vote. This is nothing but a made-up talking point from Democrats because they want to allow illegals to vote. It is real simple.

I am tired of hearing Democrats use every excuse in the book to allow illegals to vote in our election.

Now, we all know the Democrats can't win on their radical ideas, so they have to try to weaponize our elections. That is wrong.

Americans who are perfectly capable of showing their ID to board an airplane, visit a doctor's office, and prove their citizenship deserve secure elections.

We are only here today because Democrats have created a system in this country that has totally failed the American people, and Americans want secure elections. We must make sure Americans can have the faith that their vote counts and that the election results reflect the will of the people. We must put simple standards in place that a majority of Americans approve of and that will help Americans trust that our elections are free and fair.

And why wouldn't Democrats want to make certain that elections in the United States of America are free and fair? We want that for every other country in the world. Why wouldn't we want it here?

The fact is, over the last decades, Democrats' priorities are totally out of whack with what Americans want. Under the Biden administration, Democrats purposefully opened our borders, and our country was flooded by illegal aliens, the same illegal aliens that Democrats are now putting above Americans as they do everything in their power to destroy this bill.

Then when Democrats saw how enraged the American people were about their wide-open borders and all of the crime they were allowing into this country, the left claimed we needed new laws to fix it. As we all know, in the case of our border security, that was a complete lie.

But for election security, we do need new laws because the ones we have aren't strong enough. And President Trump, on his own, can't secure elections.

President Trump secured our border, and now, Congress must secure our elections.

The facts are simple: Illegal aliens should not vote in American elections. We know it is happening, and we must do everything we can to stop it.

Democrats still say it is racism, but they say everything is racism when they don't like it. Is it racist that before I board a plane, I have to show my ID? Is it racist that in order to buy certain medicines, apply for a job or a bank account, check into a hotel, rent a car, purchase a lottery ticket, order a drink at a bar, or get into the DNC convention—or shovel snow for goodness' sake—that we, as Americans, have to show ID? Absolutely not, and anyone telling you otherwise is lying.

Now here is my simple question for Democrats: Why should voting in our elections, something that dictates the direction of our country and is essential to building trust in government, have a lower ID standard than buying a six-pack of beer or a lottery ticket? The answer is simple: It shouldn't.

When the minority leader isn't calling minorities and women too stupid to show ID and register to vote, he has claimed that we can't pass this bill because President Trump is trying to rig the elections.

He is lying, and he is telling on himself. The minority leader and the Democrats think that stopping illegal aliens from voting in American elections is rigging the system. Now that is a remarkable thing for them to admit, but when they tell you who they are, we have to listen.

What is clear to me is Democrats don't think they can win. They don't think they can win unless we allow people who are not legally allowed to vote to cast a ballot.

Clearly, the minority leader is more concerned about what passing the SAVE America Act would mean for his future as majority leader than he is about election security, faith in our democracy, or delivering for the American people.

Democrats, George Soros, and the radical left will try to convince you that their opposition to this bill is about fairness and integrity; it is about protecting American democracy. Don't listen to them.

It is not fair for illegals to vote in American elections. I don't get to vote in the French elections or the British elections or the Canadian elections.

It is not fair to let men compete in women's sports. It is not fair to allow the mutilation of children with gender reassignment surgery for minors.

The fact is that fairness, integrity, and our future are on the line. It is this bill that will protect them, and it is what Senator LEE and I and so many others are fighting for today as we once again call on this body to pass the SAVE America Act. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, there are some issues we consider so logical and so obviously rooted in common sense that I have got to believe the American people are sitting at home and wondering why Congress is even having this debate. And such is the case with the bill the U.S. Senate is considering this week, the SAVE America Act.

Let me be clear. The bill before us today requires proof of citizenship when registering to vote, and it requires photo ID in order to vote in a Federal election.

If you come to my office here in Washington, DC, you will see fairly quickly I am an avid outdoorsman. There are a lot of hunting and fishing

pictures on the walls that say a lot about the great State of Montana.

As many know, Montana has some of the very best outdoor recreation in the country, even the world: hunting, fishing, backpacking, you name it.

I remember growing up in Montana. My grandpa and my dad had a fly rod in my hand when I was still a little boy before fly fishing was cool even, back in the early seventies. And I remember fly fishing before Brad Pitt discovered it with Robert Redford and made the movie "A River Runs Through It." If you want to fish in Montana, if you want to fly fish, if you want to get a tag to hunt, you want to shoot a mule deer or an elk or a white tail, you know what you need to get a tag? To get a fishing license? You have got to produce a valid ID. To go fishing, you need a license. And to get a license, you need a valid ID.

Now, nobody has a problem with this when it comes to America's great outdoors. So why does the left protest so hard against ID requirements to vote?

It is an explicit law that only American citizens can vote, and all Americans have an ID or the ability to easily obtain one.

The right to vote and participate in democracy is a core principle of this great country. It is what gives us our freedom. It is what gives us a voice. But when election integrity is compromised, our institutions suffer, and the people don't trust the outcome of elections or their government anymore.

And that is why 95 percent of Republicans and 71 percent of Democrats support having voter ID. It is truly that bipartisan. I am not sure there is a more bipartisan issue right now facing us in Washington.

People want to restore trust in their elections and their government. So why is this so hard?

I will tell you why it is so hard. Our friends on the other side of the aisle are captive to their radical base. I grew up as the grandson of a Democrat in Montana. My dad was a Democrat growing up. But this is a different kind of Democrat today. The radical base is steering the party that we debate with across the aisle here in Washington.

Remember under Joe Biden's border catastrophe, at least 10 million—and that is a conservative number—10 million illegal aliens poured into the country unchecked. And in many States, these illegal aliens are eligible for driver's licenses, which makes it easier to illegally register to vote.

And that is why you need to have proof of citizenship. That is why the SAVE America Act is so important. Requiring a photo ID is basic. It is common sense. It is not controversial. It is time to get this done.

I am very grateful to my colleague Senator MIKE LEE of Utah and my colleague Senator ERIC SCHMITT of Missouri who have been fighting so hard to get this bill across the finish line.

I urge the rest of our colleagues to get on board, support the SAVE Amer-

ica Act, stand up for election integrity, and vote for the SAVE America Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, there are moments when the Senate is asked whether it will merely manage decline or whether it will still govern. This is one of those moments.

What is before us today is a test, a test of whether the Senate still understands what it is for, a test of whether article I of the Constitution still means what it says, that Congress possesses the power to write the rules of the road, a test of whether this body still exists to defend the American people, strengthen the Republic, and use constitutional authority for the common good.

That is why I rise in support of my substitute amendment to the SAVE America Act, and it comes before us at a fitting hour in our Nation's life. America is approaching her 250th birthday. We were taught in schools to think of the American founding as though it were unimaginably far away, sealed off behind glass, but 250 years is smaller than it seems.

President John Tyler was born during the First Congress in 1790. He was born in the very infancy of this Republic. President Tyler's last living grandson died only last year. That is how near the founding it still is and how recent this great experiment in self-government remains. And if the founding is that near, then our duty is that much clearer.

We are not the curators of a dead tradition. We are the stewards of a living Republic. Our Republic was founded on a daring claim: that free people could govern itself—not that a free people could drift forever; not that a free people could live off inherited greatness while its leaders refuse every hard question; not that a free people could dissolve every boundary, mock every limit, and still expect to remain free. No. The American founding rested on a harder truth: Liberty is fragile, and so it requires structure. Man has fallen, and so self-government requires virtue. A republic requires citizens, truth, and the courage to defend both. That is why this bill matters.

Some will say that this bill and all of its titles don't belong together; that five-pronged, three-titled amendment is just a package or a wish list or a collection of unrelated priorities. But that only proves they do not understand what time it is, and they don't understand what our Republic is.

The five prongs and three titles of this amendment are united by one central question: Will American law still defend the basic conditions of self-government?

Title I, Save American Voter, says the franchise belongs to its citizens and voting should be secure.

Title II, Save American Sports, says that women's sports exist for women and girls, acknowledging biological reality over a legal fiction imposed by elite ideology.

Title III, Save American Children, says that children should be protected from irreversible harm, not handed over to the appetites, fashions, and confusions of the age.

Citizenship, reality, responsibility—those are the basic truths a nation must defend if it intends to remain a nation.

Let me begin with title I. A republic has the right to distinguish citizens from noncitizens. That should not be controversial. That should not even be difficult. The vote is not a global entitlement. The vote is not a participation trophy for anyone who happens to cross our borders. It is one of the central privileges and duties of political membership. If citizenship means anything, it must mean something here first. That is why requiring proof of citizenship to vote in Federal elections is foundational. It is a minimum requirement. It is so common sense in a self-governing nation because a people who cannot say who belongs to the polity cannot remain a polity at all.

The same is true for voter identification. We are told endlessly that asking a voter to identify himself before casting a ballot is somehow oppressive, somehow unreasonable, somehow outside the bounds of democratic decency. The American people know better. That is why over 80 percent of American voters support voter ID.

Identity verification is ordinary in every serious sphere of life. We require it for small things, for lesser things, for trivial things. There is nothing wrong with requiring lawful voters to identify themselves before participating in the elections of those who will govern the United States of America. Honest elections require lawful voters, lawful ballots, and lawful verification.

And then there is the question of mail voting. For too long, this country has been told to accept a system of mass mail-in voting as though it were the settled inheritance of the American Republic. It is not. In its current form, mass mail-in voting is a modern phenomenon, and in many places it is a direct holdover from the COVID era. COVID is over. The emergency has passed. The extraordinary accommodations of that period should not become the permanent architecture of American elections.

For most of our history, the presumption was simple: If you could vote in person, you voted in person. You appeared before lawful election officials. Your identity could be verified. Your ballot could be secured. The chain of custody could be protected. The people could trust what they were seeing. That is not cruelty. That is not oppression. That is what republican government looks like.

Now, of course, there are those who are unable to vote in person, and they should be helped. Military voters should be helped. Individuals with disabilities should be helped. Those who are sick should be helped. Caregivers

with real burdens should be helped. Those with genuine, qualifying hardships should be helped. But accommodation should remain the exception, not the organizing principle of the whole system because voting is not a consumer transaction.

The highest values in election administrations should be on legitimacy, public confidence, and trust. Not so long ago, even Democrats shared these values. The Carter-Baker Commission, formed by former Democrat President Jimmy Carter and former Republican Secretary of State James Baker III, made many of the recommendations that my amendment promotes: voter ID, proof of citizenship, and limiting mail-in balloting. Democrat Senators may not support these provisions, but their voters do. Seventy-one percent of self-identified Democrats support voter ID.

A free people should want its elections to be visible, accountable, and resistant to bad actors. That is what title I is trying to restore—not the denial of lawful voting but the integrity of lawful voting; not confusion but confidence; not looseness but legitimacy.

I know this issue because I have experienced these fights myself. When I served as Missouri's attorney general, I fought in court and defended our State's election integrity laws against a coordinated assault from the left in 2020. The left's dark money-funded election superlawyers did not merely challenge one rule here or there; they challenged the very idea that we can get serious rules to protect the ballot, deter fraud, preserve order, and sustain public confidence in the vote. They came for the safeguards that made elections credible. They came for the principle that absentee and mail voting must be governed by rules. They came for the simple proposition that the people are entitled not only to cast a ballot but to trust the system by which ballots are cast, handled, counted, and certified.

And Missouri won. We defended the truth that election law is the framework by which free people govern itself. Election law isn't the arcane inconvenience to be brushed aside whenever the left sees a tactical advantage. We defended the proposition that deadlines matter because finality matters. We defended ballot security because legitimacy matters. We defended verification requirements because public trust matters. We defended the authority of the people acting through their laws to insist that elections be honest, orderly, and worthy of confidence. And Missouri won.

That fight has taught me something I have never forgotten: The fight over election integrity is about more than mechanics or procedure; rather, it is about whether we still have the moral confidence to defend the elementary conditions of self-government—because once every safeguard is treated as suspect, once every verification measure is denounced as oppression, once every

effort to secure the ballot is caricatured as hostility to democracy, what is really under attack is the public's faith that elections are fair, lawful, and real.

So when I speak today about voter ID, proof of citizenship, and limits on mass mail voting, I do so from experience. I have fought these battles before. I have seen the pressure campaign to dissolve the rules that protect the vote. I have seen how quickly common sense is denounced when it stands in the way of ideological ambition. I have seen when the public officials are willing to stand firm and that, when you do that, you can win.

That is what title I and Saving American Voters is all about. It is not extreme. It is not novel. It is the restoration of an old and necessary principle that, in a republic, the vote must be lawful, secure, and worthy of confidence of the American people.

Now, let me turn to title II. If the law cannot defend women from men acting as women, it cannot defend reality. Women's sports exist because men and women are not the same. That is biological reality. It is moral reality. It is the plain reality on which fair competition depends. And when the law refuses to recognize that reality, the category of women's sports becomes fraudulent.

Girls are told to surrender fairness. They are told to surrender privacy. They are told to surrender safety. They are told to surrender recognition. And they are told to do all of this so the ruling class can flatter itself for its own moral sophistication. The State has no right to impose that sacrifice.

I have two daughters. They both love sports. But this is more than just about sports; it is about whether the law is still going to reflect reality or whether it will be conscripted into enforcing a falsehood. It is about whether a civilization still possesses enough moral competence to say: What is the truth? And that is not cruelty. It is about whether we still believe that girls deserve a realm of fair competition that is actually their own. A serious republic does not ask girls to bear the cost of elite confusion. A serious republic tells the truth about the world and builds laws on that truth. That is what title II does.

Now, let me turn to title III. A decent nation protects children. Children are not ideological property. Children are not experimental material. Children are not raw material for the ambitions of activists, for the cowardice of institutions, or for the self-indulgence of adults who have forgotten the law exists first to defend those who need protection.

There are lines that a humane society does not cross. Irreversible medical interventions on minors for ideological ends are one of those lines. A child in distress needs guidance, protection, patience, love, stability, truth. A child in distress does not need a civilization so morally exhausted that it answers confusion with scalpels, sterilization, and

permanent medicalization. The burden of uncertainty should favor preserving the child, not fundamentally remaking the child.

Too often, our ruling class has preferred euphemism to honesty here. We are told this is compassion. We are told this is care. We are told that the enlightened position is to ratify distress with irreducible harm.

It is not compassion to mutilate what cannot be restored. It is not compassion to medicalize what may pass. It is not compassion to turn children into lifelong patients before they are old enough to understand what is being taken from them, permanently. That is not mercy; it is cruelty masked in liberation.

A republic worthy of the name protects children from adult passions, from ideological capture, and from the fashionable madness of the age. That is what title II is trying to do.

And that is why these three titles belong together—because this amendment is more than a list of 80–20 issues that the American people are demanding. The SAVE America Act is the defense of the elementary truths on which republican life—small “r”—still depends: America belongs to its citizens. Men and women are real. Children should be protected from permanent harm. If a nation will not defend these truths, it will not defend truth for very long. If a nation will not defend these boundaries, it will not keep any boundary for long.

And that brings me to this Chamber itself. Americans still love “Mr. Smith Goes to Washington” for a reason. They love it because they still want to believe something about this institution. They want to believe that the Senate, a uniquely American invention, can be used for the common good. They still want to believe that conviction can defeat cynicism. They want to believe that a man can come here and fight for his country rather than merely manage its decline.

Well, here is our chance to prove that hope is not foolish. The Senate is not a museum. It is not a Visiting Angels retirement village for proceduralism. It is not here merely to confirm nominees, pass omnibuses, and fund the legislative achievements of long dead men while the living Nation loses confidence in its own government.

The U.S. Senate is here to legislate in defense of the American people. The Senate is here to draw lines. The Senate is here to make judgments. The Senate is here to govern.

So the question for this Chamber is really simple: Are we here to govern or merely preside? Are we here to act for the people or simply explain why action is impossible? Are we here to use power rightly or merely to congratulate ourselves for the restraint while the country pays the price?

Because the stakes here are plain. We see distrust in elections. We see the collapse of moral clarity. We are seeing girls told to accept injustices as

progress. We are seeing children offered up to the altar of extreme ideology. We are seeing a governing class that refuses to draw any line into the line that has already been erased.

And republics don't usually fall in one dramatic stroke. They weaken when truth is no longer defended. They weaken when citizenship is diluted. They weaken when institutions lose the will to govern. They weaken when elites ask ordinary people to live under conditions they themselves know are disordered. They weaken when men without chests hold positions requiring virtue and enterprise.

That is what this debate is really about. It is about whether the country still defends first principles. It is about whether the Senate understands what time it is. It is about whether constitutional power can still be used for the common good.

And as America approaches her 250th birthday, that question becomes even more urgent. A republic approaching its quarter millennium should not be content merely to remember greatness. It should show that it still knows how to govern itself. It should show that it still has the strength to defend citizenship. It should show that it still has the courage to defend women. It should show that it still has the decency to defend children.

Article I is supposed to be the branch of action. This body exists to do more than simply fund legislative achievements of long-dead men. The legislative power exists to make judgments, draw lines, and defend our country. The Senate should prove that it still understands that duty.

So pass this bill to restore integrity to Federal elections. Pass this bill to defend women and girls. Pass this bill to protect kids. Pass this bill to show the American people that we can still act in the defense of the American people. Pass this bill because these are commonsense reforms. Pass this bill because Americans are tired of being told that their most basic moral instincts are somehow beyond the pale. Pass this bill because a nation serious about the future doesn't apologize for governing itself. Pass this bill because America 250 should be more than some commemoration. It should be a renewal.

The age of excuses should end. The era of drift should end. The Senate should act, and the SAVE America Act should pass.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next 60 minutes be under control of the Democratic leader or his designee, followed by the next 60 minutes by the Republican leader or his designee, and, finally, the next 60 minutes be the Democratic leader or his designee, and following that, the majority leader or his designee be recognized.

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

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, you know, when it comes to broken promises, it seems like Trump and Republicans have raised every price that they ever said they would lower—costs on groceries with Trump's sweeping tariffs, the largest tax increase on working families in American history.

They sent energy costs higher by canceling clean energy projects. They sent gas prices skyrocketing by starting a new war in the Middle East.

And they let healthcare premiums skyrocket for patients—doubling, tripling, and more through sheer indifference.

And now, desperate to avoid the wave of angry voters to whom Republicans had promised to lower prices and no new wars, Republicans are even going to raise the cost of voting, because their “Save Trump Act” would nickel and dime Americans who are just trying to vote but have to slog through one new Republican roadblock after another.

Under the Republicans' bill, one of our citizens' most basic freedoms now comes with a price, and it comes with a lot of brandnew hurdles that serve no purpose but to trip people up. Some folks will have to shell out for a copy of their birth certificate. Some will have to get a passport. That is 165 bucks, by the way.

Some folks will have to travel hours away to register in person, costing time and travel fare or maybe gas costs, which Trump is now sending through the roof.

And that is not the half of it.

Just consider all the people who will face new challenges just to vote for no good reason. If you are a student who just moved to start college, Republicans will make it harder for you to vote because, if this bill passes, you will need to show a photo ID and proof of citizenship in every single State. But a student ID won't count.

Many Tribal IDs also won't be enough under the new Republican restrictions.

If you are a married woman who changed her last name, like me and the overwhelming majority of moms across the country, Republicans will make it harder for you to vote because you would now have to bring an ID, proof of citizenship, and some additional paperwork showing your name change. That could affect 70 million people.

If you are a senior who just moved into a new nursing home and has mobility issues, Republicans will make it harder for you to vote because you can no longer just register online or by mail. You now have to show up in person to show your papers.

Voting will also be harder for rural families far from any place where they could show their papers and register in person.

In Washington State, we have a lot of families who might have to take a

ferry just to register to vote. Or heaven forbid you are someone living abroad, maybe working for an American company or working at a nonprofit or even serving our Nation as a diplomat. You might just have to buy a flight all the way back home so you can register.

And the inconvenience doesn't stop at registration because Republicans will make voting by mail harder for everyone as well. They are going to require you to photocopy your ID when you apply for that mail-in ballot, and then they are going to require another photocopy when you send in your mail-in ballot—at least as long as Trump doesn't get his wish to scrap mail-in voting altogether.

And if you are someone who doesn't know where your birth certificate is or doesn't have easy access to it, or if you are one of half of Americans who doesn't have a passport—that is 146 million people—you are going to have to pay fees and fill out a lot of paperwork.

And what is the Republican plan for when the State Department gets flooded with a recordbreaking number of passport applications, by the way, because there is no money for surge capacity in this bill?

What are Americans supposed to do when their paperwork gets delayed for weeks on end or, heaven forbid, the President just slow-walks it?

And, by the way, under the "Save Trump Act," there is a perfectly awful chance that you do everything right and still get robbed of your vote by Republicans because this bill pushes States to rely on a DHS-verification tool that just frankly is a dumpster fire.

States that have tried this got results with huge errors where DHS was wrongly saying many citizens were not citizens. The Trump administration tool has already wrongly advised States to purge lawful voters from their voter rolls.

But the biggest problem with this bill goes to its roots because the biggest problem is that Republicans' own premise is built on a lie. Trump has been lying for years now about our elections—lying about winning in 2020, lying about winning in States like California, lying about crazy conspiracies that have been debunked, time and time again.

He has been debunked by Republican elections commissioners. He has been debunked by thorough news investigations and carefully conducted audits. He has been debunked by million-dollar legal cases where other liars were sued for defamation.

That has not stopped Trump.

Instead of calling out the lies like so many of them once actually did, first, Republicans just started ignoring this, and then they started normalizing them. And now, many of them are repeating these lies and conspiracies.

Our elections are free, and they are fair. That is beyond question. Anyone who values our democracy should be

shouting that from the rooftops. But instead of defending our democracy, instead of defending our elections from misinformation and conspiracies and a President who has stated, quite directly, that he wants to take control over the elections, Republicans are joining Trump in the same sort of ruse he pulled to rile people up on January 6.

The biggest fraud here is this: Republicans who know their agenda is unpopular; Republicans who know that when entrusted by the voters to fulfill their promises, all they have done is break them, raising prices, starting new wars; Republicans who know they will not keep their majorities in a free and fair election. So they are pushing for this bill instead.

This is not how elections work. This is not how America works. In this country, we fight for change with our voices and our votes. And if Republicans think for a second Democrats will let them take away people's votes, they better buckle up because you can bet we will use our voices to block this bill for as long as it takes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in standing up to protect Americans' constitutional right to vote and to fight back against this administration's most recent attack on access to the ballot box.

Instead of making the case to Americans about policies and what you want to do and why you think it is important to have say—the tariffs that in my State are wreaking havoc for our farmers with more yet to come—this legislation would actually be an end-around of the voting process.

This legislation would make it hard for a whole bunch of American citizens to vote, which appears to be the endgame, given what the President has said about it. By his own admission, he said that passing this bill "will guarantee the midterms."

That is not my quote. It is an exact quote by the President of the United States.

The SAVE America Act will kick American citizens off State voter rolls. And how is this happening?

Well, this is a complete invasion of the privacy of voters. It makes secretaries of state give the voter rolls—the voter information, the voter data—to the Department of Homeland Security, as in the same Agency that brought us ICE, and then run that information through some kind of DOGE-like system that is somehow going to spit back out to the States which voters they should kick off the voter rolls.

Then the bill also creates the bureaucratic hurdles that make it complicated and costly for American citizens to register to vote or change their registration, particularly for the 69 million women who have chosen to change their name when they got married. Why should they be penalized?

And millions of American citizens don't have the specific document required by this bill to prove citizenship because this bill won't allow for driver's licenses anymore. You have got to produce other documents like a passport or a birth certificate.

More than half of Americans don't have passports, and they cost at least \$165 to get. Birth certificates can cost \$30. In my State they are \$24. And they can take tons of in-person time to obtain.

For anyone that has ever had that experience, maybe for some other purpose that you have to get your birth certificate, it is not always as easy as people think.

And this bill also requires people to register to vote in person at their election offices, effectively ending proven and popular methods of registration used by millions of Americans in Democratic- and Republican-led States all across the country, like online and mail-in registration.

This would be a significant barrier for registration for millions of voters, especially for people in rural areas who have to drive hours to get that registration completed now. Rural Americans in many places would be forced to travel an average of about 4 hours round trip, and some voters in Alaska and Hawaii would be forced to take a flight just to register in person.

This bill creates chaos. Maybe that is not the motivation of some of my colleagues, but I do believe it is the motivation of the President, who basically said:

It will guarantee the midterms.

It is designed to make it harder for American citizens—certain American citizens—to vote. It is designed to undermine mail-in voting and lay the groundwork for this obsession that the President seems to have with banning mail-in voting, while in some States, it is actually the prevailing way that people vote, including a number of red States, as the Presiding Officer is aware.

Because the administration can read the polls, they see that there is major concern in America with high costs. So instead of maybe passing a different bill, which we could call the Save Americans Money Act, which would be doing something about these gas prices when we know it has happened—now gas prices are up \$30 or \$40 a barrel, \$30 to \$40 a barrel, and every \$10 in increase for a barrel of oil is a \$450-a-year increase for the average American family. For the second time ever, the average price of diesel has reached \$5 per gallon. Look at what is happening with groceries. Electricity prices were up an average of \$110 last year on Americans' bills. Healthcare costs continue to skyrocket.

There are things we can do. We have a bipartisan housing bill we just passed in the Senate that needs to get passed in the House. We have some permitting bills. I was long a supporter of Senator Manchin's proposal on permitting. We

could get that done. We should be adding energy to the grid. This idea that somehow we are going to think that North Dakota wind is bad in a pretty red State and then ban grants that would have brought that wind, which was good for North Dakota and Minnesota, to Minnesota with a power company in northern Minnesota—that is one of the grants that had gotten singled out and I think has just recently gotten released.

All that stuff are things that we could do to help Americans with their costs. So we should be working on the Save Americans Money Act instead of this.

So I urge my Republican colleagues to change course and stand with us and stand up for the fundamental right to vote. That always used to be bipartisan.

The idea that you are going to make all these people reregister or register with an expensive passport or birth certificate, that they can no longer use their driver's license, that their private voter data is sent to Homeland Security to go through some Elon Musk-designed computer system, is not what people want in this country right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, the average price of a gallon of gas in New Jersey right now is \$3.68. A month ago, it was \$2.94. In that month, we have started a war with Iran—a war that this administration doesn't have a plan to end; a war that has cost 13 American lives and has injured hundreds of others. That is putting America's reliability as a partner further in doubt and driving up costs across the board at a time when costs are already too high for most Americans.

Now, what are we doing about this crisis and trying to address it? What are we doing to drive down the costs that the American people are demanding that we take on? What are we doing to make it easier for Americans to pay their bills and to be able to provide for their families?

We are here on the Senate floor today debating a bill that Donald Trump wants because he is afraid. He knows that he is at the weakest point of his Presidency. His approval numbers are way down. And in a little more than 230 days, voters will go to the ballot box for the midterm elections.

So instead of working to lower costs, instead of ending this war and getting gas prices down, instead of focusing on working families, Donald Trump has Senate Republicans here to peddle a bill because, in his words, "It will guarantee the midterms"—a bill, by the way, that, again to quote Donald Trump, "supersedes everything else"; a bill that Trump says he would "close government" to ensure it passes.

So clearly we see something that is not what the American people want to see get done, not of benefit to the American people at a time when they

are demanding that we take on the high cost of living, but instead something that is good for Donald Trump.

So while you are cutting back on driving because gas prices are skyrocketing and you are seeing prices at the grocery store go up because it is a lot more to transport food and you are rethinking that vacation because the CEO of Delta just said airline tickets are about to go up too, Donald Trump and congressional Republicans are focused on passing a bill that drives up your costs.

The SAVE America Act is an awful bill, and I will talk a little bit about this bill in a moment. But what this bill represents at its core is Donald Trump's extreme agenda when it comes to elections. It is an election that is built to, in Trump's own words yet again, "guarantee the midterms." He said that Democrats won't be able to win for 50 years if this goes through.

He is saying the quiet part out loud about why he is doing this, and that is because his agenda has three core tenets: No. 1, let the billionaires buy the elections; No. 2, let politicians pick their voters; and No. 3, price people out of voting.

Let's start with the insane amount of big money in our politics today. According to a report last year by the Brennan Center, the amount of dark money spent in Federal races in 2024 was nearly \$2 billion. That is hard to imagine, just unfathomable amounts of money being poured into our elections right now. It is nearly double what it was just 4 years prior in 2020.

That dark money represents a real threat to the integrity of our elections. A report published last month by the Campaign Legal Center highlights the way that the super-rich can use our weakened campaign finance laws to basically bribe public officials. The report exposed the story of a man named Velutini, a Venezuela billionaire who was charged with criminal bribery and was later pardoned by Donald Trump after his daughter gave \$3.5 million to a Trump-supporting super PAC.

These kinds of straw donor actions can take place when we have a campaign finance system that has been built for corruption. That is exactly what we are seeing—a system working exactly how it is supposed to, which is marginalizing the American people and average working families and lifting up the power of billionaires and corporations. It is a system that has been built so billionaires can buy the candidates they want, and if they get into trouble, they can buy themselves a get-out-of-jail-free card literally.

If my colleagues are concerned about election integrity, getting \$2 billion of dark, corrupt money out of our system would be a good place to start, and I think you would find bipartisan support to be able to take that on.

The next place is getting rid of a system that Donald Trump has supercharged where politicians get to pick their voters, not the other way around like the Constitution says it should be.

Gerrymandering has never been weaponized like what we are seeing right now under the direction of Donald Trump. He is so afraid of losing the House of Representatives that he has threatened Members of his own party who didn't want to go along with his plans. Just a few months ago, he targeted Republicans in Indiana, saying that "anyone that votes against redistricting . . . will be met with a MAGA primary."

So we have a system, championed by Donald Trump, that lets billionaires buy the elections and politicians pick their voters. So where does that leave you? Where does that leave the American people? Well, if this bill passes, it will make it harder for people to be able to vote. It will make it such that they have to pay for a constitutional right of voting, which is so sacred to our democracy.

Voting shouldn't cost people extra money; it shouldn't require you to be able to have a poll tax. For millions of Americans, they will need to potentially scramble to get a new form of ID.

Maybe my colleagues will say: Oh, just go get a passport.

Well, look, a new passport costs \$165, and to expedite it in order to vote costs much more than that. And we need to be able to deliver that quickly, so that is an added \$22 on top of that. That is nearly \$250 for your right to vote. That is nearly \$250 when this administration has hurt our ability to get healthcare, be able to fill our tanks with gas, be able to get groceries. They made it more expensive across the board, and they have given massive giveaways to those at the very top.

This bill will make it harder for married women to vote if their current legal name doesn't match the name on their birth certificate. How does that make sense? It will make it harder for seniors and young people to vote by throwing up new restrictions on mail-in voting, requiring seniors and others to have to go and register in person when they haven't had to do that before.

Why is it that we are trying to make it so hard for Americans to be able to vote? But then you realize that is the point. That is actually the point of this all. Trump wants to make it harder for you to vote and make it easier for him to have his bidding. Why else did we see this happening right on the tail of so much of what he was doing in pushing gerrymandering so blatantly against our Constitution and our laws? Trump wants to make it more expensive for Americans to vote because that makes it easier for him and his supporters and his donors to be able to buy their way to power. He wants congressional Republicans to cease doing anything else and pass this bill so he can "guarantee the midterms."

Well, that is not what the American people want. They want a choice. It is their choice. They are supposed to be in the driver's seat of their democracy. The American people want our elections to be secure.

I want our elections to be secure. I want to make sure that voters can have full faith in our electoral process.

I have been fighting for years to get dark money out of our politics, to reverse Citizens United, which I believe is going to go in the history books as one of the most dangerous moments of our democracy. That has unleashed a torrent of dark money and problems and this nightmare we are seeing ourselves in.

I have been fighting to end the practice of letting politicians pick their voters since my first day here on the House side. I even stood up to my own party in New Jersey by suing to fix a broken ballot that let power players pick candidates, not voters.

This is not about partisanship; this is about delivering for the American people and preserving their ability to be able to drive our democracy.

We have real work that we can do to make our elections safer, get rid of this dark money, and make sure the voters get to pick their politicians. But that is not the bill that we have before us, and that is not the bill that Donald Trump is pressuring my colleagues here to push through. Instead, this bill is a distraction from Donald Trump's failures and is a desperate attempt to compensate for the power he sees slipping away right between his fingers.

We can't let him do this. We can't let him distract us from the real problems our constituents are facing today of \$3.68 a gallon in New Jersey for our gas. Let's put an end to this distraction. Let's stop doing Donald Trump's bidding to hold onto power and do what we are supposed to do—to focus on what the American people want—which is, right now, so clearly about lowering the prices that they see skyrocketing every single day. That is what we are here for, and that is what they want us to do.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, let me, first of all, thank my colleague and friend the Senator from New Jersey who, I think, has brought us a fresh voice, has incredible energy, and is somebody who has a history of working extraordinarily well on national security issues.

I agree with virtually everything he just said in that this is a bit of a distraction. I think part of the reason it is a distraction is that, at the end of the day, this President has frankly refused to acknowledge that the American people's will in 2020 was not to rehire him. He cannot accept the legitimate outcome of the 2020 election. Despite officials from his own administration calling the 2020 election the most secure in American history, the President continues to promote unsubstantiated claims of voter fraud, and that is after investigations from multiple courts and the States' attorneys general and election officials from both parties strongly declaring that there was no

evidence to support allegations of substantial fraud. Simply put, the 2020 election was certified, litigated, and affirmed.

Tomorrow, we are going to hear from some of the intelligence officials as our committee takes on the worldwide threat assessment where, unfortunately, senior intelligence officials seem to be still focusing on relitigating the 2020 election rather than making us safe for 2026 and 2028 because the truth is, after all of these years, the President and his allies haven't been able to find any evidence of legitimate voter fraud in past elections. As a matter of fact, there have been studies ad nauseam that show millions and hundreds of millions of votes and that the number of people who were undocumented and voted by mistake were in the single digits.

Now, they are looking forward to the effort that is on the floor right now toward suppressing and wrongfully influencing future elections through this so-called SAVE America Act.

Again, I know the Presiding Officer and my friend from Wisconsin and others are going to say I am going to go over the top, so let me just use the President's own words. The Presiding Officer comes from Utah, which has a proud history of States' rights and local control, but in the President's own words, he wants Republicans to "take over" election administration, going so far as to say Republicans ought to nationalize the voting. If there were ever an "Alice in Wonderland up is down and down is up," that is what is happening.

Again, I don't know if this comment led to her firing, but before he fired her, the President's DHS Secretary Kristi Noem pushed for the passage of the SAVE America Act while stating that her goal was to have the right people voting so we can elect the right leaders. I mean, this sounds like it comes out of some dystopian novel or 1930s advocacy. I just don't get it. We all know that the strength of our democracy depends on voter participation and access to the ballot box. I have been doing this, I guess, long enough that I remember when things like "motor voter" and "let's make it easier to register" were all bipartisan.

Unfortunately, contrary to the name the SAVE America Act, this legislation undermines the very foundations that it claims to protect. This bill would impose sweeping requirements that would make it extremely difficult for eligible voters to participate in our democracy. New voters, married women, and servicemembers would face additional hurdles when registering to vote. That is because, under the SAVE America Act, Americans who have voted for years and have had no question about their citizenship would have to go back and provide documentary proof of citizenship to register to vote in Federal elections.

Let me say, at the front end, that I support voter ID. We have voter ID in

Virginia. I don't think you should be able to vote without showing a legitimate ID, but under this bill, that so-called reasonable policy would put in place requirements that are so stringent that it would mean if you don't have access to the right documentation, like a passport, you wouldn't be able to vote for the President of the United States.

The truth is, according to the U.S. State Department, only half of all Americans possess a passport. That means, if this bill passes, half of all American citizens would not be able to provide one of the primary acceptable forms of documentation that would be required to vote under the SAVE Act.

Additionally, under this bill, States would be barred from accepting online and mail-in voter registrations unless the applicant also presented proof of citizenship in person. So this is somebody who made the choice to change their name who is now 85 years old and who has to go back and find a birth certificate or get a passport and has to show up in person to kind of get registered again, even though she has been voting for the last 50 years with no question about her citizenship.

This effectively, frankly, guts the online and mail-in voter registration processes that are available across many States, which creates, I think, an unnecessary burden for all voters, particularly rural voters, senior citizens, and individuals with disabilities disproportionately.

I see my friend from California here. It has been States in the West, whether it is Oregon or California or Utah, that have used these tools to get more people involved. In fact, these efforts don't make our elections more secure. All this does is disenfranchise millions of eligible voters.

My view is that the goal of the SAVE Act is more about cutting out voters and suppressing the vote than it is about saving anything going forward. We are having this debate, and we are going to probably go through lots of procedural antics that most folks won't understand. I just wish that my Republican colleagues would come back to what I think we should be spending all of our time on. If we are going to spend all night, let's focus on funding the TSA, FEMA, CISA, and the Coast Guard.

Frankly, I believe we need to fund all of the folks at the Customs and Border Patrol who aren't assigned to interior immigration enforcement. So, last week, Senator MURRAY and Senate Democrats attempted to say: Hey, we have got to debate about ICE, and we have got to debate about some of the CBP people who are doing domestic enforcement. If we can't come to an agreement there, let's fight over that, but let's not make sure that we hold all of these other folks hostage.

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues blocked five separate bills that were offered by Senate Democrats that would have fully funded all of the components of DHS. I think about our

hard-working TSA officers who, thank goodness, got a paycheck on March 12—a partial paycheck—but now, they are going unpaid.

The amazing thing is that this is kind of a crisis that doesn't need to be a crisis. The fact is, last July, my Republican colleagues voted to give the Department of Homeland Security a slush fund worth nearly \$170 billion. Of that funding, \$75 billion was a blank check to ICE, providing the Agency with a budget larger than of most global militaries. I actually think the ICE budget is now bigger than the French military's, and I know it is bigger than the FBI's budget. You know, the truth is that \$75 billion could actually fund ICE for the next 7 years without any additional appropriations.

I am here today because I and my Democratic colleagues are fighting to ensure that all the funding that is used for immigration enforcement will no longer be used in inappropriate ways. I think even most of my Republican colleagues have acknowledged that what happened in Minneapolis kind of went off the rails in that we were seeing ICE agents literally abuse and brutalize Americans and disrespect basic human dignity.

The unfortunate thing is, under this administration, ICE has been turned frankly into kind of a secret police that I believe has waged enormous violence against Americans. I know in my State, that of the daily quota of people they have to pick up, 80 to 85 percent have never violated any other law other than coming into the country and most of them are going through an amnesty process that was set up. You know, we have seen the images of ICE ripping apart families and arresting moms as they drop off kids to daycare. As a matter of fact, I know that I tried to do some oversight, which is part of my job, and it took a lot of hoops to get through to even do that oversight.

I believe, because of these actions, all of our citizens are less safe. So we have got to make meaningful reforms to ICE which I don't think are outrageous, like requiring body cameras, making sure that immigration enforcement officers show their faces and identify themselves, and making sure there is proper training and upholding traditional use-of-force standards. These are the same requirements that my local law enforcement has to deal with every day and has had to for years. These aren't new. These are commonsense, basic accountability measures that, as I said, our State and local police abide by because that is how you keep communities safe.

Unfortunately, so far, the White House doesn't seem to see it that way. They continue to drag their feet on negotiations at the expense, frankly, of the TSA, FEMA, the Coast Guard, and Customs and Border Patrol—not the folks doing interior enforcement—who are not getting paid. That doesn't make any sense.

As a matter of fact, we have even seen tools where, in the last shutdown,

the administration didn't decide to cut off Global Entry or TSA PreCheck because those are actually funded by separate fees, but suddenly, they decided to amp up the political pressure and close off those programs. Now, thank goodness, because of pressure from the public, the Trump administration has reversed course and restarted the Global Entry program, but it should have never been suspended in the first place. We have got to get these folks paid. Take yes for an answer. Take yes for an answer.

As I pointed out earlier, with \$75 billion for ICE, it is not going to stop. We have got to get the reforms in place. So let's keep the negotiations going. We ought to get them done. I am going to make sure that the TSA agents at Dulles, at National, and at airports across my Commonwealth get their paychecks.

As a State on the ocean, I want to make sure that the Coast Guard gets their paychecks. We have been hit hard by Hurricane Helene, and I want to make sure FEMA gets funded. And CISA—the Cybersecurity Agency, which is one of the things that guards against foreign malign influence—has been decimated by this administration. As we go into an election season where I extraordinarily fear foreign interference, close to 50 percent of the personnel have been cut or eliminated.

So we can do better. We must do better.

We can debate the SAVE Act, which I think is, again, about voter disenfranchisement, not voter safety or integrity, but I do think, while we debate this, why not go ahead and take yes for an answer and fund all of the other components of DHS so those folks who help protect us day in and day out get their paychecks?

Let's reopen these critical Agencies. Let's acknowledge that ICE has a \$75 billion slush fund that we could complain about as Democrats—Democrats do—but it is the law of the land. They have the resources. In the meantime, why hold up the pay of these Americans who are doing so many things to keep us safe? I think those folks deserve better. I think we all deserve better.

I guess I am a little old-fashioned. I actually think, back to the subject at hand, you know, our elections are better if more people participate. I am welcome to having more folks participate—citizens participate. Citizens participate. Unfortunately, this SAVE Act cuts back on a whole lot of Americans that will be disenfranchised simply because, oh my gosh, they did the radical thing of changing their name when they got married; or, oh my gosh, they were willing to join our military; or, oh my gosh, they are aged and they don't want to spend 150 bucks to get a passport.

Our country deserves better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I, too, rise in opposition to S. 1383, the so-called SAVE America Act. I think a better name—more, actually, representative of the contents of the bill—would be the “Save Republicans From the Consequences of Their Actions Act.” I have some other choice names for it, too, but not exactly appropriate for the Senate floor, so we will stick to the SAVE Act just to be short.

Last year, President Trump and Republicans in Congress promised the American people that they would lower costs—costs across the board but specifically healthcare costs. If you recall, just a few months ago, they promised to do something about the 15 million people that were being kicked off their health insurance when they failed to extend the Affordable Care Act tax credits. They failed on that promise.

The administration's war on clean energy has driven electricity prices up 13 percent since Trump took office. So much for “all of the above” energy strategies. So much for energy dominance. The price of oil is up 40 percent and gasoline is up 25 percent and rising in these few short weeks since Donald Trump initiated an unauthorized war on Iran. That is the largest single-month increase in gas prices since Hurricane Katrina, just for context.

I don't need to tell you all that many people are struggling with the rising cost of rents or their mortgages while the Speaker of the House reportedly told House Republicans that the President thinks “No one gives a [bleep] about housing.”

Well, President Trump, listen to this: 76 percent of renters and nonhomeowners, asked in a recent poll by the National Association of REALTORS, say that they don't think they will ever be able to afford to buy a house.

This Senate, at least, passed the bipartisan ROAD to Housing Act last week. If our colleagues in the House got their act together, that bill has the potential to do a whole lot of good.

In addition to healthcare and housing, Congress urgently needs to act and deliver long overdue disaster assistance for California and a number of other States and regions affected by disaster this last year.

So there are a lot of truly pressing issues for us to be focusing on and taking action on right now, but are we addressing any of those on this to-do list this week? No. Not even close.

Instead of focusing on the affordability crisis or trying to save us from endless wars, Senate Republicans are once again doing Donald Trump's bidding. This time, they are making his conspiracy-fueled election takeover bill their top priority.

Since we have launched into this debate over the bill, we have already heard all sorts of debunked lies and misinformation and misrepresentations repeated over and over again by our Republican colleagues.

Let me make a few things very clear. First of all, no, this is not a simple

voter ID bill. The latest version of the SAVE Act is a Trojan horse, actually. It is a voter suppression bill filled with poison pills and designed to change the rules of the election as we are in the middle of primary election season already and the November election is on the horizon. And for what? For partisan political gain?

The President himself has said that if this bill passes, Republicans will “never lose a race. For 50 years, we won’t lose a race.”

The lead sponsor of this bill in the Senate has stated:

Republicans will lose power—likely for a long time—if we don’t get the SAVE America Act passed.

Colleagues, it doesn’t get any more obvious than that.

Here is how it works. The voter ID rhetoric is actually a bait-and-switch. The SAVE Act does not allow Americans to use their driver’s licenses or other common forms of ID to register to vote. That is right. The SAVE Act does not allow Americans to use their driver’s licenses or common IDs to register to vote. The SAVE Act would require a passport in order to vote—something that half of Americans don’t have, not to mention the \$165 it costs and a 4- to 6-week wait time to get one.

If you are one of the 148 million Americans who do not have a passport but you are otherwise eligible to vote, you will need to, what, maybe dig through the attic or call your parents to try to find your original birth certificate—that is if you still even have it.

According to 1 survey, there are an estimated 21 million people who lack access to these documents. That is a big chunk of the electorate.

If you are one of the 69 million married women who chose to change your name when you got married, tough luck. Your name doesn’t match your birth certificate anymore, even if you can find the birth certificate, so now you have to jump through additional hoops and bring your birth certificate and your marriage license to the election office. That is your recourse.

Just to make this even more of a burden, the SAVE Act mandates that you bring these documents—and let me quote from the bill—“in person to the office of the appropriate election official” and sign an affidavit. That is what the text of the bill says. As a result, millions of women are going to face additional barriers to the ballot than their spouses have to face. When does anybody have time for that? Some evening after work? Maybe on a weekend? That is assuming elections offices are open in the evenings and on the weekends. So more than likely, someone is going to have to take time off from work to register to vote or renew their registration.

What does the SAVE Act mean in practice if, Heaven forbid, this passed and was signed into law? Bottom line: It is the complete elimination of voter registration as we have known it for

decades. The voter registration drives we see in communities and on college campuses—gone. Online voter registration or mailing in a voter registration card—which you sign under penalty of perjury, by the way—gone. Motor voter—remember that element of the 1993 National Voter Registration Act that was passed with overwhelming bipartisan support of Congress creating an opportunity to register to vote when you are doing your business at the department of motor vehicles? That, too, gone or thrown into chaos.

It seems like the goal is actually very, very clear: Let’s eliminate opportunities for people to register to vote and have their voices heard in the elections.

All of that was in the original SAVE Act, which, thankfully, this Senate had the good sense to not even take up, but this new version of the bill that is now before the Senate—we know it was rushed through the House of Representatives and now seems to be rushed through the Senate without a single hearing, and this version is even worse. How can it get worse? Folks, you are going to love hearing this. This bill mandates that all 50 States share their confidential voter roll information with Trump’s Department of Homeland Security. That is right. Let me say that again. Every State would be required to hand over confidential voter data to Trump’s Department of Homeland Security, which, by the way, does not run elections. If they have any role in elections, it is to assist State and local governments with cyber security, but they are backtracking on that responsibility.

By the way, this is the same Department of Homeland Security which has been found in violation of 200 court orders since December alone just in Minnesota alone. This is who the SAVE Act would entrust to take over voter list maintenance for every State in the Nation? For what purpose? So that political appointees of this administration can go through the lists—again, every voter in every State—and order people that were on the voter rolls to be purged from those lists.

This isn’t a hypothetical, folks. The fact is they are already test-driving this power with States that are choosing to cooperate. At least 12 States have provided the full statewide voter registration lists, including driver’s license information and Social Security information. They either did it voluntarily or they succumbed to the political pressure by Donald Trump. The results of this demonstration should alarm all of us.

ProPublica, the Texas Tribune, and other sources have found that, rather than identifying noncitizens on the rolls, DHS is sending back to the States false positives, directing people to be removed from the voter lists who are actually U.S. citizens and eligible to vote. That is right. This lawless and incompetent DHS is already trying to purge thousands of eligible Americans

from the voter lists. If this bill were to pass, it would supercharge those efforts with actual congressional authorization.

Is that what your goal is? Is that what you intend to do? Not on my watch. Not on my watch.

But there are even more troubling provisions in this voter suppression bill. If you listen to Donald Trump or, better yet, just check the White House website, it says, and once again I quote, “No Mail-in ballots,” with only a few, very narrow exceptions.

So this bill would also ban no-excuse absentee voting, which is widely used in 28 States across the country. And according to reports, President Trump himself has voted by mail. Over 48 million people voted by mail in 2024. That is about one in three voters across the country—or ballots cast across the country.

And let me be clear about something: This is not a blue State versus red State dynamic. The list of States that have used vote-by-mail include Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, North and South Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

But, sadly, too many Republicans simply cannot admit that “Emperor” Trump has no clothes when it comes to elections.

Why are we doing this? I have to suspect that there are two primary reasons for this voter suppression effort. First, because President Trump and the agenda that this Republican majority has supported has been so bad—not just so unpopular but so harmful to American families—that they are trying to limit who can have a voice in the midterm elections.

The second, clearly, is Donald Trump’s obsession with the Big Lie and his refusal to accept the fact that he lost the 2020 Presidential election. Now, we all know that, after losing the 2020 election, Donald Trump encouraged a mob of his supporters to storm this building—the U.S. Capitol—including this very Chamber, on January 6. Why? Because every single court case, every investigation and recount, confirmed the same exact thing: Donald Trump lost that election. But he felt like he needed to stop the peaceful transfer of power.

Thank God for all the officers, for the more than 15 Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, as well as the National Guard, who protected the Capitol that day. And I am grateful—I hope we are grateful on a bipartisan basis—that we have a plaque commemorating their heroism finally hanging in the Capitol.

But here we are, 6 years later, and Trump is as obsessed as ever with vengeance: pursuing vindictive prosecutions of his perceived enemies, seizing ballots in Georgia because I guess he is still trying to find those 11,870 votes, sending subpoenas for the 2020 Cyber Ninjas audit—yes, the one that

found that Joe Biden won Arizona by even more votes than originally thought.

So, make no mistake, the SAVE Act isn't about protecting our elections; it is about attacking them.

As the Presiding Officer can tell, I am strongly opposed to this anti-voter bill, and I will do everything in my power to defeat it. And, no, I am not alone. Senate Democrats will fight this voter suppression bill—tooth and nail, day after day, night after night—for as long as it takes to protect our democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, 250 years ago—actually, 250 years ago this summer—we wrote a letter to good King George III, and in that letter we now call the Declaration of Independence, we complained about foreign intervention into the activities of Americans, the colonists. We wanted the right to be able to actually control our own destiny. We wanted the ability to be able to speak for our own future, decide for our own families, without having foreign interference coming across an ocean to be able to affect us. We determined that we wanted to run our own Nation.

Now, 250 years later, we still want to run our own Nation. We want to make our own decisions without foreign interference, without anyone stepping in and telling us, as Americans, whom we are going to be and what we are going to do. We disagree with each other enough; we don't need individuals from the outside coming in and expressing their opinion. We handle this as Americans, and the way that we do that is with elections.

Elections have been routinely done through the history of our country since our Constitution was ratified in 1789. It has been a distinguishing mark of the United States. We are the oldest functioning constitutional democracy in the world. And in our Republic, we choose representatives. Those representatives speak on our behalf. And if we decide we don't like them for whatever reason, we choose different representatives. But we, as Americans, choose our own path through our own elected officials. That is what we do, and we do it on a regular, consistent basis.

Now, in the earliest days, it was literally a wooden box and slips of paper. We have improved that over the years. Step by step, decade after decade, we have done elections a little bit differently.

Now, they are done differently all over the country on it, but we have some basic foundational rules that are also guidance. We choose our own leaders, but we do it the right way.

It wasn't always that way. But as we have improved, we make our elections more transparent, better, with faster responses, giving more trust.

Many folks in my generation will never forget the photograph of staring

at a hanging chad from the Bush election, with a person in an election board closely staring through a magnifying glass to try to figure out if there was a dimple on a piece of paper.

There is no election system in the country that does chads anymore because we all determined that is a terrible idea. It is just a bad way to be able to prove the intent of a vote. And the whole younger generation has no idea what a hanging chad would even be because we no longer do that anymore.

We protect the right of all individuals to vote—every American citizen—because in the middle of the 1960s, we as a Nation passed the Voting Rights Act, determining that every person in America has the right to be able to vote and that would be protected, that if there would be any jurisdiction in the country that would violate that, a Federal court could literally step in and just say: No, every single citizen of the country would have a protected right to vote.

In fact, if you want me to read it to you, the Voting Rights Act actually begins with this simple statement:

All citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people, in any State, Territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other territorial subdivision, shall be entitled and allowed to vote.

But the simple statement that the Voting Rights Act begins with—"All citizens"—what is interesting is the Voting Rights Act protected the ability of a court to step in and say, if some citizen is not being allowed to vote, the courts can step in and mandate that that actually occur. But it did not set up a way to say: Are you a citizen at all?

It was just assumed that only citizens would actually be the ones to vote. It is the baseline of the civil rights in that time period and in the Voting Rights Act—that our elections would be protected only for citizens. But this is a "trust" bill in that way, and there is no "verify."

What we as Republicans have brought—we have brought out of the House and brought to the floor of the Senate—is not a "trust" bill. It is a "trust and verify" bill. It takes the next step from the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which mandated that it would only be citizens that would vote.

In fact, there was a penalty actually established that if you are a noncitizen, you get up to 5 years in prison if you vote in a Federal election. That is a big deal.

The challenge is, we have no way to be able to track it. That doesn't actually occur anymore. So we want to just be able to bring a most basic thing that all Americans can agree on—we would hope—that only citizens of the United States would be able to vote, and that before you register to vote, we would have some way to be able to show you actually are a citizen. That is, the Vot-

ing Rights Act of 1965 said that all of those American citizens have a protected right to be able to vote, and they can choose to—hopefully, they do—or not. That is up to them as an American.

So let me walk through this.

The first thing I wanted to be able to say is thank you to the State election board folks and all the State election officials and the poll workers that work for every election all across the country. We lose track of this at times.

It takes almost three-quarters of a million people just to run a Federal election—three-quarters of a million. Those are poll workers. Those are poll watchers. Those are State election officials. Those are folks that work behind the scenes in every county and parish, in cities and municipalities all across the country—three-quarters of a million people just to be able to pull together an election.

Those folks are incredibly important to be able to protect the most basic rights of individuals to be able to vote and to protect the basic right of one person, one vote.

Let me share this with this body. Here is how we do it in Oklahoma. In Oklahoma, we have one of the highest rated, secure election systems in the country—in the country. And we encourage people to come out and to vote and to participate in the entire process.

Some of the things that we choose to do is, in all of our polling locations and every time ballots are actually presented, there is always a Republican and a Democrat poll worker that is always there in every area—always—so both parties are always represented in that and so everyone can look at each other and constantly be able to check the system.

We are still old school. We do a piece of paper and a marker, and you mark your ballot. And it runs through an optical scanner, and it registers that ballot was actually fully handled. So at the end of the night, if there is any challenge at all to that ballot, we can go back to the paper ballots and actually count them by hand and be able to verify all of them, because we want to make sure, every single election, we can verify every single vote, every single time.

In fact, at the end of the night, when machines are finished, we literally print out on a piece of paper and post on the window of the election board location, wherever this was that the election was being held—we actually publicly post, at the instant the election was done that night, at 7 p.m., so that it is public information immediately how many votes were taken in this area. So if, at some point, it shows up later that it was a different number, everyone could see it.

We have full verification through the entire process.

In Oklahoma, we have voter ID at every single location, at every single vote. How do we do it? If you vote in

person and you show up to vote on election day, you pull out an ID, and you show an ID—every single person.

If you vote early, absentee—we have that all over our State in county election boards everywhere—as you walk up, you have to pull out an ID and to be able to show that ID to vote.

And if you are going to mail in your ballot, we welcome that, but you have got to show ID when you actually do it. That means actually going into a location where you can get a notary that, before you put your ballot in the mail, it shows your envelope, you show the ID, it shows on the envelope who the person is on it, and you actually have a notary to do that.

We have voter ID at every single stage. We don't allow ballot harvesting at all. We are a very, very secure system, and we are proud of that. We want every single person to be able to vote, but we want to make sure it is one person, one vote.

We occasionally still do have some folks who try to vote twice in Oklahoma. I am sure that happens in other States, as well, where they will do a request for a mail-in ballot, they will mail it in with a notary and verify that it is them, and then, on election day, they will show up and vote again.

During the last Presidential election, we had a little over 1.5 million people that showed up to vote on that. We found 2 people that double-voted in multiple counties and 27 people that actually double-voted in the same county—29 folks total that double-voted in over 1.5 million people.

By the way, we didn't ignore those 29. They were all referred for prosecution because according to Federal law—Federal law, now—according to Federal law, it is up to 5 years in prison if you vote twice.

So we refer folks for prosecution to say we don't allow that. We are careful in how we do the balloting and the voting on this. But we have a voter ID, and we walk through the process to make sure that every person actually has that opportunity to be able to vote.

Interestingly enough, in Oklahoma, we asked a question several years ago: How many folks showed up for jury duty and, when they showed up for jury duty, were excused from the jury duty because they went before the judge and said: I am not a citizen of United States?

This happens all the time, actually, where someone comes in and says: I am not a citizen of the United States, and so I need to be excused.

They are not eligible for a jury if they are not a citizen of the United States. We had about 40 people in Oklahoma that made that claim and said: I am not a citizen of the United States.

But when we checked voter rolls, they were registered to vote—40. They were excused from jury duty but were also registered to vote.

So in Oklahoma law, do you know what we do? Anytime, in any county, if someone says, I am not a citizen of the

United States in the jury duty, that now gets turned into a list. And if they are registered to vote, their registration gets purged because we are serious about only Oklahoma U.S. citizens voting in Oklahoma.

Do you know why? Because 250 years ago, we fought a war against good King George to say: We make our own decisions, not someone else outside our country. We make our own.

So we make sure that we purge our own voter rolls. In fact, that is State law, to be able to do that.

Listen, we have a very simple, straightforward proposition. It is called the SAVE America Act. The two most basic features of the SAVE America Act should not be controversial. They are simple and straightforward.

We have to verify you are an American citizen. It is already Federal law—already right now—that you have to be an American citizen. We just don't verify it. So this is the “trust and verify” portion of the bill. We trust you that you are an American citizen. How about we just check?

So you have to show that you are an American citizen to be able to register to vote.

The second part of it is you have to have ID to be able to vote. Again, we have done this in Oklahoma for years. This can be done and should be done, and it just shouldn't be that controversial.

I have to share, though, just as who I am as a person. Mr. President, as a personal note of privilege on this, I had to smile when I saw the title of our bill, when it started working its way through the very calm House of Representatives and was sent over to us: The SAVE America Act.

There are a lot of things that can save America, and this bill is incredibly important. It is vital that we get it done. But just as a personal privilege, can I just say: I personally believe what saves America is that more people had a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. I think that would be the greatest thing ever to be able to save the nature of our country.

Our country has become incredibly divided and angry. People are mad and screaming at each other and don't even know why anymore.

Two thousand years ago, a young lawyer walked up to Jesus, and said: Rabbi, of all the teachings, of all the commandments that are out there, what is the heaviest? What is the greatest commandment?

And he said: The biggest one is to love God with all your heart, soul, mind, and spirit.

And then he said: You didn't ask me for two, but let me give you the second one. The second one is just like the first one—he said—to love your neighbor as yourself.

If we are going to save America, protecting our voting integrity is incredibly important, and let's get that done. But if we are really going to save America—not just a bill—I think we

need to get back to the most basic truth, to restart again and ask ourselves, as individuals that make up a nation, if we are going to love God with all our heart, soul, mind, and strength, and love our neighbor as ourself.

And as the old joke says, when the person says, “Who is my neighbor?” the response is, “probably the person you wish I wouldn't say.” That is the person who is your neighbor.

Jesus was headed toward his execution. He knew it, but the people around him didn't. And he was heading through Jericho, and as he approached Jericho, there was a tax collector there. His name was Zacchaeus. He was up in a tree because he was a little guy and because he wanted to see Jesus come by.

Now, he was a wretched guy who had stolen from everybody in town, and everybody knew it. When Jesus saw this wretched guy, he looked at him and he said: Why don't you come down? I want to spend some more time with you.

And the one person in town that everybody thought Jesus would ignore, Jesus actually pointed him out and said: I want to spend more time with you.

At the end of the conversation, everybody looked at him and said: Why did you spend time with that broken, depraved person?

Jesus responded: Because I came to seek and to save what was lost. That is why.

Just a personal privilege, if we are going to talk about saving America, maybe we should start with our own souls.

But in the meantime, as we contemplate that as individuals, why don't we just do the most basic thing? Why don't we verify that only American citizens are voting—because we all know it is happening, and I just told you stories from my own State.

Why don't we just verify, as we go through the polls, to increase the trust of all Americans for our election process? I am looking forward to the debate on the floor this week and for folks to have the opportunity to be able to talk this through. This is something important that we need to be able to finish, and it is something strongly the American people are supportive of.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

HONORING CAPTAIN CURTIS ANGST, CAPTAIN SETH KOVAL, AND MASTER SERGEANT TYLER SIMMONS

MR. HUSTED. Mr. President, I come today to request a pause in the political discourse of this Chamber for a moment of reflection.

As those both in this Chamber and across the Nation know, last Thursday, March 12, 2026, an American KC-135 refueling aircraft went down in western Iraq.

The crash claimed the lives of the aircraft's six crew members. I would like to take a moment of the Senate's time this evening to honor three of

Ohio's favorite sons, the airmen who were serving in the Ohio National Guard with the 121st Air Refueling Wing at Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base in Columbus.

And listening to my colleague Senator LANKFORD, I will say this, quote a passage from John 15:13:

Greater love has no one than this to lay down one's life for his friends.

Let me first speak of one of Ohio's favorite sons, Capt. Curtis J. Angst. He was 30 years old from Wilmington, OH. He was a KC-135 pilot with 10 years of military service.

He graduated from Wilmington High School in 2014 and enlisted in Ohio's Air National Guard a year later. He earned a degree in aerospace engineering in 2020 from the University of Cincinnati. His family states that his commitment to his country was matched only by his devotion to his wife Mary and his passion for music, traveling, and the outdoors.

His family stated:

Those who knew Curtis remember his steady kindness and the joy he carried with him everywhere he went.

His constant smile and instantly recognizable laugh made people feel welcome, valued, and part of something bigger.

Another family member described Captain Angst's life as one defined by service, generosity, and a genuine love for people.

The Air Force says he logged 880 flight hours, 67 of which were in combat. He was promoted to captain just last November. He earned multiple honors, including the Air and Space Achievement Medal and the Meritorious Unit Award.

He will be missed by his wife Mary, his parents, and many more friends and family.

MSgt Tyler Simmons. You see them all pictured here. There is Curtis. Here is Tyler. MSgt Tyler Simmons was 28 years old from Columbus, OH. He was a 2015 graduate of Eastmoor Academy on Columbus's East Side, where he was his high school's quarterback.

He loved football and was a loyal fan of Texas Christian University, TCU. His service began in April 2018. His father said that Master Sergeant Simmons loved airplanes and always had plans for joining the Air Force.

His unit commander reports that Master Sergeant Simmons has been posthumously promoted from tech sergeant to master sergeant. He was a musician and played both the viola and violin in his high school. Amazing talent.

His family says he loved to roller skate. Tyler loved his family but was particularly fond of his grandmother Bernice, who, at 85 years old, is described as his confidante and workout buddy.

Tyler's smile could light up any room. His strong presence would fill it, his family says. His mother said he loved serving in the military and that he was born for it.

We mourn today alongside Master Sergeant Simmons' entire family. You

see him pictured there. You can see his smile. You can tell what they mean when they talk about his smile.

The third individual I would like to honor is Capt. Seth Koval. He was 38 years old from Mooresville, IN, and he was an aircraft commander with 19 years of service to our country. He graduated with a bachelor's degree in aviation operations from Purdue University in 2011. He was a KC-135R Stratotanker instructor pilot. You see Captain Koval there.

Captain Koval first enlisted in 2006 as a machinist with Indiana's National Guard 122nd Fighter Wing and transferred to the Ohio National Guard, which we welcomed and loved to have him, in 2017. He flew a total of 2,076 hours, 443 of those in combat.

His wife said he grew up dreaming of being a pilot, a dream that his hard work made come true. He was a man of devout faith in Jesus. He was a man of devout faith in Jesus as his Lord and Savior. He was described as loving, generous, selfless, kindhearted, smart, devoted and a fixer of all things and a real outdoorsman.

His loss is one mourned by many but most of all by his wife Heather, his son, and countless other close family members and friends of Capt. Seth Koval.

You see our three heroes right there. These servicemembers, alongside their three other brothers and sisters in arms, gave the last full measure of devotion to their country last week.

I thank my colleagues for hearing their stories this evening, for honoring their service, for celebrating their lives, and for mourning their loss alongside a grateful nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate observe a moment of silence in remembrance of Capt. Curtis Angst, MSgt Tyler Simmons, and Capt. Seth Koval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(Moment of Silence.)

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. President, may God bless these servicemembers and their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I would like to echo my colleague's sentiment. I think he said it beautifully and perfectly. I think he honored these three brave soldiers really well.

I would like to, of course, join him in recognizing Capt. Seth Koval, Capt. Curtis Angst, and MSgt Tyler Simmons, who made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States of America and gave their lives for our country.

You see them pictured here. I am a dad of kids that age, and I can't imagine what their mom and dad, their siblings, and family members must be going through. It is far too easy for us to take the blessings of freedom and liberty for granted here in America. We are lucky to live in a stable democracy.

And while our public discourse can sometimes be heated, I look at my col-

league from Vermont, and sometimes at the end of the day we leave and we are frustrated and aggravated about why we can't get this or that, I think it is important for us to acknowledge that at the end of the day, we can still break bread together. At the end of the day, we acknowledge, at least we must acknowledge that what unites us is much, much greater than what divides us.

The honest truth is that we live in the luckiest—we are absolutely the luckiest people on earth to live here in the United States of America. We enjoy the blessings of liberty every day, but on days like today, it is important for us to remember why we can live with these liberties, and it is because of the selfless sacrifice of young men and young women, but in this case, three young men, that gave their lives for that.

They signed up, as my colleague from Ohio said, without hesitation. They served honorably, and with incredible sacrifice they gave the ultimate to this Nation. These three Ohioans were the most courageous and selfless individuals of our great Nation.

They were in the National Guard, not for fame, not for fortune, because they always felt ready to be called on to protect and defend our great Nation. As distinguished members of Ohio's National Guard, they answered that call that their unit was activated. They didn't hesitate. They didn't doubt. They didn't worry. They were ready to go and serve, not for themselves, for all of us, every single one of us.

It is their sacrifice that allows us to debate the issues of this democracy every single day.

So when the Senate concludes its business today and each of us goes our own merry way and we sleep in safety and peace, let us not forget that there is a soldier in some distant corner of the world standing watch on our behalf, looking out for us.

And if their families are anything like my family or like my wife, there is a mom waiting by the phone, hoping and praying that they never get the call that these three soldiers' families got.

As we think of those young airmen, Captain Koval, Captain Angst, Master Sergeant Simmons, who put their lives in harm's way for this country. Let us remember these words from the Air Force chaplain's "Book of Prayers":

Our Heavenly Father, in this hour of stunned grief, our first reaction is silence. But in our silence, as many airmen before us have done, we turn to you and ask for your presence and reassurance and guidance.

My colleague Senator HUSTED and I have put together a resolution honoring the families. We will file that tomorrow in the U.S. Senate. We will also fly to the Dover Air Force Base to pay our respects to the airmen in person.

I think what all of us have to do in a moment like this is to understand that, with the issues that we debate

here every single day in this Hall—that will live well beyond any of our lifetimes and that existed well before any of us walked the Earth—we will have the humility to understand the weight of our decision making; that, while, yes—sadly, by the way—politics always plays a role in a political environment, we will take note of how everything we do affects many, many American families.

I would ask at this moment in which we are debating a lot of issues, that we just take one step back and realize, with deep humility, the responsibility we should all feel for these families. When we see these young men, we should realize that the decisions made here in Washington, DC, carry enormous weight and not to be flippant about it and don't think about what it means for a social media post.

These are really important decisions we make here. Thank God we have soldiers like these three young men who were willing to answer the call of this country. As we get into heated debates between Republicans and Democrats and we start posturing and wondering what this group or that group is going to think, let's just take a little moment and realize that, if not for the sacrifice of men like these, we would not even be able to do any of it.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to honor these three men. Hopefully, what this will add during this week that is obviously going to be contentious will be a moment of self-reflection and humility for this Chamber which, I think, is so desperately, desperately needed.

To the moms and dads of these three young soldiers, I can't even process what you are going through. I can't even imagine the emotions that you are feeling. Just know that America is grateful beyond words for the sacrifices that your heroic sons made.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to begin by referencing the remarks of my colleague from Ohio and expressing my gratitude for the service and sacrifice of the airmen lost in action over Iraq recently.

As many know, Dover Air Force Base, in Dover, DE, is where the remains of every American who falls in service to our Nation overseas first returns to our soil. My State and the men and women of the Dover community and of the Dover Air Force Base have long considered it a sacred obligation, a blessing, and an opportunity to welcome the families who are grieving in order to help prepare their sons and daughters for ultimate burial in their home States. We have welcomed many Senators from across the country to what is known as a dignified transfer, which they carry out with great solemnity.

So let me join my colleagues from Ohio in expressing deep gratitude to the families of those who have fallen in

action in the air over Iraq and for their service and sacrifice and for the support to the United States military that all of us should be offering at this time of great solemnity.

S. 1383

With that, Mr. President, I am going to turn to the issue of the day in front of this Chamber.

What is the issue of the day? It is a bill known as the SAVE Act. It is a bill that is principally focused on voter disenfranchisement and voter suppression.

Americans today face a whole series of crises: the cost of living and the war in Iran. Our war of choice in Iran is now in its third week, and the cost to American families continues to rise. Prices—costs at home for consumers—are rising as well. I just checked a few minutes ago. A month ago, in my home State of Delaware, a gallon of gas was \$2.87. Today, it is \$3.68. That is a 30-percent jump in just a month, the fastest increase in gas prices since the 1973 oil embargo. Nationally, there is a similar rise of \$2.95 to \$3.84.

The larger point is that most Americans know they are paying a lot more at the pump. They are paying more at the pump, and it is going to end up having all sorts of secondary consequences for costs because what passes through the Strait of Hormuz isn't just oil—it is oil, it is natural gas, it is petrochemicals, it is fertilizers, it is helium. It is a whole series of things that are essential to our modern economy.

We are on the verge of planting season—it will soon be spring—and American farmers are seeing their fertilizer prices jump as well. You might not have ever thought of it, but helium is absolutely critical to a whole series of advanced industrial products, both medical and semiconductor, and it is a byproduct of natural gas production. Most of the world's helium also passes through the Strait of Hormuz. As I am sure you have heard many times today on the news and on the floor, Iran has blocked the Strait of Hormuz not for Iranian ships and not for allied ships that are going to China or to other countries but for the United States and our allies.

We have watched in the last few years as our adversaries have come closer and closer together—Iran, China, North Korea, and Russia. These four countries have deep and rapidly deepening partnerships in military security, in cyber offense, and in the support for terrorism throughout the world, and we chose—President Trump chose—to take us to war against Iran.

The recent polling of Americans shows that, by an 18-percentage-point margin, the Americans polled actually think President Trump is focused on the wrong thing, that instead of focusing on the cost of living, instead of focusing on growing our economy, instead of focusing on making American manufacturing and innovation strong again, he is focusing on the war in Iran, and that, here in the Senate of

the United States, we are focused on a bill that will take away the chance to vote for millions of Americans.

In 2024, 48 million Americans voted by mail. Vote by mail has been the law for decades in several of our Western States. It is secure. It has been shown to be resistant to fraud, and it is a longstanding tradition in majority Democrat States. If the SAVE Act were to become law, vote by mail would end. Seventy million American women would be disenfranchised by this law, including my wife and my mother, because their birth certificates and their current names on their passports and their driver's licenses are not the same. Like millions and millions of American women, they changed their names upon getting married. This law would require them to go through an expensive and complex process to restore their right to vote.

Last, the mandated sharing of every State's voter rolls with the Department of Homeland Security and for them to run them through some DOGE algorithm and throw off the voter rolls of millions and millions of Americans is a solution in search of a problem. The Heritage Foundation looked at the last 20 years of voting and found virtually no examples of those who are not here legally voting in American elections.

That handful of examples is what is being demanded that we pass today, that we focus today on a bill that we know would disenfranchise tens of millions of Americans. I think it is a profound misdirection of the time and energy of this body. When the No. 1 issue that I am hearing about from Delawareans is why are we at war in Iran, I don't really have an answer. In classified briefings I have attended recently with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and the full Senate, I haven't gotten a better answer in those classified briefings than we have gotten in public.

The military is focused on a few fairly clearly defined objectives, but the President and his so-called Secretary of War keep throwing out other goals, other objectives: regime change, ending any possibility in the future of any nuclear enrichment by Iran, and stopping Iran's ability to project power influence in the region.

Our core challenge is that President Trump has offered a maximum goal: Overthrow the regime of a large and populous country that has, yes, a brutal and murderous regime that has suppressed its own people and spread terrorism throughout the region but that is very powerfully ensconced. They are bombing them day after day after day. Unfortunately, what the Iranians are showing is that, when we have pushed them to the wall and said that we intend to overthrow your regime, they are unleashing everything they have got.

I think President Trump learned the wrong lesson from killing Qasem

Soleimani, who was the general in charge of the IRGC in his first term—General Soleimani, an evil man, whose passing I would not grieve for a moment and who had the blood of Americans on his hands. When previous Presidents considered taking him out, they were cautioned that Iran would strike back. It would use its cyber capabilities and its global terrorism network. It would close the Strait of Hormuz. It would go after Americans.

Trump took that bold action, and Iran did not respond in those ways. We waited, but despite threats to carry out terrorist attacks against Americans, we did not see Iran respond with full force.

Then, last summer, President Trump ordered Operation Midnight Hammer—something that had been funded, practiced, and developed over many Presidencies, over decades. Massive bombs were dropped on Iran's nuclear enrichment facilities—at Natanz, at Isfahan, at Fordow—that were designed underground to have the capability to resist any but the most massive attack. Again, when weighing the possibility of using military force to deny Iran the possibility of having a nuclear bomb, previous Presidents were cautioned that Iran would use everything they had. They would close the Strait of Hormuz. They would carry out cyber attacks. They would carry out terrorist attacks in the United States, and they largely didn't.

What is the difference?

In those two previous attacks, President Trump and the Secretary of War never said that our goal was regime change. This time, they did.

So, when the leaders of this administration—when this President—says they are surprised that Iran is attacking all of our partners and allies in the gulf, surprised that Iran is launching drones at American Embassies, surprised that Iran is using its naval mines, its light, fast, cheap, effective drones to close the Strait of Hormuz, how could they possibly be surprised?

This has been prepared for by folks in the Pentagon for many, many years. In every intelligence briefing I have had on Iran over my 15 years here, they have said that they have three tools: their ballistic missiles and drones, their capability as an aggressive cyber force, and a global network of dispersed terrorists who are capable of inflicting pain on civilian populations. When we came short of an all-out assault on the regime, they deescalated. We negotiated, and we were able to step back from the brink of full-on regional war.

But, in this war, our President did not seek the approval of this Chamber. He did not fully brief the American people. He posted a midnight Truth Social video that had been recorded in his West Palm Beach resort. He did not address the American people. He did not address the American Congress. Instead, he launched into a war with our ally Israel that he said was about regime change. What he has succeeded in

doing is killing an aging, cancer-ridden ayatollah and replacing him with a 30-year-younger, more conservative, likely to be more aggressive and repressive ayatollah.

They are showing us the lessons of Vietnam, of Iraq, and of our own Revolution. Two hundred fifty years ago, a small, hardy band of American patriots took on the world's greatest military power. Over the course of that long war, the Americans showed we didn't have to win any battle. In fact, we lost almost every major battle, but we kept melding back into the woods, reappearing, and imposing costs on the British and their Hessian mercenaries. All we had to do was not lose, and we survived.

In our war in South Vietnam, in a war in the region against North Vietnamese forces, we dropped huge amounts of munitions from the air. We enjoyed massive air superiority and technical superiority, and all the North Vietnamese had to do was not lose, meld into the jungle, avoid ever engaging with us in a major conflagration where we could win. And in the end, exhausted, we left.

I could give a summary of what happened in Iraq, but it is largely the same. We have been tempted to believe that our massive technological superiority, our ability to deliver weapons and armaments with great precision at huge volume will inevitably win the war in Iran, when, in fact, with their back against the wall, this hateful, murderous regime of the mullahs and ayatollahs in Tehran is perfectly capable of suppressing their own people and of using their thousands of drones to keep plinking away at Dubai, Qatar, Oman, and Saudi Arabia, at our Embassies, hurting our families, and taking the lives of our soldiers.

Folks, in my view, the costs are just too high. We have lost 13 brave American soldiers so far. We have had chaos and dislocation at our Embassies and consulates that were not adequately prepared to be evacuated.

We have seen the cost of gas, fertilizer, and natural gas and oil skyrocket, all of which could have been dealt with more responsibly through better planning.

Last, when you are going into a fight, you want as many allies as possible by your side. President George W. Bush made the case to the United Nations, to the Congress, and to our allies and assembled a coalition.

Today, when President Trump acts surprised that Iran is closing the Strait of Hormuz, he is desperately, at the last minute, calling up and haranguing leaders of our long-trusted and closest allies. And, surprise, because they weren't involved in the runup to this war, many have demurred.

Then Trump commits again what I think is a horrible offense against our NATO allies. He said yesterday: NATO has never stood by us. I knew all along we couldn't count on NATO.

Well, it was earlier this year that I led a bipartisan delegation to Denmark

at exactly the time that our President was threatening to extract Greenland from Denmark either by force or by the use of tariffs against our closest NATO partners. And during that fight, President Trump said: We never asked NATO for a thing, and they never did a thing for us. And Senator TILLIS and I and our delegation went and laid a memorial wreath at the site where Danes remember the 52 Danish soldiers who died serving alongside Americans in Afghanistan and Iraq.

It is not true that NATO has never come to our defense and NATO has done nothing for us. In fact, only once has the NATO Mutual Defense Treaty been invoked, after 9/11, by our NATO allies at our request for our defense.

And nearly a third of the combat casualties of the very long and violent war in Afghanistan were NATO troops.

So, Mr. President, rather than distracting the American people with this flawed bill designed to accomplish voter suppression, I think you might want to go back to the history books because it is recent history, and we all lived through it.

We have been blessed by the strongest alliance in human history, and our NATO allies last year stepped up and offered tens of billions more for their defense and ours. They have stood by us.

And had you done your job and planned for this war appropriately and consulted with Congress and the American people and engaged our allies, you would be in a very different place than you are today, a place today where our costs are rising and our creditability is sinking—not a great place for the American people.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

MR. WELCH. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the SAVE Act. The SAVE Act, the SAVE America Act, is part of President Trump's and the Republicans' agenda to disenfranchise voters.

You know, I heard my colleague from Oklahoma talk about the Voting Rights Act, and that was really an effort on the part of this Congress to respect and ensure that people who are being denied the vote had the right to vote, and it did take Federal action to make that citizens' right a reality.

The SAVE Act is really an effort to interfere with the right of people to vote, and it is based on an assertion that is flatout false about widespread voter fraud. And, of course, that goes back to January 6, after the election defeat in 2020, when President Trump then said that that election was rigged and that it was false; the outcome was not correct.

There was litigation. Sixty-three courts ruled that the President had lost to President Biden.

The President is now relying on conspiracy theorists like Kurt Olsen, one of the lawyers that pushed Trump's "Stop the Steal" efforts in court to

now lead the effort, seizing election materials related to the 2020 elections.

And those claims have been debunked, even by many Republican elected officials. A lot of our local Republican elected officials care deeply about protecting the right of citizens to vote.

Last month, President Trump said that the Republicans should “take over” the election administration in 15 States. Any attempt by a President, including this President, to take over elections is flatout unconstitutional, as article I, section 4, of the elections clause of the U.S. Constitution gives States the duty to administer elections and Congress the ability to legislate laws around election administration.

The executive branch itself has literally no role in direct election administration.

And this system works. It has worked well for 250 years because the States are best positioned to identify and create policies that meet the needs and accommodations of their own communities.

There is public reporting that officials in President Trump’s White House have been coordinating with far-right activists and operatives like Jerome Corsi to declare a baseless national emergency. We have heard that term used quite a bit in this administration. But to declare a “national emergency” surrounding the 2026 election—that term has been used. It has been invoked to justify the imposition of tariffs unilaterally by the President with respect to the IEEPA tariffs. The Supreme Court held that that position was unconstitutional. We haven’t had the Court weigh in on a “national emergency” that may be declared around voting, but it is worth very much taking seriously.

The Trump administration has defunded election security infrastructure while at the same time making false claims that our elections are insecure.

The administration has gutted the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Act, known as CISA, which Congress created in 2018 to oversee programs responsible for securing our elections, like the cyber threat intelligence.

The administration is also trying to seize voters’ personal data in violation of Federal privacy laws, despite research proving that noncitizen voting is very, very rare.

This is a concerted effort on the part of the President whose ire over losing the 2020 election resulted in January 6 and has also been a sustained campaign on the part of the President to insist that that election was bogus.

The SAVE America Act, in any form, as it is drafted, would block millions of U.S. citizens from voting. And we can have reasonable ID requirements like allowing U.S. citizens to register with a driver’s license or a military ID. Several States have them.

Vermont does not have that, except at the initial point of registering, and

we have such good, high-level participation by voters and basically zero election fraud.

But voter registration should permit all eligible citizens, and only eligible citizens, to register and vote in Federal elections. That is already Federal law. That is not what this SAVE America legislation does.

Your driver’s license wouldn’t work. That wouldn’t be a valid ID. Your REAL ID wouldn’t work. It gets us on a plane, gets us through security, but it wouldn’t work to get you in to vote.

Your military ID—you know, we just had a tribute to our soldiers. But our soldiers with that ID would not be allowed to use that to be able to register to vote.

If your passport has your maiden name on it, as millions of American women’s passports do, that won’t work because it doesn’t correspond to their married name.

The list of acceptable identification under the SAVE Act to register to vote, such as passports or birth certificates, is stricter than many of the 36 States which do require some identification to vote. And therein lies the problem because the more onerous you make this, the more difficult it is—a person who doesn’t have a passport, doesn’t have a driver’s license, has to do something just for the purpose of voting—the fewer people who are going to be able to do that.

So here are some facts that we should not ignore. About 146 million Americans don’t have a passport. In 2024, 153 million Americans voted. And, by the way, passports are pretty expensive. A new passport is at least \$165 for the passport application and the facility acceptance fee or even more if you want it expedited.

And approximately 69 million women have a birth certificate with their maiden name and not the name matching their identification, meaning their birth certificates would be insufficient identification for voter registration under this bill. How can we do that to millions of American women?

Eleven percent of registered voters don’t have access to their birth certificate; 52 percent of registered voters do not have an unexpired passport with their current legal name; and 9 percent of all eligible voters do not have or do not have easy access to documentary proof of citizenship.

These details really matter. You know, it is not just the top-line name “voter ID.” It is what is in this legislation that limits what can be a legitimate voter ID for the purposes of voting.

And even if voters were to provide documentary proof of citizenship, verifying the authenticity of those documents is an inherently complex task, one that election officials in motor vehicle departments often don’t have the resources or the training to perform.

The SAVE America Act would disenfranchise Americans of all ages and races. But younger voters, rural voters,

poorer voters would suffer disproportionately. Rural voters—and by the way, 60 percent of whom identify as Republican—would face some of the largest hurdles to showing up in person at their election office to register to vote. Many rural voters rely heavily on remote voter registration methods that would be effectively blocked by the SAVE America Act, such as registering to vote online or mailing in an application, and also these voters rely greatly on mail-in voting.

This has been an incredible convenience for voters, and reliable. This would become much more difficult under this legislation, with the need to scan and print out copies of their voter ID.

By the way, when it comes to seniors, nearly half of all seniors don’t have a passport.

The SAVE America Act would make it harder for Americans to register and vote in 2026. If the SAVE America Act were signed into law, it would go into effect immediately—overnight—changing the requirements for voter registration for all Americans from the day before the act was signed to the day after. This would effectively block voter registration methods nearly all Americans use and add new restrictions on voting at the polls and by mail in virtually every State. It would be a mess.

The bill not only requires proof of citizenship but also proof of residence in order to register. This could block even more voters from voting. Roughly 9 percent of the U.S. population has moved to a new home within their own State in the past year, but many will not update their driver’s license until they expire—more people who aren’t going to be able to vote who are entitled to vote. Right now, we have protections 90 days out from an election that prevent voters from being removed from the rolls. This bill would end those protections.

The SAVE America Act would eliminate mail registration, and it would disrupt online registration. In 2022, more than 7 million Americans registered to vote by mail and almost 11 million Americans registered to vote online without any problem to election integrity. These bills would also require online registration systems to be overhauled to fit the bill’s requirements. The bill would also prohibit universal mail voting, requiring all mail voters to submit an application in order to receive a mail ballot—a lot of bureaucracy here being created. This would end the longstanding principal method of voting in eight States and in Washington, DC—and, by the way, in my State of Vermont.

The bill would require voters registering to vote by mail to submit documentary proof of citizenship, which States do not currently require. And, by the way, that is without incident.

Mail-in voting supports rural communities that local election administrators can’t reach well. This is why

several of my Republican colleagues' States—Nebraska, Idaho, North Dakota—make mail-in voting possible for certain voters. Arkansas and Louisiana allow digital IDs as valid voter identification.

The Trump administration has been on a furious effort to silence citizens and deny them our most fundamental constitutional right: the right to vote. The "show your papers" requirement is an attack on the freedom to vote.

Congress should stand firm to protect the right of all of our citizens to vote and reject the SAVE America Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my very eloquent colleague from Vermont in the common cause that brings us to the floor tonight, which is to say no—no—to a bill that so fundamentally and far-reachingly would undermine—in fact, destroy—our democracy. It may sound like an exaggeration, but it is the truth.

Republicans want you to believe that this bill is about making sure that citizens vote. Actually, it is about making sure that citizens cannot vote. Trump and the Republicans can't win on their policy decisions, so they must win by taking away the vote this November and for elections to come.

Make no mistake, this bill will take away votes from millions of Americans. Literally, it will roll back the clock on the civil rights era, on decades earlier during Reconstruction, on the Civil War itself. It will move America back in time and jeopardize our very democracy.

The simple fact is 21 million Americans do not have the requisite documentation this bill requires to register to vote. Passports are expensive. A passport book costs more than \$100. And birth certificates are not readily accessible to many, many people. I have to admit, I don't know where my birth certificate is. There are many people who may not have their birth certificate at all and will have to try to track it down and then spend the money that is necessary to obtain it.

Then, for 69 million married women who have changed their name but whose documentation reflects at birth their maiden name, they will be required to provide documentary proof of citizenship plus additional documentation like a marriage certificate or they will have to sign an affidavit.

The SAVE America Act is not about saving America. If it were, it would not make it harder for service men and women, our veterans, and our military families to vote. Think of it for a moment. It fails to recognize military IDs as valid proof of citizenship.

I want to emphasize this point for a moment because I think it so epitomizes what is evil about this legislation. A military ID can grant servicemembers access to military bases; highly secure, sometimes classified and

in some cases restricted facilities; but under this Republican proposal, it just isn't enough to allow those servicemembers access to the ballot box, the foundation of democracy. They go to bases. They go to restricted areas. They can go to other kinds of military facilities. But they cannot go to vote.

It imposes burdens on servicemembers abroad, including children of servicemembers. It excludes them—military voters born abroad—and it imposes burdens on servicemembers and military families stationed overseas, requiring in-person proof of citizenship at a government office in the United States when registering or updating voter registration. So in order to vote, they have to know about the law, and then they have to make a trip to a government office, probably while they are on leave with limited amounts of time. They want to be with their family, and they have to spend additional time going to a government office to register to vote. These are men and women defending our right to vote, and this bill restricts their right to vote.

The bill would also impose unacceptable barriers to voting for disabled veterans and veterans living in rural communities. It would require veterans to travel long distances simply to register or update their registration. Yet, for veterans with service-connected disabilities, mobility challenges, or limited transportation options, this requirement will create unacceptable obstacles for them to exercise their right to vote—veterans, again, who served and sacrificed for our country, who defend our rights and liberties, including the right to vote, themselves effectively being denied that right.

It is wrong. It is wrong morally. It is probably wrong constitutionally. Our servicemembers, military spouses and children, and veterans sacrifice so much for this country. It seems unfathomable and unforgivable to make it harder for the military community to vote because of one President's vanity and vengeance and political games—and the effort to win election.

Senate Republicans make a lot of promises when it comes to our veterans and our military. They have the best rhetoric going. I want to remind them that promises are meaningless unless they are kept; words are ineffectual unless there is action to support them.

While we sit here debating a bill that will make it harder for members of the military and veterans to vote, I want to remind this body that Senate Republicans continue to block the Major Richard Star Act—a bipartisan bill to deliver combat-injured veterans their full military pension. That is right. Republicans have blocked it twice just this year.

Let's keep in mind what this legislation does and why it is supported by the vast majority of Members of Congress and the people of the United States. It says, in effect, you cannot deduct from a combat-injured retiree's

pay the amount that goes to that person for disability compensation. Republicans say the cost is too high. They say it is double-dipping. Our veterans have earned both retirement pay and disability compensation. They have earned it. It is not something given to them out of charity.

They have not only blocked the passage of that bill, but they have also blocked my efforts even to allow floor consideration of it. I asked for unanimous consent twice just to give us a vote. Let that sink in. They will not even allow a vote. It wouldn't take more than 30 minutes. Let's see if we have the votes. Let's see who is going to be accountable.

We made a promise to these veterans that they would receive both retirement and disability benefits. Our legislation would deliver on that promise.

Republicans in leadership can't find the courage to give this legislation a vote despite 77 Members sponsoring it—both sides of the aisle, across the ideological spectrum. Yet they have found floor time to try to pass this mockery of a bill, to pass the SAVE America Act—a bill that will make it harder for our military and our veterans to vote.

This isn't the message we should be sending to Americans, especially amid action that is putting more troops in harm's way. What a time. American troops deployed in kinetic action, in harm's way, and the SAVE America Act has a single, simple goal: turning away American voters at the ballot box, including our military and our veterans.

We have seen this discouragement of voting time and again: sending Tulsi Gabbard to Fulton, GA, continuing the false narrative that somehow there was fraud in the Georgia vote; continuing the distorted message that there is voting fraud rampant in the Nation. The statistics and the facts prove this contention is absolutely wrong. It is false, fallacious, mistaken.

The intimidation of poll workers, the demand for voting information, private information not available to the public—all of it unjustified, probably illegal. This administration continues to pursue it because the goal is to suppress the vote.

Let's be clear. Voter suppression is the objective. This bill is the cornerstone of that vast voter suppression effort. I will give him credit for his consistency. It has been constant, the effort that President Trump is demanding of Republicans in Congress to pass the SAVE America Act—a bill that would constitute the most significant restriction on the right to vote in generations—because Republicans cannot win this November without it, and they have said the quiet part out loud. In fact, President Trump has shouted the quiet part out loud. We don't have to read between the lines. He has made it absolutely clear that voter suppression is the end, the strategy, and the goal.

Over 20 million Americans—1 in 10 voting-age Americans—simply don't

have access to the documentation that this bill would require to vote. Voting identification in some form ought to be required, no question. This is not a voter identification bill; it is a voter purge bill. It would take that private information from voter rolls and in effect eliminate those names from the rolls based on other information available to the administration.

If President Trump were really serious about stopping voter fraud, especially cyber interference and possible foreign influence, he would not have dismantled the Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency, he would not have decimated the Agency that is responsible for stopping voter fraud, he would not have dismantled the counterterrorism units of the FBI and the Department of Justice. He would make them more robust, devote more resources to them, because that is the way to stop voter fraud, is to have investigators and experts go after it, pursue it, prosecute it. But the goal here is not to go after noncitizen voting because that problem is negligible. It is miniscule. The objective is to stop legitimate voters from going to the polls.

Mr. President, 250 years ago, America broke from the chains of monarchy. They chose democracy, a government that is supposed to be by and for the people. But as we approach this Nation's birthday, we are challenged as never before to defend democracy by advocating the right of every American to vote in free and fair elections and defending that right—not enough to talk about it but to defend it.

Thankfully, we still do have our democracy. It is under threat as never before. We are seeing the tentacles of totalitarianism begin to strangle the free press through the FCC's vicious attacks, through the effort to stifle legitimate dissent within our government and among our people. But we know there are people willing to stand up and speak out. We have seen it in the indivisible rallies across the country. We have seen it in the anger that we are all hearing and the angst and anxiety about the future of our great Nation in peril at the moment.

We will have it as long as we recognize that democracy is not a spectator sport. It is not something that is guaranteed unless we defend it. We will have it only so long as we keep it, as Benjamin Franklin warned. And we will have a republic, as he told the person who asked him after the Constitutional Convention, only as long as we can keep it. It is up to us. Our time is now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, my colleagues across the aisle are presenting what they call the SAVE Act and are saying it is about stopping noncitizens from voting, but that is not true. This bill is entirely about stopping citizens from voting, taking

away the ballot box from millions and millions of Americans.

So let's call this bill what it really is: the "Stop Citizens From Voting ACT" or "Stop Act." It is about rigging the next election, and we know so because Donald Trump said it himself. He said: You pass this act, and "It will guarantee the midterms" and "every election for a long time."

Why did he have such confidence that it would guarantee the November election for his party? The answer is because this bill is about stopping groups from voting who tend to vote for Democrats. This is, again, about rigging the next election.

There are repeated investigations by law enforcement, by news organizations, by universities that have found that you are more likely to get struck by lightning than for a noncitizen to vote. It is not just rare for a noncitizen to vote, it is super rare.

In Oregon, a review of vote-by-mail by the State over 19—actually 20 years, 2000 through 2019, found less than 1 in a million cases of voter fraud.

In Utah—my colleague who is presiding tonight is from Utah. Utah completed a citizenship review of its voter registration list of more than 2 million voters. They identified one noncitizen—one—and zero instances of noncitizen voting. One registered out of 2 million; zero voting.

Even Speaker JOHNSON admitted about noncitizen voting that "it's not been something . . . provable." Well, actually, what he really should have said: It is not provable because it is rarer than rare.

That is why we know this bill is not about noncitizens voting; it is about stopping citizens from voting.

Let's just take a look at the impact, starting with the impact on married women.

The Republican plan: Stop married women from voting. A slightly softer version of that is, make it very difficult for them to vote, because this is what the bill does. It says that each State has to submit its voter registration database to the Trump administration. The Trump administration will go through and identify anyone it suspects might not be a citizen. And it has clarified that that means if your last name is different than the name on your birth certificate, you are suspect.

Well, where we are—69 million married women in America changed their names when they got married. That means 69 million American women get pinged by the Trump administration saying: We are not sure you can vote, and you are going to have to start from scratch and reregister.

Reregistering is very difficult. You have to have a passport or you have to have a combination of a birth certificate and another form of approved ID in combination—either a passport by itself or two forms of ID, one of which is your birth certificate, and that other piece has to be very specific, meeting the terms of the bill.

In Oregon, our estimate is that 700,000 married women would have to reregister to vote, including my wife. My wife's name is Mary Sorteberg. That was the name on her birth certificate, except on her birth certificate, her middle name is different because when we got married, she changed her middle name to honor her grandmother Rose. She would have a hard time voting. Millions of American women would have a hard time voting.

It is also about stopping Tribal citizens from voting. The "Stop Act" makes it impossible to use your Tribal ID to register to vote, and it makes it impossible to use your Tribal ID by itself to actually vote. You can't use it for registration, and you can't use it by itself to actually vote.

Tribal citizens are less likely to have a passport in the first place, and we know that many do not have a birth certificate. All across America, there are people who have been born at home who do not have birth certificates—more common in some Tribal communities.

Tribal communities are remote. Often, they have to travel a long way to get to a place where you can register to vote because you have to register to vote in person.

So all of these things are designed to make it harder for Tribal members to vote, and that is wrong.

This bill is also about the less affluent being able to vote. It makes it hard for them. Stop the less affluent from voting or at least make it much more difficult for them.

You know that a passport takes 6 months to get and costs about \$165. That is a big toll. A couple, if they were trying to get that passport so they could vote, might not get it in time for the election, and they would have to pay \$330. Wow. That is a poll tax on the less affluent to be able to vote.

If they can locate the county registrar and their specific county in America and if they were born in a hospital and if there was a birth certificate, they might also be able to acquire their birth certificate. That also costs money.

We know that the less affluent are much less likely to have a passport in the first place, and therefore it is much more expensive for them to undertake the qualifications of this bill. In fact, only one in five Americans who earn less than \$50,000 has a passport. And we know that poorer States are less likely to have passports, including many States in the South—Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Louisiana.

So we are facing an attack on each of these groups, but those are not the only groups. Let's talk about students.

The "Stop Act" is designed to make it hard for students to vote. First of all, it says you can't have a voter drive. Why? Because you can't register people at their dorm room with ordinary documents the way it has always been done everywhere. No. They have

to go in person to an election center, and who knows where that election center is.

And they are going to have to miss class or go to do it, and they are like, well, why can't I upload these documents online to be examined? Well, because they are trying to make it hard for you to vote. Why? Because students tend to vote on the blue side of the aisle.

And if you need your birth certificate to register, now, if you are going to school in a different State from where you are registered to vote or where you would register to vote, you would have to travel home.

Well, many students don't travel home during holidays because it is expensive, and students often don't have money.

Oh, they are rich; they are fine. I am sure they will take a private jet to go get their voter registration.

But ordinary students, they are struggling to pay that tuition. That is a big imposition to say you have to travel to another State in order to be able to register to vote.

So here we are with yet another attack beyond these groups, and that is an attack on vote-by-mail. Under the amendment that has been filed by the Republicans this evening, it bans vote-by-mail.

Now, let's think about how hard it is to hold an election in a State like Oregon or a State like Utah that votes by mail. Oregon hasn't had a vote at a polling booth in 28 years.

So here we are. This law goes into effect immediately. Our primary election in Oregon is on May 20. How are you supposed to get all those polling places in place, all that whole new system, in just a few weeks' time? Extremely difficult.

And then you submit your voter database to Team Trump. They purge it with a very big bias to make it hard for demographic groups that associate more with Democrats to vote. They ping them and say: You are no longer registered. You have to reregister.

And maybe they get that ping. I don't know. The election in Oregon is on May 19. Maybe they get that notice on May 10. You have 9 days to get a passport. It is not going to happen.

You have got 9 days to reach out to your county somewhere around the country, where you were born, and get a birth certificate. It is not going to happen.

Millions of people are instantly disenfranchised in an impossible-to-set-up system in a few weeks' time.

Those groups that I talked about—students, Tribal members, the less affluent, women—this bill is targeted at them with extraordinary precision because this bill is about rigging the November election.

And that is exactly what Trump said: You give me this bill; my party will win November and every other election for a long time to come.

So, colleagues, this is wrong. Every one of my fellow Senators on both sides

of the aisle knows what this is. This is an attack on a partisan basis to rig the November election. Every person here who took an oath to the Constitution to defend the right to vote knows that this is about rigging the election by stopping people from voting. It is really a violation of your oath of office.

So let's not let this happen—this egregious assault by an authoritarian President. We have already seen this authoritarian President take away powers from this body—the House and the Senate, Congress—that belong under the Constitution to Congress.

Our Founders said the power of taxation, including tariffs, belongs to Congress. This President took it anyway and said: I don't care that I am violating the Constitution. Challenge me in court.

It took a year for the courts to act.

He proceeded to say: I am going to cancel programs that are both funded and authorized by Congress—which is a violation of law and the Constitution.

It is the power of the purse, and he said: I don't care. Challenge me in court.

He proceeded to launch a war without authorization, even though the Constitution requires this body to authorize a war.

So here we are, three major powers—power of the purse, power of taxation, power of war—all stolen by the President and not confronted by the House or Senate leadership.

And now we have House and Senate leadership conspiring with the President to strip the vote from millions of Americans, an extraordinarily unconstitutional act. But this time, it is not the President acting alone. He is acting with the support, the cooperation, the partnership of the majority party.

There is probably nothing more sacred in a democratic republic than the ballot box. It is the beating heart of what it means to be a democratic republic. This bill takes a knife and stabs it through that beating heart.

Let's not let this happen.

MORNING BUSINESS

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1884. An act to clarify the Holocaust Expropriated Art Recovery Act of 2016, to appropriately limit the application of defenses based on the passage of time and other non-merits defenses to claims under that Act.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 528. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a program for Post-Disaster Reforestation and Restoration Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 831. An act to establish an interest-bearing account for the non-Federal con-

tributions to the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1422. An act to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in significant transactions related or incidental to the processing, refining, export, transfer or sale of oil, condensates, or other petroleum or petrochemical products in whole or in part from the Islamic Republic of Iran.

H.R. 1665. An act to require the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to establish online portals to accept, process, and dispose of certain Form 299s, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2196. An act to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs.

H.R. 2294. An act to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009.

H.R. 2709. An act to improve the health and resiliency of giant sequoias, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3073. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Utah with respect to civil causes of action arising on or within the Indian lands of the Shivwits Band of Paiutes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4284. An act to amend the Small Tract Act of 1983 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey, without consideration, certain cemeteries, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4467. An act to modify the boundary of the Vicksburg National Military Park in the State of Mississippi, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Gateway Arch Park Foundation to host private events in Gateway Arch National Park buildings, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5729. An act to authorize direct emergency acquisition flexibilities for the National Park Service for the purpose of retaining, vetting, approving, and expediting contractor approval for the clearing rebuilding, maintenance, and improvement of the Grand Canyon grounds that have been impacted by the Dragon Bravo Fire.

H.R. 6380. An act to redesignate the Chiricahua National Monument in the State of Arizona as Chiricahua National Park, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 528. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a program for Post-Disaster Reforestation and Restoration Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1422. An act to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in significant transactions related or incidental to the processing, refining, export, transfer or sale of oil, condensates, or other petroleum or petrochemical products from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign in whole or in part Relations.

H.R. 1665. An act to require the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to establish online portals to accept, process, and dispose of certain Form 299s, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2196. An act to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its

environs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2294. An act to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2709. An act to improve the health and resiliency of giant sequoias, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 3073. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Utah with respect to civil causes of action arising on or within the Indian lands of the Shivwits Band of Paiutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 4284. An act to amend the Small Tract Act of 1983 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey, without consideration, certain cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 5254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Gateway Arch Park Foundation to host private events in Gateway Arch National Park buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 5729. An act to authorize direct emergency acquisition flexibilities for the National Park Service for the purpose of retaining, vetting, approving, and expediting contractor approval for the clearing, rebuilding, maintenance, and improvement of the Grand Canyon grounds that have been impacted by the Dragon Bravo Fire; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6380. An act to redesignate the Chiricahua National monument in the State of Arizona as Chiricahua National park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1366. An act to provide for the location of multiple hardrock mining mill sites, to establish the Abandoned Hardrock Mine Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6392. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to recognize students who have completed secondary school education in a home school setting as high school graduates, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 4124. A bill to prohibit funds made available to the Department of Justice from being used to make a personal payment to the President in connection with a claim that is subject to the Federal Tort Claims Act, whether in the form of a settlement or any other payment from the Judgment Fund for the personal benefit of the President.

S. 4125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on damages received by certain officers of the United States on account of any civil action filed against the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 4126. A bill to address the ineligibility of Ashli Babbitt for military funeral honors.

S. 4127. A bill making continuing appropriations for essential Transportation Security Administration pay and operations during the lapse in appropriations beginning on February 14, 2026, and for other purposes.

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-2982. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13664 with respect to South Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2983. A communication from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of the 30-Day Notification Requirement Prior to Termination of Lease for Nonpayment of Rent" (RIN2501-AE14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2984. A communication from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Regulations for the John Heinz Neighborhood Development Program" (RIN2506-AC65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2985. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fair Housing Home Loan Data System" (RIN1557-AF42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2986. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Bank Chartering" (RIN1557-AF47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2987. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Community Bank Licensing Amendments" (RIN1557-AF38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2988. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Community Mental Health Services Block Grant Crisis Set-Aside Funds, 2022-2024"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2989. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2025 Report to Congress: Mental Health Crisis Response Partnership Pilot Program"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2990. A communication from the Clerk of Court, United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (United States of America v. Swanner) received in the Office of the Presi-

dent pro tempore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2991. A communication from the Research Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of the recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 84th Plenary Session received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2992. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The CY 2021 Competitive Acquisition Ombudsman Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2993. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to the Trade Act of 1974, the 2026 Trade Policy Agenda and 2025 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2994. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 911(d) (4) - 2025 Update" (Rev. Proc. 2026-16) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2995. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Calendar Year (CY) 2026 Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers (SMART) Act Medicare Secondary Payer (MSP) Non-Group Health Plan (NGHP) Threshold Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2996. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Finalizing Medicare Regulations under Section 902 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act (MMA) of 2003 for Calendar Year 2025"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2997. A communication from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation's fiscal year 2025 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2998. A communication from the Equal Employment Opportunity Director, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Farm Credit Administration's fiscal year 2025 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2999. A communication from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2025 through September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3000. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer of the Division of Regulations, Jurisdiction, and Special Park Uses, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Assateague Island National Seashore; Oversand Vehicles" (RIN1024-AE90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 30, 2026; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3001. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2025, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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. COTTON:

S. 4105. A bill to include any felony conviction as a ground for revocation of naturalization, to strike the 5-year limitation on the revocation of naturalization for membership in certain totalitarian or treasonous organizations, and to eliminate the 10-year statute of limitation for certain criminal penalties that would disqualify a person from naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 4106. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve access to certain medications under the TRICARE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4107. A bill to amend section 5 of the Clayton Act to include proposed voluntary dismissals in the court's consideration of proposed consent judgements and clarify the public interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 4108. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase burial and funeral expenses paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in the case of death from a service-connected disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 4109. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4110. A bill to revise and extend health workforce programs under title VII of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits excise tax on crude oil and to rebate the tax collected back to individual taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JUSTICE:

S. 4112. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit period for the production of refined coal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SLOTKIN:

S. 4113. A bill to provide for limitations on the use of artificial intelligence by Depart-

ment of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4114. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for institutional ineligibility based on low cohort repayment rates and to require risk-sharing payments of institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 4115. A bill to band certain types of wagers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 4116. A bill to advance next-generation geothermal electricity generation demonstration projects in new regions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 4117. A bill to allow Federal law enforcement officers to purchase retired service weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 4118. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of hospice care furnished under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 4119. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow married couples to apply the student loan interest deduction limitation separately to each spouse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 4120. A bill to designate certain categorical exclusions for water resources development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 4121. A bill to prohibit the unauthorized possession of a firearm at a Federal election site; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to equalize treatment of capital gains and earned income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 4123. A bill to prohibit preferential screening for Members of Congress at airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 4124. A bill to prohibit funds made available to the Department of Justice from being used to make a personal payment to the President in connection with a claim that is subject to the Federal Tort Claims Act, whether in the form of a settlement or any other payment from the Judgment Fund for the personal benefit of the President; read the first time.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on damages received by certain officers of the United

States on account of any civil action filed against the United States, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

S. 4126. A bill to address the ineligibility of Ashli Babbitt for military funeral honors; read the first time.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 4127. A bill making continuing appropriations for essential Transportation Security Administration pay and operations during the lapse in appropriations beginning on February 14, 2026, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. ALSOBROOKS:

S.J. Res. 125. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Pay-to-Pay Fees"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KIM:

S.J. Res. 126. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (Regulation F); Time-Barred Debt"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KIM:

S.J. Res. 127. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; File Disclosure"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S.J. Res. 128. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024-03: Unlawful and Unenforceable Contract Terms and Conditions"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S.J. Res. 129. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "The Fair Credit Reporting Act's Limited Preemption of State Laws"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RICKETTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. Res. 645. A resolution recognizing 2026 as the "International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. Res. 646. A resolution recognizing March 14, 2026, as "Black Midwives Day" and the longstanding and invaluable contributions of

Black midwives to maternal and infant health in the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mrs. MOODY):

S. Res. 647. A resolution designating March 21, 2026, as "National Osceola Turkey Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 648. A resolution honoring the memory, service, and sacrifice of Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, United States Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 142

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 142, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to wildland firefighters in recognition of their strength, resiliency, sacrifice, and service to protect the forests, grasslands, and communities of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 410

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 410, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 478

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 478, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from transmitting certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system.

S. 492

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 492, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and enhance the work opportunity tax credit, to encourage longer-service employment, and to modernize the credit to make it more effective as a hiring incentive for targeted workers, and for other purposes.

S. 494

At the request of Mr. SCHMITT, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 494, a bill to establish a national plan to coordinate research on epilepsy, and for other purposes.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mrs.

MOODY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 545, a bill to prohibit certain uses of xylazine, and for other purposes.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to achieve parity between the cost-of-living adjustment with respect to an annuity under the Federal Employees Retirement System and an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes.

S. 679

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 679, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Law Enforcement Officers Safety Act of 2004 and provisions relating to the carrying of concealed weapons by law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 782, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to amend regulations to allow for certain packers to have an interest in market agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 976, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to reduce fraudulent enrollments in qualified health plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1283

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1283, a bill to modernize Federal firearms laws to account for advancements in technology and less-than-lethal weapons, and for other purposes.

S. 1343

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1343, a bill to improve coordination between the Department of Energy and the National Science Foundation on activities carried out under the National Quantum Initiative Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1404

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1404, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods and cargo for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 1542

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1542, a bill to support the human rights of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups residing primarily in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, to safeguard their distinct identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1552

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

S. 1572

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1572, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve the Federal carjacking statute.

S. 1609

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1609, a bill to provide for further comprehensive research at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke on unruptured intracranial aneurysms.

S. 1746

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1746, a bill to establish the Commission on American Quantum Information Science Dominance, and for other purposes.

S. 1816

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1816, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements with respect to the use of prior authorization under Medicare Advantage plans.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 1970

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1970, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the service members of the Military Assistance Command Vietnam-Studies and Observations Group, in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in South Vietnam, North Vietnam,

Laos, and Cambodia during the Vietnam War.

S. 2265

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2265, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles, California, and the 2034 Olympics and Paralympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City, Utah.

S. 2541

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2541, a bill to establish requirements for quality and discard date phrases that are voluntarily declared on the food label to display calendar dates.

S. 2842

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2842, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for congenital Cytomegalovirus screening of newborns.

S. 2903

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2903, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 3062

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3062, a bill to require artificial intelligence chatbots to implement age verification measures and make certain disclosures, and for other purposes.

S. 3138

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3138, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include adaptive prostheses and terminal devices for sports and other recreational activities in the medical services furnished to eligible veterans by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 3220

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 3220, a bill to transfer \$160,000,000 from the Travel Promotion Fund to Brand USA.

S. 3257

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGU) were added as cosponsors of S. 3257, a bill to

require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to revise regulations for certain individuals carrying out aviation activities who disclose a mental health diagnosis or condition, and for other purposes.

S. 3304

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3304, a bill to provide for the coverage of medical food and vitamins and individual amino acids for digestive and inherited metabolic disorders under Federal health programs, to ensure State and Federal protection for existing coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 3456

At the request of Mr. SHEEHY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3456, a bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for a free annual National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass for law enforcement officers and firefighters.

S. 3726

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3726, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the President to define veteran success and to develop and implement a National Veterans Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 3892

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3892, a bill to prohibit retail food stores from price gouging and engaging in surveillance-based price setting practices, and for other purposes.

S. 3938

At the request of Mr. KING, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 3938, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize representatives of veterans service organizations to participate in presentations to promote certain benefits available to veterans during pre-separation counseling under the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 3949

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3949, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require the promulgation of cybersecurity and digital service regulations relating to the use of EBT cards under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 3985

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3985, a bill to allow States

to require payment of State fees related to boating as a condition for issuance of a vessel number and to collect such fees in conjunction with other fees related to vessel numbering.

S. 4049

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4049, a bill to repeal section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974 relating to balance-of-payments authority.

S. 4051

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4051, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins that are emblematic of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial and the service and sacrifice of firefighters throughout the history of the United States.

S. 4061

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4061, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require local educational agencies to include mental health and suicide prevention information on student identification cards, and for other purposes.

S. 4064

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4064, a bill to provide for a system of regulation of the offer and sale of digital commodities by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 4087

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4087, a bill to exempt public school employees from non-processing related fees for H-1B visas imposed by Presidential Proclamation 10973.

S. RES. 629

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 629, a resolution honoring the life and legacy of Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, Sr., and commending him for his significant leadership during the Civil Rights Movement and his decades of advocacy in pursuit of justice, equality, and human rights.

S. RES. 642

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 642, a resolution celebrating the 175th anniversary of the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA).

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 4109. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to introduce the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Reauthorization Act of 2026 with Senators TIM SCOTT, TINA SMITH, and JAMES LANKFORD.

Our bipartisan bill will reauthorize the C.W. Bill Young National Marrow Donor Program and the National Cord Blood Inventory, which help individuals diagnosed with leukemia and lymphomas, sickle cell anemia, and rare genetic blood disorders find suitable bone marrow or umbilical cord blood donors.

More than 18,000 individuals are diagnosed with diseases like blood cancer and sickle cell disease each year and hope for a blood stem cell or bone marrow transplant to help treat or even cure their disease. Since the 1980s, the public registries created under these programs have been a lifeline for the more than 75 percent of Americans who do not have a matched donor in their families. By strengthening and enhancing the important programs operating these registries, many more Americans will be afforded the opportunity to find a match if they are ever in need.

I look forward to swift consideration of this legislation in the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and working toward passage in the full Senate.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4110. A bill to revise and extend health workforce programs under title VII of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be introducing the Educating Medical Professionals and Optimizing Workforce Efficiency and Readiness, EMPOWER, for Health Act with Senator Murkowski. Our bipartisan legislation would reauthorize funding for the title VII health professions programs to help strengthen the distribution, quality, and diversity of the health professions workforce so it is better prepared to meet the country's evolving and emerging health care needs.

The title VII health professions programs have a longstanding history of increasing the supply of primary care professionals, expanding access to care in rural and urban underserved areas, and developing a workforce that reflects the Nation's diversity and the needs of patients. At a time when the country is facing persistent health provider shortages, it is critical that we continue to support the programs that

build our healthcare workforce, such as scholarships for disadvantaged students, public health and preventive medicine, geriatrics training, area health education centers, oral health training, and primary care medicine.

These education and training programs guide current and aspiring health professionals to high-demand careers in areas of greatest need, and this legislation will take an important step in ensuring that these programs can continue to serve students and patients for years to come. Our legislation addresses some ongoing challenges with the Pediatric Subspecialty Loan Repayment Program, clarifying eligibility requirements and making it easier for qualified pediatric subspecialists to apply.

I want to thank the stakeholders supporting this bill, including AIDS Action Baltimore, AIDS Foundation Chicago, the AIDS Institute, the AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Association of Medical Colleges, the American Public Health Association, the American Society for Microbiology, the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, Big Cities Health Coalition, the Children's Hospital Association, Fast-Track Health, the Gerontological Society of America, the HIV Dental Alliance, the HIV Medicine Association, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, the International Association of Providers of AIDS Care, the National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors, the National Association of County & City Health Officials, the National Association for Geriatric Education, the National Hispanic Medical Association, NMAC, the San Francisco AIDS Foundation, and the Society of Infectious Diseases Pharmacists and I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator MURKOWSKI in working to pass the EMPOWER for Health Act this year.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 4124. A bill to prohibit funds made available to the Department of Justice from being used to make a personal payment to the President in connection with a claim that is subject to the Federal Tort Claims Act, whether in the form of a settlement or any other payment from the Judgment Fund for the personal benefit of the President; read the first time.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 4124

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

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON USING FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR PAYMENTS TO THE PRESIDENT WITH RESPECT TO TORT CLAIMS.

None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice before, on, or after

the date of enactment of this Act may be used to approve or facilitate a claim that—

(1) is subject to chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the "Federal Tort Claims Act"); and

(2) results in a personal payment to the President, whether in the form of a settlement or any other payment issued under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, (commonly known as the "Judgment Fund") for the personal benefit of the President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 645—RECOGNIZING 2026 AS THE "INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF RANGELANDS AND PASTORALISTS"

Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RICKETTS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 645

Whereas rangelands cover up to 770,000,000 acres of land in the United States;

Whereas rangelands include prairies, grasslands, pampas, shrublands, wetlands, woodlands, savannas, chaparrals, steppes, and tundras inhabited by grasses, grass-like plants, forbs, or shrubs that comprise nearly 36 percent of land in the United States;

Whereas rangelands are economically, socially, and culturally vital to human communities through an array of ecological services, water resources, biodiversity, wildlife habitat, and carbon sequestration and storage, and provide renewable and nonrenewable energy resources and aesthetic and recreational opportunities;

Whereas American rangelands are crucial for domestic production of forage, food, and fiber like beef, lamb, wool, and hides, as more than 50 percent of the national sheep herd and 60 percent of the Western cattle herd spend some time on Federal public rangelands;

Whereas rangelands cover over half the terrestrial surface of the globe, totaling more than 19,800,000,000 acres and supporting nearly 2,000,000,000 people;

Whereas pastoral grazing management decreases the risk of catastrophic wildfire by up to 60 percent, makes rangelands more diverse and resilient, and increases biodiversity;

Whereas pastoralists are the ranchers, nomads, and transhumant herders who raise livestock or semi-domesticated animals as they steward and protect these rangelands;

Whereas American pastoralists and ranchers have generations of traditional knowledge in managing these landscapes and use science-based management, adaptive grazing practices, and emerging information and technologies to support ecological balance and economic productivity;

Whereas American ranchers and land management stewards work with the Federal Government to manage 43 percent of the rangelands across the country, with millions of acres managed as private land on agricultural operations;

Whereas rangelands and the pastoralists who manage them play a key role in domestic food security, rural community viability, and ecosystem health in the United States and worldwide;

Whereas the United Nations, in recognition of the vital nature of rangelands and the significance of pastoralism to the stewardship and societal benefits of rangelands, designated 2026 as the “International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists”;

Whereas national, regional, provincial, and local governments around the world will celebrate the International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists in 2026 through education, research, advertisements, films, and advocacy efforts that are supportive of rangelands and pastoralists; and

Whereas the International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists provides an opportunity for the United States to highlight the contributions of pastoralists, ranchers, farmers, scientists, and land managers in the United States and across the world who work on behalf of multiple-use and sustainable rangeland management: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes 2026 as the “International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists”;

(2) recognizes the economic, social, and ecological importance of rangelands and the ranchers, farmers, land managers, pastoralists, and partners who have been caretakers of the American rangelands for generations; and

(3) encourages Federal agencies, universities, and organizations across the country to engage in activities that promote education, research, and outreach related to rangeland management.

SENATE RESOLUTION 646—RECOGNIZING MARCH 14, 2026, AS “BLACK MIDWIVES DAY” AND THE LONGSTANDING AND INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF BLACK MIDWIVES TO MATERNAL AND INFANT HEALTH IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOOKER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 646

Whereas recognizing March 14, 2026, as “Black Midwives Day” underscores the importance of midwifery in helping to achieve better maternal health outcomes by addressing fundamental gaps in access to high-quality care and multiple aspects of well-being;

Whereas the Black Midwives Day campaign, founded and led by the National Black Midwives Alliance in 2023, is a day of awareness, activism, education, and community building;

Whereas March 14, 2026, is intended to increase attention for the state of Black maternal health in the United States, the root causes of poor maternal health outcomes, and for community-driven policy, program, and care solutions;

Whereas the United States is experiencing a maternity care desert crisis in which more than 2,300,000 women of childbearing age live in maternity care deserts where they have no hospital offering obstetric care, no birth center, and no obstetric clinic;

Whereas maternity care deserts lead to higher risks of maternal morbidity and mortality as most complications occur in the postpartum period when patients are far away from their providers;

Whereas midwife-led care has been shown to result in cost savings, reduced medical interventions, lower cesarean rates, decreased preterm births, and improved health outcomes for both mothers and infants;

Whereas midwives provide essential maternal healthcare services across diverse set-

tings, including homes, communities, hospitals, birth centers, clinics, and health units, ensuring accessibility and continuity of care;

Whereas increasing the number of Black midwives in the workforce is critical to addressing maternal health disparities, as Black midwives offer culturally competent care that builds trust, enhances maternal satisfaction, and improves health outcomes for Black mothers and their infants;

Whereas incorporating midwives fully into the United States maternity care system would reduce maternal health disparities and address the maternity care desert crisis;

Whereas, despite the medicalization of childbirth in the United States, the maternal mortality rates in the United States are among the highest in the developed world and disproportionately higher among, Black women;

Whereas Black women in the United States are at a significantly higher risk of suffering from life threatening pregnancy complications, known as “maternal morbidities”, than White women;

Whereas deaths from maternal morbidities have devastating effects on Black children and families, and the vast majority of maternal morbidities are entirely preventable through assertive efforts to ensure that Black women have access to information, services, and supports to make their own health care decisions, particularly around pregnancy and childbearing;

Whereas, according to the 2024 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Report, the maternal mortality rate for Black women in the United States was 44.8 deaths per 100,000 live births, compared to the rates observed for—

(1) White women, with a rate of 14.2 deaths per 100,000 live births;

(2) Hispanic women, with a rate of 12.1 deaths per 100,000 live births; and

(3) Asian women, with a rate of 18.1 deaths per 100,000 live births;

Whereas the high rates of maternal mortality among Black women span across income levels, education levels, and socioeconomic statuses;

Whereas structural racism, gender oppression, and the social determinants of health inequities experienced by Black women in the United States significantly contribute to the disproportionately high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity among Black women;

Whereas Black women are more likely to report experiences of disrespect, abuse, and neglect when birthing in facility-based settings as compared to White people;

Whereas Black families benefit from access to Black midwives to receive culturally sensitive and congruent care established through trust and respect, backed with the wisdom of time-honored techniques and best practices;

Whereas the work and contributions of past and present midwives who have ushered in new life have done so despite a history fraught with persecution, enslavement, violence, racism, and the systematic erasure of traditional and lay Black midwives throughout the 20th century;

Whereas the decimation of midwifery across the southern United States reduced the numbers of Black midwives from thousands to dozens in a 50-year period from the 1920s to the 1970s, leaving many communities without care providers;

Whereas some States have criminalized and suppressed direct-entry midwives, despite rising maternal mortality rates across the United States;

Whereas the criminalization and overregulation of midwifery disproportionately impacts Black midwives and birthing families,

exacerbating maternal health disparities and reducing access to culturally competent care;

Whereas the resurgence of Black midwifery is a testament to the resilience, resistance, and determination of spirit in the preservation of healing modalities that are practiced all over the world;

Whereas the focus on holistic care, which involves caring for the whole person, family, and community, is what makes a difference in midwifery;

Whereas midwifery honors the right to bodily autonomy of the birthing person and can be facilitated at home, in a birth center, or hospital, and works in tandem with doulas, community health workers, obstetricians, pediatricians, and other maternal, reproductive, and perinatal health care providers;

Whereas the Midwifery Model of Care has been proven to have better pregnancy outcomes through preventing infant mortality and morbidity, lowering preterm births, reducing medical interventions, and providing the birthing person continuous support;

Whereas, in 2022, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (referred to in this preamble as “CERD”) of the United Nations expressed concerns regarding the impact of systemic racism and intersecting factors on access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health services for women, and the limited availability of culturally sensitive and respectful maternal health care, particularly for those with low incomes, rural residents, individuals of African descent, and indigenous communities;

Whereas CERD recommended that the United States further develop policies and programs to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in the field of sexual and reproductive health and rights, while integrating an intersectional and culturally respectful approach in order to reduce the high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity affecting racial and ethnic minorities, including through midwifery care;

Whereas, in 2023, the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations expressed similar concerns as CERD and further recommended that the United States take measures to remove restrictive and discriminatory legal and practice barriers to midwifery care, including those affecting Black and indigenous peoples;

Whereas a fair distribution of resources, especially with regard to reproductive health care services, is critical to closing the racial disparity gap in maternal health outcomes;

Whereas an investment must be made in robust, quality, and comprehensive health care for Black women, with policies that support and promote affordable and holistic maternal health care that is free from gender and racial discrimination;

Whereas it is fitting and proper on Black Midwives Day to recognize the tremendous impact of the human rights, reproductive justice, and birth justice frameworks have on protecting and advancing the rights of Black women;

Whereas Black Midwives Day is an opportunity to acknowledge the fight to end maternal mortality locally and globally;

Whereas maternal health is intractably linked to infant health, and the United States infant mortality rate rose 3 percent from a rate of 5.44 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in 2021 to 5.60 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in 2022, the largest increase in the infant mortality rate in 2 decades; and

Whereas Congress must mitigate the effects of systemic and structural racism to ensure that all Black people have access to midwives, doulas, and other community-based, culturally matched perinatal health providers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes March 14, 2026, as “Black Midwives Day”;

(2) encourages the Federal Government and State and local governments to take proactive measures to address racial disparities in maternal health outcomes by supporting initiatives aimed at diversifying the perinatal workforce, increasing access to culturally congruent maternal health care;

(3) commits to collaborating with relevant stakeholders to develop and enact policy solutions that promote health equity, address systemic racism, and support the advancement of Black midwifery;

(4) calls for—

(A) increased funding for education, training, and access to Black preceptors;

(B) removing barriers and restrictions to Black preceptors;

(C) providing financial pathways to support students and preceptors;

(D) mentorship programs that focus on promoting and sustaining Black midwifery; and

(E) removing barriers related to accreditation by recognizing midwives across all training pathways;

(5) encourages the Federal Government and State governments to authorize the autonomous practice of all midwives to the full extent of their training;

(6) promotes the authorization or reauthorization of funding for TRICARE and Medicaid coverage of maternity care provided by midwives of all training pathways;

(7) encourages the Federal Government and State and local governments to take active steps to destigmatize and decriminalize midwifery pathways in the setting of choice of the pregnant person, including their homes, birth centers, clinics, or health units; and

(8) supports and recognizes the longstanding and invaluable contributions of Black midwives to maternal and infant health in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 647—DESIGNATING MARCH 21, 2026, AS “NATIONAL OSCEOLA TURKEY DAY”

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mrs. MOODY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 647

Whereas wild turkey has been an important part of the history and family traditions of the United States;

Whereas wild turkey was on the table at the very first Thanksgiving, and turkey continues to be a mainstay during many holiday traditions;

Whereas wild turkey is a healthy, organic, and delicious source of lean protein;

Whereas, in the United States, turkey hunters have spent approximately \$76,900,000 per year since 1985 with an economic impact of \$128,700,000 annually;

Whereas Florida has a rich history of wild turkey hunting, management, and research;

Whereas Florida is home to the Wild Turkey Cost Share Program, which is the largest public-private partnership program in the United States for the maintenance of wild turkey habitat on wildlife management areas and other public lands open to hunting;

Whereas, since the Wild Turkey Cost Share Program began in 1994, upwards of 1,000,000 acres of upland habitat have received funding for turkey habitat management efforts;

Whereas, in the 2025 Florida spring wild turkey season, an estimated 28,162 hunters participated in turkey hunting, including an estimated 5,968 non residents of the Sunshine State;

Whereas, in Florida, revenue generated from the sale of wild turkey permits is used for conservation, research, and management of wild turkeys or promoting the cultural heritage of hunting;

Whereas turkey hunters are an important part of the Wild Turkey Cost Share Program, and the money generated from the sale of turkey permits, which are a requirement for hunting wild turkeys in Florida unless exempt, allows the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission to make significant contributions to the Wild Turkey Cost Share Program each year;

Whereas Florida is home to 2 subspecies of wild turkey, the eastern wild turkey and the Osceola or Florida wild turkey;

Whereas the Osceola is 1 of 5 subspecies of wild turkey in North America;

Whereas the Osceola turkey exists only in peninsular Florida;

Whereas the Osceola subspecies of wild turkey is often perceived as mysterious and the most difficult to harvest because of its small geographic range and the often swampy habitat where it is found;

Whereas hunters in pursuit of the 4 subspecies of turkey in the United States, known as a “Grand Slam”, are required to hunt in Florida; and

Whereas March 7, 2026, is the opening day of turkey harvesting season in part of Florida, and March 21, 2026, is the opening day for the entire State of Florida: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 21, 2026, as “National Osceola Turkey Day”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Osceola Turkey Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 648—HONORING THE MEMORY, SERVICE, AND SACRIFICE OF MASTER SERGEANT NICOLE M. AMOR, UNITED STATES ARMY RESERVE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 648

Whereas United States servicemembers assigned to the 103rd Sustainment Command, United States Army Reserve, were deployed to Port Shuaiba, Kuwait, in support of Operation Epic Fury;

Whereas, on March 1, 2026, an unmanned aircraft system attack on Port Shuaiba killed Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, age 39, of White Bear Lake, Minnesota, Captain Cody A. Khork, Sergeant First Class Noah L. Tietjens, Sergeant Declan J. Coady, Major Jeffrey O'Brien, and Chief Warrant Officer 3 Robert M. Marzan;

Whereas Master Sergeant Amor was a dedicated soldier who served the United States with distinction for nearly 20 years in the United States Army Reserve, including on previous deployments to Kuwait and Iraq in 2019;

Whereas Master Sergeant Amor earned numerous military awards and decorations for her service, including the Army Commendation Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Service Medal, the Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, and the Armed Forces Reserve Medal with “M” Device;

Whereas Master Sergeant Amor was posthumously promoted from Sergeant First Class to Master Sergeant; and

Whereas Master Sergeant Amor was a devoted spouse and mother and was beloved by her community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the memory, service, and sacrifice of Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, United States Army Reserve;

(2) extends its sympathies, gratitude, and support to the family of Master Sergeant Amor, and to all others affected by the attack at Port Shuaiba, Kuwait, on March 1, 2026; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Master Sergeant Amor.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4399. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4400. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4401. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4402. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4403. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4404. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4405. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4406. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4407. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4408. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4409. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4410. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4411. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4412. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4413. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4414. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4415. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4416. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4417. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4418. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4419. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4420. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1383, supra.

SA 4421. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, supra.

SA 4422. Mr. THUNE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1383, supra.

SA 4423. Mr. THUNE proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4422 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the bill S. 1383, supra.

SA 4424. Mr. THUNE proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4423 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the amendment SA 4422 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the bill S. 1383, supra.

SA 4425. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. TUBERVILLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4426. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4427. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4428. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4429. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4430. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4431. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4432. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4433. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4434. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4435. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4436. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4437. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4438. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4439. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him

to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4440. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4441. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4442. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4443. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4444. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4445. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4446. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4447. Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4448. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4449. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4450. Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4451. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. PADILLA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4452. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4453. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4454. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4455. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4456. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4457. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. TUBERVILLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4458. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4459. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4399. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE SEX OFFENDER SECURITY CLASSIFICATION INTEGRITY ACT OF 2026

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Sex Offender Security Classification Integrity Act of 2026”.

SEC. 02. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **BUREAU.**—The term “Bureau” means the Bureau of Prisons.

(2) **LOW SECURITY FACILITY.**—The term “low security facility” means a Federal correctional institution or other institution of the Bureau classified by the Bureau as low security with a secure perimeter and increased staff to inmate ratio compared to a minimum security facility.

(3) **MINIMUM SECURITY FACILITY.**—The term “minimum security facility” means a Federal prison camp or other institution of the Bureau classified by the Bureau as minimum security that permits relatively free inmate movement and, in whole or in part, access to the community or to activities outside a secure perimeter.

(4) **PUBLIC SAFETY FACTOR.**—The term “public safety factor” means a classification factor used by the Bureau to require placement of an inmate in a more secure facility based on specific offense conduct, criminal history, or other security related characteristics, including a designation as a sex offender.

(5) **SEX OFFENDER.**—The term “sex offender” means—

(A) a sex offender (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (34 U.S.C. 20911)); or

(B) any other offender who is subject to a sex offender public safety factor or equivalent designation under the inmate custody classification policies of the Bureau.

(6) **SEX OFFENSE.**—The term “sex offense” means—

(A) a sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (34 U.S.C. 20911)); or

(B) any other offense which the Bureau has designated a sex offender public safety factor or equivalent designation under the inmate custody classification policies of the Bureau.

SEC. 03. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Bureau operates facilities at security levels that include minimum and low security facilities, and uses a custody classification system that assigns public safety factors for certain categories of offenders, including sex offenders.

(2) Under longstanding Bureau policy and practice, individuals with a sex offender public safety factor are, by default, ineligible for placement at minimum security facilities, and are instead required to be housed, at a minimum, in low security facilities, absent a formal waiver approved through established procedures.

(3) Ghislaine Maxwell, a close confidant of Jeffrey Epstein, was convicted in Federal court in 2022 of serious sex trafficking offenses involving minors and designated as a

sex offender for purposes of her Bureau classification. She was originally housed at a low security facility in Tallahassee, Florida.

(4) In July 2025, Maxwell was transferred from that low security facility to a minimum security facility in Bryan, Texas, notwithstanding the Bureau's default policy that individuals with sex offender public safety factors are not appropriate for placement in minimum security facilities that permit inmate access to the community, and ordinarily may be transferred there only upon the grant of a waiver by Bureau officials.

(5) Public reporting indicates that Maxwell's transfer followed meetings over 2 days with the Deputy Attorney General, Todd Blanche, during which Maxwell provided information relating to matters under review by the Department of Justice.

(6) Deputy Attorney General Blanche has publicly defended Maxwell's transfer to a less restrictive, minimum security facility.

(7) The apparent deviation from ordinary Bureau policy in Maxwell's case, and the subsequent public defense of that deviation by a senior Department of Justice official, raises serious concerns about whether the security classification system is being applied consistently, transparently, and without favoritism.

(8) Congress has a compelling interest in ensuring that individuals convicted of sex offenses are not assigned to facilities that are inconsistent with established security policies, that any exceptions are narrowly justified and subject to clear oversight, and that the Department of Justice maintains the confidence of the public and of crime victims in the even handed administration of Federal criminal sentences.

SEC. 04. STATUTORY BASELINE SECURITY LEVEL FOR INDIVIDUALS CONVICTED OF SEX OFFENSES.

(a) BASELINE SECURITY LEVEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, regulation, or policy, the Bureau shall designate and house at a facility that is classified, at a minimum, as a low security facility any inmate who is a sex offender—

(A) has been convicted of a sex offense in a court of the United States; or

(B) is subject to a sex offender public safety factor or equivalent designation under the inmate classification system of the Bureau.

(2) PROHIBITION ON INITIAL PLACEMENT AT MINIMUM SECURITY FACILITIES.—The Bureau may not initially designate or house an inmate described in paragraph (1) at a minimum security facility.

(b) LIMITED EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) MEDICAL OR GERIATRIC PLACEMENT.—The Director of the Bureau may, on a case by case basis, authorize the placement of an inmate described in subsection (a)(1) at a minimum security facility if—

(A) the inmate is assigned to, or is being transferred solely for placement in, a secure medical center, residential reentry center, or other specialized unit that is functionally equivalent to low security confinement in terms of perimeter security and community access; or

(B) the inmate is of advanced age or has a serious medical condition, and the Director of the Bureau certifies in writing that—

(i) the inmate does not pose a significant risk of escape or danger to the community; and

(ii) no appropriate low security or higher security placement is reasonably available to meet the inmate's medical or geriatric needs.

(2) WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION AND NOTICE.—Any exception under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be supported by a written determination signed by the Director of the Bureau

that specifically addresses each criterion in paragraph (1); and

(B) be transmitted, not later than 30 days after the determination, to—

(i) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(3) RECORDKEEPING.—The Bureau shall maintain, for not less than 10 years, a record of each exception granted under this subsection, including the written determination and the name, register number, offense of conviction, prior security classification, and facility history of the applicable inmate.

(c) TRANSFERS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON DOWN CLASSIFICATION TO MINIMUM SECURITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Bureau may not transfer an inmate described in subsection (a)(1) from a low security facility or a higher security facility to a minimum security facility.

(2) NO ADVERSE EFFECT ON UPWARD TRANSFERS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the Bureau from transferring an inmate described in subsection (a)(1) to a medium or high security facility when warranted by misconduct, escape risk, or other security concerns.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a liberty interest in any particular facility, security level, or geographic location, or to limit the authority of the Bureau to manage inmate populations consistent with this section and other applicable law.

SEC. 05. TRANSPARENCY AND REPORTING.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director of the Bureau shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

(1) the total number of inmates in Bureau custody during the preceding fiscal year who were classified as sex offenders;

(2) the number of such inmates housed, at any point during that fiscal year, at—

(A) minimum security facilities; and

(B) low, medium, or high security facilities;

(3) the number of written determinations issued under section 04(b)(1), and a brief, non-identifying description of the justification for each such determination; and

(4) a description of any changes made during that fiscal year to Bureau policy or practice regarding security classifications or public safety factors for sex offenders.

(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Bureau shall make each report submitted under subsection (a) available to the public on the website of the Bureau, except that the Bureau may redact information only to the extent necessary to protect specific law enforcement sensitive information, the safety of any individual, or the security of a particular facility.

SEC. 06. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau shall revise the inmate security designation and custody classification policies, program statements, and related regulations of the Bureau to conform to the requirements of this title, including explicit incorporation of the statutory baseline security level for individuals convicted of sex offenses and the limitations on placement at minimum security facilities set forth in section 04.

SEC. 07. RETROACTIVE EFFECT.

As soon as is practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau shall reverse any change made on or after January 20, 2025, to the housing or

placement of an inmate who is classified as a sex offender and determine the housing and placement of the inmate in accordance with this title.

SA 4400. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —VETERANS VISA AND PROTECTION ACT OF 2026

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Veterans Visa and Protection Act of 2026”.

SEC. 02. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ARMED FORCES.—The term “Armed Forces” has the meaning given the term “armed forces” in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) CRIME OF VIOLENCE.—The term “crime of violence” means an offense defined in section 16(a) of title 18, United States Code—

(A) that is not a purely political offense; and

(B) for which a noncitizen has served a term of imprisonment of at least 5 years.

(3) ELIGIBLE VETERAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “eligible veteran” means a veteran who—

(i) is a noncitizen; and

(ii) meets the criteria described in section 03(e).

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “eligible veteran” includes a veteran who—

(i) was removed from the United States; or

(ii) is abroad and is inadmissible under section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)).

(4) NONCITIZEN.—The term “noncitizen” means an individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(6) SERVICE MEMBER.—The term “service member” means an individual who is serving as a member of—

(A) a regular or reserve component of the Armed Forces on active duty; or

(B) a reserve component of the Armed Forces in an active status.

(7) VETERAN.—The term “veteran” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 03. RETURN OF ELIGIBLE VETERANS REMOVED FROM THE UNITED STATES; ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.

(a) PROGRAM FOR ADMISSION AND ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program and an application procedure that allow—

(1) eligible veterans outside the United States to be admitted to the United States as aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a))); and

(2) eligible veterans in the United States to adjust status to that of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(b) VETERANS ORDERED REMOVED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to noncitizen veterans who are the subjects of final orders of removal, including noncitizen veterans who are outside the United States, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall—

(A) reopen the removal proceedings of each such noncitizen veteran; and

(B) make a determination with respect to whether each such noncitizen veteran is an eligible veteran.

(2) **RESCISSION OF REMOVAL ORDER.**—In the case of a determination under paragraph (1)(B) that a noncitizen veteran is an eligible veteran, the Attorney General shall—

(A) rescind the order of removal;

(B) adjust the status of the eligible veteran to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and

(C) terminate removal proceedings.

(c) **VETERANS IN REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—With respect to noncitizen veterans, the removal proceedings of whom are pending as of the date of the enactment of this Act, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall make a determination with respect to whether each such noncitizen veteran is an eligible veteran.

(2) **TERMINATION OF PROCEEDINGS.**—In the case of a determination under paragraph (1), that a noncitizen veteran is an eligible veteran, the Attorney General shall—

(A) adjust the status of the eligible veteran to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and

(B) terminate removal proceedings.

(d) **NO NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.**—Nothing in this section or in any other provision of law may be construed to apply a numerical limitation to the number of veterans who may be eligible to receive a benefit under this section.

(e) **ELIGIBILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including sections 212 and 237 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182 and 1227), a noncitizen veteran shall be eligible to participate in the program established under subsection (a) or for adjustment of status under subsection (b) or (c), as applicable, if the Secretary or the Attorney General, as applicable, determines that the noncitizen veteran—

(A) was not removed or ordered removed from the United States based on a conviction for—

(i) a crime of violence; or

(ii) a crime that endangers the national security of the United States for which the noncitizen veteran has served a term of imprisonment of at least 5 years; and

(B) is not inadmissible to, or deportable from, the United States based on a conviction for a crime described in subparagraph (A).

(2) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary may waive the application of subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1)—

(A) for humanitarian purposes;

(B) to ensure family unity;

(C) based on exceptional service in the Armed Forces; or

(D) if a waiver is otherwise in the public interest.

SEC. 04. PROTECTING VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS FROM REMOVAL.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 237 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227), a noncitizen who is a veteran or service member may not be removed from the United States unless the noncitizen has been convicted for a crime of violence.

SEC. 05. NATURALIZATION THROUGH SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), a noncitizen who has obtained the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to section 03 shall be eligible for naturalization through service in the Armed Forces under sections 328 and 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1439 and 1440).

(b) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(1) **GOOD MORAL CHARACTER.**—In determining whether a noncitizen described in subsection (a) is a person of good moral character, the Secretary shall disregard the one or more grounds on which the noncitizen was—

(A) removed or ordered removed from the United States; or

(B) rendered inadmissible to, or deportable from, the United States.

(2) **PERIODS OF ABSENCE.**—The Secretary shall disregard any period of absence from the United States of a noncitizen described in subsection (a) due to the noncitizen having been removed from, or being inadmissible to, the United States if the noncitizen satisfies the applicable requirement relating to continuous residence or physical presence.

SEC. 06. ACCESS TO MILITARY BENEFITS.

A noncitizen who has obtained the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to section 03 shall be eligible for all military and veterans benefits for which the noncitizen would have been eligible had the noncitizen not been ordered removed or removed from the United States, voluntarily departed the United States, or rendered inadmissible to, or deportable from, the United States, as applicable.

SEC. 07. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION.**—The Secretary shall identify noncitizen service members and veterans at risk of removal from the United States by—

(1) before initiating a removal proceeding against a noncitizen, asking the noncitizen whether he or she is serving, or has served, as a member of—

(A) a regular or reserve component of the Armed Forces on active duty; or

(B) a reserve component of the Armed Forces in an active status;

(2) requiring U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel to seek supervisory approval before initiating a removal proceeding against a service member or veteran; and

(3) keeping records of any service member or veteran who has been—

(A) the subject of a removal proceeding;

(B) detained by the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; or

(C) removed from the United States.

(b) **RECORD ANNOTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a noncitizen service member or veteran identified under subsection (a), the Secretary shall annotate all immigration and naturalization records of the Department of Homeland Security relating to the noncitizen—

(A) to reflect that the noncitizen is a service member or veteran; and

(B) to afford an opportunity to track the outcomes for the noncitizen.

(2) **CONTENTS OF ANNOTATION.**—Each annotation under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the branch of military service in which the noncitizen is serving or has served;

(B) whether the noncitizen is serving, or has served, during a period of military hostilities described in section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1440);

(C) the immigration status of the noncitizen on the date of enlistment;

(D) whether the noncitizen is serving honorably or was separated under honorable conditions;

(E) the ground on which removal of the noncitizen from the United States was sought; and

(F) in the case of a noncitizen, the removal proceedings of whom were initiated on the basis of a criminal conviction, the crime for which the noncitizen was convicted.

SEC. 08. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall

promulgate regulations to implement this title.

SA 4401. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. CORRECTIONAL FACILITY DISASTER PREPAREDNESS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Correctional Facility Disaster Preparedness Act of 2026”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the term “major disaster” means—

(1) a major disaster declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170); or

(2) any natural disaster or extreme weather or public health emergency event that—

(A)(i) causes physical damage to a Bureau of Prisons facility or contract prison; or

(ii) disrupts services described in paragraph (2), (4), (5), or (6) of section 3(a); and

(B) the Bureau of Prisons determines is a major disaster.

(c) **BUREAU OF PRISONS ANNUAL SUMMARY REPORT OF DISASTER DAMAGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Government Accountability Office, and the Inspector General of the Department of Justice an annual summary report of disaster damage on the scope of physical damage from a major disaster by each Bureau of Prisons facility and its contract prisons impacted or struck by a major disaster that explains the effects of the damage on inmates and staff, including—

(A) data on injury and loss of life of inmates and staff;

(B) access to health and medical care, food, special dietary needs, drinkable water, personal protective equipment, and personal hygiene products;

(C) guidance used to adjudicate early release or home confinement requests, data on early release or home confinement approvals, denials, and justification for denials;

(D) an explanation as to whether using home confinement or early release was considered;

(E) access to cost-free and uninterrupted visitation with legal counsel and visitors with justifications for facility decisions that resulted in suspended or altered visitations;

(F) access to appropriate accommodations for inmates with disabilities;

(G) access to educational and work programs;

(H) inmate grievances;

(I) assessment of the cost of the damage to the facility and estimates for repairs;

(J) the impact on staffing, equipment, and financial resources; and

(K) other factors relating to the ability of the Bureau of Prisons and any existing contract prison to uphold the health, safety, and civil rights of the correctional population.

(2) **CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include agency corrective actions that the Bureau of Prisons will take to improve and modernize emergency preparedness plans, as they relate to natural disasters, extreme weather, and

public health emergencies and a timeline to implement the corrective action plan.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include specific legislative recommendations to Congress for improving emergency preparedness plans within the Bureau of Prisons.

(4) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons shall appoint an official of the Bureau of Prisons responsible for carrying out the corrective action plan.

(d) **NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS.**—Section 4351 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “ten” and inserting “14”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) One shall have served a sentence in either a Federal or State correctional facility or have a professional background advocating on the behalf of formerly incarcerated or incarcerated individuals.

“(4) One shall have a background as an emergency response coordinator that has created an emergency management accreditation program.

“(5) One shall have an educational and professional background in public health working with communicable diseases.

“(6) One shall represent the labor union that represents Bureau of Prisons employees.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) **FIELD HEARING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the National Institute of Corrections shall conduct at least one public field hearing on how correctional facilities can incorporate in their emergency preparedness plans and recovery efforts—

“(1) inmate access to medical care, food, drinkable water, personal protective equipment, and personal hygiene products;

“(2) consideration by staff of using home confinement or early release;

“(3) inmate access to cost-free and uninterrupted visitation with legal counsel and visitors with clear standards for when facilities may suspend or alter visitations;

“(4) inmate access to appropriate accommodations for inmates with disabilities;

“(5) use of Federal funding to restore disaster-damaged correctional facilities; and

“(6) incorporation by staff of risk management best practices, such as those made available under the relevant agencies of the Federal Emergency Management Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Government Accountability Office to enhance emergency preparedness plans.”.

SA 4402. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PAROLE FOR CERTAIN RELATIVES OF CURRENT AND FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (B) or” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C) and”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C)(i) Except as provided in clause (iii), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall parole into the United States an alien who is

the spouse, widow or widower, parent, or child of—

“(I) a member of the Armed Forces on active duty;

“(II) a member of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve; or

“(III) an individual, whether living or deceased, who—

“(aa) previously served as—

“(AA) a member of the Armed Forces on active duty; or

“(BB) a member of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve; and

“(bb) was discharged or released from such service under a condition other than dishonorable.

“(ii) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall parole an alien into the United States under clause (i) in 1-year increments.

“(iii)(I) An application for parole under this subparagraph may be denied only if the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly issue a written justification for the denial.

“(II) The Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not delegate the responsibility described in subclause (I).

“(III)(aa) In the case of a denial under subclause (I), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall publish on a publicly available internet website of the Department of Homeland Security information about the denial, including a detailed justification for the denial.

“(bb) Information published under item (aa) shall not include personally identifiable information.”.

SA 4403. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . IDENTIFYING ALIENS CONNECTED TO THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the application by an alien for an immigration benefit or the placement of an alien in an immigration enforcement proceeding, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) determine whether the alien is serving, or has served, as a member of—

(A) a regular or reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty; or

(B) a reserve component of the Armed Forces in an active status; and

(2) with respect to the immigration and naturalization records of the Department of Homeland Security relating to an alien who is serving, or has served, as a member of the Armed Forces described in paragraph (1), annotate such records—

(A) to reflect that membership; and

(B) to afford an opportunity to track the outcomes for each such alien.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON USE OF INFORMATION FOR REMOVAL.**—Information gathered under subsection (a) may not be used for the purpose of removing an alien from the United States.

SA 4404. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PAROLE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS.

Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (B) or” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (C) and”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D)(i) The Secretary of Homeland Security may parole any alien qualified under clause (i) into the United States—

“(I) at the discretion of the Secretary;

“(II) on a case-by-case basis; and

“(III) temporarily under such conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

“(ii) To qualify for parole under clause (i) an alien applying for admission to the United States shall—

“(I) be a veteran (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code);

“(II) seek parole to receive health care furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code; and

“(III) be outside of the United States pursuant to having been ordered removed or voluntarily departed from the United States under section 240B.

“(iii) Parole of an alien under clause (i) shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien.

“(iv) If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that the purposes of such parole have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which the alien was paroled.

“(v) Parole shall not be available under clause (i) for an alien who is inadmissible due to a criminal conviction—

“(I)(aa) for a crime of violence (as defined in section 16(a) of title 18, United States Code), excluding a purely political offense; or

“(bb) for a crime that endangers the national security of the United States; and

“(II) for which the alien has served a term of imprisonment of at least 5 years.”.

SA 4405. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RESPONSIBLE RETIREMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT FIREARMS ACT OF 2025.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Responsible Retirement of Law Enforcement Firearms Act of 2026” or the “RRLEF Act of 2026”.

(b) **CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.**—Section 502 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10153) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(5)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and”; and

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) the applicant and each grantee or subgrantee under the jurisdiction of the applicant shall not transfer a firearm to, or purchase a firearm from, a licensed dealer that is on the list of covered licensed dealers most recently published at the time of certification by the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives under section 2(b)(2) of the RRLEF Act of 2026.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘covered licensed dealer’ means a licensed dealer with respect to whom, in not less than two of the three calendar years prior to the publication of the

list under section 2(b)(2) of the RRLEF Act of 2026, the National Tracing Center of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives has traced to the firearms business of such licensed dealer, in such calendar years, not less than 25 firearms that had a short time-to-crime;

“(2) the terms ‘licensed dealer’ and ‘firearm’ have the meaning given such terms in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code; and

“(3) the term ‘short time-to-crime’ means, a period of not more than three calendar years between the date of the last known retail sale of a firearm and the date on which a law enforcement agency recovers such firearm as a result of such firearm being purchased for, possessed during, or used in, an actual or suspected criminal offense.”.

(c) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF DATABASE INFORMATION OF BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, shall—

(1) notify a State or local law enforcement agency if any firearm (as such term is defined in section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code) that was transferred by such agency was used, or suspected of being used, in the commission of a criminal offense, as traced by the National Tracing Center of the Bureau; and

(2) make publicly available on the internet website of the Bureau a list of each covered licensed dealer (as such term is defined in section 502(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as added by subsection (a) of this section).

(d) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS ON PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF DATABASE INFORMATION OF BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES.—

(1) PUBLIC LAW 112-55.—The 6th proviso in the matter under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES” in title II of division B of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 112-55) is amended by striking “and in each fiscal year thereafter”.

(2) PUBLIC LAW 111-117.—The 6th proviso in the matter under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES” in title II of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2010 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 111-117) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2010 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2010”.

(3) PUBLIC LAW 111-8.—The 6th proviso in the matter under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES” in title II of division B of the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 111-8) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2009 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2009”.

(4) PUBLIC LAW 110-161.—The 6th proviso in the matter under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES” in title II of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 110-161) is amended by striking “beginning in fiscal year 2008 and thereafter” and inserting “in fiscal year 2008”.

(5) PUBLIC LAW 109-108.—The 6th proviso in the matter under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES” in title I of the Science, State, Jus-

tice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 109-108) is amended by striking “with respect to any fiscal year” and inserting “with respect to fiscal year 2006”.

(6) PUBLIC LAW 108-447.—The 6th proviso in the matter under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES” in title I of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (18 U.S.C. 923 note; Public Law 108-447) is amended by striking “with respect to any fiscal year” and inserting “with respect to fiscal year 2005”.

(7) PUBLIC LAW 108-7.—Section 644 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2003 (5 U.S.C. 552 note; Public Law 108-7) is amended by striking “with respect to any fiscal year” and inserting “with respect to fiscal year 2003”.

SA 4406. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . KOREMATSU-TAKAI CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTION.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Korematsu-Takai Civil Liberties Protection Act of 2026”.

(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST UNLAWFUL DETENTION.—Section 4001 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) PROHIBITION ON DETENTION BASED ON PROTECTED CHARACTERISTICS.—

“(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ‘protected characteristic’ includes each of the following:

- “(A) Race.
- “(B) Ethnicity.
- “(C) National origin.
- “(D) Religion.
- “(E) Sex.
- “(F) Gender identity.
- “(G) Sexual orientation.
- “(H) Disability.

“(I) Any additional characteristic that the Attorney General determines to be a protected characteristic.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—No individual may be imprisoned or otherwise detained based solely on an actual or perceived protected characteristic of the individual.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to allow the Attorney General to remove a characteristic described in subparagraphs (A) through (H) of paragraph (1).”.

SA 4407. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Supreme Court Biennial Appointments and Term Limits Act of 2026”.

SEC. 2. SUPREME COURT TERMS OF OFFICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking by section 1 and inserting the following:

“§ 1. Number of justices; quorum

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Supreme Court of the United States shall consist of a Chief Justice of the United States and not fewer than 8 associate justices, any 6 of whom shall constitute a quorum.

“(b) APPELLATE JURISDICTION CASES.—Only the 9 most recently appointed justices of the Supreme Court of the United States who are not unavailable due to a temporary absence shall preside over appellate jurisdiction cases.

“(c) ORIGINAL JURISDICTION CASES AND OTHER POWERS.—All justices of the Supreme Court of the United States shall preside over original jurisdiction cases, and may, subject to any procedures established by the Supreme Court, continue to exercise all other official powers, duties, or responsibilities of a justice of the Supreme Court required by law.”.

(2) by striking section 3 and inserting the following:

“§ 3. Vacancy in office of Chief Justice; disability

“(a) POWERS AND DUTIES OF CHIEF JUSTICE.—Whenever the Chief Justice is unable to perform the duties of the office or the office is vacant, the powers and duties of Chief Justice shall devolve upon the associate justice next in precedence who is able to act, until such disability is removed or another Chief Justice is appointed and duly qualified.

“(b) PERMANENT VACANCY IN OFFICE OF CHIEF JUSTICE.—In the event of a permanent vacancy in the office of Chief Justice of the United States, the first appointment of a justice under this chapter following such vacancy shall be to the office of Chief Justice of the United States.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 7. Appointment

“(a) APPOINTMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 individual to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States within the first 120 days of the first and third years of a Presidential term.

“(2) WITHDRAWAL OR DISAPPROVAL.—If the nomination of an individual under this section is withdrawn or disapproved by the Senate, the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 individual to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States not later than 120 after the date of such withdrawal or disapproval.

“(3) APPLICABILITY.—The President shall not appoint any individual to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States if the number of justices who do not hear appellate jurisdiction cases is 9.

“(b) EXCLUSIVE MANNER OF APPOINTMENT.—Except as provided under subsection (c), the President shall not appoint an individual to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States except as provided under this section.

“(c) FEWER THAN 9 JUSTICES.—If due to a permanent vacancy the total number of justices of the Supreme Court of the United States is fewer than 9, the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, such number of individuals as necessary to be a justice of the Supreme Court until the total number of justices of the Supreme Court is 9.

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term for justices appointed under this section shall begin on July 1.

“(2) FEWER THAN 9 JUSTICES.—The term of an appointment under subsection (c) shall

begin on the date on which the appointment is made.

“§ 8. Definitions

“In this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘appellate jurisdiction cases’ means any action, proceeding, or controversy under section 1253, 1254, 1257, 1258, 1259, or 1260;

“(2) the term ‘original jurisdiction cases’ means any action, proceeding, or controversy under section 1251;

“(3) the term ‘permanent vacancy’ means a vacancy in the office of justice of the Supreme Court of the United States due to death, resignation, retirement, or removal; and

“(4) the term ‘temporary absence’ means an absence due to disability, recusal, or disqualification.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 1 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“7. Appointment.

“8. Definitions.”.

(c) **RULES OF THE SENATE.**—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of the Senate, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure of the Senate) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the Senate.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply beginning on the date on which the first full term of a President commences pursuant to section 101 of title 3, United States Code, after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or any application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SA 4408. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Supreme Court Ethics, Recusal, and Transparency Act of 2026”.

SEC. 2. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 365. Codes of conduct

“(a) **JUSTICES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Supreme Court of the United States shall, after appropriate public notice and opportunity for comment in accordance with section 2071, issue a code of conduct for the justices of the Supreme Court.

“(b) **OTHER JUDGES.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Judicial Conference of the United

States shall, after appropriate public notice and opportunity for comment in accordance with section 2071, issue a code of conduct for the judges of the courts of appeals, the district courts (including bankruptcy judges and magistrate judges), and the Court of International Trade.

“(c) **MODIFICATION.**—The Supreme Court of the United States and the Judicial Conference may modify the applicable codes of conduct under this section after giving appropriate public notice and opportunity for comment in accordance with section 2071.

“§ 366. Public access to ethics rules

“The Supreme Court of the United States shall make available on its internet website, in a full-text, searchable, sortable, and downloadable format, copies of the code of conduct issued under section 365(a), any rules established by the Counselor to the Chief Justice of the United States under section 677 and any other related rules or resolutions, as determined by the Chief Justice of the United States, issued by the Counselor to the Chief Justice of the United States or agreed to by the justices of the Supreme Court.

“§ 367. Complaints against justices

“(a) **RECEIPT OF COMPLAINTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Supreme Court of the United States shall establish procedures, modeled after the procedures set forth in sections 351 through 364, under which individuals may file with the Court, or the Court may identify, complaints alleging that a justice of the Supreme Court—

“(A) has violated—

“(i) the code of conduct issued pursuant to section 365(a);

“(ii) section 455; or

“(iii) any other applicable provision of Federal law; or

“(B) has otherwise engaged in conduct that undermines the integrity of the Supreme Court.

“(2) **PROCEDURES.**—Procedures established under this subsection shall, at minimum, contain provisions—

“(A) requiring that all complaints submitted under this section contain—

“(i) the signature and contact address of the complainant;

“(ii) a concise statement of the specific facts on which the claim of misconduct is based; and

“(iii) a sworn affirmation that to the best of the knowledge and belief of the complainant, under penalty of perjury, the facts alleged in the complaint are true and form a reasonable basis to believe a justice has committed misconduct under this section; and

“(B) providing for the restriction on the future filing of complaints with respect to complainants who are shown to have filed repetitive, harassing, or frivolous complaints, or have otherwise abused the complaint procedure.

“(b) **JUDICIAL INVESTIGATION PANEL.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon receipt or identification of a complaint under subsection (a), the Supreme Court of the United States shall refer such complaint to a judicial investigation panel, which shall be composed of a panel of 5 judges selected randomly from among the chief judge of each circuit of the United States.

“(2) **DUTIES.**—The judicial investigation panel—

“(A) shall review and, if appropriate as determined by the panel, investigate all complaints submitted to the panel using procedures established by the panel and modeled after the procedures set forth in sections 351 through 364;

“(B) shall present to the Supreme Court of the United States any findings and rec-

ommendations for necessary and appropriate action by the Supreme Court, including dismissal of the complaint, disciplinary actions, or changes to Supreme Court rules or procedures;

“(C) if the panel does not recommend dismissal of the complaint, not later than 30 days following the presentation of any findings and recommendations under this paragraph, shall publish a report containing such findings and recommendations; and

“(D) if the panel recommends dismissal of the complaint, may publish any findings and recommendations if the panel determines that such publication would be in furtherance of the public interest.

“(3) **POWERS.**—In conducting any investigation under this section, the judicial investigation panel may hold hearings, take sworn testimony, issue subpoenas ad testificandum and subpoenas duces tecum, and make necessary and appropriate orders in the exercise of its authority.

“(4) **ACCESS.**—If the judicial investigation panel determines that a substantially similar complaint was previously submitted under section 351, but that such substantially similar complaint was dismissed for lack of authority to review or act upon such complaint, the panel shall have access to any information gathered pursuant to this chapter in relation to such substantially similar complaint.

“(5) **COMPENSATION.**—The judicial investigation panel may appoint and fix the compensation of such staff as it deems necessary.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“365. Codes of conduct.

“366. Public access to ethics rules.

“367. Complaints against justices.”.

SEC. 3. MINIMUM GIFT AND DISCLOSURE STANDARDS FOR JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Section 677 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) The Counselor, with the approval of the Chief Justice, shall establish rules governing the acceptance of gifts and the disclosure of all gifts, income, or reimbursements, as those terms are defined in section 13101 of title 5, received by any justice and any law clerk to a justice. Such rules shall, at minimum, require disclosure of any information concerning gifts, income, and reimbursements required to be disclosed under the Standing Rules of the Senate and the Rules of the House of Representatives, and restrict the acceptance of gifts, and require processes for written approval of certain gifts, to the same extent as restricted or required under the Standing Rules of the Senate and the Rules of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 4. CIRCUMSTANCES REQUIRING DISQUALIFICATION.

(a) **ANTICORRUPTION PROTECTIONS.**—Subsection (b) of section 455 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) Where the justice or judge knows that a party to the proceeding or an affiliate of a party to the proceeding made any lobbying contact, as defined in section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602), or spent substantial funds in support of the nomination, confirmation, or appointment of the justice or judge.

“(7) Where the justice or judge, their spouse, their minor child, or a privately held entity owned by any such person received income, a gift, or reimbursement, as those terms are defined in section 13101 of title 5—

“(A) from a party to the proceeding or an affiliate of a party to the proceeding; and

“(B) during the period beginning on the date that is 6 years before the date on which the justice or judge was assigned to the proceeding and ending on the date of final disposition of the proceeding.”.

(b) **DUTY TO KNOW.**—Subsection (c) of section 455 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(c) A justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States shall ascertain—

“(1) the personal and fiduciary financial interests of the justice or judge;

“(2) the personal financial interests of the spouse and minor children residing in the household of the justice or judge; and

“(3) any interest of the persons described in paragraph (2) that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding.”.

(c) **DIVESTMENT.**—Subsection (f) of section 455 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “under subsection (b)(4)” after “disqualified”.

(d) **DUTY TO NOTIFY.**—Section 455 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) If at any time a justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States learns of a condition that could reasonably require disqualification under this section, the justice or judge shall immediately notify all parties to the proceeding.”.

(e) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—Section 455 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this section, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking “**judge, or magistrate judge**” and inserting “**judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge**”;

(2) in subsection (a), by striking “judge, or magistrate judge” and inserting “judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “the judge or such lawyer” and inserting “the justice, the judge, or such lawyer”;

(B) in paragraph (5)(iii), by inserting “justice or” before “judge”; and

(C) in paragraph (5)(iv), by inserting “justice’s or” before “judge’s”;

(4) in subsection (d)(4)(i), by inserting “justice or” before “judge”; and

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “judge, or magistrate judge” and inserting “judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States”.

(f) **PUBLIC NOTICE.**—The rules of each court subject to section 455 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this section, shall be amended to require that the clerk shall publish timely notice on the website of the court of—

(1) any matter in which a justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States is disqualified under such section;

(2) any matter in which the reviewing panel under section 1660 of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 5 of this Act, rules on a motion to disqualify; and

(3) an explanation of each reason for the disqualification or ruling, which shall include a specific identification of each circumstance that resulted in such disqualification or ruling, but which shall not include any private or sensitive information deemed by a majority of the reviewing panel under section 1660 of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 5 of this Act, to be appropriate for redaction and unnecessary in order to provide the litigants and public a full understanding of the reasons for the disqualification or ruling.

SEC. 5. REVIEW OF CERTIFIED DISQUALIFICATION MOTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**§1660. Review of certified motions to disqualify**

“(a) **MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION.**—If a justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States is required to be disqualified from a proceeding under any provision of Federal law, a party to the proceeding may file a timely motion for disqualification, accompanied by a certificate of good faith and an affidavit alleging facts sufficient to show that disqualification of the justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge is so required.

“(b) **CONSIDERATION OF MOTION.**—A justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States shall either grant or certify to a reviewing panel a timely motion filed pursuant to subsection (a) and stay the proceeding until a final determination is made with respect to the motion.

“(c) **REVIEWING PANEL.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A reviewing panel to which a motion is certified under subsection (b) with respect to a justice, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States shall be composed of 3 judges selected at random from judges of the United States who do not sit on the same court—

“(A) as the judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge who is the subject of the motion; or

“(B) as the other members of the reviewing panel.

“(2) **CIRCUIT LIMITATION.**—Not more than 1 member of the reviewing panel may be a judge of the same judicial circuit as the judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge who is the subject of the motion.

“(3) **PARTICIPATION.**—The reviewing panel, prior to its final determination with respect to a motion filed under subsection (a), shall provide the judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States who is the subject of such motion an opportunity to provide in writing the views of the judge on the motion, including the explanation of the judge for not granting the motion.

“(d) **SUPREME COURT REVIEW.**—The Supreme Court of the United States, not including the justice who is the subject of a motion seeking to disqualify a justice under subsection (a), shall be the reviewing panel for such motions.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1660. Review of certified motions to disqualify.”.

SEC. 6. DISCLOSURE BY PARTIES AND AMICI.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Supreme Court of the United States shall prescribe rules of procedure in accordance with sections 2072 through 2074 of title 28, United States Code, requiring each party or amicus to list in the petition or brief of the party or amicus, as applicable, a description and value of—

(1) any gift, income, or reimbursement, as those terms are defined in section 13101 of title 5, United States Code, provided to any justice, during the period beginning 2 years prior to the commencement of the proceeding and ending on the date of final disposition of the proceeding, by—

(A) each such party, amicus, or affiliate of each such party or amicus;

(B) the lawyers or law firms in the proceeding of each such party or amicus; and

(C) the officers, directors, or employees of each such party or amicus; and

(2) any lobbying contact or expenditure of substantial funds by any person described in

subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) in support of the nomination, confirmation, or appointment of a justice.

SEC. 7. AMICUS DISCLOSURE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by section 5, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**§1661. Disclosures related to amicus activities**

“(a) **DISCLOSURE.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any person that files an amicus brief in a court of the United States shall list in the amicus brief the name of any person who—

“(A) contributed to the preparation or submission of the amicus brief;

“(B) contributed not less than 3 percent of the gross annual revenue of the amicus, or an affiliate of the amicus, for the previous calendar year if the amicus is not an individual; or

“(C) contributed more than \$100,000 to the amicus, or an affiliate of the amicus, in the previous calendar year.

“(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The requirements of this subsection shall not apply to amounts received in commercial transactions in the ordinary course of any trade or business by the amicus, or an affiliate of the amicus, or in the form of investments (other than investments by the principal shareholder in a limited liability corporation) in an organization if the amounts are unrelated to the amicus filing activities of the amicus.

“(b) **AUDIT.**—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall conduct an annual audit to ensure compliance with this section.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by section 5, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1661. Disclosures related to amicus activities.”.

SEC. 8. CONFLICTS RELATED TO AMICI CURIAE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Supreme Court of the United States and the Judicial Conference of the United States shall prescribe rules of procedure in accordance with sections 2072 through 2074 of title 28, United States Code, for prohibiting the filing of or striking an amicus brief that would result in the disqualification of a justice, judge, or magistrate judge.

(b) **INITIAL TRANSMITTAL.**—The Supreme Court of the United States shall transmit to Congress—

(1) the proposed rules required under subsection (a) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any rules in addition to those transmitted under paragraph (1) pursuant to section 2074 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 9. STUDIES AND REPORTS.

(a) **STUDIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and not later than December 1 of every other year thereafter, the Director of the Federal Judicial Center shall—

(A) conduct a study on the extent of compliance or noncompliance with the requirements of sections 144 and 455 of title 28, United States Code; and

(B) submit to Congress the results of the study required under subparagraph (A).

(2) **ADDITIONAL TIME.**—With respect to the first such study required to be submitted under paragraph (1), the requirements of that paragraph may be implemented after the date described in that paragraph if the Director of the Federal Judicial Center identifies in writing to the relevant committees

of Congress the additional time needed for submission of the study.

(3) **FACILITATION OF STUDIES.**—The Director of the Federal Judicial Center shall maintain a record of each instance in which—

(A) a justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States was not assigned to a case due to potential or actual conflicts; and

(B) a justice, judge, magistrate judge, or bankruptcy judge of the United States disqualifies themselves after a case assignment is made.

(b) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than April 1 of each year following the completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Director of the Federal Judicial Center shall submit to Congress a report containing the findings of the study and any recommendations to improve compliance with sections 144 and 455 of title 28, United States Code.

(c) **GAO REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the report is submitted under subsection (b), if determined appropriate by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate or the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the Comptroller General of the United States, and every 5 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(A) an review of the methodology and findings of the study required under subsection (a); and

(B) a review of the methodology and findings of the audit required under section 1661 of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 7 of this Act.

(2) **ACCESS.**—For purposes of conducting the reviews required under paragraph (1), and consistent with section 715 of title 31, United States Code, the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized to obtain such records of the Federal Judicial Center and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts as the Comptroller requires, including those records relating to the Supreme Court of the United States.

SA 4409. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Democracy Is Strengthened by Casting Light On Spending in Elections Act of 2026” or the “DISCLOSE Act of 2026”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

TITLE I—CLOSING LOOPHOLES ALLOWING SPENDING BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTIONS

Sec. 101. Clarification of application of foreign money ban to certain disbursements and activities.

Sec. 102. Study and report on illicit foreign money in Federal elections.

Sec. 103. Prohibition on contributions and donations by foreign nationals in connection with ballot initiatives and referenda.

Sec. 104. Disbursements and activities subject to foreign money ban.

Sec. 105. Prohibiting establishment of corporation to conceal election contributions and donations by foreign nationals.

TITLE II—REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS

Sec. 201. Reporting of campaign-related disbursements.

Sec. 202. Reporting of Federal judicial nomination disbursements.

Sec. 203. Coordination with FinCEN.

Sec. 204. Application of foreign money ban to disbursements for campaign-related disbursements consisting of covered transfers.

Sec. 205. Sense of Congress regarding implementation.

Sec. 206. Effective date.

TITLE III—OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

Sec. 301. Petition for certiorari.

Sec. 302. Judicial review of actions related to campaign finance laws.

Sec. 303. Effective date.

TITLE IV—STAND BY EVERY AD

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Stand by every ad.

Sec. 403. Disclaimer requirements for communications made through prerecorded telephone calls.

Sec. 404. No expansion of persons subject to disclaimer requirements on internet communications.

Sec. 405. Effective date.

TITLE V—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 501. Severability.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Campaign finance disclosure is a narrowly tailored and minimally restrictive means to advance substantial government interests, including fostering an informed electorate capable of engaging in self-government and holding their elected officials accountable, detecting and deterring quid pro quo corruption, and identifying information necessary to enforce other campaign finance laws, including campaign contribution limits and the prohibition on foreign money in U.S. campaigns. To further these substantial interests, campaign finance disclosure must be timely and complete, and must disclose the true and original source of money given, transferred, and spent to influence Federal elections. Current law does not meet this objective because corporations and other entities that the Supreme Court has permitted to spend money to influence Federal elections are subject to few if any transparency requirements.

(2) As the Supreme Court recognized in its per curiam opinion in *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, (1976), “disclosure requirements certainly in most applications appear to be the least restrictive means of curbing the evils of campaign ignorance and corruption that Congress found to exist.” *Buckley*, 424 U.S. at 68. In *Citizens United v. FEC*, the Court reiterated that “disclosure is a less restrictive alternative to more comprehensive regulations of speech.” 558 U.S. 310, 369 (2010).

(3) No subsequent decision has called these holdings into question, including the Court’s decision in *Americans for Prosperity Foundation v. Bonta*, 141 S. Ct. 2373 (2021). That case did not involve campaign finance disclosure, and the Court did not overturn its longstanding recognition of the substantial interests furthered by such disclosure.

(4) Campaign finance disclosure is also essential to enforce the Federal Election Campaign Act’s prohibition on contributions by and solicitations of foreign nationals. See section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121).

(5) Congress should close loopholes allowing spending by foreign nationals in domestic elections. For example, in 2021, the Federal Election Commission, the independent Federal agency charged with protecting the integrity of the Federal campaign finance process, found reason to believe and conciliated a matter where an experienced political consultant knowingly and willfully violated Federal law by soliciting a contribution from a foreign national by offering to transmit a \$2,000,000 contribution to a super PAC through his company and two 501(c)(4) organizations, to conceal the origin of the funds. This scheme was only unveiled after appearing in a *The Telegraph* UK article and video capturing the solicitation. See Conciliation Agreement, MURs 7165 & 7196 (Great America PAC, et al.), date June 28, 2021; Factual and Legal Analysis, MURs 7165 & 7196 (Jesse Benton), dated Mar. 2, 2021.

TITLE I—CLOSING LOOPHOLES ALLOWING SPENDING BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN ELECTIONS

SEC. 101. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN TO CERTAIN DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES.

Section 319(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(2) by striking “As used in this section, the term” and inserting the following: “DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) **FOREIGN NATIONAL.**—The term”;

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) **CONTRIBUTION AND DONATION.**—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), the term ‘contribution or donation’ includes any disbursement to a political committee which accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with any of the limitations, prohibitions, and reporting requirements of this Act (or any disbursement to or on behalf of any account of a political committee which is established for the purpose of accepting such donations or contributions), or to any other person for the purpose of funding an expenditure, independent expenditure, or electioneering communication (as defined in section 304(f)(3)).”

SEC. 102. STUDY AND REPORT ON ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) **STUDY.**—For each 4-year election cycle (beginning with the 4-year election cycle ending in 2024), the Comptroller General shall conduct a study on the incidence of illicit foreign money in all elections for Federal office held during the preceding 4-year election cycle, including what information is known about the presence of such money in elections for Federal office.

(b) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than the applicable date with respect to any 4-year election cycle, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) **MATTERS INCLUDED.**—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a description of the extent to which illicit foreign money was used to target particular groups, including rural communities, African-American and other minority communities, and military and veteran communities, based on such targeting information as is available and accessible to the Comptroller General.

(3) **APPLICABLE DATE.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “applicable date” means—

(A) in the case of the 4-year election cycle ending in 2024, the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) in the case of any other 4-year election cycle, the date that is 1 year after the date on which such 4-year election cycle ends.

(C) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) 4-YEAR ELECTION CYCLE.—The term “4-year election cycle” means the 4-year period ending on the date of the general election for the offices of President and Vice President.

(2) ILLICIT FOREIGN MONEY.—The term “illicit foreign money” means any contribution, donation, expenditure, or disbursement by a foreign national (as defined in section 319(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(b))) prohibited under such section.

(3) ELECTION; FEDERAL OFFICE.—The terms “election” and “Federal office” have the meanings given such terms under section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101).

(4) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

(d) SUNSET.—This section shall not apply to any 4-year election cycle beginning after the election for the offices of President and Vice President in 2036.

SEC. 103. PROHIBITION ON CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS IN CONNECTION WITH BALLOT INITIATIVES AND REFERENDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 319(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(b)), as amended by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(3) FEDERAL, STATE, OR LOCAL ELECTION.—The term ‘Federal, State, or local election’ includes a State or local ballot initiative or referendum, but only in the case of—

“(A) a covered foreign national as defined in paragraph (4); or

“(B) a foreign principal described in section 1(b)(2) or 1(b)(3) of the Foreign Agent Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(b)(2), (b)(3)) or an agent of such a foreign principal under such Act.

“(4) COVERED FOREIGN NATIONAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered foreign national’ means—

“(i) a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b)) that is a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party;

“(ii) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal described in clause (i) or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal described in clause (i); or

“(iii) any person included in the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury pursuant to authorities relating to the imposition of sanctions relating to the conduct of a foreign principal described in clause (i).

“(B) CLARIFICATION REGARDING APPLICATION TO CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.—In the case of a citizen of the United States, clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) applies only to the

extent that the person involved acts within the scope of that person’s status as the agent of a foreign principal described in clause (i) of subparagraph (A).’.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held in 2026 or any succeeding year.

SEC. 104. DISBURSEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES SUBJECT TO FOREIGN MONEY BAN.

(a) DISBURSEMENTS DESCRIBED.—Section 319(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) an expenditure;

“(D) an independent expenditure;

“(E) a disbursement for an electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(f)(3));

“(F) a disbursement for a communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on a website, web application, or digital application that refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and is disseminated within 60 days before a general, special or runoff election for the office sought by the candidate or 30 days before a primary or preference election, or a convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate for the office sought by the candidate;

“(G) a disbursement by a covered foreign national (as defined in subsection (b)(4)) for a broadcast, cable or satellite communication, or for a communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on a website, web application, or digital application, that promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the communication contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy);

“(H) a disbursement for a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication, or for any communication which is placed or promoted for a fee on an online platform (as defined in subsection (b)(5)), that discusses a national legislative issue of public importance in a year in which a regularly scheduled general election for Federal office is held, but only if the disbursement is made by a covered foreign national (as defined in subsection (b)(4));

“(I) a disbursement by a covered foreign national (as defined in subsection (b)(4)) to compensate any person for internet activity that promotes, supports, attacks or opposes the election of a clearly identified candidate for Federal, State, or local office (regardless of whether the activity contains express advocacy or the functional equivalent of express advocacy); or

“(J) a disbursement by a covered foreign national (as defined in subsection (b)(4)) for a Federal judicial nomination communication (as defined in section 324(g)(2)).’.

(b) DEFINITION OF ONLINE PLATFORM.—Section 319(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30121(b)), as amended by sections 101 and 103, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) ONLINE PLATFORM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, subject to subparagraph (B), the term ‘online platform’ means any public-facing website, web application, or digital application (including a social network, ad network, or search engine) which—

“(i) sells qualified political advertisements; and

“(ii) has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors or users for a majority of months during the preceding 12 months; or

“(ii) is a third-party advertising vendor that has 50,000,000 or more unique monthly United States visitors in the aggregate on any advertisement space that it has sold or bought for a majority of months during the preceding 12 months, as measured by an independent digital ratings service accredited by the Media Ratings Council (or its successor).

“(B) EXEMPTION.—Such term shall not include any online platform that is a distribution facility of any broadcasting station or newspaper, magazine, blog, publication, or periodical.

“(C) THIRD-PARTY ADVERTISING VENDOR DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘third-party advertising vendor’ includes, but is not limited to, any third-party advertising vendor network, advertising agency, advertiser, or third-party advertisement serving company that buys and sells advertisement space on behalf of unaffiliated third-party websites, search engines, digital applications, or social media sites.’.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 105. PROHIBITING ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION TO CONCEAL ELECTION CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS BY FOREIGN NATIONALS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 612. Establishment of corporation to conceal election contributions and donations by foreign nationals

“(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for an owner, officer, attorney, or incorporation agent of a corporation, company, or other entity to establish or use the corporation, company, or other entity with the intent to conceal an activity of a foreign national (as defined in section 319 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121)) prohibited under such section 319.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be imprisoned for not more than 5 years, fined under this title, or both.’.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“612. Establishment of corporation to conceal election contributions and donations by foreign nationals.’.

TITLE II—REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS

SEC. 201. REPORTING OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30126) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 324. DISCLOSURE OF CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS BY COVERED ORGANIZATIONS.

“(a) DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any covered organization that makes campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000 in an election reporting cycle shall, not later than 24 hours after each disclosure date, file a statement with the Commission made under penalty of perjury that contains the information described in paragraph (2)—

“(A) in the case of the first statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the first such disclosure date) and ending on the first such disclosure date; and

“(B) in the case of any subsequent statement filed under this subsection, for the period beginning on the previous disclosure date and ending on such disclosure date.

“(2) INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The information described in this paragraph is as follows:

“(A) The name of the covered organization and the principal place of business of such organization and, in the case of a covered organization that is a corporation (other than a business concern that is an issuer of a class of securities registered under section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78l) or that is required to file reports under section 15(d) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 78o(d))) or an entity described in subsection (e)(2), a list of the beneficial owners (as defined in paragraph (4)(A)) of the entity that—

“(i) identifies each beneficial owner by name and current residential or business street address; and

“(ii) if any beneficial owner exercises control over the entity through another legal entity, such as a corporation, partnership, limited liability company, or trust, identifies each such other legal entity and each such beneficial owner who will use that other entity to exercise control over the entity.

“(B) The amount of each campaign-related disbursement made by such organization during the period covered by the statement of more than \$1,000, and the name and address of the person to whom the disbursement was made.

“(C) In the case of a campaign-related disbursement that is not a covered transfer, the election to which the campaign-related disbursement pertains and if the disbursement is made for a public communication, the name of any candidate identified in such communication and if such communication is in support of or in opposition to the identified candidate.

“(D) A certification by the chief executive officer or person who is the head of the covered organization that the campaign-related disbursement is not made in cooperation, consultation, or concert with or at the request or suggestion of a candidate, authorized committee, or agent of a candidate, political party, or agent of a political party.

“(E)(i) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using exclusively funds in a campaign-related disbursement segregated fund, for each payment made to the account by a person other than the covered organization—

“(I) the name and address of each person who made such payment to the account during the period covered by the statement;

“(II) the date and amount of such payment; and

“(III) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date, but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the account in an aggregate amount of \$10,000 or more during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date.

“(ii) In any calendar year after 2027, section 315(c)(1)(B) shall apply to the amount described in clause (i) in the same manner as such section applies to the limitations established under subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(3), and (h) of such section, except that for purposes of applying such section to the amounts described in subsection (b), the ‘base period’ shall be calendar year 2027.

“(F)(i) If the covered organization makes campaign-related disbursements using funds other than funds in a campaign-related disbursement segregated fund, for each payment to the covered organization—

“(I) the name and address of each person who made such payment during the period covered by the statement;

“(II) the date and amount of such payment; and

“(III) the aggregate amount of all such payments made by the person during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date, but only if such payment was made by a person who made payments to the covered organization in an aggregate amount of \$10,000 or more during the period beginning on the first day of the election reporting cycle (or, if earlier, the period beginning one year before the disclosure date) and ending on the disclosure date.

“(ii) In any calendar year after 2027, section 315(c)(1)(B) shall apply to the amount described in clause (i) in the same manner as such section applies to the limitations established under subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(3), and (h) of such section, except that for purposes of applying such section to the amounts described in subsection (b), the ‘base period’ shall be calendar year 2027.

“(G) Such other information as required in rules established by the Commission to promote the purposes of this section.

“(3) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) AMOUNTS RECEIVED IN ORDINARY COURSE OF BUSINESS.—The requirement to include in a statement filed under paragraph (1) the information described in paragraph (2) shall not apply to amounts received by the covered organization in commercial transactions in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments (other than investments by the principal shareholder in a limited liability corporation) in the covered organization. For purposes of this subparagraph, amounts received by a covered organization as remittances from an employee to the employee’s collective bargaining representative shall be treated as amounts received in commercial transactions in the ordinary course of the business conducted by the covered organization.

“(B) DONOR RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The requirement to include in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) the information described in subparagraph (F) of paragraph (2) shall not apply if—

“(i) the person described in such subparagraph prohibited, in writing, the use of the payment made by such person for campaign-related disbursements; and

“(ii) the covered organization followed the prohibition and deposited the payment in an account which is segregated from a campaign-related disbursement segregated fund and any other account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(C) THREAT OF HARASSMENT OR REPRISAL.—The requirement to include any information relating to the name or address of any person (other than a candidate) in a statement submitted under paragraph (1) shall not apply to any person or persons who provide specific and particular evidence establishing that the inclusion of such information would subject that person or persons to serious threats, harassment, or reprisals. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms ‘threats’, ‘harassment’, and ‘reprisals’ do not include social ostracism, negative commentary, or criticism.

“(4) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(A) BENEFICIAL OWNER DEFINED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the term ‘beneficial owner’ means, with respect to any entity, a natural person who, directly or indirectly—

“(I) exercises substantial control over an entity through ownership, voting rights, agreement, or otherwise; or

“(II) has a substantial interest in, or receives substantial economic benefits from, the assets of an entity.

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘beneficial owner’ shall not include—

“(I) a minor child;

“(II) a person acting as a nominee, intermediary, custodian, or agent on behalf of another person;

“(III) a person acting solely as an employee of an entity and whose control over, or economic benefits from, the entity derives solely from the employment status of the person;

“(IV) a person whose only interest in an entity is through a right of inheritance, unless the person also meets the requirements of clause (i); or

“(V) a creditor of an entity, unless the creditor also meets the requirements of clause (i).

“(iii) ANTI-ABUSE RULE.—The exceptions under clause (ii) shall not apply if used for the purpose of evading, circumventing, or abusing the provisions of clause (i) or paragraph (2)(A).

“(B) CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENT SEGREGATED FUND.—The term ‘campaign-related disbursement segregated fund’ means a segregated bank account consisting of funds that were paid directly to such account by persons other than the covered organization that controls the account.

“(C) DISCLOSURE DATE.—The term ‘disclosure date’ means—

“(i) the first date during any election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000; and

“(ii) any other date during such election reporting cycle by which a person has made campaign-related disbursements aggregating more than \$10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such election reporting cycle.

“(D) ELECTION REPORTING CYCLE.—The term ‘election reporting cycle’ means the 2-year period beginning on the date of the most recent general election for Federal office.

“(E) PAYMENT.—The term ‘payment’ includes any contribution, donation, transfer, payment of dues, or other payment.

“(b) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—

“(1) OTHER REPORTS FILED WITH THE COMMISSION.—Information included in a statement filed under this section may be excluded from statements and reports filed under section 304.

“(2) TREATMENT AS SEPARATE SEGREGATED FUND.—A campaign-related disbursement segregated fund may be treated as a separate segregated fund for purposes of section 527(f)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(c) FILING.—Statements required to be filed under subsection (a) shall be subject to the requirements of section 304(d) to the same extent and in the same manner as if such reports had been required under subsection (c) or (g) of section 304.

“(d) CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENT DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ‘campaign-related disbursement’ means a disbursement by a covered organization for any of the following:

“(A) An independent expenditure which expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office, or is the functional equivalent of express advocacy because, when taken as a whole, it can be interpreted by a reasonable person only as advocating the

election or defeat of a candidate for election for Federal office.

“(B) An applicable public communication.

“(C) An electioneering communication, as defined in section 304(f)(3).

“(D) A covered transfer.

“(2) APPLICABLE PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘applicable public communication’ means any public communication, including any communication that is produced for a fee or is placed or promoted for a fee on a website or digital device, application, service, or platform, that refers to a clearly identified candidate for election for Federal office and which promotes or supports the election of a candidate for that office, or attacks or opposes the election of a candidate for that office, without regard to whether the communication expressly advocates a vote for or against a candidate for that office.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Such term shall not include any news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any print, online, or digital newspaper, magazine, publication, or periodical, unless such facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate.

“(e) COVERED ORGANIZATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘covered organization’ means any of the following:

“(1) A corporation (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(2) A limited liability corporation that is not otherwise treated as a corporation for purposes of this Act (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(3) An organization described in section 501(c) of such Code and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code (other than an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of such Code).

“(4) A labor organization (as defined in section 316(b)).

“(5) Any political organization under section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, other than a political committee under this Act (except as provided in paragraph (6)).

“(6) A political committee with an account that accepts donations or contributions that do not comply with the contribution limits or source prohibitions under this Act, but only with respect to such accounts.

“(f) COVERED TRANSFER DEFINED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In this section, the term ‘covered transfer’ means any transfer or payment of funds by a covered organization to another person if the covered organization—

“(A) designates, requests, or suggests that the amounts be used for—

“(i) campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(B) made such transfer or payment in response to a solicitation or other request for a donation or payment for—

“(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) making a transfer to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements;

“(C) engaged in discussions with the recipient of the transfer or payment regarding—

“(i) the making of or paying for campaign-related disbursements (other than covered transfers); or

“(ii) donating or transferring any amount of such transfer or payment to another person for the purpose of making or paying for such campaign-related disbursements; or

“(D) knew or had reason to know that the person receiving the transfer or payment

would make campaign-related disbursements in an aggregate amount of \$50,000 or more during the 2-year period beginning on the date of the transfer or payment.

“(2) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘covered transfer’ does not include any of the following:

“(A) A disbursement made by a covered organization in a commercial transaction in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments made by the covered organization.

“(B) A disbursement made by a covered organization if—

“(i) the covered organization prohibited, in writing, the use of such disbursement for campaign-related disbursements; and

“(ii) the recipient of the disbursement followed the prohibition and deposited the disbursement in an account which is segregated from a campaign-related disbursement segregated fund and any other account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING TRANSFERS AMONG AFFILIATES.—

“(A) SPECIAL RULE.—A transfer of an amount by one covered organization to another covered organization which is treated as a transfer between affiliates under subparagraph (C) shall be considered a covered transfer by the covered organization which transfers the amount only if the aggregate amount transferred during the year by such covered organization to that same covered organization is equal to or greater than \$50,000.

“(B) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS AMONG AFFILIATES.—In determining the amount of a transfer between affiliates for purposes of subparagraph (A), to the extent that the transfer consists of funds attributable to dues, fees, or assessments which are paid by individuals on a regular, periodic basis in accordance with a per-individual calculation which is made on a regular basis, the transfer shall be attributed to the individuals paying the dues, fees, or assessments and shall not be attributed to the covered organization.

“(C) DESCRIPTION OF TRANSFERS BETWEEN AFFILIATES.—A transfer of amounts from one covered organization to another covered organization shall be treated as a transfer between affiliates if—

“(i) one of the organizations is an affiliate of the other organization; or

“(ii) each of the organizations is an affiliate of the same organization,

except that the transfer shall not be treated as a transfer between affiliates if one of the organizations is established for the purpose of making campaign-related disbursements.

“(D) DETERMINATION OF AFFILIATE STATUS.—For purposes of subparagraph (C), a covered organization is an affiliate of another covered organization if—

“(i) the governing instrument of the organization requires it to be bound by decisions of the other organization;

“(ii) the governing board of the organization includes persons who are specifically designated representatives of the other organization or are members of the governing board, officers, or paid executive staff members of the other organization, or whose service on the governing board is contingent upon the approval of the other organization; or

“(iii) the organization is chartered by the other organization.

“(E) COVERAGE OF TRANSFERS TO AFFILIATED SECTION 501(c)(3) ORGANIZATIONS.—This paragraph shall apply with respect to an amount transferred by a covered organization to an organization described in paragraph (3) of section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code in the same

manner as this paragraph applies to an amount transferred by a covered organization to another covered organization.

“(g) NO EFFECT ON OTHER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (b)(1), nothing in this section shall be construed to waive or otherwise affect any other requirement of this Act which relates to the reporting of campaign-related disbursements.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304(f)(6) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104) is amended by striking “Any requirement” and inserting “Except as provided in section 324(b), any requirement”.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Election Commission shall promulgate regulations relating to the application of the exemption under section 324(a)(3)(C) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (as added by subsection (a)). Such regulations—

(1) shall require that the legal burden of establishing eligibility for such exemption is upon the organization required to make the report required under section 324(a)(1) of such Act (as added by subsection (a));

(2) shall require reapplication for such exemption every 4 years;

(3) shall provide that applications for such exemption, and documents reflecting the Federal Election Commission’s consideration thereof, with appropriate redactions necessary to protect the personal information of any person or persons to whom such exemption applies, be published or made available for public inspection; and

(4) shall be consistent with the principles applied in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

SEC. 202. REPORTING OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL NOMINATION DISBURSEMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A fair and impartial judiciary is critical for our democracy and crucial to maintain the faith of the people of the United States in the justice system. As the Supreme Court held in *Caperton v. Massey*, “there is a serious risk of actual bias—based on objective and reasonable perceptions—when a person with a personal stake in a particular case had a significant and disproportionate influence in placing the judge on the case.” (*Caperton v. A. T. Massey Coal Co.*, 556 U.S. 868, 884 (2009)).

(2) Public trust in government is at a historic low. According to polling, most Americans believe that corporations have too much power and influence in politics and the courts.

(3) The prevalence and pervasiveness of dark money drives public concern about corruption in politics and the courts. Dark money is funding for organizations and political activities that cannot be traced to actual donors. It is made possible by loopholes in our tax laws and regulations, weak oversight by the Internal Revenue Service, and donor-friendly court decisions.

(4) Under current law, “social welfare” organizations and business leagues can use funds to influence elections so long as political activity is not their “primary” activity. Super PACs can accept and spend unlimited contributions from any non-foreign source. These groups can spend tens of millions of dollars on political activities. Such dark money groups spent an estimated \$1,050,000,000 in the 2020 election cycle.

(5) Dark money is used to shape judicial decision-making. This can take many forms, akin to agency capture: influencing judicial selection by controlling who gets nominated and funding candidate advertisements; creating public relations campaigns aimed at mobilizing the judiciary around particular

issues; and drafting law review articles, amicus briefs, and other products which tell judges how to decide a given case and provide ready-made arguments for willing judges to adopt.

(6) Over the past decade, nonprofit organizations that do not disclose their donors have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to influence the nomination and confirmation process for Federal judges. One organization alone has spent nearly \$40,000,000 on advertisements supporting or opposing Supreme Court nominees since 2016.

(7) Anonymous money spent on judicial nominations is not subject to any disclosure requirements. Federal election laws only regulate contributions and expenditures relating to electoral politics; thus, expenditures, contributions, and advocacy efforts for Federal judgeships are not covered under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. Without more disclosure, the public has no way of knowing whether the people spending money supporting or opposing judicial nominations have business before the courts.

(8) Congress and the American people have a compelling interest in knowing who is funding these campaigns to select and confirm judges to lifetime appointments on the Federal bench.

(b) **REPORTING.**—Section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30126), as amended by section 201, is amended by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) **APPLICATION TO FEDERAL JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section—

“(A) a disbursement by a covered organization for a Federal judicial nomination communication shall be treated as a campaign-related disbursement; and

“(B) in the case of campaign-related disbursements which are for Federal judicial nomination communications—

“(i) the dollar amounts in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall be applied separately with respect to such disbursements and other campaign-related disbursements;

“(ii) the election reporting cycle shall be the calendar year in which the disbursement for the Federal judicial nomination communication is made;

“(iii) references to a candidate in subsections (a)(2)(C), (a)(2)(D), and (a)(3)(C) shall be treated as references to a nominee for a Federal judge or justice;

“(iv) the reference to an election in subsection (a)(2)(C) shall be treated as a reference to the nomination of such nominee.

“(2) **FEDERAL JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMUNICATION.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘Federal judicial nomination communication’ means any communication—

“(i) that is by means of any broadcast, cable, or satellite, paid internet, or paid digital communication, paid promotion, newspaper, magazine, outdoor advertising facility, mass mailing, telephone bank, telephone messaging effort of more than 500 substantially similar calls or electronic messages within a 30-day period, or any other form of general public political advertising; and

“(ii) which promotes, supports, attacks, or opposes the nomination or Senate confirmation of an individual as a Federal judge or justice.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Such term shall not include any news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station or any print, online, or digital newspaper, magazine, publication, or periodical, unless such facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate.

“(C) **INTENT NOT REQUIRED.**—A disbursement for an item described in subparagraph (A) shall be treated as a disbursement for a Federal judicial nomination communication regardless of the intent of the person making the disbursement.”.

SEC. 203. COORDINATION WITH FINCEN.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury shall provide the Federal Election Commission with such information as necessary to assist in administering and enforcing section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended by this title.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, in consultation with the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network of the Department of the Treasury, shall submit to Congress a report with recommendations for providing further legislative authority to assist in the administration and enforcement of such section 324.

SEC. 204. APPLICATION OF FOREIGN MONEY BAN TO DISBURSEMENTS FOR CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS CONSISTING OF COVERED TRANSFERS.

Section 319(b)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30121(a)(1)(A)), as amended by section 101, is amended—

(1) by striking “includes any disbursement” and inserting “includes—

“(A) any disbursement”;

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”, and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) any disbursement, other than a disbursement described in section 324(a)(3)(A), to another person who made a campaign-related disbursement consisting of a covered transfer (as described in section 324) during the 2-year period ending on the date of the disbursement.”.

SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Election Commission should simplify the process for filing any disclosure required under the provisions of, and amendments made by, this title in order to ensure that such process is as easy and accessible as possible.

SEC. 206. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to disbursements made on or after January 1, 2027, and shall take effect without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments.

TITLE III—OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

SEC. 301. PETITION FOR CERTIORARI.

Section 307(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30107(a)(6)) is amended by inserting “(including a proceeding before the Supreme Court on certiorari)” after “appeal”.

SEC. 302. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ACTIONS RELATED TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Title IV of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30141 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 406 the following new section:

“SEC. 407. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If any action is brought for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge, whether facially or as-applied, the constitutionality or lawfulness of any provision of this Act, including title V, or of chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of

1986, or is brought to with respect to any action of the Commission under chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the following rules shall apply:

“(1) The action shall be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and an appeal from the decision of the district court may be taken to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

“(2) In the case of an action relating to declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of a provision, the party filing the action shall concurrently deliver a copy of the complaint to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.

“(3) It shall be the duty of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of the action and appeal.

“(b) **CLARIFYING SCOPE OF JURISDICTION.**—If an action at the time of its commencement is not subject to subsection (a), but an amendment, counterclaim, cross-claim, affirmative defense, or any other pleading or motion is filed challenging, whether facially or as-applied, the constitutionality or lawfulness of this Act or of chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or is brought to with respect to any action of the Commission under chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the district court shall transfer the action to the District Court for the District of Columbia, and the action shall thereafter be conducted pursuant to subsection (a).

“(c) **INTERVENTION BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**—In any action described in subsection (a) relating to declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge the constitutionality of a provision, any Member of the House of Representatives (including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress) or Senate shall have the right to intervene either in support of or opposition to the position of a party to the case regarding the constitutionality of the provision. To avoid duplication of efforts and reduce the burdens placed on the parties to the action, the court in any such action may make such orders as it considers necessary, including orders to require interveners taking similar positions to file joint papers or to be represented by a single attorney at oral argument.

“(d) **CHALLENGE BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**—Any Member of Congress may bring an action, subject to the special rules described in subsection (a), for declaratory or injunctive relief to challenge, whether facially or as-applied, the constitutionality of any provision of this Act or chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 9011 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9011. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“For provisions relating to judicial review of certifications, determinations, and actions by the Commission under this chapter, see section 407 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”.

(2) Section 9041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 9041. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

“For provisions relating to judicial review of actions by the Commission under this chapter, see section 407 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971.”.

(3) Section 310 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30110) is repealed.

(4) Section 403 of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 30110 note) is repealed.

SEC. 303. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect and apply on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title.

TITLE IV—STAND BY EVERY AD**SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Stand By Every Ad Act”.

SEC. 402. STAND BY EVERY AD.

(a) **EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.**—Section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS NOT AUTHORIZED BY CANDIDATES OR COMMITTEES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (6), any communication described in paragraph (3) of subsection (a) which is transmitted in an audio or video format (including an internet or digital communication), or which is an internet or digital communication transmitted in a text or graphic format, shall include, in addition to the requirements of paragraph (3) of subsection (a), the following:

“(A) The individual disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(A) (if the person paying for the communication is an individual) or the organizational disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(B) (if the person paying for the communication is not an individual).

“(B) If the communication is transmitted in a video format, or is an internet or digital communication which is transmitted in a text or graphic format, and is paid for in whole or in part with a payment which is treated as a campaign-related disbursement under section 324—

“(i) the Top Five Funders list (if applicable); or

“(ii) in the case of a communication which, as determined on the basis of criteria established in regulations issued by the Commission, is of such short duration that including the Top Five Funders list in the communication would constitute a hardship to the person paying for the communication by requiring a disproportionate amount of the content of the communication to consist of the Top Five Funders list, the name of a website which contains the Top Five Funders list (if applicable) or, in the case of an internet or digital communication, an adapted disclaimer (as defined in paragraph (6)(C)) that directs persons reading, observing, or listening to the communication to the Top Five Funders list (if applicable).

“(C) If the communication is transmitted in an audio format and is paid for in whole or in part with a payment which is treated as a campaign-related disbursement under section 324—

“(i) the Top Two Funders list (if applicable); or

“(ii) in the case of a communication which, as determined on the basis of criteria established in regulations issued by the Commission, is of such short duration that including the Top Two Funders list in the communication would constitute a hardship to the person paying for the communication by requiring a disproportionate amount of the content of the communication to consist of the Top Two Funders list, the name of a website which contains the Top Two Funders list (if applicable).

“(2) **DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS DESCRIBED.**—

“(A) **INDIVIDUAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS.**—The individual disclosure statement described in this subparagraph is the following:

‘I am _____, and I approve this message.’, with the blank filled in with the name of the applicable individual.

“(B) **ORGANIZATIONAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS.**—The organizational disclosure statement described in this subparagraph is the following: ‘I am _____, the _____ of _____, and _____ approves this message.’, with—

“(i) the first blank to be filled in with the name of the applicable individual;

“(ii) the second blank to be filled in with the title of the applicable individual; and

“(iii) the third and fourth blank each to be filled in with the name of the organization or other person paying for the communication.

“(3) **METHOD OF CONVEYANCE OF STATEMENT.**—

“(A) **COMMUNICATIONS IN TEXT OR GRAPHIC FORMAT.**—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in a text or graphic format, the disclosure statements required under paragraph (1) shall appear in letters at least as large as the majority of the text in the communication.

“(B) **COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTED IN AUDIO FORMAT.**—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in an audio format, the disclosure statements required under paragraph (1) shall be made by audio by the applicable individual in a clear and conspicuous manner.

“(C) **COMMUNICATIONS TRANSMITTED IN VIDEO FORMAT.**—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in a video format, the information required under paragraph (1) shall appear in writing at the end of the communication or in a crawl along the bottom of the communication in a clear and conspicuous manner, with a reasonable degree of color contrast between the background and the printed statement, for a period of at least 6 seconds.

“(4) **APPLICABLE INDIVIDUAL DEFINED.**—The term ‘applicable individual’ means, with respect to a communication to which this subsection applies—

“(A) if the communication is paid for by an individual, the individual involved;

“(B) if the communication is paid for by a corporation, the chief executive officer of the corporation (or, if the corporation does not have a chief executive officer, the highest ranking official of the corporation);

“(C) if the communication is paid for by a labor organization, the highest ranking officer of the labor organization; and

“(D) if the communication is paid for by any other person, the highest ranking official of such person.

“(5) **TOP FIVE FUNDERS LIST AND TOP TWO FUNDERS LIST DEFINED.**—

“(A) **TOP FIVE FUNDERS LIST.**—The term ‘Top Five Funders list’ means, with respect to a communication which is paid for in whole or in part with a campaign-related disbursement (as defined in section 324), a list of the 5 persons who, during the 12-month period ending on the date of the disbursement, provided the largest payments of any type in an aggregate amount equal to or exceeding \$10,000 to the person who is paying for the communication and the amount of the payments each such person provided. If 2 or more people provided the fifth largest of such payments, the person paying for the communication shall select 1 of those persons to be included on the Top Five Funders list.

“(B) **TOP TWO FUNDERS LIST.**—The term ‘Top Two Funders list’ means, with respect to a communication which is paid for in whole or in part with a campaign-related disbursement (as defined in section 324), a list of the persons who, during the 12-month pe-

riod ending on the date of the disbursement, provided the largest and the second largest payments of any type in an aggregate amount equal to or exceeding \$10,000 to the person who is paying for the communication and the amount of the payments each such person provided. If 2 or more persons provided the second largest of such payments, the person paying for the communication shall select 1 of those persons to be included on the Top Two Funders list.

“(C) **EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS.**—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), in determining the amount of payments made by a person to a person paying for a communication, there shall be excluded the following:

“(i) Any amounts provided in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the person paying for the communication or in the form of investments in the person paying for the communication.

“(ii) Any payment which the person prohibited, in writing, from being used for campaign-related disbursements, but only if the person paying for the communication followed the prohibition and deposited the payment in an account which is segregated from a campaign-related disbursement segregated fund (as defined in section 324) and any other account used to make campaign-related disbursements.

“(6) **SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.**—

“(A) **EXCEPTION FOR COMMUNICATIONS PAID FOR BY POLITICAL PARTIES AND CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES.**—This subsection does not apply to any communication to which subsection (d)(2) applies.

“(B) **TREATMENT OF VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS LASTING 10 SECONDS OR LESS.**—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is transmitted in a video format, or is an internet or digital communication which is transmitted in a text or graphic format, the communication shall meet the following requirements:

“(i) The communication shall include the individual disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(A) (if the person paying for the communication is an individual) or the organizational disclosure statement described in paragraph (2)(B) (if the person paying for the communication is not an individual).

“(ii) The statement described in clause (i) shall appear in writing at the end of the communication, or in a crawl along the bottom of the communication, in a clear and conspicuous manner, with a reasonable degree of color contrast between the background and the printed statement, for a period of at least 4 seconds.

“(iii) To the extent that the format in which the communication is made permits the use of an adapted disclaimer, the communication shall include an adapted disclaimer that directs persons reading, observing, or listening to the communication to all of the information described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) of this subsection with respect to the communication. If the format will not allow for an adapted disclaimer, the communication shall include, in a clear and conspicuous manner, a website address with a landing page which will provide all of the information described in paragraph (1)(B)(i) of this subsection with respect to the communication. The adapted disclaimer or website address shall appear for the full duration of the communication.

“(C) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(i) **ADAPTED DISCLAIMER.**—The term ‘adapted disclaimer’ means a statement that satisfies the requirements of paragraph (1)(B)(i) of this subsection and includes an indicator and a mechanism.

“(ii) INDICATOR.—The term ‘indicator’ means any visible or audible element associated with a communication that is presented in a clear and conspicuous manner and gives notice to persons reading, observing, or listening to the communication that they may read, observe, or listen to a disclaimer satisfying the requirements of paragraph (1)(B)(i) of this subsection through a mechanism. An indicator may take any form, including words, images, sounds, symbols, and icons.

“(iii) MECHANISM.—The term ‘mechanism’ means any use of technology that enables the person reading, observing, or listening to a communication to read, observe, or listen to a disclaimer satisfying the requirements of paragraph (1)(B)(i) of this subsection after not more than 1 action by a recipient of the communication. A mechanism may take any form, including hover-over text, pop-up screens, scrolling text, rotating panels, and hyperlinks to a landing page.”

(b) APPLICATION OF EXPANDED REQUIREMENTS TO CAMPAIGN-RELATED DISBURSEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 318(a) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)) is amended by striking “for the purpose of financing communications expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate” and inserting “for a campaign-related disbursement described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 324(d)(1)”.

(2) CLARIFICATION OF EXEMPTION FROM INCLUSION OF CANDIDATE DISCLAIMER STATEMENT IN FEDERAL JUDICIAL NOMINATION COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 318(a)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)(3)) is amended by striking “shall clearly state” and inserting “shall (except in the case of a Federal judicial nomination communication, as defined in section 324(d)(3)) clearly state”.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR COMMUNICATIONS PAID FOR BY POLITICAL PARTIES AND CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—Section 318(d)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “OTHERS” and inserting “CERTAIN POLITICAL COMMITTEES”;

(2) by striking “Any communication” and inserting “(A) Any communication”;

(3) by inserting “which (except to the extent provided in subparagraph (B)) is paid for by a political committee (including a political committee of a political party) and” after “subsection (a)”;

(4) by striking “or other person” each place it appears; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B)(i) This paragraph does not apply to a communication paid for in whole or in part during a calendar year with a campaign-related disbursement, but only if the covered organization making the campaign-related disbursement made campaign-related disbursements (as defined in section 324) aggregating more than \$10,000 during such calendar year.

“(ii) For purposes of clause (i), in determining the amount of campaign-related disbursements made by a covered organization during a year, there shall be excluded the following:

“(I) Any amounts received by the covered organization in the ordinary course of any trade or business conducted by the covered organization or in the form of investments in the covered organization.

“(II) Any amounts received by the covered organization from a person who prohibited, in writing, the organization from using such amounts for campaign-related disbursements, but only if the covered organization followed the prohibition and deposited the amounts in an account which is segregated from a campaign-related disbursement segregated fund (as defined in section 324) and

any other account used to make campaign-related disbursements.”

(d) MODIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 318(d) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through radio” and inserting “which is in an audio format”; and

(B) by striking “BY RADIO” in the heading and inserting “AUDIO FORMAT”;

(2) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by striking “which is transmitted through television” and inserting “which is in video format”; and

(B) by striking “BY TELEVISION” in the heading and inserting “VIDEO FORMAT”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “transmitted through radio or television” and inserting “made in audio or video format”; and

(B) by striking “through television” in the second sentence and inserting “in video format”.

SEC. 403. DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS FOR COMMUNICATIONS MADE THROUGH PRERECORDED TELEPHONE CALLS.

(a) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 318(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30120(a)) is amended by striking “mailing” each place it appears and inserting “mailing, telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message”.

(2) APPLICATION TO COMMUNICATIONS SUBJECT TO EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 318(e)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(e)(1)), as added by section 402(a), is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “which is transmitted in an audio or video format” and inserting “which is transmitted in an audio or video format or which consists of a telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message”.

(b) TREATMENT AS COMMUNICATION TRANSMITTED IN AUDIO FORMAT.—

(1) COMMUNICATIONS BY CANDIDATES OR AUTHORIZED PERSONS.—Section 318(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) PRERECORDED TELEPHONE CALLS.—Any communication described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) (other than a communication which is subject to subsection (e)) which is a telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message shall include, in addition to the requirements of such paragraph, the audio statement required under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) or the audio statement required under paragraph (2) (whichever is applicable), except that the statement shall be made at the beginning of the telephone call.”

(2) COMMUNICATIONS SUBJECT TO EXPANDED DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 318(e)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30120(e)(3)), as added by section 402(a), is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) PRERECORDED TELEPHONE CALLS.—In the case of a communication to which this subsection applies which is a telephone call consisting in substantial part of a prerecorded audio message, the communication shall be considered to be transmitted in an audio format.”

SEC. 404. NO EXPANSION OF PERSONS SUBJECT TO DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENTS ON INTERNET COMMUNICATIONS.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title may be construed to require any person who is not required under section 318 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to include a disclaimer on communications made by the person through the internet to include any disclaimer on any such communications.

SEC. 405. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to communications made on or after January 1, 2027, and shall take effect without regard to whether or not the Federal Election Commission has promulgated regulations to carry out such amendments.

TITLE V—SEVERABILITY

SEC. 501. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act and amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendments to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

SA 4410. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Big Oil Windfall Profits Tax Act”.

SEC. 2. WINDFALL PROFITS TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new chapter:

“CHAPTER 56—WINDFALL PROFITS ON CRUDE OIL

“Sec. 5896. Imposition of tax.

“Sec. 5897. Definitions and special rules.

“SEC. 5896. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other tax imposed under this title, in each calendar quarter there is hereby imposed on any covered taxpayer an excise tax at the rate determined under subsection (b) on—

“(1) each barrel of taxable crude oil extracted by the taxpayer within the United States and removed from the property of such taxpayer during the calendar quarter, and

“(2) each barrel of taxable crude oil entered into the United States during the calendar quarter by the taxpayer for consumption, use, or warehousing.

“(b) RATE OF TAX.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The rate of tax imposed by this section on any barrel of taxable crude oil for any calendar quarter is the product of—

“(A) 50 percent, and

“(B) the excess (if any) of—

“(i) the average price of a barrel of Brent crude oil over the covered calendar quarter, over

“(ii) the average price of a barrel of Brent crude oil over the period beginning on January 1, 2025, and ending on December 31, 2025.

“(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a calendar quarter beginning in any taxable year beginning after 2026, the amount determined under paragraph (1)(B)(ii) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘2025’ for ‘2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

“(B) ROUNDING.—If any dollar amount, after being increased under subparagraph (A), is not a multiple of \$0.50, such dollar amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$0.01.

“(c) FRACTIONAL PART OF BARREL.—In the case of a fraction of a barrel, the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be the same fraction of the amount of such tax imposed on the whole barrel.

“SEC. 5897. DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this chapter—

“(1) COVERED TAXPAYER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered taxpayer’ means, with respect to any calendar quarter, any taxpayer if—

“(i) the average daily number of barrels of taxable crude oil extracted and imported by the taxpayer for calendar year 2025 exceeded 300,000 barrels, or

“(ii) the average daily number of barrels of taxable crude oil extracted and imported by the taxpayer for the calendar quarter exceeds 300,000.

“(B) AGGREGATION RULES.—All persons treated as a single employer under subsection (a) or (b) of section 52 or subsection (m) or (o) of section 414 shall be treated as one person for purposes of paragraph (1).

“(2) TAXABLE CRUDE OIL.—The term ‘taxable crude oil’ includes crude oil, crude oil condensates, and natural gasoline.

“(3) BARREL.—The term ‘barrel’ means 42 United States gallons.

“(4) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’ has the same meaning given such term under section 4612.

“(b) WITHHOLDING AND DEPOSIT OF TAX.—The Secretary shall provide such rules as are necessary for the withholding and deposit of the tax imposed under section 5896 on any taxable crude oil.

“(c) RECORDS AND INFORMATION.—Each taxpayer liable for tax under section 5896 shall keep such records, make such returns, and furnish such information (to the Secretary and to other persons having an interest in the taxable crude oil) with respect to such oil as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

“(d) RETURN OF WINDFALL PROFIT TAX.—The Secretary shall provide for the filing and the time of such filing of the return of the tax imposed under section 5896.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this chapter.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“CHAPTER 56. WINDFALL PROFIT ON CRUDE OIL”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to crude oil removed or entered after December 31, 2025, in calendar quarters ending after such date.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN QUARTERS DURING 2026.—In the case of any calendar quarter ending before July 1, 2026, the tax imposed under section 5896 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) shall not be due before September 30, 2026.

SEC. 3. GASOLINE PRICE REBATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter B of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 6436. GASOLINE PRICE REBATES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an eligible individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by subtitle A for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 2025, an amount equal to the sum of the gasoline price rebate amount for calendar quarters beginning in such taxable year.

“(b) GASOLINE PRICE REBATE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘gasoline price rebate amount’ means, with respect to any taxpayer for any calendar quarter beginning in a taxable year, an amount determined by the Secretary not later than 30 days after the end of such calendar quarter taking into account the number of eligible individuals and the amount of revenues in the Protect Consumers from Gas Hikes Fund resulting from the tax imposed by section 5896 for the preceding calendar quarter.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of an eligible individual filing a joint return, the gasoline price rebate amount shall be 150 percent of the amount determined under paragraph (1) with respect to other taxpayers.

“(3) LIMITATION BASED ON ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—The amount of the credit allowed by subsection (a) (determined without regard to this subsection and subsection (e)) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by 5 percent of so much of the eligible individual’s adjusted gross income as exceeds—

“(A) \$150,000 in the case of a joint return,

“(B) \$112,500 in the case of a head of household, and

“(C) \$75,000 in any other case.

“(c) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible individual’ means any individual other than—

“(1) any nonresident alien individual,

“(2) any individual who is a dependent of another taxpayer for a taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which the individual’s taxable year begins, and

“(3) an estate or trust.

“(d) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DEPENDENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘dependent’ has the meaning given such term by section 152.

“(2) IDENTIFICATION NUMBER REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a return other than a joint return, the gasoline price rebate amount in subsection (b)(1) shall be treated as being zero unless the taxpayer includes the valid identification number of the taxpayer on the return of tax for the taxable year.

“(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the gasoline price rebate amount in subsection (b)(1) shall be treated as being—

“(i) 50 percent of the amount otherwise determined without regard to this paragraph if the valid identification number of only 1 spouse is included on the return of tax for the taxable year, and

“(ii) zero if the valid identification number of neither spouse is so included.

“(C) VALID IDENTIFICATION NUMBER.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘valid identification number’ means a social security number issued to an individual by the Social Security Administration on or before the due date for filing the return for the taxable year.

“(D) SPECIAL RULE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.—Subparagraph (B) shall not apply in the case where at least 1 spouse was a member of the Armed Forces of the United States at any time during the taxable year and the valid identification number of at least 1 spouse is included on the return of tax for the taxable year.

“(E) COORDINATION WITH CERTAIN ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—In the case of any payment determined pursuant to subsection (f)(6), a valid identification number shall be treated for purposes of this paragraph as included on the taxpayer’s return of tax if such valid identification number is available to the Secretary as described in such subsection.

“(F) MATHEMATICAL OR CLERICAL ERROR AUTHORITY.—Any omission of a correct valid identification number required under this paragraph shall be treated as a mathe-

matical or clerical error for purposes of applying section 6213(g)(2) to such omission.

“(3) CREDIT TREATED AS REFUNDABLE.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be treated as allowed by subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this section.

“(f) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall carry out a robust and comprehensive outreach program to ensure that all taxpayers learn of their eligibility for the credits allowed under this section and are provided assistance in claiming such credits.”.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN POSSESSIONS.—

(1) PAYMENTS TO POSSESSIONS WITH MIRROR CODE TAX SYSTEMS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each possession of the United States which has a mirror code tax system amounts equal to the loss (if any) to that possession by reason of the amendments made by this section. Such amounts shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on information provided by the government of the respective possession.

(2) PAYMENTS TO OTHER POSSESSIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each possession of the United States which does not have a mirror code tax system amounts estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury as being equal to the aggregate benefits (if any) that would have been provided to residents of such possession by reason of the amendments made by this section if a mirror code tax system had been in effect in such possession. The preceding sentence shall not apply unless the respective possession has a plan, which has been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, under which such possession will promptly distribute such payments to its residents.

(3) INCLUSION OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each possession of the United States to which the Secretary makes a payment under paragraph (1) or (2) an amount equal to the increase (if any) of the administrative expenses of such possession—

(A) in the case of a possession described in paragraph (1), by reason of the amendments made by this section, and

(B) in the case of a possession described in paragraph (2), by reason of carrying out the plan described in such paragraph, or the amount described in subparagraph (A) shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on information provided by the government of the respective possession.

(4) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST UNITED STATES INCOME TAXES.—No credit shall be allowed against United States income taxes under section 6434 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) to any person—

(A) to whom a credit is allowed against taxes imposed by the possession by reason of the amendments made by this section, or

(B) who is eligible for a payment under a plan described in paragraph (2).

(5) MIRROR CODE TAX SYSTEM.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘mirror code tax system’ means, with respect to any possession of the United States, the income tax system of such possession if the income tax liability of the residents of such possession under such system is determined by reference to the income tax laws of the United States as if such possession were the United States.

(6) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—For purposes of section 1324 of title 31, United States Code, the payments under this subsection shall be treated in the same manner as a refund due from a credit provision referred to in subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(c) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

(1) DEFINITION OF DEFICIENCY.—Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and 6433” and inserting “6433, and 6436.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting “6436,” after “6433.”

(B) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 6436. Gasoline price rebates.”.

SEC. 4. PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM GAS PRICE HIKES FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 9512. PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM GAS PRICE HIKES FUND.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNDING.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be referred to as the ‘Protect Consumers from Gas Hikes Fund’, consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to such trust fund as provided for in this section and section 9602(b).

“(b) TRANSFERS TO THE PROTECT CONSUMERS FROM GAS PRICE HIKES FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Protect Consumers from Gas Hikes Fund amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury under section 5896.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall pay from time to time from the Protect Consumers from Gas Price Hikes Fund to the general fund of the Treasury amounts equal to the amounts of refunds provided under section 6436.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 98 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 9512. Protect Consumers from Gas Price Hikes Fund.”.

SA 4411. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Medicare and Social Security Fair Share Act”.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATION OF PAYROLL TAXES.

(a) WAGE BASE FOR TAXES FUNDING SOCIAL SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) in the case of taxes imposed by sections 3101(a) and 3111(a), for any calendar year in which the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) is less than \$400,000, so much of the remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection) with respect to employment that has been paid to an individual by an employer during the calendar year as exceeds such contribution and benefit base but does not exceed \$400,000;”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) SUCCESSOR EMPLOYERS.—Section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(aa) SPECIAL RULES FOR SUCCESSOR EMPLOYERS.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1),

if an employer (hereinafter referred to as successor employer) during any calendar year acquires substantially all the property used in a trade or business of another employer (hereinafter referred to as predecessor), or used in a separate unit of a trade or business of a predecessor, and immediately after the acquisition employs in his trade or business an individual who immediately prior to the acquisition was employed in the trade or business of such predecessor, then, for the purpose of determining the amount of remuneration paid by the successor employer under such subsection, any remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the paragraphs succeeding paragraph (1) of subsection (a)) with respect to employment paid (or considered under this subsection as having been paid) to such individual by such predecessor during such calendar year and prior to such acquisition shall be considered as having been paid by such successor employer.”.

(B) APPLICATION TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAXES.—Clause (i) of section 3231(e)(2)(A) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For any calendar year in which the applicable base is less than \$400,000, the term ‘compensation’ does not include so much of the remuneration paid during any calendar year to an individual by an employer for services rendered as an employee to such employer as exceeds the applicable base but does not exceed \$400,000.”.

(b) FURTHER ADDITIONAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TAX ON VERY HIGH INCOME TAXPAYERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3101(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) FURTHER ADDITIONAL TAX.—In addition to the tax imposed by paragraphs (1) and (2) and the preceding subsection, there is hereby imposed on every taxpayer (other than a corporation, estate, or trust) a tax equal to 1.2 percent of wages which are received with respect to employment (as defined in section 3121(b)) during the taxable year which are in excess of—

“(A) in the case of a joint return, \$500,000,

“(B) in the case of a married taxpayer (as defined in section 7703) filing a separate return, ½ of the dollar amount determined under subparagraph (A), and

“(C) in any other case, \$400,000.”.

(2) COLLECTION OF TAX.—Section 3102 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) SPECIAL RULES FOR FURTHER ADDITIONAL TAX.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any tax imposed by section 3101(b)(3), subsection (a) shall only apply to the extent to which the taxpayer receives wages from the employer in excess of \$400,000, and the employer may disregard the amount of wages received by such taxpayer’s spouse.

“(2) COLLECTION OF AMOUNTS NOT WITHHELD.—To the extent that the amount of any tax imposed by section 3101(b)(3) is not collected by the employer, such tax shall be paid by the employee.

“(3) TAX PAID BY RECIPIENT.—If an employer, in violation of this chapter, fails to deduct and withhold the tax imposed by section 3101(b)(3) and thereafter the tax is paid by the employee, the tax so required to be deducted and withheld shall not be collected from the employer, but this paragraph shall in no case relieve the employer from liability for any penalties or additions to tax otherwise applicable in respect of such failure to deduct and withhold.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to remuneration paid, and taxable years beginning, on or after January 1 of the first calendar

year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. MODIFICATION OF TAXES ON SELF-EMPLOYMENT INCOME.

(a) TAX ON NET EARNINGS FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT UP TO CONTRIBUTION AND BENEFIT BASE AND MORE THAN \$400,000.—Paragraph (1) of section 1402(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(1) in the case of the tax imposed by section 1401(a) for any taxable year beginning in a calendar year in which the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) is less than \$400,000, the excess (if any) of—

“(A) so much of the net earnings from self-employment which is in excess of—

“(i) an amount equal to the contribution and benefit base (as determined under section 230 of the Social Security Act) which is effective for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins, reduced (but not below zero) by

“(ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during such taxable year, over

“(B) the sum of—

“(i) the excess (if any) of—

“(I) the net earnings from self-employment reduced by the excess (if any) of subparagraph (A)(i) over subparagraph (A)(ii), over

“(II) \$400,000, reduced by such contribution and benefit base, plus

“(ii) the amount of the wages paid to such individual during such taxable year in excess of such contribution and benefit base and not in excess of \$400,000; or”.

(b) FURTHER ADDITIONAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TAX ON VERY HIGH INCOME TAXPAYERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1401(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) FURTHER ADDITIONAL TAX.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the tax imposed by paragraphs (1) and (2) and the preceding subsection, there is hereby imposed on every taxpayer (other than a corporation, estate, or trust) for each taxable year a tax equal to 1.2 percent of the self-employment income for such taxable year which is in excess of—

“(i) in the case of a joint return, \$500,000,

“(ii) in the case of a married taxpayer (as defined in section 7703) filing a separate return, ½ of the dollar amount determined under subparagraph (A), and

“(iii) in any other case, \$400,000.

“(B) COORDINATION WITH FICA.—The amounts under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) (whichever is applicable) of subparagraph (A) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount of wages taken into account in determining the tax imposed under section 3101(b)(3) with respect to the taxpayer.”.

(2) NO DEDUCTION FOR FURTHER ADDITIONAL TAX.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(f) of such Code is amended by striking “section 1401(b)(2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1401(b)”.

(B) DEDUCTION FOR NET EARNINGS FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT.—Section 1402(a)(12)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “the rate imposed under paragraph (2) of section 1401(b)” and inserting “the rates imposed under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 1401(b)”.

(3) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 1401(b)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “section 3121(b)(2)” and inserting “section 3101(b)(2)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to net earnings from self-employment derived, and taxable years beginning, on or after January 1 of the first calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. TAXES ON UNEARNED INCOME.

(a) MODIFICATIONS TO TAX ON NET INVESTMENT INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1411 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR CERTAIN HIGH INCOME INDIVIDUALS.—

“(1) INCLUSION OF SPECIFIED NET INCOME.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any individual whose modified adjusted gross income for the taxable year exceeds the high income threshold amount, subsection (a)(1) shall be applied by substituting ‘the greater of specified net income or net investment income’ for ‘net investment income’ in subparagraph (A) thereof.

“(B) PHASE-IN OF INCREASE.—The increase in the tax imposed under subsection (a)(1) by reason of the application of subparagraph (A) (determined before application of paragraph (2)) shall not exceed the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such increase (determined without regard to this paragraph) as—

“(i) the excess described in subparagraph (A), bears to

“(ii) \$100,000 (½ such amount in the case of a married taxpayer (as defined in section 7703) filing a separate return).

“(2) ADDITIONAL RATE BRACKET.—In the case of any individual whose modified adjusted gross income for the taxable year exceeds the high income threshold amount, the amount of tax imposed under subsection (a)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to 13.6 percent of the lesser of—

“(A) the greater of the specified net income or net investment income for the taxable year, or

“(B) the excess (if any) of—

“(i) the modified adjusted gross income for such taxable year, over

“(ii) the high income threshold amount.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—

“(A) HIGH INCOME THRESHOLD AMOUNT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘high income threshold amount’ means—

“(i) except as provided in clause (ii) or (iii), \$400,000,

“(ii) in the case of a taxpayer making a joint return under section 6013 or a surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)), \$500,000, and

“(iii) in the case of a married taxpayer (as defined in section 7703) filing a separate return, ½ of the dollar amount determined under clause (ii).

“(B) SPECIFIED NET INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘specified net income’ means net investment income determined—

“(i) without regard to the phrase ‘other than such income which is derived in the ordinary course of a trade or business not described in paragraph (2),’ in subsection (c)(1)(A)(i),

“(ii) without regard to the phrase ‘described in paragraph (2)’ in subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii),

“(iii) without regard to the phrase ‘other than property held in a trade or business not described in paragraph (2)’ in subsection (c)(1)(A)(iii),

“(iv) without regard to paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (c), and

“(v) by treating paragraphs (5) and (6) of section 469(c) (determined without regard to the phrase ‘To the extent provided in regulations,’ in such paragraph (6)) as applying for purposes of subsection (c) of this section.”

(b) APPLICATION TO TRUSTS AND ESTATES.—Section 1411(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “3.8 percent” and inserting “17.4 percent”, and

(2) in subparagraph (A) thereof, by striking “undistributed net investment income” and

inserting “the greater of undistributed specified net income or undistributed net investment income”.

(c) CLARIFICATIONS WITH RESPECT TO DETERMINATION OF NET INVESTMENT INCOME.—

(1) CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS.—Section 1411(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(6) SPECIAL RULES.—Net investment income shall not include—

“(A) any item taken into account in determining self-employment income for such taxable year on which a tax is imposed by section 1401(b),

“(B) wages received with respect to employment on which a tax is imposed under section 3101(b) (determined without regard to section 3101(c)) or 3201(a) (including amounts taken into account under section 3121(v)(2)), and

“(C) wages received from the performance of services earned outside the United States for a foreign employer.”

(2) NET OPERATING LOSSES NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—Section 1411(c)(1)(B) of such Code is amended by inserting “(other than section 172)” after “this subtitle”.

(3) INCLUSION OF CERTAIN FOREIGN INCOME.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1411(c)(1)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of clause (ii), by striking “over” at the end of clause (iii) and inserting “and”, and by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) any amount includible in gross income under section 951, 951A, 1293, or 1296, over”.

(B) PROPER TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PREVIOUSLY TAXED EARNINGS AND PROFITS.—Section 1411(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) CERTAIN EARNINGS AND PROFITS OF FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, a distribution of earnings and profits that is not treated as a dividend for purposes of chapter 1 by reason of section 959(d) or section 1293(c) shall not be treated as a dividend for purposes of this section.

“(B) REGULATIONS AND OTHER GUIDANCE.—The Secretary shall issue regulations or other guidance providing for the treatment of distributions by a foreign corporation after December 31, 2025, of earnings and profits of such foreign corporation which accrued before such date, but which have not been previously subject to tax under this section.”

(d) TRANSFERS OF REVENUES TO OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS, DISABILITY INSURANCE, AND FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUNDS.—

(1) FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS TRUST FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401(a)) is amended—

(i) by striking “100 per centum of”,

(ii) by inserting “100 percent of” before “the taxes” each place it appears in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), and

(iii) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting “; and”, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) 71.3 percent of the taxes imposed by section 1411 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2025, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegate based on tax returns under subtitle F of such Code, less the amounts specified in paragraph (3) of subsection (b).”

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The fourth sentence of section 201(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 401(a)) is amended by striking

“clauses (3) and (4)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraphs (3), (4), and (5)”.

(2) FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Section 201(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “100 per centum of”, and

(B) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) 10.3 percent of the taxes imposed by section 1411 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2025, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegate based on tax returns under subtitle F of such Code.”

(3) FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Section 1817(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking “100 per centum of”,

(B) by inserting “100 percent of” before “the taxes” each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2), and

(C) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) 28.7 percent of the taxes imposed by section 1411 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2025, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegate based on tax returns under subtitle F of such Code.”

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SA 4412. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the “No Tax Breaks for Outsourcing Act”.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title, etc.
- Sec. 2. Current year inclusion of net CFC tested income.
- Sec. 3. Country-by-country application of limitation on foreign tax credit based on taxable units.
- Sec. 4. Limitation on deduction of interest by domestic corporations which are members of an international financial reporting group.
- Sec. 5. Modifications to rules relating to inverted corporations.
- Sec. 6. Treatment of foreign corporations managed and controlled in the United States as domestic corporations.

SEC. 2. CURRENT YEAR INCLUSION OF NET CFC TESTED INCOME.

(a) COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY APPLICATION OF SECTION BASED ON CFC TAXABLE UNITS.—Section 951A is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY APPLICATION OF SECTION BASED ON CFC TAXABLE UNITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If any CFC taxable unit of a United States shareholder is a tax resident of (or, in the case of a branch, is located in) a country which is different from the country with respect to which any other CFC taxable unit of such United States shareholder is a tax resident (or, in the case of a branch, is located in)—

“(A) such shareholder's net CFC tested income for purposes of subsection (a) shall be the sum of the amounts of net CFC tested income determined separately with respect to each such country, and

“(B) for purposes of determining such separate amounts of net CFC tested income—

“(i) except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, any reference in subsection (b) to a controlled foreign corporation of such shareholder shall be treated as reference to a CFC taxable unit of such shareholder, and

“(ii) net CFC tested income and such other items and amounts as the Secretary may provide, shall be determined separately with respect to each such country by determining such amounts with respect to the CFC taxable units of such shareholder which are a tax resident of such country.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) CFC TAXABLE UNIT.—The term ‘CFC taxable unit’ means any taxable unit described in clause (ii), (iii), or (iv) of section 904(e)(2)(B), determined—

“(i) by substituting ‘controlled foreign corporation’ for ‘foreign corporation’ each place it appears in such clauses, and

“(ii) without regard to the references to the taxpayer in clauses (iii) and (iv) of such section.

“(B) APPLICATION OF OTHER DEFINITIONS.—Terms used in this subsection which are also used in section 904(e) shall have the same meaning as when used in section 904(e).

“(3) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN RULES.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, rules similar to the rules of section 904(e) shall apply.

“(B) ALLOCATION OF NET CFC TESTED INCOME TO CONTROLLED FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, subsection (d)(2) shall be applied separately with respect to each CFC taxable unit.”

(b) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Section 951A, as amended by subsection (b), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out, or prevent the avoidance of, the purposes of this section, including regulations or guidance which provide for—

“(1) the treatment of property if such property is transferred, or held, temporarily,

“(2) the treatment of property if the avoidance of the purposes of this section is a factor in the transfer or holding of such property,

“(3) appropriate adjustments to the basis of stock and other ownership interests, and to earnings and profits, to reflect tested losses (whether or not taken into account in determining net CFC tested income),

“(4) rules similar to the rules provided under the regulations or guidance issued under section 904(e)(4),

“(5) other appropriate basis adjustments,

“(6) appropriate adjustments to be made, and appropriate tax attributes and records to be maintained, separately with respect to CFC taxable units, and

“(7) appropriate adjustments in determining tested income or tested loss if property is transferred between related parties or

amounts are paid or accrued between related parties.”

(c) COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—Section 951A(d)(1) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, references to section 951 or section 951(a) in sections 959, 961, 962, and such other provisions as the Secretary may identify shall include references to section 951A or section 951A(a), respectively.”

(d) REPEAL OF REDUCED RATE OF TAX ON NET CFC TESTED INCOME AND FOREIGN-DETERMINED INTANGIBLE INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part VIII of subchapter B of chapter 1 is amended by striking section 250 (and by striking the item relating to such section in the table of sections of such part).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 59A(c)(4)(B)(i) is amended by striking “section 172, 245A, or 250” and inserting “section 172 or 245A”.

(B) Section 172(d) is amended by striking paragraph (9).

(C) Section 246(b)(1) is amended—

(i) by striking “subsection (a) and (b) of section 245, and section 250” and inserting “and subsection (a) and (b) of section 245”; and

(ii) by striking “subsection (a) and (b) of section 245, and 250” and inserting “and subsection (a) and (b) of section 245”.

(D) Section 469(i)(3)(E)(iii) is amended by striking “, 221, and 250” and inserting “and 221”.

(E) Section 904(b)(5) is amended—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), and

(ii) by striking “subparagraphs (B) and (C)” in the second sentence and inserting “subparagraphs (A) and (B)”.

(e) REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXCLUSIONS FROM THE DETERMINATION OF TESTED INCOME.—Section 951A(b)(2)(A)(i) is amended—

(1) by striking subclauses (III) and (V),

(2) by redesignating subclause (IV) as subclause (III),

(3) by adding “and” at the end of subclause (II), and

(4) by striking “and” at the end of subclause (III) (as so redesignated) and inserting “over”.

(f) INCREASE IN DEEMED PAID CREDIT FOR TAXES PROPERLY ATTRIBUTABLE TO TESTED INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 960(d) is amended by striking “90 percent of”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 78 is amended by striking “(determined without regard to the phrase ‘90 percent of’ in subsection (d)(1) thereof)”.

(B) Section 960(d) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(g) REPEAL OF HIGH TAX EXCLUSION FOR FOREIGN BASE COMPANY INCOME AND INSURANCE INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 954(b) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 904(d)(3)(E) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(h) ELIMINATION OF CARRYBACK OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 904(c) is amended—

(A) by striking “in the first preceding taxable year, and in any of the first 10 succeeding taxable years, in that order” and inserting “in any of the first 10 succeeding taxable years, in order”;

(B) by striking “preceding or” each place it appears, and

(C) by striking “CARRYBACK AND” in the heading thereof.

(2) APPLICATION TO LIMITATION ON FOREIGN OIL AND GAS TAXES.—Section 907(f) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “in the first preceding taxable year and”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “preceding or” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A),

(C) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(i) by striking “in a preceding or succeeding” and inserting “in a succeeding”, and

(ii) by striking “in such preceding or succeeding” both places it appears and inserting “in such succeeding”, and

(D) in the heading, by striking “CARRYBACK AND”.

(i) TREATMENT OF FOREIGN BASE COMPANY OIL RELATED INCOME AS SUBPART F INCOME.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 954(a) is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) the foreign base company oil related income for the taxable year (determined under subsection (f) and reduced as provided in subsection (b)(5)).”

(2) FOREIGN BASE COMPANY OIL RELATED INCOME.—Section 954 is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

“(f) FOREIGN BASE COMPANY OIL RELATED INCOME.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘foreign base company oil related income’ means foreign oil related income (within the meaning of paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 907(c)) other than income derived from a source within a foreign country in connection with—

“(1) oil or gas which was extracted from an oil or gas well located in such foreign country, or

“(2) oil, gas, or a primary product of oil or gas which is sold by the foreign corporation or a related person for use or consumption within such country or is loaded in such country on a vessel or aircraft as fuel for such vessel or aircraft.

Such term shall not include any foreign personal holding company income (as defined in subsection (c)).”

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 952(c)(1)(B)(iii) is amended by redesignating subclauses (III) and (IV) as subclauses (IV) and (V), respectively, and by inserting after subclause (II) the following new subclause:

“(III) foreign base company oil related income.”

(B) Section 954(b) is amended—

(i) by striking “and the foreign base company services income” in paragraph (5) and inserting “the foreign base company services income, and the foreign base company oil related income”, and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) FOREIGN BASE COMPANY OIL RELATED INCOME NOT TREATED AS ANOTHER KIND OF FOREIGN BASE COMPANY INCOME.—Income of a corporation which is foreign base company oil related income shall not be considered foreign base company income of such corporation under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a).”

(j) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after December 31, 2025, and to taxable years of United States shareholders in which or with which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

(2) REGULATORY AUTHORITY AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROVISIONS.—The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall

apply to taxable years of foreign corporations beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act, and to taxable years of United States shareholders in which or with which such taxable years of foreign corporations end.

(3) **REPEAL OF REDUCED RATE OF TAX; INCREASE IN DEEMED PAID CREDIT.**—The amendments made by subsections (d) and (f) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

(4) **ELIMINATION OF CARRYBACK OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT.**—The amendment made by subsection (h) shall apply to credits arising in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

(k) **NO INFERENCE REGARDING CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS.**—The amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall not be construed to create any inference with respect to the proper application of any provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to any taxable year beginning before the taxable years to which such amendments apply.

SEC. 3. COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY APPLICATION OF LIMITATION ON FOREIGN TAX CREDIT BASED ON TAXABLE UNITS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 904 is amended by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) **COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY APPLICATION BASED ON TAXABLE UNITS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (d) (and the provisions of this title referred to in paragraph (1) of such subsection) shall be applied separately with respect to each country by taking into account the aggregate income properly attributable or otherwise allocable to a taxable unit of the taxpayer which is a tax resident of (or, in the case of a branch, is located in) such country.

“(2) **TAXABLE UNITS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, each item shall be attributable or otherwise allocable to exactly one taxable unit of the taxpayer.

“(B) **DETERMINATION OF TAXABLE UNITS.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the taxable units of a taxpayer are as follows:

“(i) **GENERAL TAXABLE UNIT.**—The person that is the taxpayer and that is not otherwise described in a separate clause of this subparagraph.

“(ii) **CERTAIN FOREIGN CORPORATIONS.**—Each foreign corporation with respect to which the taxpayer is a United States shareholder.

“(iii) **INTERESTS IN PASS-THROUGH ENTITIES.**—Each interest held (directly or indirectly) by the taxpayer or any foreign corporation referred to in clause (ii) in a pass-through entity if such pass-through entity is a tax resident of a country other than the country with respect to which such taxpayer or foreign corporation (as the case may be) is a tax resident.

“(iv) **BRANCHES.**—Each branch (or portion thereof) the activities of which are directly or indirectly carried on by the taxpayer or any foreign corporation referred to in clause (ii) and which give rise to a taxable presence in a country other than the country with respect to which such taxpayer or foreign corporation (as the case may be) is a tax resident.

“(3) **DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.**—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) **TAX RESIDENT.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the term ‘tax resident’ means a person or entity subject to tax under the tax law of a country as a resident. If an entity is organized under the law of a country, or resident in a country, that does not impose an income tax with respect to such entities, such entity shall, except as provided by the Secretary, be treated as sub-

ject to tax under the tax law of such country for the purposes of the preceding sentence.

“(B) **PASS-THROUGH ENTITY.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the term ‘pass-through entity’ includes any partnership or other entity to the extent that income, gain, deduction, or loss of the entity is taken into account in determining the income or loss of a person that owns (directly or indirectly) an interest in such entity.

“(C) **BRANCH.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, the term ‘branch’ means a taxable presence of a tax resident in a country other than its country of residence as determined under such other country’s tax law. The Secretary shall provide regulations or other guidance applying such term to activities in a country that do not give rise to a taxable presence.

“(D) **TREATMENT OF FISCALLY AUTONOMOUS JURISDICTIONS.**—Any fiscally autonomous jurisdiction shall be treated as a separate country. Any possession of the United States shall also be treated as a separate country.

“(E) **POSSESSION OF THE UNITED STATES.**—The term ‘possession of the United States’ means each of American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

“(4) **REGULATIONS.**—The Secretary shall issue such regulations or other guidance as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out, or prevent avoidance of, the purposes of this subsection, including regulations or other guidance—

“(A) providing for the application of this subsection to an entity or arrangement that is considered a tax resident of more than one country or of no country,

“(B) providing for the application of this subsection to hybrid entities or hybrid transactions (as such terms are used for purposes of section 267A), pass-through entities, passive foreign investment companies, trusts, and other entities or arrangements not otherwise described in this subsection, and

“(C) providing for the assignment of any item (including foreign taxes and deductions) to taxable units, including in the case of amounts not otherwise taken into account in determining taxable income under this chapter.”

(b) **APPLICATION OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN BRANCHES.**—Section 904(d)(2)(J)(i) is amended—

(1) by striking “qualified business units (as defined in section 989(a)) in 1 or more foreign countries” and inserting “foreign branches described in section 904(e)(2)(B)(iv)”, and

(2) by striking “a qualified business unit” and inserting “a foreign branch”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION OF INTEREST BY DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS WHICH ARE MEMBERS OF AN INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REPORTING GROUP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 163 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (p) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) **LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION OF INTEREST BY DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REPORTING GROUPS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of any domestic corporation which is a member of any international financial reporting group, the deduction under this chapter for interest paid or accrued during the taxable year shall not exceed the sum of—

“(A) the allowable percentage of 110 percent of the excess (if any) of—

“(i) the amount of such interest so paid or accrued, over

“(ii) the amount described in subparagraph (B), plus

“(B) the amount of interest includible in gross income of such corporation for such taxable year.

“(2) **INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REPORTING GROUP.**—

“(A) For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘international financial reporting group’ means, with respect to any reporting year, any group of entities which—

“(i) includes—

“(I) at least one foreign corporation engaged in a trade or business within the United States, or

“(II) at least one domestic corporation and one foreign corporation.

“(ii) prepares consolidated financial statements with respect to such year, and

“(iii) reports in such statements average annual gross receipts (determined in the aggregate with respect to all entities which are part of such group) for the 3-reporting-year period ending with such reporting year in excess of \$100,000,000.

“(B) **RULES RELATING TO DETERMINATION OF AVERAGE GROSS RECEIPTS.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii), rules similar to the rules of section 448(c)(3) shall apply.

“(3) **ALLOWABLE PERCENTAGE.**—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘allowable percentage’ means, with respect to any domestic corporation for any taxable year, the ratio (expressed as a percentage and not greater than 100 percent) of—

“(i) such corporation’s allocable share of the international financial reporting group’s reported net interest expense for the reporting year of such group which ends in or with such taxable year of such corporation, over

“(ii) such corporation’s reported net interest expense for such reporting year of such group.

“(B) **REPORTED NET INTEREST EXPENSE.**—The term ‘reported net interest expense’ means—

“(i) with respect to any international financial reporting group for any reporting year, the excess of—

“(I) the aggregate amount of interest expense reported in such group’s consolidated financial statements for such taxable year, over

“(II) the aggregate amount of interest income reported in such group’s consolidated financial statements for such taxable year, and

“(ii) with respect to any domestic corporation for any reporting year, the excess of—

“(I) the amount of interest expense of such corporation reported in the books and records of the international financial reporting group which are used in preparing such group’s consolidated financial statements for such taxable year, over

“(II) the amount of interest income of such corporation reported in such books and records.

“(C) **ALLOCABLE SHARE OF REPORTED NET INTEREST EXPENSE.**—With respect to any domestic corporation which is a member of any international financial reporting group, such corporation’s allocable share of such group’s reported net interest expense for any reporting year is the portion of such expense which bears the same ratio to such expense as—

“(i) the EBITDA of such corporation for such reporting year, bears to

“(ii) the EBITDA of such group for such reporting year.

“(D) **EBITDA.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘EBITDA’ means, with respect to any reporting year, earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation, and amortization—

“(I) as determined in the international financial reporting group’s consolidated financial statements for such year, or

“(II) for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i), as determined in the books and records of the international financial reporting group which are used in preparing such statements if not determined in such statements.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF DISREGARDED ENTITIES.—The EBITDA of any domestic corporation shall not fail to include the EBITDA of any entity which is disregarded for purposes of this chapter.

“(iii) TREATMENT OF INTRA-GROUP DISTRIBUTIONS.—The EBITDA of any domestic corporation shall be determined without regard to any distribution received by such corporation from any other member of the international financial reporting group.

“(E) SPECIAL RULES FOR NON-POSITIVE EBITDA.—

“(i) NON-POSITIVE GROUP EBITDA.—In the case of any international financial reporting group the EBITDA of which is zero or less, paragraph (1) shall not apply to any member of such group the EBITDA of which is above zero.

“(ii) NON-POSITIVE ENTITY EBITDA.—In the case of any group member the EBITDA of which is zero or less, paragraph (1) shall be applied without regard to subparagraph (A) thereof.

“(4) CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘consolidated financial statement’ means any consolidated financial statement described in paragraph (2)(A)(i) if such statement is—

“(A) a financial statement which is certified as being prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, international financial reporting standards, or any other comparable method of accounting identified by the Secretary, and which is—

“(i) a 10-K (or successor form), or annual statement to shareholders, required to be filed with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission,

“(ii) an audited financial statement which is used for—

“(I) credit purposes,

“(II) reporting to shareholders, partners, or other proprietors, or to beneficiaries, or

“(III) any other substantial nontax purpose, but only if there is no statement described in clause (i), or

“(iii) filed with any other Federal or State agency for nontax purposes, but only if there is no statement described in clause (i) or (ii), or

“(B) a financial statement which—

“(i) is used for a purpose described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of subparagraph (A)(ii), or

“(ii) filed with any regulatory or governmental body (whether domestic or foreign) specified by the Secretary, but only if there is no statement described in subparagraph (A).

“(5) REPORTING YEAR.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘reporting year’ means, with respect to any international financial reporting group, the year with respect to which the consolidated financial statements are prepared.

“(6) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN ENTITIES.—

“(A) PARTNERSHIPS.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary in paragraph (7), this subsection and subsection (o) shall apply to any partnership which is a member of any international financial reporting group under rules similar to the rules of section 163(j)(4).

“(B) FOREIGN CORPORATIONS ENGAGED IN TRADE OR BUSINESS WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.—Except as otherwise provided by

the Secretary in paragraph (7), any deduction for interest paid or accrued by a foreign corporation engaged in a trade or business within the United States shall be limited in a manner consistent with the principles of this subsection.

“(C) CONSOLIDATED GROUPS.—For purposes of this subsection, the members of any group that file (or are required to file) a consolidated return with respect to the tax imposed by chapter 1 for a taxable year shall be treated as a single corporation.

“(7) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may issue such regulations or other guidance as are necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this subsection.”.

(b) CARRYFORWARD OF DISALLOWED INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 163 is amended by inserting after subsection (n), as added by subsection (a), the following new subsection:

“(o) CARRYFORWARD OF CERTAIN DISALLOWED INTEREST.—The amount of any interest not allowed as a deduction for any taxable year by reason of subsection (j)(1) or (n)(1) (whichever imposes the lower limitation with respect to such taxable year) shall be treated as interest (and as business interest for purposes of subsection (j)(1)) paid or accrued (and as interest expense reported as described in clause (i)(I) or (ii)(I) of subsection (n)(3)(B), as the case may be) in the succeeding taxable year. Interest paid or accrued in any taxable year (determined without regard to the preceding sentence) shall not be carried past the fifth taxable year following such taxable year, determined by treating interest as allowed as a deduction on a first-in, first-out basis.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 163(j)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(2) CARRYFORWARD CROSS-REFERENCE.—For carryforward treatment, see subsection (o).”.

(B) Section 163(j)(4)(B)(i)(I) is amended by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “subsection (o)”.

(C) Section 381(c)(20) is amended to read as follows:

“(20) CARRYFORWARD OF DISALLOWED INTEREST.—The carryover of disallowed interest described in section 163(o) to taxable years ending after the date of distribution or transfer.”.

(D) Section 382(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) APPLICATION TO CARRYFORWARD OF DISALLOWED INTEREST.—The term ‘pre-change loss’ shall include any carryover of disallowed interest described in section 163(o) under rules similar to the rules of paragraph (1).”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATIONS TO RULES RELATING TO INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 7874 is amended to read as follows:

“(b) INVERTED CORPORATIONS TREATED AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 7701(a)(4), a foreign corporation shall be treated for purposes of this title as a domestic corporation if—

“(A) such corporation would be a surrogate foreign corporation if subsection (a)(2) were applied by substituting ‘80 percent’ for ‘60 percent’, or

“(B) such corporation is an inverted domestic corporation.

“(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes after December 22, 2017, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) and the preceding sentence, the term ‘substantial business activities’ shall have the meaning given such term under regulations in effect on December 22, 2017, except that the Secretary may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after December 22, 2017.

“(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

“(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

“(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

“(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

“(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States, determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on December 22, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Clause (i) of section 7874(a)(2)(B) is amended by striking “after March 4, 2003,” and inserting “after March 4, 2003, and before December 23, 2017.”.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 7874 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”;

(ii) by inserting “or (b)(2)(A)” after “(a)(2)(B)(i)” in subparagraph (B);

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting “or (b)(2)(B)(i), as the case may be,” after “(a)(2)(B)(ii)”;

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking “subsection (a)(2)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsections (a)(2)(B)(ii) and (b)(2)(B)(i)”;

(D) in paragraph (6), by inserting “or inverted domestic corporation, as the case may be,” after “surrogate foreign corporation”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 22, 2017.

(d) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON ASSESSMENT.—If the period of limitation on assessment of tax resulting from the amendments made by subsection (a) expires before the end of the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, such assessment (to the extent attributable to such amendments) may, nevertheless, be made before the close of such 3-year period.

SEC. 6. TREATMENT OF FOREIGN CORPORATIONS MANAGED AND CONTROLLED IN THE UNITED STATES AS DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7701 is amended by redesignating subsection (p) as subsection (q) and by inserting after subsection (o) the following new subsection:

“(p) CERTAIN CORPORATIONS MANAGED AND CONTROLLED IN THE UNITED STATES TREATED AS DOMESTIC FOR INCOME TAX.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), in the case of a corporation described in paragraph (2) if—

“(A) the corporation would not otherwise be treated as a domestic corporation for purposes of this title, but

“(B) the management and control of the corporation occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, then, solely for purposes of chapter 1 (and any other provision of this title relating to chapter 1), the corporation shall be treated as a domestic corporation.

“(2) CORPORATION DESCRIBED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A corporation is described in this paragraph if—

“(i) the stock of such corporation is regularly traded on an established securities market, or

“(ii) the aggregate gross assets of such corporation (or any predecessor thereof), including assets under management for investors, whether held directly or indirectly, at any time during the taxable year or any preceding taxable year is \$50,000,000 or more.

“(B) GENERAL EXCEPTION.—A corporation shall not be treated as described in this paragraph if—

“(i) such corporation was treated as a corporation described in this paragraph in a preceding taxable year,

“(ii) such corporation—

“(I) is not regularly traded on an established securities market, and

“(II) has, and is reasonably expected to continue to have, aggregate gross assets (including assets under management for investors, whether held directly or indirectly) of less than \$50,000,000, and

“(iii) the Secretary grants a waiver to such corporation under this subparagraph.

“(3) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of a corporation is to be treated as occurring primarily within the United States.

“(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that—

“(i) the management and control of a corporation shall be treated as occurring primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the corporation who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the corporation are located primarily within the United States, and

“(ii) individuals who are not executive officers and senior management of the corporation (including individuals who are officers or employees of other corporations in the same chain of corporations as the corporation) shall be treated as executive officers and senior management if such individuals exercise the day-to-day responsibilities of the corporation described in clause (i).

“(C) CORPORATIONS PRIMARILY HOLDING INVESTMENT ASSETS.—Such regulations shall also provide that the management and control of a corporation shall be treated as occurring primarily within the United States if—

“(i) the assets of such corporation (directly or indirectly) consist primarily of assets being managed on behalf of investors, and

“(ii) decisions about how to invest the assets are made in the United States.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning on or after the date which is 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, whether or not regulations are issued under section 7701(p)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section.

SA 4413. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP REQUIRED FOR ASSAULT WEAPON PURCHASES.

Section 922 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(aa) DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP REQUIRED FOR ASSAULT WEAPON PURCHASES.—It shall be unlawful for any person to sell or otherwise dispose of an assault weapon to any individual unless the individual presents documentary proof of United States citizenship, as defined in sec-

tion 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502).”.

SA 4414. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Cell-Site Simulator Warrant Act of 2026”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON CELL-SITE SIMULATOR USE.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Chapter 205 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 3119. Cell-site simulators

“(a) PROHIBITION OF USE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d), it shall be unlawful—

“(A) for any individual or entity to knowingly use a cell-site simulator in the United States; or

“(B) for an element of the intelligence community to use a cell-site simulator outside the United States if the subject of the surveillance is a United States person.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to authorize a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity to use a cell-site simulator outside the United States.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any individual or entity that violates subsection (a)(1) shall be fined not more than \$250,000.

“(c) PROHIBITION OF USE AS EVIDENCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no information acquired through the use of a cell-site simulator in violation of subsection (a)(1), and no evidence derived therefrom, may be received in evidence in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR ENFORCEMENT.—Information acquired through the use of a cell-site simulator in violation of subsection (a)(1) by a person, and evidence derived therefrom, may be received in evidence in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding described in paragraph (1) of this subsection relating to the alleged violation of subsection (a)(1) in connection with such use.

“(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) WARRANT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the use of a cell-site simulator by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity under a warrant issued—

“(I) in accordance with this subparagraph; and

“(II) using the procedures described in, and in accordance with the requirements for executing and returning a warrant under, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant and execution and return procedures and, in the case of a court-martial or other proceeding under chapter 47 of title 10 (the Uniform Code of Military Justice), issued under section 846 of that title and in accordance with the requirements for executing and returning such a warrant, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President) by a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—A court may issue a warrant described in clause (i) (except, with respect to a State court, to the extent use of

a cell-site simulator by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity is prohibited by the law of the State) only if the law enforcement agency—

“(I) demonstrates that other investigative procedures, including electronic location tracking methods that solely collect records of the investigative target—

“(aa) have been tried and have failed; or

“(bb) reasonably appear to be—

“(AA) unlikely to succeed if tried; or

“(BB) too dangerous;

“(II) specifies the likely area of effect of the cell-site simulator to be used and the time that the cell-site simulator will be in operation;

“(III) certifies that the requested area of effect and time of operation are the narrowest reasonably possible to obtain the necessary information; and

“(IV) demonstrates that the requested use of a cell-site simulator would be in compliance with applicable provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and the rules of the Federal Communications Commission.

“(iii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In considering an application for a warrant described in clause (i), the court shall—

“(I) weigh the need of the government to enforce the law and apprehend criminals against the likelihood and impact of any potential negative side effects disclosed by the government under subparagraph (C); and

“(II) not grant a request for a warrant that would put public safety at risk or unreasonably inconvenience the community.

“(iv) PERIOD OF INITIAL AUTHORIZATION.—No warrant described in clause (i) may authorize the use of a cell site simulator for any period longer than is necessary to achieve the objective of the authorization, nor in any event for longer than 30 days.

“(v) EXTENSIONS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A court may grant extensions of a warrant described in clause (i), but only upon application for an extension made in accordance with clause (i) and the court considering the factors described in clause (iii) and determining the requirements under clause (ii) are met.

“(II) PERIOD OF EXTENSION.—The period of an extension of a warrant shall be no longer than the authorizing judge determines necessary to achieve the purposes for which the extension was granted, nor in any event for longer than 30 days.

“(vi) TERMINATION PROVISION.—Each warrant described in clause (i), and each extension thereof, shall contain a provision that the authorization to use the cell site simulator shall be executed as soon as practicable and shall terminate upon attainment of the authorized objective, or in any event in 30 days.

“(vii) START OF 30-DAY PERIODS.—The 30-day periods described in clauses (iv), (v)(II), and (vi) shall begin on the earlier of—

“(I) the date on which a law enforcement agency first begins to use the cell site simulator as authorized by the warrant, or extension thereof; or

“(II) the date that is 10 days after the warrant, or extension thereof, is issued.

“(B) EMERGENCY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the use of a cell-site simulator by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity, or use of a cell-site simulator as part of assistance provided by a component of the Department of Defense or an Armed Force to such a law enforcement agency, if—

“(I) the governmental entity reasonably determines an emergency exists that—

“(aa) involves—

“(AA) immediate danger of death or serious physical injury to any person;

“(BB) conspiratorial activities characteristic of organized crime; or

“(CC) an immediate threat to a national security interest; and

“(bb) requires use of a cell-site simulator before a warrant described in subparagraph (A) can, with due diligence, be obtained; and

“(II) except in an instance in which the governmental entity is trying to locate a lost or missing person, locate someone believed to have been abducted or kidnapped, or find victims, dead or alive, in an area where a natural disaster, terrorist attack, or other mass casualty event has taken place—

“(aa) there are grounds upon which a warrant described in subparagraph (A) could be entered to authorize such use; and

“(bb) the governmental entity applies for a warrant described in subparagraph (A) approving such use not later than 48 hours after such use begins, and takes such steps to expedite the consideration of such application as may be possible.

“(ii) TERMINATION OF EMERGENCY USE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A law enforcement agency of a governmental entity shall immediately terminate use of a cell-site simulator under clause (i) of this subparagraph at the earlier of the time the information sought is obtained or the time the application for a warrant described in subparagraph (A) is denied.

“(II) WARRANT DENIED.—If an application for a warrant described in clause (i)(II)(bb) is denied—

“(aa) any information or evidence derived from use of the cell-site simulator shall be—

“(AA) subject to subsection (c); and

“(BB) promptly destroyed by the applicable law enforcement agency; and

“(bb) the applicable law enforcement agency shall serve an inventory on each person named in the application.

“(C) DISCLOSURES REQUIRED IN APPLICATION.—In any application for a warrant authorizing the use of a cell-site simulator under subparagraph (A) or (B), the governmental entity shall include the following:

“(i) A disclosure of any potential disruption of the ability of the subject of the surveillance or bystanders to use commercial mobile radio services or private mobile services, including using advanced communications services, to make or receive, as applicable—

“(I) emergency calls (including 9-1-1 calls);

“(II) calls to the universal telephone number within the United States for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system designated under paragraph (4) of section 251(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e));

“(III) calls to the nationwide toll-free number for the poison control centers established under section 1271 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-71);

“(IV) calls using telecommunications relay services; or

“(V) any other communications or transmissions.

“(ii) A certification that the specific model of the cell-site simulator to be used has been inspected by a third party that is an accredited testing laboratory recognized by the Federal Communications Commission to verify the accuracy of the disclosure under clause (i).

“(iii) A disclosure of the methods and precautions that will be used to minimize disruption, including—

“(I) any limit on the length of time the cell-site simulator can be in continuous operation; and

“(II) any user-defined limit on the transmission range of the cell-site simulator.

“(iv) A disclosure as to whether the cell-site simulator will primarily be used at a

gathering where constitutionally protected activity, including speech, will occur.

“(D) NOTICE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Within a reasonable time, but, subject to clause (ii), not later than 90 days after the filing of an application for a warrant authorizing the use of a cell-site simulator which is denied or the termination of the period of such a warrant, or extensions thereof, the issuing or denying judge shall cause to be served on the persons named in the warrant or the application, and, as the judge may determine, in the discretion of the judge, is in the interest of justice, other persons about whose devices the government obtained information with the cell site simulator, an inventory which shall include notice of—

“(I) the fact of the entry of the warrant or the application;

“(II) the date of the entry and the period of authorized, approved or disapproved use of a cell-site simulator, or the denial of the application; and

“(III) whether, during the period—

“(aa) information about their device was, or was not, obtained by the government;

“(bb) their location was, or was not, tracked; and

“(cc) their communications were, or were not, intercepted.

“(ii) DELAY OF NOTICE.—On an ex parte showing of good cause to a court of competent jurisdiction, the serving of the inventory required under clause (i) may be postponed.

“(2) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE.—Use of a cell-site simulator by an element of the intelligence community shall not be subject to subsection (a)(1) if it is conducted in a manner that is in accordance with—

“(A) title I of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) (including testing or training authorized under paragraph (1) or (3) of section 105(g) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1805(g)) (including such testing or training conducted in conjunction with a component of the Department of Defense or an Armed Force), if any information obtained during such testing or training (including metadata) is destroyed after its use for such testing or training; or

“(B) section 704(c)(1)(E) of such Act (50 U.S.C. 1881c(c)(1)(E)).

“(3) RESEARCH.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the use of a cell-site simulator in order to engage, in good-faith, in research or teaching by a person that is not—

“(A) a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity;

“(B) an element of the intelligence community; or

“(C) acting as an agent thereof.

“(4) PROTECTIVE SERVICES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the use of a cell-site simulator in the performance of protective duties pursuant to section 3056 of this title, or as otherwise authorized by law.

“(B) PROHIBITION ON USE AS EVIDENCE.—No information acquired through the use of a cell-site simulator under the authority under subparagraph (A), and no evidence derived therefrom, may be received in evidence in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof.

“(C) NO BAR TO OTHER AUTHORIZED USE.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be construed to prohibit the United States Secret Service from using a cell-site simulator in accordance with a provision of this section other than subparagraph (A).

“(5) CONTRABAND INTERDICTION BY CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the use of a contraband interdiction system if the correctional facility or the entity operating the contraband interdiction system for the benefit of the correctional facility—

“(A) has—

“(i) taken reasonable steps to restrict transmissions by the contraband interdiction system to cellular devices physically located within the property of the correctional facility;

“(ii) posted signs around the correctional facility informing visitors and staff that the correctional facility employs such a contraband interdiction system; and

“(iii) complied with any relevant regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission and, as applicable, policies issued by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration;

“(B) annually tests and evaluates compliance with subparagraph (A) in accordance with best practices, which shall be issued by the Federal Communications Commission; and

“(C) not later than 10 business days after identifying an issue relating to the use of the contraband interdiction system, whether in the course of normal business operations or conducting testing and evaluation, submits to the Federal Communications Commission a report describing the issues identified and the steps taken to address the issues.

“(6) TESTING AND TRAINING BY LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the use of a cell-site simulator by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity in the normal course of official duties that is not targeted against the communications of any particular person or persons, under procedures approved by the Attorney General, solely to—

“(A) test the capability of electronic equipment, if—

“(i) it is not reasonable to obtain the consent of the persons incidentally subjected to the surveillance;

“(ii) the test is limited in extent and duration to that necessary to determine to capability of the equipment;

“(iii) any information obtained during such testing (including metadata) is retained and used only for the purpose of determining the capability of the equipment, is disclosed only to test personnel, and is destroyed before or immediately upon completion of the test; and

“(iv) the test is for a period of not longer than 90 days, unless the law enforcement agency obtains the prior approval of the Attorney General; or

“(B) train law enforcement personnel in the use of electronic surveillance equipment, if—

“(i) it is not reasonable to—

“(I) obtain the consent of the persons incidentally subjected to the surveillance;

“(II) train persons in the course of otherwise authorized law enforcement activities; or

“(III) train persons in the use of such equipment without engaging in surveillance;

“(ii) such surveillance is limited in extent and duration to that necessary to train the personnel in the use of the equipment; and

“(iii) any information obtained during such training (including metadata) is destroyed after its use for such training.

“(7) FCC TESTING.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the use of a cell-site simulator by the Federal Communications Commission, or an accredited testing laboratory recognized by the Federal Communications Commission, in order to test the cell-site simulator.

“(8) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to exempt a State or local government from complying with regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission, including the requirement to obtain authorization to transmit on spectrum regulated by the Federal Communications Commission.

“(e) LIMIT ON CERTAIN USE NOT CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO WARRANTS AND ORDERS.—The use of a cell-site simulator under subsection (d)(1)(B) of this section (which shall not include such a use by a component of the Department of Defense or an Armed Force providing assistance to a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity under such subsection (d)(1)(B)), under section 105(e) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805(e)), or under clause (i) or (ii) of section 102(a)(1)(A) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1802(a)(1)(A)) may only be carried out lawfully using a specific model of a cell-site simulator for which the disclosures required under clauses (i) and (ii) of subsection (d)(1)(C) were included with respect to the specific model in connection with—

“(1) for use by an element of the intelligence community under title I of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), an application for an order under such Act that was approved; or

“(2) for use by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity, an application for a warrant—

“(A) under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that was approved by a judge of the judicial district in which the law enforcement agency intends to use the cell-site simulator; or

“(B) using State warrant procedures that was approved by a judge of the State in which the law enforcement agency intends to use the cell-site simulator.

“(f) MINIMIZATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall adopt specific procedures that are reasonably designed to minimize the acquisition and retention, and prohibit the dissemination, of information obtained through the use of a cell-site simulator under an exception under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (d) that pertains to any person who is not an authorized subject of the use.

“(2) PUBLICATION.—The Attorney General shall make publicly available on the website of the Department of Justice the procedures adopted under paragraph (1) and any revisions to such procedures.

“(3) USE BY AGENCIES.—If a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity or element of the intelligence community acquires information pertaining to a person who is not an authorized subject of the use of a cell-site simulator under an exception under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (d), the law enforcement agency or element of the intelligence community shall—

“(A) minimize the acquisition and retention, and prohibit the dissemination, of the information in accordance with the procedures adopted under paragraph (1); and

“(B) destroy the information (including metadata) at the earliest possible opportunity.

“(g) DISCLOSURE TO DEFENDANT.—Any information acquired through the operation of a cell-site simulator, or derived from such information, shall be disclosed to the defendant in any action in which the information is introduced into evidence.

“(h) SCOPE OF COLLECTION.—

“(1) AUTHORIZED USE.—Information collected under this section may only include information identifying nearby electronic devices communicating with the cell-site simulator and the strength and direction of transmissions from those electronic devices.

“(2) COMPLIANCE WITH WIRETAPPING REQUIREMENTS TO OBTAIN CONTENTS.—In the case of any interception of a wire or electronic communication by the cell-site simulator—

“(A) with respect to an interception by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity, the provisions of chapter 119 shall apply in addition to the provisions of this section; and

“(B) with respect to an interception by an element of the intelligence community, the element of the intelligence community may only conduct the surveillance using the cell-site simulator in accordance with an order authorizing the use issued in accordance with title I of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), in addition to complying with the provisions of this section.

“(3) COMPLIANCE WITH TRACKING DEVICE REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If a cell-site simulator is to be used by a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity to locate or track the movement of a person or object, the provisions of section 3117 and rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure shall apply in addition to the provisions of this section.

“(B) COURT.—For purposes of applying section 3117 and rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to the use of a cell-site simulator, a court may authorize such use within the jurisdiction of the court, and outside that jurisdiction if—

“(i) the use commences within that jurisdiction; or

“(ii) at the time the application is presented to the court, the governmental entity certifies that it has probable cause to believe that the target is physically located within that jurisdiction.

“(i) CIVIL ACTION.—Any person subject to an unlawful operation of a cell-site simulator may bring a civil action for appropriate relief (including declaratory and injunctive relief, actual damages, statutory damages of not more than \$500 for each violation, and attorney fees) against the person, including a governmental entity, that conducted that unlawful operation before a court of competent jurisdiction.

“(j) ADMINISTRATIVE DISCIPLINE.—If a court or appropriate department or agency determines that the United States or any of its departments or agencies has violated any provision of this section, and the court or appropriate department or agency finds that the circumstances surrounding the violation raise serious questions about whether or not an officer or employee of the United States acted willfully or intentionally with respect to the violation, the department or agency shall, upon receipt of a true and correct copy of the decision and findings of the court or appropriate department or agency promptly initiate a proceeding to determine whether disciplinary action against the officer or employee is warranted. If the head of the department or agency involved determines that disciplinary action is not warranted, he or she shall notify the Inspector General with jurisdiction over the department or agency concerned and shall provide the Inspector General with the reasons for such determination.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

“(1) the terms defined in section 2711 have, respectively, the definitions given such terms in that section;

“(2) the term ‘advanced communications services’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153);

“(3) the term ‘cell-site simulator’ means any device that functions as or simulates a base station for commercial mobile services

or private mobile services in order to identify, locate, or intercept transmissions from cellular devices for purposes other than providing ordinary commercial mobile services or private mobile services;

“(4) the term ‘commercial mobile radio service’ has the meaning given that term in section 20.3 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto;

“(5) the term ‘contraband interdiction system’ means any device that functions as or simulates a base station for commercial mobile services or private mobile services for purposes of identifying, locating, or intercepting transmissions from contraband cellular devices in correctional facilities;

“(6) the term ‘derived’ means, with respect to information or evidence, that the government would not have originally possessed the information or evidence but for the use of a cell-site simulator, and regardless of any claim that the information or evidence is attenuated from the surveillance would inevitably have been discovered, or was subsequently reobtained through other means;

“(7) the term ‘electronic communication’ has the meaning given that term in section 2510;

“(8) the term ‘electronic device’ has the meaning given the term ‘computer’ in section 1030(e);

“(9) the term ‘emergency call’ has the meaning given that term in section 6001 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401);

“(10) the term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003);

“(11) the term ‘mitigation’ means the deletion of all information collected about a person who is not the subject of the warrant or investigation;

“(12) the term ‘private mobile service’ has the meaning given that term in section 332 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 332);

“(13) the term ‘telecommunications relay service’ has the meaning given that term in section 225 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 225); and

“(14) the term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).”.

(b) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978 REQUIREMENTS.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 101 (50 U.S.C. 1801), by adding at the end the following:

“(q) ‘Cell-site simulator’ has the meaning given that term in section 3119 of title 18, United States Code.”;

(2) in section 102(a) (50 U.S.C. 1802(a)), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) The Government may only use a cell-site simulator pursuant to the authority under clause (i) or (ii) of paragraph (1)(A) without obtaining an order under this title authorizing such use if the Government has implemented measures that are reasonably likely to limit the collection activities to—

“(A) means of communications used exclusively between or among foreign powers, as defined in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 101(a); or

“(B) property or premises under the open and exclusive control of a foreign power, as defined in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 101(a).”;

(3) in section 105 (50 U.S.C. 1805), by adding at the end the following:

“(k)(1) A judge having jurisdiction under section 103 may issue an order under this section that authorizes the use of a cell-site simulator only if the applicant—

“(A) demonstrates that other investigative procedures, including electronic location tracking methods that solely collect records of the investigative target—

“(i) have been tried and have failed; or

“(ii) reasonably appear to be—

“(I) unlikely to succeed if tried; or

“(II) too dangerous;

“(B) specifies the likely area of effect of the cell-site simulator to be used and the time that the cell-site simulator will be in operation;

“(C) certifies that the requested area of effect and time of operation are the narrowest reasonably possible to obtain the necessary information; and

“(D) demonstrates that the requested use of a cell-site simulator would be in compliance with applicable provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and the rules of the Federal Communications Commission.

“(2) In any application for an order under this section authorizing the use of a cell-site simulator, the applicant shall include the following:

“(A) A disclosure of any potential disruption of the ability of the subject of the surveillance or bystanders to use commercial mobile radio services or private mobile services, including using advanced communications services, to make or receive, as applicable—

“(i) emergency calls (including 9-1-1 calls);

“(ii) calls to the universal telephone number within the United States for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system under designated under paragraph (4) of section 251(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 251(e));

“(iii) calls to the nationwide toll-free number for the poison control centers established under section 1271 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-71);

“(iv) calls using telecommunications relay services; or

“(v) any other communications or transmissions.

“(B) A certification that the specific model of the cell-site simulator to be used has been inspected by a third party that is an accredited testing laboratory recognized by the Federal Communications Commission to verify the accuracy of the disclosure under subparagraph (A).

“(C) A disclosure of the methods and precautions that will be used to minimize disruption, including—

“(i) any limit on the length of time the cell-site simulator can be in continuous operation; and

“(ii) any user-defined limit on the transmission range of the cell-site simulator.

“(D) A disclosure as to whether the cell-site simulator will primarily be used at a gathering where constitutionally protected activity, including speech, will occur.

“(3) In considering an application for an order under this section that authorizes the use of a cell-site simulator, the court shall—

“(A) weigh the need of the Government to obtain the information sought against the likelihood and impact of any potential negative side effects disclosed by the Government under paragraph (2); and

“(B) not grant a request for an order that would put public safety at risk or unreasonably inconvenience the community.”; and

(4) in section 704(c)(1) (50 U.S.C. 1881c(c)(1))—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) if the applicant is seeking to use a cell-site simulator (as defined in section 101),

the requirements that would apply for the use of a cell-site simulator in the United States under section 105(k) have been satisfied.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3127 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking “but such term does not include any” and inserting “except such term does not include any cell-site simulator, as that term is defined in section 3119, or”; and

(2) in paragraph (4) by striking “of any communication” and inserting “of any communication, except such term does not include any cell-site simulator, as that term is defined in section 3119”.

(d) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “covered Federal entity” means—

(A) a law enforcement agency of a department or agency of the Federal Government; and

(B) an element of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)).

(2) REPORTS.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community shall annually submit to Congress a joint report, and publish an unclassified version of the report on the website of each such inspector general, on—

(A) the overall compliance of covered Federal entities with this Act and the amendments made by this Act;

(B) the number of applications by covered Federal entities for use of a cell-site simulator that were applied for and the number that were granted;

(C) the number of emergency uses of a cell-site simulator under section 3119(d)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act;

(D) the number of such emergency uses for which a court subsequently issued a warrant authorizing the use and the number of such emergency uses in which an application for a warrant was denied;

(E) the number of devices that were targeted with a cell-site simulator, which shall be provided separately for targeting conducted pursuant to a warrant or court order and targeting conducted pursuant to an authority to use a cell-site simulator without a warrant or order;

(F) the number of devices that were not the target of the use of a cell-site simulator about which information was obtained with the cell-site simulator, which shall—

(i) be provided separately for use conducted pursuant to a warrant or court order and use conducted pursuant to an authority to use a cell-site simulator without a warrant or order; and

(ii) include the number of such devices about which the information was not destroyed as a result of the minimization requirements under section 3119(f) of title 18, United States Code, as added by this section, which shall be provided separately for use conducted pursuant to a warrant or court order and use conducted pursuant to an authority to use a cell-site simulator without a warrant or order;

(G) which components of a law enforcement agency of a department or agency of the Federal Government are using cell-site simulators and how many are available to that component; and

(H) instances in which a law enforcement agency of a department or agency of the Federal Government made cell-site simulators available to a State or unit of local government.

(3) FORM OF REPORTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) FCC REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall initiate any proceeding that may be necessary to promulgate or modify regulations promulgated by the Federal Communications Commission to implement this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to expand or contract the authority of the Federal Communications Commission.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, and the amendments made by such subsections, shall apply on and after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “cell-site simulator” has the meaning given that term in section 3119 of title 18, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(B) EXTENSION FOR EXISTING CELL-SITE SIMULATORS.—For any model of a cell-site simulator in use before the date of enactment of this Act, including such use in a contraband interdiction system at a correctional facility, if the Attorney General certifies that additional time is necessary to obtain independent tests of the model of cell-site simulator, subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, and the amendments made by such subsections, shall apply to the use of the model of cell-site simulator on and after the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4415. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Privacy Act Modernization Act of 2026”.

SEC. 2. MODERNIZING PRIVACY ACT DEFINITIONS.

(a) RECORDS.—Section 552a(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence” and inserting the following: “a natural person who is—

“(A) a United States person, as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801); or

“(B) in the United States;”;

(2) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting the following:

“(4) the term ‘record’ means any personally identifiable information processed by an agency;

“(5) the term ‘system of records’ means a group of any records maintained by or for, or otherwise under the control of, any agency;”;

(3) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) the term ‘personally identifiable information’ means any information that iden-

tifies, or is linked or reasonably linkable, alone or in combination with other data, to—

“(A) an individual; or

“(B) a device that identifies, or is linked or reasonably linkable to, an individual; and

“(15) the term ‘process’, with respect to personally identifiable information, means to perform an operation or set of operations on the personally identifiable information, including by storing, analyzing, organizing, structuring, using, modifying, or otherwise handling the personally identifiable information, whether or not by automated means.”.

(b) MATCHING PROGRAMS.—Section 552a(a)(8)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “of”;

(2) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “two or more automated systems of records or a system of records with non-Federal records” and inserting the following: “involving any data from 1 or more systems of records”; and

(3) in clause (ii), by striking “two or more” and inserting “of 2 or more”.

(c) GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS.—Section 552a(m)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “for the operation by or on behalf of the agency of a system of records to accomplish an agency function” and inserting “or other agreement, including with another agency, for the operation by or on behalf of the agency of a system of records”.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 552a of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “section 552(e)” and inserting “section 552(f)”; and

(B) in paragraph (8)(B)—

(i) in clause (iv)(III), by striking “section 404(e), 464, or 1137” and inserting “section 464 or 1137”; and

(ii) in clause (x), by striking “section 3(d)(4) of the Achieving a Better Life Experience Act of 2014” and inserting “section 529A(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986”; and

(2) in subsection (1), by striking “National Archives of the United States” each place that term appears and inserting “National Archives and Records Administration”.

SEC. 3. STRENGTHENING PROTECTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS.

(a) ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR COLLECTIONS, USES, AND DISCLOSURES.—Section 552a of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(7), by inserting “and is appropriate and reasonably necessary for the efficient and effective conduct of the Government” before the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting “and that disclosure is consistent with, and related to, a purpose described under subsection (e)(4)(D) of this section” before the semicolon at the end; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “that maintains a system of records”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “under Federal programs”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) any purpose for which the information is intended to be used, including each routine use;”;

(ii) in subparagraph (H), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (I), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) the legal authority for each purpose for which the records contained in the system are used, which shall contain a citation

to the applicable law, executive order, or other authority;”;

(D) in paragraph (11), by striking “and” at the end;

(E) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) use records only for a legally authorized purpose; and

“(14) take reasonable efforts to ensure that a record that is disclosed contains the minimum amount of information necessary to accomplish the purpose of the disclosure.”.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR MATCHING PROGRAMS.—Section 552a(a)(8)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

“(ii) matches performed to support any research or statistical project, if the results of the match are not intended to be used, and are not used, to—

“(I) make decisions concerning the rights, benefits, or privileges of specific individuals; or

“(II) take any adverse financial, personnel, or disciplinary action, or any other adverse action, against Federal personnel;”;

(2) in clause (viii), by inserting “or” after the semicolon at the end;

(3) by striking clause (ix); and

(4) by redesignating clause (x) as clause (ix).

(c) ADDITIONAL CIVIL REMEDIES.—Section 552a(g) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) fails to comply with any other provision of this section, or any rule promulgated thereunder, in such a way as to have, or that could reasonably lead to, an adverse effect on any person (including any State or territory (or any political subdivision of any State or territory) or any Indian Tribe);”;

(B) in the flush text following subparagraph (D), by inserting “or person, as applicable,” after “the individual”; and

(2) by amending paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) In any suit brought under the provisions of subsection (g)(1)(C) or (D) of this section—

“(A) the court may provide such preliminary and other equitable or declaratory relief as may be appropriate; and

“(B) if the court determines that the agency acted in a manner that was intentional or willful, the United States shall be liable to the individual or person, as applicable, in an amount equal to the sum of—

“(i) actual damages, including nonpecuniary damages, sustained by the individual or person as a result of the refusal or failure, but in no case shall an individual or person entitled to recovery receive less than the sum of \$1,000;

“(ii) the costs of the action together with reasonable attorney fees as determined by the court; and

“(iii) punitive damages in an amount determined appropriate by the court.”.

(d) ADDITIONAL CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 552a(i) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following: “A person who commits an offense described in the previous sentence with the intent to sell, transfer, use, or disclose a record described in that sentence for commercial advantage, personal gain, or malicious harm shall be guilty of a felony and fined not more than \$250,000, imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “mis-demeanor and fined not more than \$5,000” and inserting “felony and fined not more than \$100,000”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY; MATCHING PROGRAM; RECIPIENT AGENCY; RECORD; SOURCE AGENCY; SYSTEM OF RECORDS.—The terms “agency”, “matching program”, “recipient agency”, “record”, “source agency”, and “system of records” have the meanings given those terms in section 552a of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 2.

(2) SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE.—The term “special Government employee” has the meaning given the term in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) TEMPORARY OR INTERMITTENT EXPERT OR CONSULTANT.—The term “temporary or intermittent expert or consultant” means an expert or consultant or an organization thereof, the services of which are procured pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(4) TEMPORARY TRANSITIONAL SCHEDULE C POSITION.—The term “temporary transitional Schedule C position” means a position established under section 213.3302 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(b) GENERAL EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the amendments made by sections 2 and 3 shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The amendments made by sections 2 and 3 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act with respect to each of the following:

(1) Any use of a record by, any disclosure of a record by or to, any maintenance of a system of records by or for, any control of a system of records by, the taking of any other action that is governed by section 552a of title 5, United States Code (as amended by this Act) by, or the taking of any of the preceding actions that is caused by any action by any of the following:

(A) The United States DOGE Service, or any successor organization.

(B) The U.S. DOGE Service Temporary Organization, or any successor organization.

(C) Any special Government employee, any temporary or intermittent expert or consultant, or any individual occupying a temporary transitional Schedule C position.

(D) Any agency not described in subparagraph (A) or (B) that is headed by, or subject to the control of—

(i) the head of the entity described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) the head of the entity described in subparagraph (B); or

(iii) any person described in subparagraph (C).

(E) Any DOGE Team (as described in Executive Order 14158 (90 Fed. Reg. 8441), relating to establishing and implementing the President’s “Department of Government Efficiency”), or any successor organization.

(F) Any agency that is within, or subject to the review of, an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (D), or (E).

(G) Any officer, employee, expert, consultant, contractor, volunteer, or other individual, without regard to title or compensation, of, within, or providing services to an entity described in subparagraph (A), (B), (D), (E), or (F).

(2) Any matching program in which—

(A) an entity or person described in any subparagraph of paragraph (1) is the source agency or recipient agency; or

(B) a system of records is maintained by or for, or otherwise under the control of, an entity or person described in any subparagraph of paragraph (1).

(d) APPLICABILITY.—If a person described in any subparagraph of paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (c), outside of the capacity of the person as described in the applicable subparagraph, discloses a record, maintains a system of records, controls a system of records, participates in a matching program, takes any other action that is governed by section 552a of title 5, United States Code (as amended by this Act), or causes any other person to take any of the preceding actions, the exception under subsection (c) shall still apply with respect to that action by that person.

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “Privacy Act” means section 552a of title 5, United States Code, as in effect at any time before the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RULE.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, may be construed to create an inference with respect to the interpretation of any provision of the Privacy Act, any regulation promulgated under the Privacy Act, or any application of such a provision or regulation, including with respect to the scope of activity covered under the Privacy Act, the legality of any activity under the Privacy Act, or the availability of any remedy or award of damages with respect to a violation of the Privacy Act.

SA 4416. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROTECTING PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 552(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) INDIVIDUAL.—The term “individual” means an individual that is a—

(A) United States person, as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801); or

(B) person in the United States.

(3) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term “personally identifiable information” means any information that identifies, or is linked or reasonably linkable, alone or in combination with other data, to—

(A) an individual; or

(B) a device that identifies, or is linked or reasonably linkable to, an individual.

(4) PROCESS.—The term “process”, with respect to personally identifiable information, means to perform an operation or set of operations on the personally identifiable information, including by storing, analyzing, organizing, structuring, using, modifying, or otherwise handling the personally identifiable information, whether or not by automated means.

(5) RECORD.—The term “record” means any personally identifiable information processed by an agency.

(6) SYSTEM OF RECORDS.—The term “system of records” means a group of any records maintained by or for, or otherwise under the control of, any agency.

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—No Federal funds may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Executive Order 14243 (90 Fed. Reg. 13681; relating to stopping waste, fraud, and abuse by eliminating information silos), or any successive executive order.

(c) CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No Federal funds may be used to acquire services or software from, or use any services or software acquired from, Palantir Technologies Inc. for the processing of personally identifiable information in 1 or more systems of records.

(2) TERMINATION.—Any contract which has a requirement for the processing described in paragraph (1) is hereby terminated.

SA 4417. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Vote at Home Act of 2026”.

SEC. 2. PROMOTING ABILITY OF VOTERS TO VOTE BY MAIL IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) VOTING BY MAIL IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“SEC. 303A. PROMOTING ABILITY OF VOTERS TO VOTE BY MAIL.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—If an individual in a State is eligible to cast a vote in an election for Federal office, the State may not impose any additional conditions or requirements on the eligibility of the individual to cast the vote in such election by mail, except to the extent that the State imposes a deadline for requesting the ballot and related voting materials from the appropriate State or local election official and for returning the ballot to the appropriate State or local election official.

“(b) PROVISION OF BALLOT MATERIALS.—Not later than 2 weeks before the date of any election for Federal office, each State shall mail ballots to individuals who are registered to vote in such election.

“(c) ACCESSIBILITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.—All ballots provided under this section shall be accessible to individuals with disabilities in a manner that provides the same opportunity for access and participation (including for privacy and independence) as for other voters.

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the authority of States to conduct elections for Federal office through the use of polling places at which individuals cast ballots.

“(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A State shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section with respect to elections for Federal office held in years beginning with 2028.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking “and 304” and inserting “303A, and 304”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Promoting ability of voters to vote by mail.”

(b) FREE POSTAGE FOR VOTING BY MAIL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 34 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 3407. Ballots provided for voting in Federal elections

“Blank ballots mailed pursuant to section 303A(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002

which are mailed by a State or local election official (individually or in bulk) to a voter, and voted ballots which are mailed by a voter to an election official, shall be carried expeditiously and free of postage.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 34 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“3407. Ballots provided for voting in Federal elections.”.

(B) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 2401(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “3403 through 3406” and inserting “3403 through 3407”.

SEC. 3. VOTER REGISTRATION THROUGH STATE MOTOR VEHICLE AUTHORITIES.

(a) STREAMLINING EXISTING PROCEDURES.—Section 5 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20504) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 5. VOTER REGISTRATION THROUGH MOTOR VEHICLE AUTHORITY.

“(a) STREAMLINED REGISTRATION THROUGH APPLICATION FOR DRIVER’S LICENSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall include a voter registration application form for elections for Federal office as part of an application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license for each applicable individual other than an applicable individual described in subsection (b)(1).

“(2) FORMS AND PROCEDURES.—The voter registration application portion of an application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license—

“(A) may not require any information that duplicates information required in the driver’s license portion of the form;

“(B) may require only the minimum amount of information necessary to—

“(i) prevent duplicate voter registrations; and

“(ii) enable State election officials to assess the eligibility of an applicable individual and to administer voter registration;

“(C) shall include a statement that—

“(i) states each eligibility requirement (including citizenship);

“(ii) contains an attestation that the applicant meets each such requirement; and

“(iii) requires the signature of the applicant, under penalty of perjury;

“(D) shall include—

“(i) a statement that, if an applicant declines to register to vote, the fact that the applicant has declined to register will remain confidential and will be used only for voter registration purposes; and

“(ii) a statement that if an applicant does register to vote, the office at which the applicant submits a voter registration application will remain confidential and will be used only for voter registration purposes; and

“(E) shall be made available (as submitted by the applicant, or in machine readable or other format) to the appropriate State election official as provided by State law—

“(i) subject to clause (ii), not later than 10 days after the date of acceptance; or

“(ii) if a registration application is accepted within 5 days before the last day for registration to vote in an election, not later than 5 days after the date of acceptance.

“(3) TREATMENT OF ATTESTATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of an application for voter registration with respect to elections for Federal office in a State under this subsection, an attestation of eligibility, including an attestation that the applicant is a United States citizen, shall be treated as the presumptive minimum amount of information necessary for the State to assess the eligibility of an applicable individual to vote in

such elections and for the State to administer voter registration, except that a State shall prevent the completion of or reject the voter registration application of an applicable individual based upon reliable information in its possession demonstrating that the individual is not a United States citizen or is otherwise ineligible to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State at the time of the application for a motor vehicle driver’s license.

“(b) AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION OF ELIGIBLE CITIZENS.—

“(1) DUTIES OF MOTOR VEHICLE AUTHORITY.—Each State motor vehicle authority shall transmit the voter registration information described in paragraph (2) with respect to an applicable individual to the appropriate election official if—

“(A) such individual has presented a document as part of an application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license (including a document presented in a previous application retained by the State’s motor vehicle authority) demonstrating that the individual is a United States citizen; or

“(B) based on information provided to the State motor vehicle authority by the appropriate election official, such individual is currently registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.

“(2) VOTER REGISTRATION INFORMATION DESCRIBED.—The voter registration information transmitted by the State motor vehicle authority described in this paragraph is, with respect to an applicable individual, the minimum amount of information necessary to—

“(A) prevent duplicate voter registrations;

“(B) enable State election officials to assess the eligibility of such an individual who is not at that time registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State and to administer voter registration; and

“(C) enable State election officials to update the address of such an individual who is currently registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.

“(3) DEADLINE FOR TRANSMISSION TO ELECTION OFFICIAL.—The voter registration information described in paragraph (2) shall be made available (in machine readable or other format) to the appropriate State election official as provided by State law—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), not later than 10 days after the date of acceptance; or

“(B) if the voter registration information is accepted within 5 days before the last day for registration to vote in an election, not later than 5 days after the date of acceptance.

“(4) DETERMINATION OF REGISTRATION STATUS BY ELECTION OFFICIALS RECEIVING INFORMATION.—Upon receiving the voter registration information with respect to an individual under paragraph (1), the appropriate State election official shall determine—

“(A) whether such individual is at that time registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State;

“(B) if the individual is at that time registered to vote in such elections, the address at which the individual is registered; and

“(C) if the individual at that time is not registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, whether such individual is eligible to vote in such elections, including as provided by section 8(a)(3)(B) through the procedure set forth in section 303(a)(2)(A)(i)(I) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(2)(A)(i)(I)).

“(5) REGISTRATION OF ELIGIBLE UNREGISTERED INDIVIDUALS.—

“(A) NOTICE.—In the case of an applicable individual who is determined by the appropriate State election official to be eligible to vote in elections for Federal office in the State and who is not at the time registered to vote in such elections, the appropriate

State election official shall issue a notice, which may be combined with the notice described in section 8(a)(2), to the individual containing—

“(i) a statement that the individual’s records and signature shall constitute a completed registration for the individual unless the individual notifies the election official in response to the notice that the individual declines to be registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State; and

“(ii) a description of the process by which the individual may decline to be registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.

“(B) REGISTRATION.—Upon the issuance of a notice to an individual under subparagraph (A), the official shall ensure that the individual is registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless in response to the notice, the individual notifies the official that the individual declines to be registered to vote in such elections.

“(C) REMOVAL OF INDIVIDUALS INCORRECTLY REGISTERED.—If, after an individual is registered under subparagraph (B) to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State, the appropriate State election official later determines that the individual does not meet the eligibility requirements for registering to vote in such elections, including as provided by section 8(a)(3)(B) or as a result of error relating to the duties of the State motor vehicle authority under paragraph (1), the individual shall be removed from the official list of registered voters in the State and deemed never to have registered to vote or attempted to register to vote.

“(6) CORRECTING ADDRESSES OF INDIVIDUALS REGISTERED AT DIFFERENT ADDRESSES.—

“(A) NOTICE.—In the case of an applicable individual who is registered to vote in elections for Federal office in the State at a different address in the State than the address provided in the information transmitted under this subsection, the appropriate State election official shall issue a notice, which may be combined with the notice described in section 8(a)(2), to the individual containing—

“(i) a statement that the address provided in such information shall be used as the individual’s address for voter registration purposes; and

“(ii) a description of the process by which the individual may correct an address for voter registration purposes.

“(B) CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Upon the issuance of a notice to an individual under subparagraph (A), the official shall ensure that the individual is registered to vote in elections for Federal office at the address provided in the information transmitted under this subsection unless the individual corrects the change of address for voter registration purposes.

“(7) VOTER PROTECTIONS.—

“(A) PROTECTIONS FOR ERRORS IN REGISTRATION.—An individual shall not be prosecuted under any Federal or State law, adversely affected in any civil adjudication concerning immigration status or naturalization, or subject to an allegation in any legal proceeding that the individual is not a citizen of the United States on any of the following grounds:

“(i) The individual notified an election official of the individual’s automatic registration to vote under this subsection.

“(ii) The individual is not eligible to vote in elections for Federal office but was automatically registered to vote under this subsection due to agency error.

“(iii) The individual was automatically registered to vote under this subsection at an incorrect address.

“(iv) The individual did not make an affirmation of citizenship, including through

automatic registration under this subsection.

“(B) LIMITS ON USE OF AUTOMATIC REGISTRATION.—The automatic registration of any individual under this subsection or the fact that an individual did not make an affirmation of citizenship, including through automatic registration under this subsection, may not be used as evidence against that individual in any State or Federal law enforcement proceeding or any civil adjudication concerning immigration status or naturalization, and an individual’s lack of knowledge or willfulness of such registration may be demonstrated by the individual’s testimony alone.

“(C) PROTECTION OF ELECTION INTEGRITY.—Nothing in subparagraphs (A) or (B) may be construed to prohibit or restrict any action under color of law against an individual who—

“(i) knowingly and willfully makes a false statement to effectuate or perpetuate automatic voter registration under this subsection by any individual; or

“(ii) casts a ballot knowingly and willfully in violation of State law or the laws of the United States.

“(C) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

“(1) PROHIBITING TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION ON NONCITIZENS.—The State motor vehicle authority shall not transmit voter registration information under this section with respect to an applicable individual if, as part of the application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license, the individual—

“(A) presents a document demonstrating that the individual is not a United States citizen at the time of the application; or

“(B) makes an attestation demonstrating that the individual is not a United States citizen at the time of the application, if such attestation is required by State law for purposes of the application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license.

“(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF INFORMATION.—No information relating to the failure of an applicant for a State motor vehicle driver’s license to sign a voter registration application or to an applicant’s decision to decline voter registration may be used for any purpose other than voter registration.

“(3) APPLICABLE INDIVIDUAL.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘applicable individual’ means any individual who submits an application for a State motor vehicle driver’s license, including an initial application, renewal application, or change of address form, whether submitted in person, by mail, or by electronic means.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO TIMING OF REGISTRATION PRIOR TO ELECTIONS.—Section 8(a)(1)(A) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) in the case of registration through a motor vehicle authority under section 5—

“(i) if the valid voter registration form of the applicant is submitted to the motor vehicle authority under section 5(a), not later than the lesser of 30 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election; or

“(ii) in the case of registration under section 5(b), if the voter registration information described in section 5(b)(2) which is transmitted by the motor vehicle authority is submitted by the applicant to the authority, not later than the lesser of 30 days, or the period provided by State law, before the date of the election; or”.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4(a)(1) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20503(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) through the State motor vehicle authority pursuant to section 5;”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon

the expiration of the 180-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 4418. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fast Track Healthcare Apprenticeships Act”.

SEC. 2. HEALTH CARE APPRENTICESHIP REGISTRATION.

The Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the “National Apprenticeship Act”; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 4 as section 6; and

(2) by inserting after section 3 the following:

“SEC. 4. HEALTH CARE APPRENTICESHIP REGISTRATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In administering this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish a national apprenticeship system that provides, with respect to any application submitted seeking to register a program in the health care field as an apprenticeship program under this Act, that—

“(1) a decision shall be provided to the applicant on the application not later than 45 days after receipt of the application; and

“(2) if a decision is not made within the 45 days after receipt, a written explanation for the delay and an estimated timeline for a determination (that is not more than 90 days after the date of such written explanation) shall be provided to the applicant.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) HEALTH CARE FIELD.—The term ‘health care field’ means the following occupations:

“(A) Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations, as described in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Standard Occupational Classification System (or any corresponding occupation in any corresponding System).

“(B) Healthcare support occupations, as described in such System (or any corresponding occupation in any corresponding System).

“(2) NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP SYSTEM.—The term ‘national apprenticeship system’ means the system established by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the activities authorized and directed to be carried out under section 1.”.

SEC. 3. DIGITIZATION OF APPRENTICESHIP AGREEMENT FORMS.

The Act of August 16, 1937 (commonly known as the “National Apprenticeship Act”; 50 Stat. 664, chapter 663; 29 U.S.C. 50 et seq.), as amended by section 2, is further amended by inserting after section 4 (as added by section 2) the following:

“SEC. 5. DIGITIZATION OF APPRENTICESHIP AGREEMENT FORMS.

“In administering this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall establish a national apprenticeship system (as such term is defined in section 4) that provides that any apprenticeship agreement form for such system (including any employer agreement form or any disability disclosure form) shall be digitized.”.

SA 4419. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “People Over Long Lines Act” or the “POLL Act”.

SEC. 2. PREVENTING UNREASONABLE VOTER WAITING TIMES.

(a) STATE PLANS REQUIRED.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 305 and 306 as sections 306 and 307; and

(2) by inserting after section 304 the following new section:

“SEC. 305. UNREASONABLE VOTER WAITING TIMES.

“(a) STATE PLANS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days before each election for Federal office, each State shall make public (including through the website of the State on which election information is normally published) and submit to the Election Assistance Commission (hereinafter in this section referred to as the ‘Commission’) a written plan which meets the public notice and comment requirements of paragraph (2) and describes the measures it is implementing to ensure, to the greatest extent possible, an equitable waiting time for all voters in the State, including for voters with disabilities, and a waiting time of less than 30 minutes at any polling place in the election.

“(2) PUBLIC NOTICE COMMENT REQUIREMENT.—The public notice and comment requirements of this paragraph are met if—

“(A) not later than 30 days prior to the submission of the plan to the Commission, the State made a preliminary version of the plan available for public inspection and comment;

“(B) the State publishes notice that the preliminary version of the plan is so available; and

“(C) the State took the public comments made regarding the preliminary version of the plan into account in preparing the plan which was submitted to the Commission under paragraph (1).

“(b) PROHIBITION ON UNREASONABLE VOTER WAITING TIMES.—Each State shall ensure that no person voting in an election for Federal office shall wait for more than 30 minutes at any polling place for purposes of casting a vote in such election.

“(c) REMEDIAL PLANS FOR STATES WITH EXCESSIVE VOTER WAIT TIMES.—

“(1) REVIEW OF VOTER WAIT TIMES.—After each election for Federal office, the Commission shall review voter waiting times for each jurisdiction for which voting in such election took place and make publicly available a report on its findings.

“(2) STATE REMEDIAL PLANS.—

“(A) REMEDIAL PLANS.—Each jurisdiction for which the Commission, after the review conducted under paragraph (1), determines that a substantial number of voters, including voters with disabilities, waited more than 60 minutes to cast a vote, or in which there were substantial violations of the standards established under section 299, shall comply with a State remedial plan established by the Attorney General to provide for the effective allocation of resources to administer elections for Federal office held in the State and to reduce the waiting time of voters.

“(B) COORDINATION.—Each remedial plan established by the Attorney General shall provide for coordination between the Commission, the Attorney General, and the State involved to monitor the compliance of the State with the remedial plan during the period leading up to the election and on the

date of the election and to respond to serious delays in the ability of voters, including voters with disabilities, to cast their ballots at polling places.

“(C) **TERMINATION.**—A jurisdiction shall not be required to comply with a State remedial plan required under subparagraph (A) if the Commission determines that the voter waiting times were less than 60 minutes for 2 consecutive regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office.

“(3) **JURISDICTION DEFINED.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘jurisdiction’ has the meaning given the term ‘registrars’ jurisdiction’ in section 8(j) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 1973gg–6(j)).

“(4) **STANDARDS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall establish standards for conducting the review under paragraph (1) and for establishing remedial plans under paragraph (2)(A).

“(5) **ROLE OF CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION AND COMMISSION.**—The Attorney General shall carry out this section acting through the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and in consultation with the Commission.

“(6) **APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to other amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Commission, there are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 2026 through 2035, \$5,000,000 for each such year for the Commission to carry out this subsection.

“(d) **EMERGENCY BALLOTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the event of a failure of voting equipment or other circumstance at a polling place that causes an unreasonable delay, any individual who is waiting at the polling place to cast a ballot in an election for Federal office at the time of the failure shall be advised immediately of the individual’s right to use an emergency paper ballot, and upon request shall be provided with such an emergency paper ballot for the election and the supplies necessary to mark the ballot.

“(2) **BALLOT REQUIREMENTS.**—Any emergency paper ballot provided under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) include the names of each candidate for each Federal office for which voting occurs at such polling place; and

“(B) be available in each language for which other ballots provided at the polling place are available.

“(3) **DISPOSITION OF BALLOT.**—Any emergency paper ballot which is cast by an individual under this subsection shall be counted in the same manner as a regular ballot, unless the individual casting the ballot would have otherwise been required to cast a provisional ballot in the absence of the delay, in which case that ballot shall be treated in the same manner as a provisional ballot.”

(b) **PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.**—Title IV of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21111 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 403. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION FOR UNREASONABLE VOTER WAITING TIME.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a violation of section 305(b), section 402 shall not apply and any person who is aggrieved by such violation may commence a civil action in any appropriate district court of the United States for relief.

“(b) **RELIEF.**—In any civil action commenced under subsection (a):

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the court finds a violation of section 305(b), the court shall assess a civil penalty equal to the sum of—

“(A) \$50; plus

“(B) an additional \$50 for each additional hour the person waited at the polling place to cast a vote; plus

“(C) reasonable attorney fees, including litigation expenses, and costs.

“(2) **SPECIAL RULE.**—If the court determines that the violation was due to an intentional action to suppress votes or was made with reckless disregard of the requirements of section 305—

“(A) paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting ‘\$650’ for ‘\$50’; and

“(B) paragraph (1)(B) shall be applied by substituting ‘\$150’ for ‘\$50’.”

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 202 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) carrying out the duties described in section 305(c);”

(d) **CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The table of contents of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 is amended—

(1) by redesignating the items relating to sections 305 and 306 as relating to sections 306 and 307, and by inserting after the item relating to section 304 the following new item:

“Sec. 305. Unreasonable voter waiting times.”;

and

(2) by inserting after the item relating to section 402 the following new item:

“Sec. 403. Private right of action for unreasonable voter waiting time.”

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to elections held on or after the expiration of the 180-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. MINIMUM REQUIRED VOTING SYSTEMS, POLL WORKERS, AND ELECTION RESOURCES.

(a) **MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

“Subtitle C—Additional Requirements

“SEC. 321. MINIMUM REQUIRED VOTING SYSTEMS AND POLL WORKERS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State shall provide for the minimum required number of voting systems, poll workers, and other election resources (including all other physical resources) for each voting site on the day of any Federal election and on any days during which such State allows early voting for a Federal election in accordance with the standards determined under section 299.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section and section 299—

“(1) the term ‘voting site’ means a polling location; and

“(2) the term ‘voting system’ means the total combination of mechanical, electromechanical, or electronic equipment (including the software, firmware, and documentation required to program, control, and support the equipment) that is used at a voting site—

“(A) to check the official list of eligible voters for purposes of confirming that an individual is eligible to cast a vote at the site;

“(B) to cast and count votes; and

“(C) to maintain and produce any audit trail information.

“(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Each State shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section on and after January 1, 2028.”

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 401 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking “and 304” and inserting “304, and subtitle C”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title III the following:

“Subtitle C—Additional Requirements

“Sec. 321. Minimum required voting systems and poll workers.”

(b) **STANDARDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20921 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle:

“Subtitle E—Guidance and Standards

“SEC. 299. STANDARDS FOR ESTABLISHING THE MINIMUM REQUIRED VOTING SYSTEMS AND POLL WORKERS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of the POLL Act, the Attorney General, acting through the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and in consultation with the Commission, shall issue standards regarding the minimum number of voting systems, poll workers, and other election resources (including all other physical resources) required under section 321 on the day of any Federal election and on any days during which early voting is allowed for a Federal election.

“(b) **DISTRIBUTION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The standards described in subsection (a) shall provide for a uniform and nondiscriminatory distribution of such systems, workers, and other resources, and shall take into account, among other factors, the following with respect to any voting site (as defined in section 321(b)):

“(A) The voting-age population.

“(B) Voter turnout in past elections.

“(C) The number of voters registered.

“(D) The number of voters who have registered since the most recent Federal election.

“(E) Census data for the population served by such voting site.

“(F) The educational levels and socio-economic factors of the population served by such voting site.

“(G) The needs and numbers of disabled voters and voters with limited English proficiency.

“(H) The type of voting systems used.

“(2) **NO FACTOR DISPOSITIVE.**—The standards shall provide that any distribution of such systems shall take into account the totality of all relevant factors, including the effects of State laws on the availability of such systems and resources for use by local election officials, and no single factor shall be dispositive under the standards.

“(3) **PURPOSE.**—To the extent possible, the standards shall provide for a distribution of voting systems, poll workers, and other election resources, with the goals of—

“(A) ensuring an equal waiting time for all voters in the State; and

“(B) preventing a waiting time of over 30 minutes at any polling place.

“(4) **SPECIAL RULE REGARDING ELECTRONIC POLL BOOKS.**—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), in the case of any voting site that uses an electronic poll book, the standards described in subsection (a) shall require at least 1 paper poll book (containing all of the information necessary to confirm that an individual is eligible to cast a vote at the site) for each such electronic poll book used at such voting site.

“(c) **DEVIATION.**—The standards described in subsection (a) shall permit States, upon giving reasonable public notice, to deviate from any allocation requirements in the case of unforeseen circumstances such as a natural disaster or terrorist attack.”

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 202 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20922), as amended by section 2(c), is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) carrying out the duties described in subtitle E;”.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title II the following:

“Subtitle E—Guidance and Standards

“Sec. 299. Standards for establishing the minimum required voting systems and poll workers.”.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES BY CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 319 the following new section:

“CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES BY CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

“SEC. 319A. (a) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for a chief State election administration official to take an active part in political management or in a political campaign with respect to any election for Federal office over which such official has supervisory authority.

“(b) CHIEF STATE ELECTION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL.—The term ‘chief State election administration official’ means the highest State official with responsibility for the administration of Federal elections under State law.

“(c) ACTIVE PART IN POLITICAL MANAGEMENT OR IN A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.—The term ‘active part in political management or in a political campaign’ means—

“(1) serving as a member of an authorized committee of a candidate for Federal office;

“(2) the use of official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election for Federal office;

“(3) the solicitation, acceptance, or receipt of a contribution from any person on behalf of a candidate for Federal office; and

“(4) any other act which would be prohibited under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 7323(b) of title 5, United States Code, if taken by an individual to whom such paragraph applies (other than any prohibition on running for public office).

“(d) EXCEPTION IN CASE OF RECUSAL FROM ADMINISTRATION OF ELECTIONS INVOLVING ELECTION OFFICIAL OR IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section does not apply to a chief State election administration official with respect to an election for Federal office in which such official or an immediate family member of the official is a candidate, but only if—

“(A) such official recuses himself or herself from all of the official’s responsibilities for the administration of such election; and

“(B) the official who assumes responsibility for supervising the administration of the election does not report directly to such official.

“(2) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In paragraph (1), the term ‘immediate family member’ means, with respect to a candidate, a father, mother, son, daughter, brother, sister, husband, wife, father-in-law, or mother-in-law.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held after January 1, 2028.

SEC. 5. PAYMENTS TO STATES TO PREVENT UNREASONABLE WAIT TIMES AND PROMOTE WELL-RUN ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART VII—PAYMENTS FOR PREVENTING UNREASONABLE VOTER WAIT TIMES

“SEC. 297. PAYMENTS TO STATES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall make a payment to each eligible State. Such payments shall be made not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this part.

“(b) ELIGIBLE STATE.—For purposes of this section, a State is an eligible State if such State has filed with the Commission a State plan covering the fiscal year in which the State describes how it intends to use the funds provided under this section.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible State shall use the payment received under this part to meet the requirements of sections 305 and 321.

“(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of payment made to a State under this section shall be the minimum payment amount described in paragraph (2) plus the voting age population proportion amount described in paragraph (3).

“(2) MINIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT.—The minimum payment amount described in this paragraph is—

“(A) in the case of any of the several States or the District of Columbia, one-half of 1 percent of the aggregate amount made available for payments under this section; and

“(B) in the case of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, or the United States Virgin Islands, one-tenth of 1 percent of such aggregate amount.

“(3) VOTING AGE POPULATION PROPORTION AMOUNT.—The voting age population proportion amount described in this paragraph is the product of—

“(A) the aggregate amount made available for payments under this section minus the total of all of the minimum payment amounts determined under paragraph (2); and

“(B) the voting age population proportion for the State (as defined in paragraph (4)).

“(4) VOTING AGE POPULATION PROPORTION DEFINED.—The term ‘voting age population proportion’ means, with respect to a State, the amount equal to the quotient of—

“(A) the voting age population of the State (as reported in the most recent decennial census); and

“(B) the total voting age population of all States (as reported in the most recent decennial census).

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated for payments under this section \$500,000,000 for each fiscal year.

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to the authority of paragraph (1) shall remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 296 the following:

“PART VII—PAYMENTS FOR PREVENTING UNREASONABLE VOTER WAIT TIMES

“Sec. 297. Payments to States.”.

SA 4420. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act” or the “SAVE America Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SAVE AMERICAN VOTERS

Subtitle A—Ensuring Only Citizens Are Registered to Vote in Elections for Federal Office

Sec. 101. Ensuring only citizens are registered to vote in elections for Federal office.

Subtitle B—Requiring Voters to Provide Photo Identification

Sec. 111. Requiring voters to provide photo identification.

Subtitle C—Manner of Holding Elections for Federal Office

Sec. 121. Authority.

Sec. 122. Definitions.

Sec. 123. In-person voting required.

Sec. 124. Limited absentee voting in Federal elections.

Sec. 125. Ballot handling and receipt.

Sec. 126. Enforcement.

Sec. 127. Preemption.

Sec. 128. Severability.

Sec. 129. Effective date.

TITLE II—SAVE AMERICAN SPORTS

Sec. 201. Amendment.

TITLE III—SAVE AMERICAN CHILDREN

Sec. 301. Genital and bodily mutilation of a minor; chemical castration of a minor.

TITLE I—SAVE AMERICAN VOTERS

Subtitle A—Ensuring Only Citizens Are Registered to Vote in Elections for Federal Office

SEC. 101. ENSURING ONLY CITIZENS ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE IN ELECTIONS FOR FEDERAL OFFICE.

(a) DEFINITION OF DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—Section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502) is amended—

(1) by striking “As used” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—As used”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—As used in this Act, the term ‘documentary proof of United States citizenship’ means, with respect to an applicant for voter registration, any of the following:

“(1) A form of identification issued consistent with the requirements of the REAL ID Act of 2005 that indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States.

“(2) A valid United States passport that indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States.

“(3) The applicant’s official United States military identification card, together with an official United States military record showing that the applicant’s place of birth was in the United States or that otherwise indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States.

“(4) A valid government-issued photo identification card issued by a Federal, State or Tribal government showing that the applicant’s place of birth was in the United States or that otherwise indicates the applicant is a citizen of the United States.

“(5) A valid government-issued photo identification card issued by a Federal, State or Tribal government other than an identification described in paragraphs (1) through (4), but only if presented together with one or more of the following:

“(A) A certified birth certificate issued by a State, a unit of local government in a State, or a Tribal government which—

“(i) was issued by the State, unit of local government, or Tribal government in which the applicant was born;

“(ii) was filed with the office responsible for keeping vital records in the State;

“(iii) includes the full name, date of birth, and place of birth of the applicant;

“(iv) lists the full names of one or both of the parents of the applicant;

“(v) has the signature of an individual who is authorized to sign birth certificates on behalf of the State, unit of local government, or Tribal government in which the applicant was born;

“(vi) includes the date that the certificate was filed with the office responsible for keeping vital records in the State; and

“(vii) has the seal of the State, unit of local government, or Tribal government that issued the birth certificate.

“(B) An extract from a United States hospital Record of Birth created at the time of the applicant's birth which indicates that the applicant's place of birth was in the United States.

“(C) A final adoption decree showing the applicant's name and that the applicant's place of birth was in the United States.

“(D) A Consular Report of Birth Abroad of a citizen of the United States or a certification of the applicant's Report of Birth of a United States citizen issued by the Secretary of State.

“(E) A Naturalization Certificate or Certificate of Citizenship issued by the Secretary of Homeland Security or any other document or method of proof of United States citizenship issued by the Federal government pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

“(F) An American Indian Card issued by the Department of Homeland Security with the classification ‘KIC’.”

(b) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20503) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “subsection (b)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) REQUIRING APPLICANTS TO PRESENT DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—Under any method of voter registration in a State, the State shall not accept and process an application to register to vote in an election for Federal office unless the applicant presents documentary proof of United States citizenship with the application.”

(c) REGISTRATION WITH APPLICATION FOR MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVER'S LICENSE.—Section 5 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20504) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “Each State motor vehicle driver's license application” and inserting “Subject to the requirements under section 8(j), each State motor vehicle driver's license application”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “Each State shall include” and inserting “Subject to the requirements under section 8(j), each State shall include”;

(3) in subsection (c)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in clause (ii), by adding “and” at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) verify that the applicant is a citizen of the United States.”;

(4) in subsection (c)(2)(C)(i), by striking “(including citizenship)” and inserting “, including the requirement that the applicant provides documentary proof of United States citizenship”; and

(5) in subsection (c)(2)(D)(iii), by striking “; and” and inserting the following: “, other than as evidence in a criminal proceeding or

immigration proceeding brought against an applicant who knowingly attempts to register to vote and knowingly makes a false declaration under penalty of perjury that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements to register to vote in an election for Federal office; and”.

(d) REQUIRING DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP WITH NATIONAL MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—Section 6 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20505) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking “Each State shall accept and use” and inserting “Subject to the requirements under section 8(j), each State shall accept and use”; and

(B) by striking “Federal Election Commission” and inserting “Election Assistance Commission”;

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: “The chief State election official of a State shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that residents of the State are aware of the requirement to provide documentary proof of United States citizenship to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.”;

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) the person did not provide documentary proof of United States citizenship when registering to vote.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) ENSURING PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP.—

“(1) PRESENTING PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP TO ELECTION OFFICIAL.—An applicant who submits the mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) or a form described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall not be registered to vote in an election for Federal office unless—

“(A) the applicant presents documentary proof of United States citizenship in person to the office of the appropriate election official not later than the deadline provided by State law for the receipt of a completed voter registration application for the election; or

“(B) in the case of a State which permits an individual to register to vote in an election for Federal office at a polling place on the day of the election and on any day when voting, including early voting, is permitted for the election, the applicant presents documentary proof of United States citizenship to the appropriate election official at the polling place not later than the date of the election.

“(2) NOTIFICATION OF REQUIREMENT.—Upon receiving an otherwise completed mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) or a form described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), the appropriate election official shall transmit a notice to the applicant of the requirement to present documentary proof of United States citizenship under this subsection, and shall include in the notice instructions to enable the applicant to meet the requirement.

“(3) ACCESSIBILITY.—Each State shall, in consultation with the Election Assistance Commission, ensure that reasonable accommodations are made to allow an individual with a disability who submits the mail voter registration application form prescribed by the Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) or a form described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) to

present documentary proof of United States citizenship to the appropriate election official.”.

(e) REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTER REGISTRATION AGENCIES.—Section 7 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20506) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (4)(A), by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iv) Receipt of documentary proof of United States citizenship of each applicant to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.”; and

(B) in paragraph (6)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i)(I), by striking “(including citizenship)” and inserting “, including the requirement that the applicant provides documentary proof of United States citizenship”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) ask the applicant the question, ‘Are you a citizen of the United States?’ and if the applicant answers in the affirmative require documentary proof of United States citizenship prior to providing the form under subparagraph (C);”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “who are citizens of the United States” after “for persons”.

(f) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO ADMINISTRATION OF VOTER REGISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “In the administration of voter registration” and inserting “Subject to the requirements of subsection (j), in the administration of voter registration”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end; and

(II) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) based on documentary proof or verified information that the registrant is not a United States citizen; or

“(E) the registration otherwise fails to comply with applicable State law.”;

(B) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (l); and

(C) by inserting after subsection (i) the following new subsections:

“(j) ENSURING ONLY CITIZENS ARE REGISTERED TO VOTE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a State may not register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless, at the time the individual applies to register to vote, the individual provides documentary proof of United States citizenship.

“(2) REQUIREMENT IN CASES OF NAME DISCREPANCIES IN DOCUMENTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a State shall accept and process an application to register to vote in an election for Federal office if the applicant—

“(A) presents with the application documentation that would constitute documentary proof of United States citizenship, except that the name on the documentation is not the name of the applicant; and

“(B) provides, through a process established by the State (which shall be subject to any relevant guidance adopted by the Election Assistance Commission)—

“(i) additional documentation as necessary to establish that the name on the documentation is a previous name of the applicant; or

“(ii) an affidavit signed by the applicant attesting that the name on the documentation is a previous name of the applicant.

“(3) ADDITIONAL PROCESSES IN CERTAIN CASES.—

“(A) PROCESS FOR THOSE WITHOUT DOCUMENTARY PROOF SUCH AS RECENTLY MARRIED WOMEN WHO DECIDE TO CHANGE THEIR SURNAME.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to any relevant guidance adopted by the Election Assistance Commission, each State shall establish a process under which an applicant who cannot provide documentary proof of United States citizenship under paragraph (1) may, if the applicant signs an attestation under penalty of perjury that the applicant is a citizen of the United States and eligible to vote in elections for Federal office, submit such other evidence to the appropriate State or local official demonstrating that the applicant is a citizen of the United States and such official shall make a determination as to whether the applicant has sufficiently established United States citizenship for purposes of registering to vote in elections for Federal office in the State.

“(ii) AFFIDAVIT REQUIREMENT.—If a State or local official makes a determination under clause (i) that an applicant has sufficiently established United States citizenship for purposes of registering to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, such determination shall be accompanied by an affidavit developed under clause (iii) signed by the official swearing or affirming the applicant sufficiently established United States citizenship for purposes of registering to vote.

“(iii) DEVELOPMENT OF AFFIDAVIT BY THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—The Election Assistance Commission shall develop a uniform affidavit for use by State and local officials under clause (ii), which shall—

“(I) include an explanation of the minimum standards required for a State or local official to register an applicant who cannot provide documentary proof of United States citizenship to vote in elections for Federal office in the State; and

“(II) require the official to explain the basis for registering such applicant to vote in such elections.

“(B) PROCESS IN CASE OF CERTAIN DISCREPANCIES IN DOCUMENTATION.—Subject to any relevant guidance adopted by the Election Assistance Commission, each State shall establish a process under which an applicant can provide such additional documentation to the appropriate election official of the State as may be necessary to establish that the applicant is a citizen of the United States in the event of a discrepancy with respect to the applicant's documentary proof of United States citizenship.

“(4) STATE REQUIREMENTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection:

“(A) Each State shall take affirmative steps, on an ongoing basis, and not less than once every calendar year quarter, to ensure that only United States citizens are registered to vote under the provisions of this Act, and such affirmative steps shall include the establishment of a program described in subparagraphs (B) and (C).

“(B) Each State shall submit the complete, official list of individuals registered as eligible voters for Federal office in the State to the Department of Homeland Security for comparison through the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (‘SAVE’) system for the purposes of identifying individuals who are not citizens of the United States and taking the necessary steps to remove such individuals who are not citizens from the official list, after notice is given to such individuals and such individuals are

given the opportunity to provide documentary proof of United States citizenship, but a State with a memorandum of agreement for such purposes with the Department of Homeland Security on the date of the enactment of this subsection may comply with this subparagraph by carrying out such purposes under the memorandum.

“(C) Each State may utilize such other sources of data available to the State for the purposes of identifying individuals who are not citizens of the United States and removing such individuals from the official list of eligible voters for Federal office in the State, including (but not limited to) the following:

“(i) The Department of Homeland Security through the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (‘SAVE’) system or otherwise.

“(ii) Other sources, including databases and information provided pursuant to an agreement with the Commissioner of Social Security under section 205(r)(9) of the Social Security Act, which can be used to confirm United States citizenship status, except that any such information provided by the Commissioner may not be the sole grounds for the removal of an individual from the official list of eligible voters for elections for Federal office in a State.

“(5) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of a State election official (including a request related to a process established by a State under paragraph (3)(A) or (3)(B)), any head of a Federal department or agency possessing information relevant to determining the eligibility of an individual to vote in elections for Federal office shall, not later than 24 hours after receipt of such request, provide the official with such information as may be necessary to enable the official to verify that an applicant for voter registration in elections for Federal office held in the State or a registrant on the official list of eligible voters in elections for Federal office held in the State is a citizen of the United States, which shall include providing the official with such batched information as may be requested by the official.

“(B) USE OF SAVE SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall respond to a request received under subparagraph (A) by using the system for the verification of immigration status under the applicable provisions of section 1137 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7), as established pursuant to section 121(c) of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-603).

“(C) SHARING OF INFORMATION.—The heads of Federal departments and agencies shall share information with each other with respect to an individual who is the subject of a request received under paragraph (A) in order to enable them to respond to the request.

“(D) INVESTIGATION FOR PURPOSES OF REMOVAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall conduct an investigation to determine whether to initiate removal proceedings under section 239 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229) if it is determined pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) that an alien (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)) is unlawfully registered to vote in elections for Federal office.

“(E) PROHIBITING FEES.—The head of a Federal department or agency may not charge a fee for responding to a State's request under paragraph (A).

“(K) REMOVAL OF NONCITIZENS FROM REGISTRATION ROLLS.—A State shall remove an individual who is not a citizen of the United States from the official list of eligible voters

for elections for Federal office held in the State at any time upon receipt of documentation or verified information that a registrant is not a United States citizen.”.

(2) AGREEMENTS FOR THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION TO SHARE APPLICABLE INFORMATION.—

(A) AGREEMENTS WITH STATE OFFICIALS.—Section 205(r)(9)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(r)(9)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(9)(A)(i) The Commissioner of Social Security shall enter into an agreement with each official responsible for a State driver's license agency for the purpose of verifying that—

“(I) the applicable information of an individual matches information contained in the records of the Commissioner; and

“(II) for each individual registering to vote or who is registered to vote, the citizenship or immigration status of such individual is consistent with the information in the records of the Commissioner.

“(ii) Each State driver's license agency shall pay to the Commissioner of Social Security the full costs (including systems and administrative costs) associated with the verification under clause (i).

“(iii) Pursuant to an agreement described in clause (i), a State driver's license agency may disclose information related to the verification under clause (i) to State and local officials as necessary to verify the eligibility of individuals registering to vote or who are registered to vote within such State.

“(iv) Agreements under this subparagraph shall include safeguards to assure compliance with subparagraph (F).”.

(B) AGREEMENTS WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—Section 205(r)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(r)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G)(i) The Commissioner of Social Security shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Homeland Security under which—

“(I) the Secretary may provide the Commissioner with applicable information; and

“(II) if the Secretary provides such information, the Commissioner provides the Secretary with a notification regarding—

“(aa) whether the applicable information of an individual matches the information contained in the records of the Commissioner;

“(bb) the social security number associated with the individual matches; and

“(cc) the citizenship or immigration status shown on the social security number of such individual.

“(ii) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall pay to the Commissioner of Social Security the full costs (including systems and administrative costs) associated with providing any applicable information and notification under clause (i).

“(iii) The Secretary may, upon request, disclose any applicable information and notification under clause (i) to State and local officials to verify the eligibility of individuals registering to vote or who are registered to vote within such State.

“(iv) Agreements under this subparagraph shall include safeguards to assure compliance with subparagraph (F).”.

(C) APPLICABLE INFORMATION DEFINED.—Subparagraph (D)(i) of section 205(r)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(r)(9)) is amended—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “information regarding whether”;

(ii) in subclause (I), by striking “provided to the Commissioner match the information contained in the Commissioner's records”; and

(iii) in subclause (II), by inserting “information regarding whether” before “such”.

(D) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Subparagraph (F) of section 205(r)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 405(r)(9)) is amended by striking “a State” each place it appears and inserting “an agency”.

(g) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF STATE TO REMOVE NONCITIZENS FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF ELIGIBLE VOTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8(a)(4) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20507(a)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by adding “or” at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) documentary proof or verified information that the registrant is not a United States citizen;”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(c)(2)(B)(i) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “(4)(A)” and inserting “(4)(A) or (C)”.

(h) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—

(1) CONTENTS OF MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—Section 9(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20508(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “(including citizenship)” and inserting “(including an explanation of what is required to present documentary proof of United States citizenship)”;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) shall include a section, for use only by a State or local election official, to record the type of document the applicant presented as documentary proof of United States citizenship, including the date of issuance, the date of expiration (if any), the office which issued the document, and any unique identification number associated with the document.”.

(2) INFORMATION ON MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION FORM.—Section 9(b)(4) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20508(b)(4)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) through (iii) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) (as so redesignated and as amended by paragraph (1)(C)), by striking “; and” and inserting the following: “, other than as evidence in a criminal proceeding or immigration proceeding brought against an applicant who attempts to register to vote and makes a false declaration under penalty of perjury that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements to register to vote in an election for Federal office; and”.

(i) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Section 11(b)(1) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20510(b)(1)) is amended by striking “a violation of this Act” and inserting “a violation of this Act, including the act of an election official who registers an applicant to vote in an election for Federal office who fails to present documentary proof of United States citizenship.”.

(j) CRIMINAL PENALTIES.—Section 12(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20511(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “or” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) in the case of an officer or employee of the executive branch, providing material assistance to a noncitizen in attempting to register to vote or vote in an election for Federal office;

“(C) purposefully registering an applicant to vote in an election for Federal office who fails to present documentary proof of United States citizenship; or”.

(k) APPLICABILITY OF REQUIREMENTS TO CERTAIN STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 4 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20503), as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended by striking “This Act does not apply to a State” and inserting “Except with respect to the requirements under subsection (j) and (k) of section 8 in the case of a State described in paragraph (2), this Act does not apply to a State”.

(2) PERMITTING STATES TO ADOPT REQUIREMENTS AFTER ENACTMENT.—Section 4 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20503) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PERMITTING STATES TO ADOPT CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS AFTER ENACTMENT.—Subsections (j) and (k) of section 8 shall not apply to a State described in subsection (c)(2) if the State, by law or regulation, adopts requirements which are identical to the requirements under such subsections not later than 60 days prior to the date of the first election for Federal office which is held in the State after the date of the enactment of the SAVE America Act.”.

(l) ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION GUIDANCE.—Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Election Assistance Commission shall adopt and transmit to the chief State election official of each State guidance with respect to the implementation of the requirements under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.), as amended by this section.

(m) INAPPLICABILITY OF PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44 (commonly referred to as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”) shall not apply with respect to the development or modification of voter registration materials under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.), as amended by this section, including the development or modification of any voter registration application forms.

(n) DUTY OF SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY TO NOTIFY ELECTION OFFICIALS OF NATURALIZATION.—Upon receiving information that an individual has become a naturalized citizen of the United States, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall promptly provide notice of such information to the appropriate chief election official of the State in which such individual is domiciled.

(o) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING PROVISIONAL BALLOTS.—Nothing in this section or in any amendment made by this section may be construed to supersede, restrict, or otherwise affect the ability of an individual to cast a provisional ballot in an election for Federal office or to have the ballot counted in the election if the individual is verified as a citizen of the United States pursuant to section 8(j) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (as added by subsection (f)).

(p) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING EFFECT ON STATE EXEMPTIONS FROM OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.—Nothing in this section or in any amendment made by this section may be construed to affect the exemption of a State from any requirement of any Federal law other than the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20501 et seq.).

(q) EXCEPTION FOR ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES VOTERS.—The requirements in this section shall not apply with respect to an applicant who is an absent uniformed services voter, as defined in section 107(1) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20310(1)).

(r) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this

section, and shall apply with respect to applications for voter registration which are submitted on or after such date.

Subtitle B—Requiring Voters to Provide Photo Identification

SEC. 111. REQUIRING VOTERS TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE PHOTO IDENTIFICATION AS CONDITION OF CASTING BALLOT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

“SEC. 303A. PHOTO IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

“(a) PROVISION OF IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED AS CONDITION OF CASTING BALLOT.—

“(1) INDIVIDUALS VOTING IN PERSON.—

“(A) REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE IDENTIFICATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the appropriate State or local election official may not provide a ballot for an election for Federal office to an individual who desires to vote in person unless the individual presents to the official a valid physical photo identification.

“(B) AVAILABILITY OF PROVISIONAL BALLOT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—If an individual does not present the identification required under subparagraph (A), the individual shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot with respect to the election under section 302(a), except that the appropriate State or local election official may not make a determination under section 302(a)(4) that the individual is eligible under State law to vote in the election unless, not later than 3 days after casting the provisional ballot, the individual presents to the official—

“(I) the identification required under subparagraph (A); or

“(II) an affidavit developed and made available to the individual by the State attesting that the individual does not possess the identification required under subparagraph (A) because the individual has a religious objection to being photographed.

“(ii) NO EFFECT ON OTHER PROVISIONAL BALLOTING RULES.—Nothing in clause (i) may be construed to apply to the casting of a provisional ballot pursuant to section 302(a) or any State law for reasons other than the failure to present the identification required under subparagraph (A).

“(2) INDIVIDUALS VOTING OTHER THAN IN PERSON.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the appropriate State or local election official may not accept any ballot for an election for Federal office provided by an individual who votes other than in person unless the individual submits with the ballot—

“(i) a copy of a valid photo identification; or

“(ii) the last four digits of the individual’s Social Security number and an affidavit developed and made available to the individual by the State attesting that the individual is unable to obtain a copy of a valid photo identification after making reasonable efforts to obtain such a copy.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) does not apply with respect to a ballot provided by—

“(i) an absent uniformed services voter, as defined in section 107(1) of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20310(1)); or

“(ii) an individual provided the right to vote otherwise than in person under section 3(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act (52 U.S.C. 20102(b)(2)(B)(ii)).

“(b) PROVIDING PUBLIC ACCESS TO DIGITAL IMAGING DEVICES.—With respect to each State, the appropriate State or local government official of the State shall ensure, to the extent practicable, public access to a digital imaging device, which shall include a printer, copier, image scanner, or multifunction machine, at State and local government buildings in the State, including courts, libraries, and police stations, for the purpose of allowing individuals to use such a device at no cost to the individual to make a copy of a valid photo identification.

“(c) VALID PHOTO IDENTIFICATIONS DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this section, a ‘valid photo identification’ means, with respect to an individual who seeks to vote in a State, any of the following:

“(1) A valid State-issued motor vehicle driver’s license that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date.

“(2) A valid State-issued identification card that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date issued by a State motor vehicle authority.

“(3) A valid United States passport for the individual.

“(4) A valid military identification for the individual.

“(5) A valid identification document issued by a Tribal government that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date.

“(d) NOTIFICATION OF IDENTIFICATION REQUIREMENT TO APPLICANTS FOR VOTER REGISTRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall ensure that, at the time an individual applies to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, the appropriate State or local election official notifies the individual of the photo identification requirements of this section.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR INDIVIDUALS APPLYING TO REGISTER TO VOTE ONLINE.—Each State shall ensure that, in the case of an individual who applies to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State online, the online voter registration system notifies the individual of the photo identification requirements of this section before the individual completes the online registration process.

“(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this section, and shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held on or after such date.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

“Sec. 303A. Photo identification requirements.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE BY ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION.—Section 311(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21101(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) in the case of the recommendations with respect to section 303A, the date of enactment of the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility Act.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking “sections 301, 302, 303, and 304” and inserting “subtitle A of title III”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this section, and shall apply with respect to elec-

tions for Federal office held on or after such date.

Subtitle C—Manner of Holding Elections for Federal Office

SEC. 121. AUTHORITY.

Congress enacts this subtitle pursuant to Article I, section 4, clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 122. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) ABSENTEE BALLOT.—The term “absentee ballot” means a ballot transmitted to a voter for voting by mail or outside of the physical presence of election officials during the voting period.

(2) ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES VOTER.—The term “absent uniformed services voter” has the meaning given that term in section 107 of the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20310).

(3) CHAIN OF CUSTODY.—The term “chain of custody” means documented procedures ensuring that absentee ballots are securely tracked from issuance through delivery, receipt, and tabulation, including records of each transfer of custody of such ballots.

(4) ELECTION.—The term “election” means—

(A) a general, special, primary, or runoff election;

(B) a convention or caucus of a political party which has authority to nominate a candidate;

(C) a primary election held for the selection of delegates to a national nominating convention of a political party; and

(D) a primary election held for the expression of a preference for the nomination of individuals for election to the office of President.

(5) FEDERAL OFFICE.—The term “Federal office” means the office of President or Vice President, Senator, Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(6) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER.—The term “immediate family member” means a spouse, parent, child, sibling, grandparent, grandchild, parent-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, brother-in-law, or sister-in-law of the voter.

(7) LEGAL GUARDIAN.—The term “legal guardian” means an individual appointed by a court of competent jurisdiction to serve as guardian of the person of the voter.

(8) STATE.—The term “State” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502).

(9) VERIFIED TRAVEL.—The term “verified travel” means travel that will result in a voter being physically absent from the jurisdiction in which the voter is eligible to vote for the entire voting period and that is supported by documentation reasonably sufficient to establish such absence. Such term does not include residence outside the United States.

(10) VOTING PERIOD.—The term “voting period” means the period beginning on the first day on which in-person voting is permitted under State law for an election for Federal office and ending at the time the polls close on the date of the election.

(11) UNIVERSAL VOTE-BY-MAIL.—The term “universal vote-by-mail” means any system under which a State automatically mails ballots to registered voters for an election for Federal office without the voter first submitting a request that meets the requirements of section 124.

SEC. 123. IN-PERSON VOTING REQUIRED.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in section 124, a State shall require an individual to vote in person in an election for Federal office.

(b) PROHIBITION ON UNIVERSAL VOTE-BY-MAIL.—A State may not conduct an election for Federal office by universal vote-by-mail.

(c) EARLY IN-PERSON VOTING NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to prohibit or limit the authority of a State to permit voting in person prior to the date of the election for an election for Federal office.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed—

(A) to regulate elections for State or local office;

(B) to establish, modify, or alter the qualifications of individuals eligible to vote in elections for Federal office;

(C) to prohibit a State from permitting the use of absentee ballots or voting by mail in elections for State or local office;

(D) to permit a State to transmit or distribute by mail a ballot that includes any office for which this subtitle applies unless the issuance of such ballot complies with the requirements of this subtitle; or

(E) to limit or modify the rights of absent uniformed services voters under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.).

(2) CLARIFICATION.—A State that permits absentee voting or voting by mail for State or local office may provide a separate ballot for such offices but may not include any Federal office on a mailed ballot unless the voter has submitted a valid absentee ballot request under section 124.

SEC. 124. LIMITED ABSENTEE VOTING IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) EXEMPTION CATEGORIES.—A State may permit an individual to vote by absentee ballot in an election for Federal office only if the individual submits a request in accordance with this section and certifies under penalty of perjury that the individual—

(A) is an absent uniformed services voter;

(B) is unable to appear in person during the entire voting period due to illness, infirmity, hospitalization, or physical disability;

(C) is the primary caregiver of an individual who is medically incapacitated during the entire voting period;

(D) will be absent from the jurisdiction during the entire voting period due to verified travel; or

(E) is unable to appear in person during the voting period due to another hardship that would make in-person voting unreasonable or impracticable, as determined by the State election authority based on a sworn certification submitted by the voter describing the nature of the hardship, as described in subsection (c)(4).

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(E), the term “hardship” shall be construed narrowly. A voter may not be considered to have a hardship unless the applicable circumstance, by itself, prevents the voter from appearing in person during the entire voting period.

(b) REQUEST REQUIREMENTS.—A request for an absentee ballot in an election for Federal office under this section shall—

(1) be in writing and signed by the applicant;

(2) be submitted not later than 14 days before the date of the election;

(3) include a copy of a valid photo identification as defined in section 303A(c) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as added by section 102 of this Act; and

(4) include a sworn certification specifying the category under subsection (a)(1) upon which eligibility is based.

(c) CERTIFICATION AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION FOR EXEMPTION CATEGORIES.—

(1) ILLNESS OR DISABILITY.—An individual seeking an absentee ballot under subsection

(a)(1)(B) shall submit, together with the request required under subsection (b), a sworn certification describing the illness, infirmity, hospitalization, or physical disability of the individual and certifying that such illness, infirmity, hospitalization, or physical disability will prevent the individual from appearing in person during the entire voting period, including documentation that is reasonably sufficient to establish such illness, infirmity, hospitalization, or physical disability.

(2) **PRIMARY CAREGIVER.**—An individual seeking an absentee ballot under subsection (a)(1)(C) shall submit, together with the request required under subsection (b), a sworn certification describing the medical incapacitation of the individual for whom the individual is a primary caregiver and certifying that such role as a primary caregiver will prevent the individual from appearing in person during the entire voting period, including documentation reasonably sufficient to establish such role as a primary caregiver of an individual who is medically incapacitated.

(3) **VERIFIED TRAVEL.**—An individual seeking an absentee ballot under subsection (a)(1)(D) shall submit, together with the request required under subsection (b), a sworn certification describing the nature of the travel that will result in the individual being absent from the jurisdiction for the entire voting period, including documentation reasonably sufficient to verify such travel.

(4) **OTHER HARDSHIP.**—An individual seeking an absentee ballot under subsection (a)(1)(E) shall submit, together with the request required under subsection (b), a sworn certification describing the hardship and certifying that such hardship will prevent the individual from appearing in person during the entire voting period, including documentation reasonably sufficient to establish the existence and duration of such hardship.

(5) **FORM OF CERTIFICATION.**—A certification under this subsection shall be signed under penalty of perjury and submitted in such form as the State may require, consistent with any standards established by the Election Assistance Commission.

(d) **VERIFICATION.**—A State shall verify compliance with subsection (b) prior to issuing an absentee ballot and shall maintain a record of such verification for purposes of audit and enforcement.

(e) **FALSE STATEMENT.**—Any individual who knowingly makes or abets a false statement under this section shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code (which fines shall be paid into the general fund of the Treasury, miscellaneous receipts (pursuant to section 3302 of title 31, United States Code), notwithstanding any other law), or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(f) **STANDARD REQUEST FORM.**—Not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, the Election Assistance Commission shall develop and make available a standardized absentee ballot request form that States may use to comply with this section.

(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING PROOF OF CITIZENSHIP.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require an applicant requesting an absentee ballot to transmit or mail documentary proof of United States citizenship if the appropriate election official is able to verify that the applicant has previously provided documentary proof of United States citizenship as required under section 8(j) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, as added by section 101 of this Act.

SEC. 125. BALLOT HANDLING AND RECEIPT.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS FOR ABSENTEE BALLOT REQUESTS.**—

(1) **ELECTION-SPECIFIC REQUEST REQUIRED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in subparagraph (B), a request for an absentee ballot in an election for Federal office shall apply only with respect to the election for which the request is submitted. Eligibility for, or receipt of, an absentee ballot in a prior election shall not establish eligibility to receive an absentee ballot in a subsequent election.

(B) **EXCEPTION FOR ABSENT UNIFORMED SERVICES VOTERS.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to an absent uniformed services voter.

(2) **PROHIBITION ON RELIANCE ON PRIOR ABSENTEE STATUS.**—A State may not issue or mail an absentee ballot to an individual for an election for Federal office based solely on the individual's receipt of, or request for, an absentee ballot in a prior election.

(3) **REQUESTED BALLOTS ONLY.**—A State may not issue or mail an absentee ballot for an election for Federal office unless a valid request under section 124 has been received and verified for that election.

(b) **RETURN OF BALLOTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An absentee ballot in an election for Federal office may only be returned by 1 of the following methods:

(A) By the voter, in person, to an office of the appropriate election official or to a polling place or other location designated by the State for the return of absentee ballots.

(B) By the United States Postal Service, certified mail with signature verification paid for by the State or municipality administering the election, and shall be tracked under a reasonable tracking system established by the United States Postal Service.

(C) By a family member, legal guardian, or caregiver of the voter casting the ballot, who shall present identification and shall sign an affidavit upon delivery that identifies the person as eligible to return the voter's ballot.

(D) In the case of an absent uniformed services voter, by a method authorized under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.).

(2) **LIMITATION.**—The authority provided under paragraph (1)(D) shall only apply with respect to an absentee ballot of an absent uniformed services voter and may not be used by a State as a general method of transmitting or returning absentee ballots for voters who are not eligible under the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (52 U.S.C. 20301 et seq.).

(c) **DEADLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An absentee ballot in an election for Federal office shall not be counted unless received by the appropriate election official not later than the closing of polls on the date of the election.

(2) **RECORD OF RECEIPT.**—Each State shall record the time and date of receipt of each absentee ballot in an election for Federal office for purposes of determining compliance with this subsection.

(d) **CHAIN OF CUSTODY.**—Each State shall establish uniform chain-of-custody procedures and ballot tracking systems for absentee ballots cast in elections for Federal office, including a system that allows the voter to track the status of the absentee ballot from issuance through receipt and acceptance or rejection of the absentee ballot. Such procedures shall be established by the State and local election officials responsible for the administration of elections for Federal office.

(e) **NOTICE AND CURE PROCESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If an election official determines that an absentee ballot in an election for Federal office does not comply with the requirements of this subtitle, the State shall promptly notify the voter of the deficiency and provide the voter a standardized

opportunity, which shall extend until not later than 48 hours after the closing of the polls, to cure the deficiency.

(2) **PROCESS.**—Each State shall determine the process for the standardized opportunity to cure a deficiency with respect to an absentee ballot in an election for Federal office prior to the beginning of the voting period for such election.

(f) **RECORD RETENTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State shall retain records relating to absentee ballot requests, verification, transmission, receipt, and cure with respect to an election for Federal office for a period of not less than 22 months after the date of the election.

(2) **ACCESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Each State shall make available to the Attorney General, upon request, any record retained under this subsection. The Attorney General may inspect, copy, or obtain such records for purposes of investigating or enforcing compliance with this subtitle.

SEC. 126. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court for such declaratory or injunctive relief as is necessary to carry out this subtitle.

(b) **PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.**—A person who is aggrieved by a violation of this subtitle may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court for declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to the violation.

(c) **EXPEDITED REVIEW.**—Any action brought under this section shall be heard by a district court of 3 judges convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, with direct appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

(d) **FUNDING CONDITION.**—After providing the State notice and an opportunity to respond within 10 days, if the Attorney General determines that a State is not in compliance with this subtitle, the Attorney General may notify the Election Assistance Commission, and for the fiscal year immediately following such determination, the State shall be ineligible to receive any grant or funding provided by the Election Assistance Commission or any other agency of the Federal government for the purpose of administration of elections for Federal office, including any grant authorized under sections 101, 103, or 104 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.) or any other provision of Federal law.

SEC. 127. PREEMPTION.

The requirements of this subtitle shall supersede any provision of State law governing absentee voting in elections for Federal office that is inconsistent with this subtitle.

SEC. 128. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this subtitle, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this subtitle and the application of the remaining provisions shall not be affected.

SEC. 129. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This subtitle shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office occurring after the date of enactment of this subtitle.

TITLE II—SAVE AMERICAN SPORTS

SEC. 201. AMENDMENT.

Section 901 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) It shall be a violation of subsection (a) for a recipient of Federal funds who operates, sponsors, or facilitates athletic programs or activities to permit a person whose sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for women or girls.

“(2) For purposes of this subsection, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.”.

TITLE III—SAVE AMERICAN CHILDREN**SEC. 301. GENITAL AND BODILY MUTILATION OF A MINOR; CHEMICAL CASTRATION OF A MINOR.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 116 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 116. Genital and bodily mutilation of a minor; chemical castration of a minor

“(a) GENITAL OR BODILY MUTILATION.—Except as provided in subsection (g), whoever, in any circumstance described in subsection (d), knowingly performs, or attempts to perform, genital or bodily mutilation on another person who is a minor, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(b) CHEMICAL CASTRATION OF A MINOR.—Except as provided in subsection (g), whoever, in any circumstance described in subsection (d), knowingly chemically castrates a minor shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(c) CERTAIN OFFENSE RELATED TO FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.—Except as provided in subsection (g), whoever, in any circumstance described in subsection (d), knowingly—

“(1) facilitates or consents to female genital mutilation of a minor; or

“(2) transports a minor for the purpose of the performance of female genital mutilation on such minor, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(d) CIRCUMSTANCES DESCRIBED.—For the purposes of subsections (a) and (b), the circumstances described in this subsection are that—

“(1) the defendant or victim traveled in interstate or foreign commerce, or traveled using a means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, in furtherance of or in connection with the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b);

“(2) the defendant used a means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce in furtherance of or in connection with the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b);

“(3) any payment of any kind was made, directly or indirectly, in furtherance of or in connection with the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) using any means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or in interstate or foreign commerce;

“(4) the defendant transmitted in interstate or foreign commerce any communication relating to or in furtherance of the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) using any means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or in interstate or foreign commerce by any means or in manner, including by computer, mail, wire, or electromagnetic transmission;

“(5) any instrument, item, substance, or other object that has traveled in interstate or foreign commerce was used to perform the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b);

“(6) the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) occurred within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or any territory or possession of the United States; or

“(7) the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) otherwise occurred in interstate or foreign commerce.

“(e) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN DEFENSE.—It shall not be a defense to a prosecution under subsection (a) that female genital mutilation is required as a matter of religion, custom, tradition, ritual, or standard practice.

“(f) PROHIBITION ON PROSECUTION OF VICTIM.—No person who is chemically castrated or on whom genital or bodily mutilation is performed may be arrested or prosecuted for an offense under this section.

“(g) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is not a violation of this section if such genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is—

“(i) necessary to the health of the minor on whom it is conducted, and is conducted by a person licensed in the place of such conduct as a medical practitioner; or

“(ii) in the case of female genital mutilation, performed on a minor in labor or who has just given birth and is performed for medical purposes connected with that labor or birth by a person licensed in the place it is performed as a medical practitioner, midwife, or person in training to become such a practitioner or midwife.

“(B) HEALTH OF A MINOR.—For the purposes of subparagraph (A), the health of a minor does not include—

“(i) mental, behavioral, or emotional distress; or

“(ii) a mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder.

“(2) EXEMPTION.—Genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is not a violation of this section if such genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is conducted with respect to any of the following individuals:

“(A) An individual with both ovarian and testicular tissue.

“(B) An individual with respect to whom a physician has determined through genetic or biochemical testing that the individual does not have normal sex chromosome structure, sex steroid hormone production, or sex steroid hormone action.

“(C) An individual experiencing infection, disease, injury, or disorder caused or exacerbated by a previous genital or bodily mutilation procedure or chemical castration.

“(D) An individual suffering from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the individual in imminent danger of impairment of a major bodily function unless the procedure is performed.

“(E) An individual diagnosed with precocious puberty, to the extent such genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is for the purpose of normalizing puberty.

“(h) CIVIL ACTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual on whom a genital or bodily mutilation was performed in violation of this section may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States against the person who performed, facilitated, or otherwise caused the violation.

“(2) RELIEF.—In a civil action brought under this subsection, the court may award—

“(A) compensatory damages;

“(B) punitive damages;

“(C) reasonable attorney's fees and costs; and

“(D) any other appropriate relief.

“(3) LIMITATION PERIOD.—An action under this subsection may be brought not later than 20 years after the date on which the individual reaches 18 years of age.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CHEMICAL CASTRATION.—The term ‘chemical castration’ means administering, supplying, prescribing, dispensing, distributing, or otherwise conveying to an individual medications for the purposes described in paragraph (1)(B), including—

“(A) gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues or other puberty-blocking drugs to stop or delay normal puberty; and

“(B) testosterone, estrogen, or other androgens to an individual at doses that are higher than would normally be produced endogenously in a healthy individual of the same age and sex.

“(2) FEMALE.—The term ‘female’ means a person who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a congenital anomaly, historical accident, or intentional or unintentional disruption, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and utilizes eggs for fertilization.

“(3) FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.—The term ‘female genital mutilation’ means any procedure performed for non-medical reasons that involves partial or total removal of, or other injury to, the external female genitalia, and includes—

“(A) a clitoridectomy or the partial or total removal of the clitoris or the prepuce or clitoral hood;

“(B) excision or the partial or total removal (with or without excision of the clitoris) of the labia minora or the labia majora, or both;

“(C) infibulation or the narrowing of the vaginal opening (with or without excision of the clitoris); or

“(D) other procedures that are harmful to the external female genitalia, including pricking, incising, scraping, or cauterizing the genital area.

“(4) GENITAL OR BODILY MUTILATION.—The term ‘genital or bodily mutilation’ means, with respect to an individual, any of the following:

“(A) Female genital mutilation.

“(B) Any surgery performed for the purpose of intentionally changing the body of such individual (including by disrupting the body's development, inhibiting its natural functions, or modifying its appearance) to no longer correspond to the individual's sex, including—

“(i) castration;

“(ii) orchiectomy;

“(iii) scrotoplasty;

“(iv) vasectomy;

“(v) hysterectomy;

“(vi) oophorectomy;

“(vii) ovariectomy;

“(viii) metoidioplasty;

“(ix) penectomy;

“(x) phalloplasty;

“(xi) vaginoplasty;

“(xii) vaginectomy;

“(xiii) vulvoplasty;

“(xiv) reduction thyrochondroplasty;

“(xv) chondrolaryngoplasty; and

“(xvi) mastectomy.

“(C) Any plastic surgery that feminizes or masculinizes the facial or other physiological features for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(D) Any placement of chest implants to create feminine breasts for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(E) Any placement of fat or artificial implants in the gluteal region for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(F) Any surgery to reconstruct the fixed part of the urethra, whether or not such surgery includes a metoidioplasty or a phalloplasty, for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(5) MALE.—The term ‘male’ means a person who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a congenital anomaly, historical accident, or intentional or unintentional disruption, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and utilizes sperm for fertilization.

“(6) MINOR.—The term ‘minor’ means any person under the age of eighteen years.

“(7) SEX.—The term ‘sex’ means the immutable biological classification of an individual as either male or female.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item related to section 116 and inserting the following:

"116. Genital and bodily mutilation of a minor; chemical castration of a minor."

SA 4421. Mr. THUNE (for Mr. TUBERVILLE for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike title II and insert the following:

TITLE II—SAVE AMERICAN SPORTS

SEC. 201. AMENDMENT.

Section 901 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d)(1) It shall be a violation of subsection (a) for a recipient of Federal funds who operates, sponsors, or facilitates athletic programs or activities to permit a person whose sex is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is designated for women or girls.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth."

SEC. 202. DATE.

This title takes effect 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4422. Mr. THUNE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 days after the date of enactment."

SA 4423. Mr. THUNE proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4422 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

SA 4424. Mr. THUNE proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4423 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the amendment SA 4422 proposed by Mr. THUNE to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "2 days" and insert "3 days"

SA 4425. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. TUBERVILLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title III and insert the following:

TITLE III—SAVE AMERICAN CHILDREN

SEC. 301. GENITAL AND BODILY MUTILATION OF A MINOR; CHEMICAL CASTRATION OF A MINOR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 116 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 116. Genital and bodily mutilation of a minor; chemical castration of a minor

"(a) GENITAL OR BODILY MUTILATION.—Except as provided in subsection (g), whoever, in any circumstance described in subsection (d), knowingly performs, or attempts to per-

form, genital or bodily mutilation on another person who is a minor, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(b) CHEMICAL CASTRATION OF A MINOR.—Except as provided in subsection (g), whoever, in any circumstance described in subsection (d), knowingly chemically castrates a minor shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(c) CERTAIN OFFENSE RELATED TO FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.—Except as provided in subsection (g), whoever, in any circumstance described in subsection (d), knowingly—

"(1) facilitates or consents to female genital mutilation of a minor; or

"(2) transports a minor for the purpose of the performance of female genital mutilation on such minor, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(d) CIRCUMSTANCES DESCRIBED.—For the purposes of subsections (a) and (b), the circumstances described in this subsection are that—

"(1) the defendant or victim traveled in interstate or foreign commerce, or traveled using a means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, in furtherance of or in connection with the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b);

"(2) the defendant used a means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce in furtherance of or in connection with the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b);

"(3) any payment of any kind was made, directly or indirectly, in furtherance of or in connection with the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) using any means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or in interstate or foreign commerce;

"(4) the defendant transmitted in interstate or foreign commerce any communication relating to or in furtherance of the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) using any means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or in interstate or foreign commerce by any means or in manner, including by computer, mail, wire, or electromagnetic transmission;

"(5) any instrument, item, substance, or other object that has traveled in interstate or foreign commerce was used to perform the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b);

"(6) the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) occurred within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or any territory or possession of the United States; or

"(7) the conduct described in subsection (a) or (b) otherwise occurred in interstate or foreign commerce.

"(e) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN DEFENSE.—It shall not be a defense to a prosecution under subsection (a) that female genital mutilation is required as a matter of religion, custom, tradition, ritual, or standard practice.

"(f) PROHIBITION ON PROSECUTION OF VICTIM.—No person who is chemically castrated or on whom genital or bodily mutilation is performed may be arrested or prosecuted for an offense under this section.

"(g) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) PROCEDURES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is not a violation of this section if such genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is—

"(i) necessary to the health of the minor on whom it is conducted, and is conducted by a person licensed in the place of such conduct as a medical practitioner; or

"(ii) in the case of female genital mutilation, performed on a minor in labor or who has just given birth and is performed for medical purposes connected with that labor

or birth by a person licensed in the place it is performed as a medical practitioner, midwife, or person in training to become such a practitioner or midwife.

"(B) HEALTH OF A MINOR.—For the purposes of subparagraph (A), the health of a minor does not include—

"(i) mental, behavioral, or emotional distress; or

"(ii) a mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder.

"(2) EXEMPTION.—Genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is not a violation of this section if such genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is conducted with respect to any of the following individuals:

"(A) An individual with both ovarian and testicular tissue.

"(B) An individual with respect to whom a physician has determined through genetic or biochemical testing that the individual does not have normal sex chromosome structure, sex steroid hormone production, or sex steroid hormone action.

"(C) An individual experiencing infection, disease, injury, or disorder caused or exacerbated by a previous genital or bodily mutilation procedure or chemical castration.

"(D) An individual suffering from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the individual in imminent danger of impairment of a major bodily function unless the procedure is performed.

"(E) An individual diagnosed with precocious puberty, to the extent such genital or bodily mutilation or chemical castration is for the purpose of normalizing puberty.

"(h) CIVIL ACTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any individual on whom a genital or bodily mutilation was performed in violation of this section may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States against the person who performed, facilitated, or otherwise caused the violation.

"(2) RELIEF.—In a civil action brought under this subsection, the court may award—

"(A) compensatory damages;

"(B) punitive damages;

"(C) reasonable attorney's fees and costs; and

"(D) any other appropriate relief.

"(3) LIMITATION PERIOD.—An action under this subsection may be brought not later than 20 years after the date on which the individual reaches 18 years of age.

"(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) CHEMICAL CASTRATION.—The term 'chemical castration' means administering, supplying, prescribing, dispensing, distributing, or otherwise conveying to an individual medications for the purposes described in paragraph (1)(B), including—

"(A) gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRH) analogues or other puberty-blocking drugs to stop or delay normal puberty; and

"(B) testosterone, estrogen, or other androgens to an individual at doses that are higher than would normally be produced endogenously in a healthy individual of the same age and sex.

"(2) FEMALE.—The term 'female' means a person who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a congenital anomaly, historical accident, or intentional or unintentional disruption, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and utilizes eggs for fertilization.

"(3) FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION.—The term 'female genital mutilation' means any procedure performed for non-medical reasons that involves partial or total removal of, or other injury to, the external female genitalia, and includes—

“(A) a clitoridectomy or the partial or total removal of the clitoris or the prepuce or clitoral hood;

“(B) excision or the partial or total removal (with or without excision of the clitoris) of the labia minora or the labia majora, or both;

“(C) infibulation or the narrowing of the vaginal opening (with or without excision of the clitoris); or

“(D) other procedures that are harmful to the external female genitalia, including pricking, incising, scraping, or cauterizing the genital area.

“(4) **GENITAL OR BODILY MUTILATION.**—The term ‘genital or bodily mutilation’ means, with respect to an individual, any of the following:

“(A) Female genital mutilation.

“(B) Any surgery performed for the purpose of intentionally changing the body of such individual (including by disrupting the body’s development, inhibiting its natural functions, or modifying its appearance) to no longer correspond to the individual’s sex, including—

“(i) castration;

“(ii) orchiectomy;

“(iii) scrotoplasty;

“(iv) vasectomy;

“(v) hysterectomy;

“(vi) oophorectomy;

“(vii) ovariectomy;

“(viii) metoidioplasty;

“(ix) penectomy;

“(x) phalloplasty;

“(xi) vaginoplasty;

“(xii) vaginectomy;

“(xiii) vulvoplasty;

“(xiv) reduction thyrochondroplasty;

“(xv) chondrolaryngoplasty; and

“(xvi) mastectomy.

“(C) Any plastic surgery that feminizes or masculinizes the facial or other physiological features for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(D) Any placement of chest implants to create feminine breasts for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(E) Any placement of fat or artificial implants in the gluteal region for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(F) Any surgery to reconstruct the fixed part of the urethra, whether or not such surgery includes a metoidioplasty or a phalloplasty, for the purposes described in subparagraph (B).

“(5) **MALE.**—The term ‘male’ means a person who naturally has, had, will have, or would have, but for a congenital anomaly, historical accident, or intentional or unintentional disruption, the reproductive system that at some point produces, transports, and utilizes sperm for fertilization.

“(6) **MINOR.**—The term ‘minor’ means any person under the age of eighteen years.

“(7) **SEX.**—The term ‘sex’ means the immutable biological classification of an individual as either male or female.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item related to section 116 and inserting the following:

“116. Genital and bodily mutilation of a minor; chemical castration of a minor.”.

SEC. 302. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title takes effect 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 4426. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP REQUIRED FOR SHORT-BARRELED RIFLE PURCHASES.

Section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in subsection (1), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) to receive or possess a firearm described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 5845(a) unless such person presents documentary proof of United States citizenship, as defined in section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502).”.

SA 4427. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP REQUIRED FOR SILENCER PURCHASES.

Section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in subsection (1), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) to receive or possess a silencer (as defined in section 921 of title 18, United States Code) unless such person presents documentary proof of United States citizenship, as defined in section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502).”.

SA 4428. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP REQUIRED FOR FIREARM PURCHASES.

Section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in subsection (1), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) to receive or possess a firearm unless such person presents documentary proof of United States citizenship, as defined in section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502).”.

SA 4429. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CONDEMNING THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION’S RECENT DECISION TO EASE SANCTIONS ON THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) On February 28, 2026, the United States launched strikes on the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(2) In retaliation, Iran has attacked United States assets and facilities and civilian infrastructure in 12 countries in the region.

(3) Reporting has indicated that the Russian Federation is helping Iran target United States personnel and assets across the region.

(4) As of March 16, 2026, 13 members of the United States Armed Forces have been killed as a result of Iranian attacks.

(5) On March 5, 2026, the Trump administration eased sanctions on Russia by authorizing transactions related to the purchase of Russian oil by India, the second-largest importer of Russian oil, for 30 days.

(6) In issuing that license during a spike in oil prices, the Trump administration is helping Russia and its oil-trading intermediaries benefit financially while Russia targets our servicemembers.

(7) Easing sanctions on the Russian Federation will enable it to further finance its war effort against Ukraine.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that Congress condemns easing sanctions on the Russian Federation as it is continuing its brutal war against Ukraine and helping Iran target United States personnel and assets across the region.

SA 4430. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REQUIREMENTS FOR IDENTIFICATIONS ISSUED BY TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.

Section 303A(c)(5) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as added by this Act, is amended by striking “that includes a photo of the individual and an expiration date”.

SA 4431. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO MAIL VOTER REGISTRATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amendments made by subsections (d) and (h) of section 2 shall not take effect until the date on which the national average price of gasoline is less than \$3 per gallon.

SA 4432. Mr. GALLEG0 submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR AN INVASION OF A NATO COUNTRY OR TERRITORY OF A NATO COUNTRY.

No Federal funds may be used for an invasion of a NATO country or territory of a NATO country without the consent of that country or invocation of the collective defense provisions of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington April 4, 1949.

SA 4433. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TERMINATION OF GENERAL LICENSES RELATING TO RUSSIAN OIL EXPORTS.

On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following licenses issued the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury shall have no force or effect:

(1) General License 133, entitled "Authorizing the Delivery and Sale of Crude Oil and Petroleum Products of Russian Federation Origin Loaded on Vessels as of March 5, 2026 to India".

(2) General License 134, entitled "Authorizing the Delivery and Sale of Crude Oil and Petroleum Products of Russian Federation Origin Loaded on Vessels as of March 12, 2026".

SA 4434. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INELIGIBILITY OF ASHLI BABBITT FOR MILITARY FUNERAL HONORS.

Ashli Babbitt shall be considered to be ineligible for military funeral honors under section 985 of title 10, United States Code. Her illegal actions of participating in the January 6, 2021 insurrection, including crawling through a broken window of a barricaded door leading to the House Speaker's Lobby, disqualify her from such honors.

SA 4435. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . TERMINATION OF INCREASED TARIFF-RATE QUOTA ON BEEF IMPORTED FROM ARGENTINA.

On and after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the increase in the tariff-rate quota on beef imported from Argentina proclaimed by the President in Proclamation 11010 (91 Fed. Reg. 7107) shall have no force or effect; and

(2) the tariff-rate quota on such beef in effect on February 5, 2026, shall apply.

SA 4436. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RATE OF COMPENSATION FOR WORK PERFORMED ON LEGAL PUBLIC HOLIDAYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3 (29 U.S.C. 203), by adding at the end the following:

"(z) 'Legal public holiday' means any legal public holiday specified in section 6103(a) of title 5, United States Code."; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (29 U.S.C. 207) the following:

"SEC. 8. RATE OF COMPENSATION FOR WORK PERFORMED ON LEGAL PUBLIC HOLIDAYS.

"No employer shall employ an employee who in any workweek is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, for work performed on a legal public holiday unless such employee receives compensation for such work at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate (as determined under section 7(e)) at which the employee is employed."

(b) EXCLUSION FROM COMPENSATION CREDITABLE TOWARDS OVERTIME COMPENSATION.—Section 7(h)(2) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207(h)(2)) is amended by inserting "(other than for work performed on a legal public holiday as required under section 8)" after "(6)".

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—Section 13(f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 213(f)) is amended by striking "6, 7, 11, and 12" and inserting "6, 7, 8, 11, and 12".

(d) PROHIBITED ACTS; ENFORCEMENT.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 15(a) (29 U.S.C. 215(a))—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "section 6 or section 7," and inserting "section 6, 7, or 8,"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "section 6 or section 7," and inserting "section 6, 7, or 8,";

(2) in section 16 (29 U.S.C. 216)—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "section 6 or section 7" each place it appears and inserting "section 6, 7, or 8";

(ii) by striking "their unpaid minimum wages, or the unpaid overtime compensation," and inserting "their unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or unpaid legal public holiday compensation,"; and

(iii) by inserting "or unpaid legal public holiday compensation" after "the amount of unpaid overtime compensation";

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking "the unpaid minimum wages or the unpaid overtime compensation" and inserting "the unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or unpaid legal public holiday compensation";

(II) by striking "section 6 or 7" and inserting "section 6, 7, or 8"; and

(III) by striking "such unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation" and inserting "such unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or unpaid legal public holiday compensation";

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking "unpaid minimum wages or overtime compensation" inserting "unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or unpaid legal public holiday compensation"; and

(iii) in the third sentence, by striking "unpaid minimum wages or unpaid overtime compensation under sections 6 and 7" and inserting "unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or unpaid legal public holiday compensation under section 6, 7, or 8"; and

(C) in subsection (e)(2), by striking "section 6 or 7" and inserting "section 6, 7, or 8"; and

(3) in section 17 (29 U.S.C. 217), by striking "minimum wages or overtime compensation" and inserting "minimum wages, over-

time compensation, or legal public holiday compensation".

(e) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—Section 18 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 218) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) No provision of this Act or of any order thereunder shall excuse noncompliance with any Federal or State law or municipal ordinance—

"(1) establishing a rate of compensation for work performed on a legal public holiday that is higher than the rate required under section 8; or

"(2) otherwise requiring compensation for work performed on any other holiday that is greater than the compensation required under this Act."

(f) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 3(o) (29 U.S.C. 203(o)), by striking "sections 6 and 7" and inserting "sections 6, 7, and 8";

(B) in section 4(f), by striking "unpaid minimum wages, or unpaid overtime compensation," and inserting "unpaid minimum wages, unpaid overtime compensation, or unpaid legal public holiday compensation,"; and

(C) by repealing section 10 (29 U.S.C. 210).

(2) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—Section 6 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 (29 U.S.C. 255) is amended by inserting "unpaid legal public holiday compensation," after "unpaid overtime compensation,".

SA 4437. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON SURVEILLANCE-BASED PRICE SETTING.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "One Fair Price Act of 2026".

(b) SURVEILLANCE-BASED PRICE SETTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall be unlawful for a person to offer or charge different prices to different consumers for the same, or a substantially similar, product or service using, informed by, or based on, in whole or in part, surveillance data.

(2) SAFE HARBOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The following shall not be considered surveillance-based price setting for purposes of paragraph (1) if the conditions of subparagraph (B) are met:

(i) A difference in price that is based solely on reasonable costs associated with providing the product or service to different consumers.

(ii) A bona fide discount that is offered to any member of a broadly defined group, including teachers, active duty personnel, veterans, senior citizens, or students.

(iii) A bona fide discount that is offered to any consumer who affirmatively and knowingly enrolls in a loyalty program.

(B) CONDITIONS FOR EXCEPTION.—The conditions described in this subparagraph are the following:

(i) Any basis for a difference in reasonable costs associated with providing a product or service to different consumers is disclosed to the consumer prior to purchase.

(ii) Any eligibility condition or criteria for receiving or earning a bona fide discount is clearly and conspicuously disclosed.

(iii) Any bona fide discount is offered uniformly to any consumer who meets the disclosed eligibility conditions or criteria.

(iv) Any surveillance data used solely to offer or administer a bona fide discount is not used for any other purpose, including profiling, targeted advertising, or individualized price setting.

(v) Any loyalty program that allows a user to accrue and exchange points, credits, or any similar nonmonetary system of value for a product or service does not charge a different price for those points, credits, or similar nonmonetary system of value to different consumers for the same or substantially similar product or service.

(3) INAPPLICABILITY TO INSURANCE OR CREDIT PRODUCTS.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) shall not apply to the business of insurance or any credit product.

(c) ENFORCEMENT BY THE COMMISSION.—

(1) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES; UNFAIR METHODS OF COMPETITION.—A violation of subsection (b) or a regulation promulgated under such subsection shall be treated as a violation of a rule defining an unfair or deceptive act or practice under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)) and as a violation of section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)) regarding unfair methods of competition.

(2) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the Commission shall enforce subsection (b) and any regulation promulgated under such subsection in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(B) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), any person who violates such subsection or a regulation promulgated under such subsection shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(C) COMMON CARRIERS, NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS, AND AIR CARRIERS.—Notwithstanding section 4, 5(a)(2), or 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44, 45(a)(2), 46) or any jurisdictional limitation of the Commission, the Commission shall also enforce subsection (b) or a regulation promulgated under subsection (b), in the same manner provided in subparagraphs (A) and (B), with respect to—

(i) common carriers subject to the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto;

(ii) organizations not organized to carry on business for their own profit or that of their members; and

(iii) air carriers and foreign air carriers subject to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

(D) RULEMAKING.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may promulgate in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, such rules as may be necessary to carry out this section, including guidance regarding how to comply with subsection (b).

(ii) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—The Commission shall consider rules necessary to carry out this Act as having a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities for purposes of chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Regulatory Flexibility Act”).

(E) AUTHORITY PRESERVED.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

(d) ACTIONS BY STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the attorney general of a State, or an official or

agency of a State, has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of such State has been or is threatened or adversely affected by the engagement of any person in an act or practice in violation of subsection (b) or a regulation promulgated under such subsection, the attorney general of the State, may as parens patriae, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate State court or an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(A) enjoin such act or practice;

(B) enforce compliance with such subsection or such regulation;

(C) obtain, for each violation, the greater of—

(i) the actual monetary damages incurred from the violation; or

(ii) \$3,000; or

(D) obtain, for each violation, any other restitution, penalties, and other legal or equitable relief as the court may deem appropriate.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing a civil action under this subsection, nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent an attorney general, official, or agency of a State from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general, official, or agency by the laws of such State to conduct investigations, administer oaths and affirmations, or compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(e) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual who has been injured by a person in violation of subsection (b) or a regulation promulgated under such subsection may bring a civil action against such person in an appropriate State court or an appropriate district court of the United States to—

(A) enjoin the violation;

(B) obtain, for each violation, the greater of—

(i) the actual monetary damages incurred from the violation; or

(ii) \$3,000; or

(C) obtain, for each violation, any other restitution, penalties, and other legal or equitable relief as the court may deem appropriate.

(2) WILLFUL VIOLATIONS.—If the court finds that the defendant acted willfully in committing a violation described in paragraph (1), the court may, in its discretion, increase the amount of the award to an amount equal to not more than 3 times the amount available under paragraph (1)(B).

(3) PRIMA FACIE CASE; REBUTTAL.—

(A) PRIMA FACIE CASE.—In any proceeding commenced pursuant to paragraph (1), the defendant shall be presumed to be in violation of subsection (b) if the plaintiff can demonstrate that—

(i) two or more individuals were offered different prices by the defendant for the same, or a substantially similar, product or service during the same, or a substantially similar, period of time; or

(ii) one individual was offered different prices by the defendant for the same, or a substantially similar, product or service during the same, or a substantially similar, period of time while using different means of viewing the price.

(B) BURDEN OF REBUTTING PRIMA FACIE CASE.—The defendant may rebut the presumption described in subparagraph (A) by demonstrating that the alleged difference in price was—

(i) not informed, in whole or in part, by surveillance data; or

(ii) fully explained by the safe harbors described in subsection (b)(2).

(4) COSTS AND ATTORNEY’S FEES.—The court shall award to a prevailing plaintiff in an action under this subsection the litigation

costs of such action and reasonable attorney’s fees, as determined by the court.

(5) LIMITATION.—An action may be commenced under this subsection not later than 5 years after the date on which the individual first discovered or had a reasonable opportunity to discover the violation.

(6) NONEXCLUSIVE REMEDY.—Bringing a civil action under this subsection shall be in addition to any other remedy available to the individual bringing such civil action.

(7) INVALIDITY OF PRE-DISPUTE ARBITRATION AND JOINT ACTION WAIVERS.—Notwithstanding chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code (commonly known as the “Federal Arbitration Act”), or any other provision of law, a pre-dispute arbitration agreement or pre-dispute joint action waiver between a person in violation of subsection (b) and an individual is not valid or enforceable for purposes of the individual bringing a civil action against such person under this subsection.

(f) JOINT STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (in this subsection referred to as the “Office of Advocacy”), in consultation with the Commission, shall conduct a joint study to evaluate the impact of this section on—

(A) small business concerns; and

(B) promoting competition between large and small business enterprises.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the Office of Advocacy completes the study under paragraph (1), the Commission and the Office of Advocacy shall submit to Congress a report on such study, including any relevant findings and recommendations resulting from such study.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BONA FIDE DISCOUNT.—The term “bona fide discount” means an offered price that is lower than the genuine price at which a product or service is widely offered to the public on a regular basis for a reasonably substantial period of time and not for the purpose of establishing a fictitious price to enable the subsequent offer of a reduction.

(2) BUSINESS OF INSURANCE; CREDIT.—The terms “business of insurance” and “credit” have the meaning given such terms in section 1002 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481).

(3) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(4) GENETIC INFORMATION.—The term “genetic information” has the meaning given such term in section 2791(d) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–91(d)).

(5) PERSONAL INFORMATION.—The term “personal information” means any quality, feature, attribute, or trait of an individual, including any immutable characteristic (such as race and eye color), mutable characteristic (such as address, weight, citizenship, family, or parenthood status), genetic information, and any other information that could reasonably be linked, directly or indirectly, with a particular individual or household.

(6) PRE-DISPUTE ARBITRATION AGREEMENT.—The term “pre-dispute arbitration agreement” means any agreement to arbitrate a dispute that has not arisen at the time of making the agreement.

(7) PRE-DISPUTE JOINT ACTION WAIVER.—The term “pre-dispute joint action waiver” means an agreement, including as part of a pre-dispute arbitration agreement, that would prohibit, or waive the right of, one of the parties to the agreement to participate in a joint, class, or collective action in a judicial, arbitral, administrative, or other forum, concerning a dispute that has not arisen at the time of making the agreement.

(8) PRICE.—The term “price” means the amount charged or offered to a consumer in

relation to a transaction, including any related cost and fee and any other material term of the transaction that has direct bearing on the amount paid by the consumer or the value of the product or service offered or provided to the consumer.

(9) **SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.**—The term “small business concern”

(A) has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

(B) shall not include a small business concern involved in developing, training, or selling a product or service for the primary purpose of aiding a business to determine a price.

(10) **SURVEILLANCE DATA.**—The term “surveillance data”

(A) means data that is related to the personal information, behavior, or biometrics of an individual; and

(B) includes data gathered, purchased, or otherwise acquired.

(h) **APPLICATION OF PROHIBITION ON SURVEILLANCE-BASED PRICE SETTING TO AIR CARRIERS AND TICKET AGENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 41712 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **PROHIBITION ON SURVEILLANCE-BASED PRICE SETTING.**—It shall be an unfair or deceptive practice under subsection (a) for an air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent to engage in surveillance-based price setting, as described in subsection (b) of the One Fair Price Act of 2026.”.

(2) **NO PREEMPTION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION CLAIMS.**—Section 41713(b)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) **NO PREEMPTION OF SURVEILLANCE-BASED PRICE SETTING CLAIMS.**—Nothing in subparagraphs (A) through (C) may be construed—

“(i) to preempt, displace, or supplant any action for civil damages or injunctive relief based on a violation of subsection (b) of the One Fair Price Act of 2026; or

“(ii) to restrict the authority of any government entity, including an attorney general of a State, from bringing a legal claim on behalf of the citizens of the State with respect to any such violation.”.

SA 4438. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ WEEKLY PUBLICATION OF VALUE OF RUSSIAN OIL EXPORTS PERMITTED BY SANCTIONS WAIVERS.

Not later than 7 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 7 days thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall post on a publicly accessible website of the Federal Government an estimate, for the preceding 7 days, of the dollar value of exports of crude oil and petroleum products from the Russian Federation enabled by each active waiver of the application of sanctions relating to such exports.

SA 4439. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that former Minneapolis residents Alex Jeffrey Pretti and Renée Nicole Good, who were both killed by Federal immigration enforcement officers in January 2026 during Operation Metro Surge, were not domestic terrorists.

SA 4440. Mr. GALLEGO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States prohibit Federal immigration officers and agents from conducting investigatory stops or making arrests based solely on race, ethnicity, or membership in any other protected class.

SA 4441. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REPEAL OF EXECUTIVE DOCUMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Executive documents described in subsection (b) shall have no force or effect and no Federal funds may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or carry out those Executive documents.

(b) **EXECUTIVE DOCUMENTS DESCRIBED.**—The Executive documents referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Executive Order 14154 (90 Fed. Reg. 8353; relating to unleashing American energy).

(2) Executive Order 14162 (90 Fed. Reg. 8455; relating to putting America first in international environmental agreements).

(3) Executive Order 14156 (90 Fed. Reg. 8433; relating to declaring a national energy emergency).

(4) Presidential memorandum entitled “Temporary Withdrawal of All Areas on the Outer Continental Shelf from Offshore Wind Leasing and Review of the Federal Government’s Leasing and Permitting Practices for Wind Projects” issued January 20, 2025 (90 Fed. Reg. 8363).

(c) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to impair any authority granted to the President.

SA 4442. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ BEACHES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND COASTAL HEALTH.

(a) **COASTAL RECREATION WATER QUALITY MONITORING AND NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS.**—Section 406 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by inserting “, including nearby shallow upstream waters,” after “coastal recreation waters”; and

(II) by inserting “or present on” after “adjacent to”;

(ii) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(II) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(III) by inserting after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) in the case of a State that uses such grant to identify specific sources of contamination pursuant to paragraph (5), any data relating to such identified sources of contamination; and”;

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) **IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC SOURCES OF CONTAMINATION.**—A State or local government receiving a grant under this subsection may use such grant to identify specific sources of contamination for coastal recreation waters, including nearby shallow upstream waters, adjacent to or present on beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public.”;

(B) in subsection (g)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by inserting “, including nearby shallow upstream waters,” after “coastal recreation waters”; and

(ii) by inserting “or present on” after “adjacent to”;

(C) in subsection (i), by striking “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005” and inserting “\$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2027 through 2031”.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 8 of the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-284; 114 Stat. 877) is amended by striking “2001 through 2005” and inserting “2027 through 2031”.

(b) **GUIDANCE.**—In providing guidance to States and local governments receiving grants under section 406 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall ensure that such guidance reflects innovations in testing technologies for water contamination.

SA 4443. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ AGRITOURISM.

(a) **FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—

(1) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(A) agritourism provides a range of unique experiences to the public, including—

(i) education, such as school tours, garden and nursery tours, winery tours, historical agricultural exhibits, hops and microbrewery tours, and distillery tours;

(ii) outdoor recreation, such as river activities, mountain biking, horseback riding, wildlife viewing and photography, fee fishing and hunting, wagon and sleigh rides, cross-country skiing, game preserves, and clay bird shooting;

(iii) entertainment, such as concerts and special events, culinary experiences, festivals, fairs, interaction with farm animals, and weddings;

(iv) direct sales, such as on-farm sales, farm stands, agriculture-related crafts and gifts, u-pick operations, u-cut tree farms, wineries, breweries, cideries, distilleries, and cut flowers;

(v) accommodations, such as bed-and-breakfast inns, farm and ranch vacations, yurts, sheep wagons, and guest ranches; and

(vi) dining on a farm;

(B) agritourism has financial, educational, and social benefits to communities; and

(C) agritourism continues—

(i) to offer educational opportunities for children and families;

(ii) to generate supplemental income for owners of agricultural enterprises, which are often small or family-run businesses;

(iii) to spur economic development in rural communities;

(iv) to preserve agricultural heritage;

(v) to help farms diversify; and

(vi) to provide alternative revenue opportunities to keep working farms in production.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, to further realize the benefits of agritourism to communities, the Secretary of Agriculture should incorporate agritourism into the Department of Agriculture comprehensively.

(b) AGRITOURISM ADVISOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6941 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 237. AGRITOURISM ADVISOR.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ADVISOR.—The term ‘Advisor’ means the Agritourism Advisor described in subsection (b).

“(2) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means—

“(A) each of the several States of the United States;

“(B) the District of Columbia; and

“(C) any territory of the United States.

“(b) ADVISOR.—The Secretary shall designate a senior official in the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development to serve as the Agritourism Advisor.

“(c) DUTIES.—The Advisor shall encourage and promote, in each State and on land under the jurisdiction of Indian Tribes (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304)), agritourism activities and agritourism businesses, including—

“(1) educational experiences;

“(2) outdoor recreation;

“(3) entertainment and special events;

“(4) direct sales;

“(5) accommodations; and

“(6) any other activity or business relating to agritourism, as determined by the Secretary.

“(d) MEANS OF ACHIEVING.—In carrying out subsection (c), the Advisor shall—

“(1) coordinate with the agencies and offices of the Department;

“(2) advise the Secretary on issues relating to agritourism;

“(3) ensure that the programs of the Department are updated to address best agritourism practices;

“(4) conduct outreach to stakeholders and coordinate external partnerships to share best practices, provide mentorship, and offer technical assistance to agritourism businesses;

“(5) facilitate interagency program coordination and develop interagency tools for the promotion of agritourism programs and resources;

“(6) review and improve farm enterprise development programs that provide information about financial literacy, business planning, and marketing for agritourism;

“(7) coordinate networks of agritourism businesses;

“(8) consolidate access to Federal resources to help agritourism businesses effectively navigate available programs and assistance; and

“(9) collaborate with other Federal agencies, as needed.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of

1994 is amended by redesignating the first section 225 (7 U.S.C. 6925) (relating to the Food Access Liaison) as section 224A.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) The authority of the Secretary to carry out section 237.”.

SA 4444. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by inserting after section 216 (7 U.S.C. 6916) the following:

“SEC. 217. OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department an office, to be known as the ‘Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Office’).

“(b) SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR FOR COMPETITION MATTERS.—The Office shall be headed by the Special Investigator for Competition Matters (referred to in this section as the ‘Special Investigator’), who shall be a senior career employee appointed by the Secretary.

“(c) DUTIES.—The Special Investigator shall—

“(1) use all available tools, including subpoenas, to investigate and prosecute violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), by packers and live poultry dealers with respect to competition and trade practices in the food and agriculture sector;

“(2) serve as a Department liaison to, and act in consultation with, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission with respect to competition and trade practices in the food and agricultural sector;

“(3) act in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security with respect to national security and critical infrastructure security in the food and agricultural sector;

“(4) maintain a staff of attorneys and other professionals with appropriate expertise; and

“(5) in carrying out paragraphs (1) through (4), coordinate with the Office of the General Counsel and the Packers and Stockyards Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service.

“(d) PROSECUTORIAL AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding title 28, United States Code, the Special Investigator shall have the authority to bring any civil or administrative action authorized under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), against a packer or a live poultry dealer.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—With respect to any action brought under this section in Federal district court, the Special Investigator shall notify the Attorney General.

“(3) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section alters the authority of the Secretary to issue a subpoena pursuant to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

“(e) LIMITATION ON SCOPE.—The Special Investigator may not bring an action under this section with respect to an entity that is not regulated under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921 (7 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 296(b) of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7014(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11) The authority of the Secretary to carry out section 217.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Subtitle A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 is amended by redesignating the first section 225 (relating to Food Access Liaison) (7 U.S.C. 6925) as section 224A.

SA 4445. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROGRAM FOR PROCUREMENT OF DOMESTICALLY GROWN UNPROCESSED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES.

Section 6(f) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “PILOT PROJECT FOR PROCUREMENT OF” and inserting “PROGRAM FOR PROCUREMENT OF DOMESTICALLY GROWN”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “conduct a pilot project” and inserting “carry out a program (referred to in this subsection as the ‘program’)”;

(B) by inserting “domestically grown” before “unprocessed”; and

(C) by striking “8” and inserting “14”;

(3) by striking “pilot project” each place it appears and inserting “program”;

(4) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “domestically grown” before “unprocessed”;

(5) in paragraph (3)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “1 project is located in a State” and inserting “2 projects are located in 1 or more States”;

(6) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (E) and (F), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) the demonstrated commitment of the State to support small, local, and socially disadvantaged farmers;

“(C) the demonstrated commitment of the State to support Tribal agricultural producers and communities utilizing traditional foods;

“(D) whether the State will serve a high proportion of children from socially disadvantaged backgrounds in carrying out the program”;

(7) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTING” and inserting “RECORDKEEPING, REPORTING, AND EVALUATION”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) the challenges and opportunities presented by the program in the State.”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) PROGRAM EVALUATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the Secretary shall evaluate the impact of the program, including with respect to—

“(I) the quantity and cost of each type of unprocessed fruit and vegetable procured by each State under the program;

“(II) the benefit of the procured unprocessed fruits and vegetables to school food service in each State, including the benefit to meeting school meal requirements;

“(III) the economic impact of the program on agricultural producers in the State;

“(IV) the economic, geographic, social, and administrative barriers to participation, including the reimbursement process, experienced by agricultural producers and school food authorities; and

“(V) eligibility requirements for agricultural producers, including any barriers to becoming approved vendors.

“(ii) REPORT.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the results of the evaluation conducted under clause (i) and an analysis of that evaluation.”; and

(8) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) FUNDING.—

“(A) MANDATORY FUNDING.—There is appropriated to carry out this subsection \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2030.

“(B) RESERVATION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds appropriated under subparagraph (A) for each fiscal year, \$10,000,000 shall be reserved for States selected under the program under paragraph (1) to carry out the activities described in clause (ii)(I).

“(ii) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS; TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The funds reserved under clause (i) shall be used—

“(aa) for the administrative costs of carrying out the program, including costs of satisfying record keeping and reporting requirements;

“(bb) to coordinate among or share with agencies and departments involved in carrying out the program in the State; and

“(cc) to provide technical assistance and outreach to—

“(AA) vendors to become certified to participate in the program; and

“(BB) school food authorities, regional food hubs, State and local agencies, Indian Tribal organizations, agricultural producers, socially disadvantaged farmers, and other entities to participate in the program.

“(II) MINIMUM ALLOTMENT.—Of the funds reserved under clause (i), each State selected under paragraph (3)(A) shall receive not less than \$500,000 for each fiscal year during which the State participates in the program.

“(C) RESERVATION FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO NONPARTICIPATING STATES.—Of the funds appropriated under subparagraph (A) for each fiscal year, \$1,000,000 shall be reserved—

“(i) only if there are fewer than 14 States participating in the program that fiscal year; and

“(ii) to provide technical assistance with eligibility requirements for States seeking to participate in the program.”.

SA 4446. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ENHANCED CYBERSECURITY FOR EBT CARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(15) CYBERSECURITY OF EBT CARDS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) CHIP-ENABLED.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘chip-enabled’, with respect to a payment card, means a payment card that uses industry standard secure payment technology, as identified by the Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, that—

“(aa) provides for secure card-based payment; and

“(bb) is resistant to cloning.

“(II) CHIP CARD TECHNOLOGY.—The Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Accredited Standards Committee X9, shall consider whether the secure payment technology described in subclause (I) should meet the industry standards for contact and contactless payments.

“(ii) MOBILE FRIENDLY.—The term ‘mobile friendly’ has the meaning given the term in section 3559(b) of title 44, United States Code.

“(iii) NIST PIN AND PASSWORD STANDARDS.—The term ‘NIST PIN and password standards’ means the PIN and password standards described in Special Publication 800-63B entitled ‘Digital Identity Guidelines’ (or a successor document) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

“(iv) PIN.—The term ‘PIN’ has the meaning given the term ‘personal identification number (PIN)’ in section 271.2 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

“(B) REGULATIONS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall promulgate, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall review and update as necessary, cybersecurity and digital service regulations relating to EBT cards and mobile technologies under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, including, at a minimum, to ensure that cybersecurity measures for EBT cards and mobile technologies keep pace with security safeguards used by the private sector and required by Federal agencies for credit, debit, and other payment cards and mobile technologies.

“(ii) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the cybersecurity and digital service regulations described in clause (i) require the following:

“(I)(aa) Each State shall operate the user interfaces listed on the list of required user interfaces maintained by the Secretary under item (dd)(AA), in accordance with this subclause, 1 or more user interfaces of which households in the State may, at the election of the applicable household, use to manage the EBT account of the applicable household.

“(bb)(AA) A State may operate other user interfaces under item (aa) in addition to the required user interfaces on the list maintained by the Secretary under item (dd)(AA).

“(BB) Any web-based online portal operated by a State as a user interface shall be mobile friendly.

“(cc) Each user interface offered by a State under items (aa) and (bb), as applicable, shall—

“(AA) provide information in each language in which the State agency is required to make material available pursuant to section 272.4(b) of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations);

“(BB) be available to households at least 99 percent of the time; and

“(CC) include any other features required by the Secretary.

“(dd)(AA) The Secretary shall maintain a list of required user interfaces for purposes of item (aa), which may include a web-based online portal and a mobile application.

“(BB) The list under subitem (AA) shall include an application programming interface through which at least 1 user interface offered by a State under item (aa) allows households to delegate access to some or all account features identified by the Secretary to third-party provided software. No fee shall be charged to any party for the use of that application programming interface.

“(CC) During the 10-year period following the date on which the regulations promulgated pursuant to clause (i) become final, unless the Secretary extends that period, the Secretary shall maintain on the list under subitem (AA) the following user interfaces: text message, voice telephone service, and a nondigital user interface that does not require the use of a phone or computer by the household.

“(II)(aa) Each State shall provide households on an opt-in basis—

“(AA) through each digital user interface offered under subclause (I), timely electronic notice of transactions using the EBT account of the household; and

“(BB) through each user interface offered under subclause (I), access to, including the ability to search, historical transactions for not less than the preceding 12 months.

“(bb) Transaction information under subitems (AA) and (BB) of item (aa) shall include the amount of the transaction, the merchant for the transaction, the city and State of the merchant for an in-person transaction, and the delivery address or collection address for an online transaction.

“(cc) Each State shall offer households the ability, through each user interface offered under subclause (I), to report a fraudulent transaction to the State.

“(dd) A State shall not require a household to respond to or acknowledge a notice of transaction delivered pursuant to item (aa)(AA).

“(ee) A State shall notify any household that has reported an instance of EBT card skimming or fraud, or is otherwise identified as being a victim of EBT card skimming or fraud, of any State or Federal funds that may be reimbursed if the household experiences fraud again.

“(III) Each State shall provide households issued an EBT card the ability, through each user interface offered under subclause (I) to check the enrollment status of the household, including the date on which the household is required to apply for recertification.

“(IV) Not later than 2 years after the date on which the regulations promulgated pursuant to clause (i) become final, States shall begin issuing chip-enabled EBT cards.

“(V) Not later than 4 years after the date on which the regulations promulgated pursuant to clause (i) become final, States may not issue new EBT cards with magnetic stripes.

“(VI) Not later than 5 years after the date on which the regulations promulgated pursuant to clause (i) become final, States shall be required to reissue any existing valid EBT cards with magnetic stripes as chip-enabled EBT cards without magnetic stripes.

“(VII) In the case of a chip-enabled EBT card reissued pursuant to any of subclauses (IV) through (VI), absent suspicion of fraud, as applicable, a State shall—

“(aa) reissue a new chip-enabled EBT card; and

“(bb) deactivate the current chip-enabled EBT card on the date that is the earlier of—

“(AA) the date on which the new chip-enabled EBT card is activated; and

“(BB) 60 days after the date on which the new chip-enabled EBT card is sent to the household.

“(iii) SUNSET FOR REQUIREMENT TO USE CHIP TECHNOLOGY.—Under the cybersecurity regulations described in clause (i), all EBT cards, except EBT cards issued to victims of a disaster pursuant to section 5(h) or solely for benefits under the summer electronic benefits transfer for children program established under section 13A of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1762), issued during the 5-year period following the deadline for carrying out clause (ii)(VI) shall be chip-enabled, unless the Secretary extends that period.

“(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The cybersecurity and digital service regulations described in clause (i) shall supersede any regulations promulgated under paragraph (2) of section 501(a) of division HH of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (7 U.S.C. 2016a(a)) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Save America Act).

“(C) REIMBURSEMENTS.—Each State upgrading EBT cards to comply with the regulations promulgated under subparagraph (B)(i) shall receive reimbursement from the Secretary in an amount determined by the Secretary to cover all reasonable costs incurred by the State, including—

“(i) the 1-time up-front costs paid by the State to card vendors; and

“(ii) the additional annual fees associated with chip-enabled cards paid by States to card vendors; and

“(iii) postage or other delivery-related costs.

“(D) PROHIBITION ON PASSWORD AND PIN REQUIREMENTS INCONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS.—Beginning 60 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, a State agency may not require, with respect to a PIN for use of an EBT card or a password for access to an online account or mobile application managing the EBT card—

“(i) that the PIN or password be periodically changed in circumstances that are prohibited by the NIST PIN and password standards; or

“(ii) that the password meet complexity requirements that are prohibited by the NIST PIN and password standards.

“(E) GRANT PROGRAM FOR CHIP-ENABLED EBT CARDS.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) ADMINISTERING ENTITY.—The term ‘administering entity’ means an entity awarded a grant under clause (ii) to provide subgrants to eligible entities.

“(II) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’ means—

“(aa) an entity described in paragraph (1) or (3) of section 3(o) that—

“(AA) is authorized to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program under section 9;

“(BB) does not have payment terminals that accept chip-enabled EBT cards; and

“(CC) is located in an area with limited grocery access, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(bb) an entity described in paragraph (2), (4), or (5) of section 3(o) that meets the requirements described in subitems (AA) and (BB) of item (aa).

“(ii) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall establish a grant program to award a grant to an administering entity to provide subgrants to eligible entities to upgrade to chip-compatible payment terminals that support contact and contactless payment card technology.

“(F) DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary shall—

“(i) collect, and publish on the website of the Department of Agriculture, data on—

“(I) the length of time each user interface offered by each State pursuant to subparagraph (B)(ii)(I) was unavailable for use, including due to technical problems or maintenance needs; and

“(II) cybersecurity measures adopted for EBT cards in each State; and

“(ii) maintain and annually update the data collected under clause (i) to support States in implementing any regulations promulgated pursuant to subparagraph (B)(i).

“(G) PUBLIC REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available on the website of the Department of Agriculture, a report that—

“(I) identifies trends relating to the theft of benefits, including the frequency of theft of benefits, the locations at which EBT cards are compromised, and the method by which EBT cards are compromised;

“(II) evaluates the effectiveness of existing cybersecurity regulations for the supplemental nutrition assistance program, including identifying ineffective measures and the compliance burden borne by individual benefit recipients;

“(III) describes the efforts of States—

“(aa) to update cybersecurity measures for EBT cards; and

“(bb) to reimburse stolen benefits; and

“(IV) examines usability issues of EBT cards, including issues that present barriers to households using benefits or affect fraud prevention goals.

“(ii) RESTRICTED ANNEX.—The report under clause (i) may include a nonpublicly available annex containing classified or law enforcement-sensitive information and any identifying merchant information.”.

(b) ONLINE TRANSACTION SECURITY.—Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(16) ONLINE TRANSACTION SECURITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In promulgating and updating, as necessary, the regulations under paragraph (15)(B)(i), the Secretary shall, with respect to online transactions using EBT cards (or any successor financial product used for a substantially similar purpose)—

“(i) require security measures that—

“(I) are effective in detecting and preventing theft of benefits through online transactions, including the theft of data from online merchants that may compromise the ability of a household to use benefits in transactions with other merchants, either online or in-person; and

“(II) prevent sensitive data from being stolen during online transactions and securely manage sensitive data generated by online transactions, including through cybersecurity enhancements for online retailers;

“(ii) establish standard reporting methods for States to collect and share data with the Secretary on the scope of benefits and data being stolen through online transactions; and

“(iii) in carrying out clauses (i) and (ii), take into consideration the feasibility of cost, availability, and implementation for States.

“(B) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall consult with the Director of the Administration for Children and Families, the Attorney General of the United States, State agencies, retail food stores, and EBT contractors—

“(i) on the measures, methods, and considerations under that subparagraph; and

“(ii) to determine—

“(I) how benefits are being stolen and sensitive data is being compromised through online transactions; and

“(II) how those stolen benefits and data are being used.

“(C) REPORT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(I) to the maximum extent practicable, information on the frequency of theft of benefits, the number of reported thefts from online transactions, the amount of benefits stolen through online transactions, and the online retailers most commonly compromised;

“(II) a description of the measures and methods developed, and considerations taken, under subparagraph (A);

“(III) the determinations made under subparagraph (B)(ii); and

“(IV) recommendations on how to consistently detect, track, report, and prevent theft of benefits, including the theft of data described in subparagraph (A)(i)(I).

“(ii) CONFIDENTIAL ANNEX.—The report under clause (i) may include a nonpublicly available confidential annex containing any identifying merchant information.”.

(c) ENSURING NO LOSS OF ACCESS TO BENEFITS DUE TO EBT CARD DAMAGE, LOSS, OR FRAUD.—Section 7(h)(7) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(7)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Regulations” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Regulations”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) ENSURING NO LOSS OF ACCESS TO BENEFITS DUE TO EBT CARD DAMAGE, LOSS, OR FRAUD.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Save America Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations requiring the following:

“(i) If an EBT card is damaged, no longer functions properly, is stolen, or is frozen due to fraud, the applicable State shall take the necessary steps to ensure that the household receives a replacement card, either by mail or in person, as selected by the household, not later than 3 business days after the household submits to the State a request for a replacement EBT card.

“(ii) A State shall not require, but shall offer as an option, in-person collection of a new or replacement EBT card.”.

(d) NO REPLACEMENT FEES FOR CERTAIN EBT CARDS.—Section 7(h)(8)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)(8)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “A State agency” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a State agency”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—Beginning 60 days after the date of enactment of the Save America Act, a State agency may not collect a charge under clause (i) if the replacement of the EBT card is due to—

“(I) the EBT card malfunctioning;

“(II) suspected or reported fraud relating to that EBT card by an individual outside of the household to which the EBT card belongs;

“(III) the expiration of the EBT card; or

“(IV) required replacement of the EBT card in compliance with regulations promulgated pursuant to paragraph (15)(B).”.

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR RETAILER USE OF CHIP-ENABLED PAYMENT TERMINALS AS A CONDITION OF SNAP PARTICIPATION.—Section 9(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—
(A) by striking “(2) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(2) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary”; and

(B) by indenting the margins of subparagraphs (A) and (B) appropriately;
(2) by indenting the margin of paragraph (3) appropriately; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) CHIP-ENABLED PAYMENT TERMINALS.—Beginning not later than 180 days after the date on which the regulations promulgated pursuant to section 7(h)(15)(B)(i) become final, the Secretary shall require retail food stores and wholesale food concerns seeking authorization or reauthorization to accept and redeem benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program to have a chip-enabled (as defined in section 7(h)(15)(A)) payment terminal at each retail location of the retail food store or wholesale food concern.”.

(f) REPORT ON EBT CARDS ISSUED IN PUERTO RICO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and make publicly available on the website of the Department of Agriculture, a report on the security of EBT cards (as defined in section 3 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012)) issued in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, including—

(A) the resistance of those EBT cards to cloning; and

(B) if appropriate, recommendations for improving the security of the electronic benefit transfer system against EBT card cloning-based fraud.

(2) RESTRICTED ANNEX.—The report under paragraph (1) may include a nonpublicly available annex containing classified or law enforcement-sensitive information.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 501 of division HH of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023 (7 U.S.C. 2016a), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” at the end;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C); and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(vi), by striking “measures” and all that follows through “(a)(1)” and inserting “measures”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” at the end;

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end; and

(iv) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “subsection (a)(3)” and inserting “subsection (a)(1)”.

SA 4447. Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—RESTORING PATIENT PROTECTIONS AND AFFORDABILITY

Subtitle A—Consumer Protections

SEC. 201. RESTORATION OF TEMPORARY ENHANCED PREMIUM CREDITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Clause (iii) of section 36B(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “January 1, 2026” and inserting “January 1, 2029”; and

(2) by striking “2025” in the heading and inserting “2028”.

(b) TAXPAYERS WHOSE HOUSEHOLD INCOME EXCEEDS 400 PERCENT OF THE POVERTY LINE.—Section 36B(c)(1)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “January 1, 2026” and inserting “January 1, 2029”; and

(2) by striking “2025” in the heading and inserting “2028”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 202. ADDITIONAL OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR PLAN YEAR 2026.

With respect to plan year 2026, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall require Exchanges to provide an additional open enrollment period under section 1311(c)(6) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(c)(6)) during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2026.

SEC. 203. RESTORING NAVIGATOR PROGRAM.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 1311(i)(6) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(i)(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Grants under” and inserting the following:

“(A) STATE EXCHANGES.—In the case of an Exchange established and operated by a State pursuant to subsection (b), grants under”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) FEDERAL EXCHANGES.—For purposes of carrying out this subsection with respect to an Exchange established and operated by the Secretary pursuant to section 1321(c), the Secretary shall obligate \$100,000,000 out of amounts collected through the user fees on participating health insurance issuers pursuant to section 156.50 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulations) for fiscal year 2026. Such amount so obligated for a fiscal year shall remain available until expended.”.

(b) STANDARDS.—Section 1311(i)(4)(A) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(i)(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) charge any fees to applicants or enrollees; or

“(iv) request any form of remuneration from or on behalf of any applicant or enrollee.”.

SEC. 204. REPEAL OF DISALLOWANCE OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT IN CASE OF CERTAIN COVERAGE ENROLLED IN DURING SPECIAL ENROLLMENT PERIOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 36B(c)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by Public Law 119–21, is amended by striking clause (iii).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to plan years beginning after December 31, 2025.

Subtitle B—Health Plan Accountability

SEC. 211. MINIMUM NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR PLAN YEAR 2025 ENROLLEES.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall require each health insurance

issuer that offered a qualified health plan through a Federal or State Exchange for plan year 2025 to notify, not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, all individuals enrolled in such plan for any month during plan year 2025 of—

(1) changes to eligibility for premium assistance credits, and to the premium assistance credit amounts, under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that first take effect with respect to plan year 2026;

(2) the additional open enrollment period for plan year 2026 pursuant to section 202; and

(3) any additional information relating to such eligibility and enrollment, as the Secretary determines appropriate, including the website and phone number for the applicable Federal or State Exchange.

SEC. 212. MINIMUM NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR PLAN YEAR 2026 ENROLLEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall require each health insurance issuer that offers a qualified health plan through a Federal or State Exchange for plan year 2026 to notify all individuals enrolled in such plan for plan year 2026 of—

(1) changes to eligibility for premium assistance credits, and to the premium assistance credit amounts, under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that first take effect with respect to plan year 2026;

(2) the additional open enrollment period for plan year 2026 pursuant to section 202; and

(3) any additional information relating to such eligibility and enrollment, as the Secretary determines appropriate, including the website and phone number for the applicable Federal or State Exchange.

(b) TIMING.—The notification by a health insurance issuer under subsection (a) shall be made—

(1) not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to individuals enrolled in such plan as of the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) not later than 15 days after an individual's enrollment, with respect to individuals enrolling, after such date of enactment, in the plan during the additional open enrollment period under section 202 for plan year 2026.

SEC. 213. HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORT FROM ISSUER.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each health insurance issuer that is subject to the reporting requirements under sections 201 and 202 shall submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services a report attesting to compliance with the requirements under sections 201 and 202.

(b) CONSOLIDATED REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Education and Workforce of the House of Representatives a report that consolidates the reports submitted by issuers under subsection (a).

SEC. 214. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the process set forth in subsections (d) and (e) of section 156.805 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), the Secretary of Health and Human Services may impose a civil monetary penalty upon any health insurance issuer who fails to comply with the notification requirements under section 201 or 202 or the reporting requirements under section 203.

(b) PENALTY AMOUNTS.—

(1) VIOLATIONS REGARDING NOTICE TO ENROLLEES.—In the case of a violation of section 201 or 202, such penalty shall be in the amount equal to \$1,000 for each individual enrolled in a plan for plan year 2025 or 2026 who did not receive a notice as required under section 201 or 202, as applicable, for each day between the date on which such notice was due and the date on which the notice is provided.

(2) REPORTING VIOLATIONS.—In the case of a violation of section 203, such penalty shall be in the amount of \$1,000 per day for each individual enrolled in health insurance coverage with respect to which the report is required, for each day between the date on which the report under section 302 was due and the date on which the report is submitted.

Subtitle C—Eliminating Red Tape

SEC. 221. APPLYING COMMERCIAL MARKET POLICY TO REENROLLMENT PROCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 36B(c)(5)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by Public Law 119–21, is amended by striking “, using applicable enrollment information that shall be provided or verified by the applicant.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2027.

SEC. 222. PROTECTION AGAINST BUREAUCRATIC COVERAGE DENIALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1311(c)(6) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(c)(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) special enrollment periods for any individual denied the advance payment for which the individual applies for one or more months pending the verification prescribed by section 36B(c)(5)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to permit enrollment of any such individual following such verification; and”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2028.

SEC. 223. AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT FROM BRONZE TO SILVER LEVEL QUALIFIED HEALTH PLANS OFFERED ON EXCHANGES.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall revise section 155.335(j) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation) to ensure that, with respect to reenrollments for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2026, a Federal or State Exchange established under subtitle D of title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18021 et seq.) may reenroll an individual who was enrolled in a bronze level qualified health plan in a silver level qualified health plan (as such terms are defined in section 1301(a) and described in 1302(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 18021(a); 18022(d))).

Subtitle D—Market Stabilization

SEC. 231. RESTORING MARKETPLACE FLEXIBILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1311(c)(6) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18031(c)(6)), as amended by section 222(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a special enrollment period once per month for any individual who is eligible for the advance payment of premium tax credits under section 1412 and whose household income is not expected to exceed 150 percent of the poverty line for a family of the size involved.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2026.

SEC. 232. NO HEALTH PLAN GOUGING.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) revise section 156.140(c) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), to provide that, for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2026, the allowable variation in the actuarial value of a health plan applicable under such section shall be the allowable variation for such plan applicable under such section for plan year 2025; and

(2) revise section 156.400 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regula-

tion), to provide that, for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2026, the term “de minimis variation for a silver plan variation” means a minus 0 percentage point and plus 2 percentage point allowable actuarial value variation.

SEC. 233. PROTECTING CONTINUITY OF COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall revise section 155.305(f)(4) of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation) to provide that an Exchange may determine an enrollee ineligible for an advance premium tax credit under section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as described in such section 155.305(f)(4) only after a taxpayer (or a taxpayer’s spouse, if married) has failed to file a Federal income tax return and reconcile their past advance premium tax credit for 2 consecutive years for which tax data will be utilized for verification of household income and family size.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2026.

SEC. 234. PROTECTING ENROLLEES FROM SURPRISE PREMIUM BILLS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 36B(f)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by Public Law 119–21, is amended—

(1) by striking “If the advanced payments” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the advanced payments”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) LIMITATION ON INCREASE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer whose household income is less than 400 percent of the poverty line for the size of the family involved for the taxable year, the amount of the increase under subparagraph (A) shall in no event exceed the applicable dollar amount determined in accordance with the following table (one-half of such amount in the case of a taxpayer whose tax is determined under section 1(c) for the taxable year):

	The applicable dollar amount is:
“If the household income (expressed as a percentage of the poverty line) is:	
Less than 200%	\$600
At least 200% but less than 300%	\$1,500
At least 300% but less than 400%	\$2,500.

“(ii) INDEXING OF AMOUNT.—In the case of any calendar year beginning after 2014, each of the dollar amounts in the table contained under clause (i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 2016’ in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

If the amount of any increase under clause (i) is not a multiple of \$50, such increase shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$50.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 35(g)(12)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “the amount determined under clause (i) shall be substituted for the amount determined under section 36B(f)(2)” and inserting “then section 36B(f)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting the amount determined

under clause (i) for the amount determined under section 36(f)(2)(A)”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 235. NO ACA AND EMPLOYER COVERAGE PREMIUM SPIKES.

Section 1302(c)(4) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18022(c)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “For calendar year 2026 and each subsequent calendar year, the lower bound of the allowable premium adjustment percentage for purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(i) is the lower bound of the premium adjustment percentage that applied under this paragraph for plan year 2022 using National Health Expenditure Accounts projections of average per enrollee employer-sponsored insurance premiums.”.

SA 4448. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP REQUIRED FOR FIREARM TRANSFERS.

Section 5812(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and his photograph” and inserting “, his photograph, and documentary proof of United States citizenship, as defined in section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502)”.

SA 4449. Mr. MURPHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . DOCUMENTARY PROOF OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP REQUIRED FOR MACHINEGUN PURCHASES.

Section 5861 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) in subsection (l), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) to receive or possess a machinegun unless such person presents documentary proof of United States citizenship, as defined in section 3 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20502).”.

SA 4450. Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . NO REWARDS FOR JANUARY 6 RIOTERS.

(a) LIMITATIONS ON USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds, including funds appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the “Judgment Fund”), or any victim compensation fund, may be used to compensate any individual prosecuted for involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, including any individual so prosecuted and subsequently pardoned.

(2) PROHIBITION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMPENSATION FUND.—No compensation fund shall be established for the purpose of compensating individuals described in paragraph (1).

(b) RESTITUTION AND FINES NOT TO BE REFUNDED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be disbursed from the United States Treasury to refund any court-ordered compensation, including restitution, fines, or special assessments, paid by any individual convicted for involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, including any individual so convicted and subsequently pardoned.

(2) TRANSFER TO AOC.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer any amounts described in paragraph (1) to the Architect of the Capitol.

SA 4451. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. PADILLA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “No Settlements for January 6 Law Enforcement Assaulters Act”.

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON LEGAL SETTLEMENTS FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL CONVICTED OF ASSAULTING A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER IN CONNECTION WITH BREACHING THE CAPITOL ON JANUARY 6, 2021.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered individual” means an individual who has been convicted of an offense involving assaulting a law enforcement officer, including a violation of section 111 of title 18, United States Code, or a violation of section 432 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia (sec. 22-405, D.C. Official Code), in connection with the events that occurred at or near the Capitol on January 6, 2021.

(b) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds, including amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the “Judgment Fund”), may be obligated or expended for any legal settlement to a covered individual if the claims giving rise to such settlement are based on alleged harm suffered by the covered individual—

(1) during the events that occurred at or near the Capitol on January 6, 2021; or

(2) from prosecution for an offense relating to such events.

SA 4452. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXCLUSION OF INDIVIDUALS NOT LAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES FROM NUMBER OF PERSONS USED TO DETERMINE APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES AND NUMBER OF ELECTORAL VOTES.

(a) EXCLUSION.—Section 22(a) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress”, approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(a)), is amended by inserting after “not taxed” the following: “and individuals who are not lawfully present in the United States”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the apportionment of Representatives carried out pursuant to the decennial census conducted during 2030 and any succeeding decennial census.

SA 4453. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING VACCINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) There is strong bipartisan support for wide access to vaccines, ensuring vaccines are affordable, trusting science and relying on peer-reviewed medical information, and protecting all individuals, especially children and vulnerable populations, from preventable illness.

(2) It is dangerous and harmful to children’s health to promote conspiracy theories and restrict access to life-saving preventive medicine, including vaccines.

(3) Having a high rate of community adoption of vaccines is critical to protect individ-

uals who medically cannot receive certain vaccinations, including infants and individuals with weakened immune systems, such as cancer patients.

(4) Routine childhood immunizations for children born between 1994 and 2023 have prevented approximately 508,000,000 cases of illness, approximately 32,000,000 hospitalizations, and over 1,100,000 deaths, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(5) Measles is a highly contagious and deadly disease with a range of serious health complications, and the measles, mumps, and rubella vaccine (MMR) is safe and effective in preventing this disease and has prevented over 60,000,000 deaths worldwide between 2000 and 2023.

(6) COVID-19 has caused over 1,200,000 deaths in the United States and over 7,100,000 deaths worldwide, with fatalities dropping dramatically once the COVID-19 vaccine became widely available.

(7) After the hepatitis A vaccine was introduced in 1995, between 1996 and 2011, the rate of hepatitis A infection dropped by 95 percent.

(8) After the hepatitis B vaccine was introduced with implementation of the birth dose recommendation, there has been a 95 percent reduction in infant hepatitis B infections, and an estimated 90,100 deaths have been prevented.

(9) Polio was a major cause of significant disability and paralysis of children prior to the polio vaccine being released in 1955, with over 21,000 paralytic cases in 1952, and the disease was eradicated in the United States by 1979 due to effectiveness of the vaccine.

(10) Diphtheria, described in history dating back to the 5th century, is a contagious disease that causes respiratory illness, has a 30 percent fatality rate (with higher fatality rates for young children), and caused up to 15,000 deaths in the United States annually in the 1920s, but due to widespread vaccination, there has been only 1 reported death from diphtheria in the United States between 1996 and 2018.

(11) Smallpox is a deadly disease that has existed for over 3000 years, with a fatality rate around 30 percent, that was eradicated in the United States by 1949 and worldwide by 1977, due to the effectiveness of vaccines.

(12) Vaccines for seniors, including vaccines for influenza, COVID-19, and shingles, are a critical prevention tool to keep older individuals healthy and out of the hospital.

(13) There are numerous additional diseases, including some cancers, that are preventable by vaccines.

(14) Vaccine research to discover new ways to prevent additional disease or treat disease should continue to receive Federal research funding with no political interference.

(15) Availability and insurance coverage of vaccines for the entire population through a wide range of medical and community settings, such as pharmacies, clinics, hospitals, physician offices, health departments, health centers, mobile clinics, and other locations, is essential to ensure access to vaccines and protect public health.

(16) Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on vaccines are tied to, and impact, a wide array of health programs, including the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), the program under section 1928 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396s; commonly referred to as the “Vaccines for Children program”), the TRICARE program under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, hospital care and medical services furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs under chapters 17 and 18 of title 38, United States

Code, the Medicare program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), and private health insurance.

(17) A lack of private or public insurance coverage for vaccines could make vaccines prohibitively expensive for millions of patients to access, forcing patients to forego vaccinations due to cost.

(18) In June 2025, Secretary of Health and Human Services Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. took the unprecedented step of dismissing all 17 members of the previously independent Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and appointed a new set of members.

(19) Such Advisory Committee has advised the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on vaccine recommendations for more than 60 years.

(20) Secretary Kennedy's actions directly threatened access to the COVID-19 vaccine in several States, including Nevada, by making it more difficult for individuals who want the vaccine to get it.

(21) In September 2025, the State of Florida became the first State in modern history to take steps to eliminate its immunization requirements for schoolchildren, putting Florida children at a higher risk of contracting preventable diseases like measles, pertussis, and other life-threatening diseases.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) public health decisions should be based on science;

(2) the stance of the American Academy of Pediatrics and other professional medical organizations in strongly recommending immunization as the safest and most cost-effective way of preventing disease, disability, and death should be supported;

(3) States taking steps to weaken school immunization requirements puts children and vulnerable individuals at serious risk;

(4) the anti-vaccine policies proposed by the State of Florida in September 2025 should be opposed;

(5) the misguided policies of Secretary of Health and Human Services Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. that are based on anti-vaccine conspiracy theories and have resulted in confusion, fear, and lack of vaccine access for American families should be condemned;

(6) the politicization of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and calls for a return to relying on unbiased and qualified medical professionals should be opposed;

(7) vaccines, including for COVID-19, should remain accessible, including through insurance coverage, and that the government should not mandate policies that make COVID-19 vaccines unavailable for those who want them; and

(8) vaccines—

(A) are critical to protecting public health, eliminating preventable illness and death, and reducing hospitalization and severity of illness;

(B) work best when adopted at a high rate within each community; and

(C) should remain easily accessible and affordable, without restriction.

SA 4454. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. **SENSE OF CONGRESS CONDEMNING FINANCIAL COMPENSATION FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TO PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP TIED TO PREVIOUS FEDERAL INVESTIGATIONS INTO HIS UNLAWFUL ACTIONS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The President of the United States holds a constitutional duty to faithfully execute the laws of the United States and an obligation to respect the independence of the Department of Justice's prosecutorial role.

(2) The Department of Justice is the preeminent law enforcement agency of the United States and must remain free from personal influence, political coercion, or self-dealing by any elected official, including the President.

(3) Any demand by a President for personal financial compensation from the Department of Justice, an agency under the executive branch of the Federal Government that he or she oversees, represents an extraordinary abuse of the public trust and a breach of fundamental ethical norms.

(4) President Trump, as a private citizen, filed administrative complaints seeking payments from the Federal Government for alleged damages related to a Federal Bureau of Investigation and Special Counsel investigation into his conduct during the 2016 election and his handling of classified documents.

(5) These complaints may ultimately be reviewed by employees of the Department of Justice who have worked closely with President Trump in his capacity as a private citizen and political candidate.

(6) In January 2025, the Department of Justice removed Associate Deputy Attorney General Bradley Weinsheimer, the senior career ethics official in the Department, from his position.

(7) In March 2025, the Department of Justice fired Jeffrey Ragsdale, the Director and Chief Counsel of the Office of Professional Responsibility, who was responsible for overseeing the office within the Department of Justice that investigates attorney misconduct.

(8) In July 2025, the Department of Justice fired Joseph Tirrell, the Director of the Departmental Ethics Office, who was responsible for advising the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General on ethics and overseeing the ethics program of the Department of Justice.

(9) On October 21, 2025, President Trump alleged that he had "a lawsuit that was doing very well" and stated that the Department of Justice would "owe [him] a lot of money".

(10) The public or private attempts by the President to extract \$230,000,000 in personal payments from the Department of Justice raise serious questions about violations of article II, section 1, clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States (commonly known as the "Domestic Emoluments Clause"), misuse of Government funds, and potential violations of Federal ethics and anti-corruption laws.

(11) Such actions erode public confidence in the impartial administration of justice.

(12) Taxpayer dollars will be used to pay for any financial award to the President.

(13) The people of the United States are struggling with an unprecedented housing affordability crisis, rising health care costs due to cuts by the Trump Administration and Republicans in Congress and their failure to address expiring tax credits that directly lower the cost of private health insurance, and other rising costs due to inflation and the tariffs imposed by President Trump.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Congress—

(1) condemns in the strongest possible terms the calls by President Donald Trump

for the Department of Justice to pay him \$230,000,000;

(2) opposes the provision of financial compensation through lawsuits, paid from taxpayer money, to President Trump;

(3) urges any officials of the Department of Justice with personal or professional ties to President Trump to recuse themselves from any review or settlement of these administrative complaints;

(4) affirms the foundational principle that no public office may be used for personal enrichment;

(5) reaffirms its commitment to the independence of the Department of Justice's prosecutorial role and the rule of law; and

(6) calls upon all public officials, including the President of the United States, to uphold the highest ethical standards and to place the public interest above personal gain.

SA 4455. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. **NO PARDON FOR GHISLAINE MAXWELL.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In December 2021, a jury in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York found Ghislaine Maxwell guilty of multiple felony offenses relating to the sexual exploitation of minors, resulting from her illegal activities with convicted child trafficker Jeffrey Epstein.

(2) In June 2022, a judgment of conviction was entered against Ghislaine Maxwell in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York of—

(A) conspiracy to transport minors with intent to engage in criminal sexual activity in violation section 371 of title 18, United States Code;

(B) transportation of a minor with intent to engage in criminal sexual activity in violation of section 2423(a) of title 18, United States Code; and

(C) sex trafficking of a minor in violation of subsections (a) and (b)(2) of section 1591 of title 18, United States Code.

(3) Ghislaine Maxwell was subsequently sentenced to 20 years in Federal prison for her role in facilitating and enabling the sexual abuse and exploitation of minors.

(4) The accountability of individuals convicted of crimes involving the sexual exploitation and trafficking of minors is essential to the protection of children and the integrity of the justice system.

(5) President Donald Trump has publicly stated that he possesses the authority to grant a pardon to Ghislaine Maxwell in this matter and has declined to categorically rule out exercising such authority.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the conviction and sentence imposed upon Ghislaine Maxwell reflect the seriousness and gravity of her offenses involving the sexual exploitation and trafficking of minors;

(2) granting a pardon, commutation, or any other form of executive clemency to Ghislaine Maxwell would be inconsistent with the interests of justice and accountability for crimes involving the sexual exploitation of children;

(3) the President should not grant a pardon, commutation, or any other form of executive clemency to Ghislaine Maxwell; and

(4) the Senate stands with the victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking and affirms its commitment to justice, accountability, and the protection of children.

SA 4456. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION ON TAXPAYER-FUNDED POLITICAL CONSULTING FIRMS AND POLITICAL ADVERTISING AND MARKETING FIRMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CABINET MEMBER.—The term “Cabinet Member” means—

(A) an individual serving in a position at level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5312 of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) any other individual who occupies a position designated by the President as a Cabinet-level position.

(2) FINANCIAL RELATIONSHIP.—The term “financial relationship” means any relationship in which financial compensation is derived directly or indirectly from a pecuniary interest.

(3) OFFICIAL ADVERTISEMENT.—The term “official advertisement” means an advertisement sponsored by the executive branch to communicate any policy priority of a Government entity, including of a Federal agency or department or a presidential administration.

(4) POLITICAL ADVERTISING AND MARKETING FIRM.—The term “political advertising and marketing firm” means a professional business that is eligible for a contract with the Government that is dedicated to the creation and execution of promotional materials and marketing for the clients of the business, including the Government.

(5) POLITICAL CONSULTING FIRM.—The term “political consulting firm” means a professional services company that is eligible for a contract with the Government to provide advice, feedback, strategy, and skills.

(6) SENIOR EXECUTIVE POLITICAL APPOINTEE.—The term “senior executive political appointee” means an individual who is—

(A) employed in a position described in sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the Executive Schedule);

(B) a limited term appointee, limited emergency appointee, or noncareer appointee in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraphs (5), (6), and (7), respectively, of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

(C) employed in a position of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(7) SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE.—The term “special Government employee” means a special Government employee, as defined in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code, who is employed in the executive branch.

(b) PROHIBITION ON TAXPAYER-FUNDED POLITICAL CONSULTING FIRMS AND POLITICAL ADVERTISING AND MARKETING FIRMS.—A Cabinet Member may not use any funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law to hire a political consulting firm or political advertising and marketing firm to develop and disseminate any official advertisement relating to the position of the Cabinet Member, the agency or department of which the Cabinet Member is the head, or the official duties of the Cabinet Member if—

(1) the Cabinet Member is an officer or employee of the political consulting firm or political advertising and marketing firm;

(2) the Cabinet Member has a financial relationship with the political consulting firm or political advertising and marketing firm; or

(3) any senior executive political appointee or special Government employee who reports to the Cabinet Member or who is employed by the agency or department of which the Cabinet Member is the head has a financial relationship with the political consulting firm or political advertising and marketing firm.

(c) PROHIBITION ON EXPEDITING OPEN BIDDING FOR OFFICIAL ADVERTISEMENTS.—Except as otherwise provided by existing Federal law, a Cabinet Member shall, when entering into a contract for an official advertisement, comply with all applicable requirements related to the full and open competitive procedures required under chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, and part 6 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(d) PROHIBITION ON SELF-PROMOTION THROUGH OFFICIAL ADVERTISEMENTS.—A Cabinet Member may not use any official advertisement for the primary purpose of self-promotion.

SA 4457. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. TUBERVILLE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4420 proposed by Mr. THUNE (for Mr. SCHMITT) to the bill S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title III and insert the following:

TITLE III—SAVE AMERICAN CHILDREN

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Chloe Cole Act”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) CHILD.—The term “child” means an individual under 18 years of age.

(2) COVERED INTERVENTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) INTERVENTIONS.—The term “covered interventions” means providing any of the items and services described in clause (ii) for the purpose of—

(I) intentionally delaying, halting, or disrupting the natural development of the individual’s body, including the onset or progression of puberty, so that it does not develop or halts developing to correspond to the individual’s sex; or

(II) intentionally changing the individual’s body, including the individual’s external appearance or biological functions, to no longer correspond to the individual’s sex.

(ii) ITEMS AND SERVICES.—The items and services described in this clause are—

(I) the use of puberty blockers, including gonadotropin releasing hormone agonists and antagonists;

(II) the use of sex hormones, such as androgen blockers, estrogen, anti-estrogen, progesterone, testosterone, or dihydrotestosterone blockers; and

(III) surgical procedures that attempt to transform an individual’s physical appearance or that attempt to alter or remove an individual’s sexual organs.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “covered interventions” does not include any of the following:

(i) Appropriate and medically necessary procedures to treat a verifiable disorder of sexual development, including an individual born with 46 XX chromosomes with virilization, with 46 XY chromosomes with

undervirilization, or having both ovarian and testicular tissue.

(ii) The treatment of any infection, injury, disease, or disorder that has been caused or exacerbated by the performance of an intervention described in subparagraph (A) without regard to whether the intervention was performed in accordance with State or Federal law or whether the intervention is covered by the private right of action under section 304.

(iii) Any intervention undertaken because the individual suffers from any diagnosed and verifiable condition of the body’s organ systems, including the following:

(I) Traumatic bodily injuries (such as fractures, organ rupture, or penetrating trauma).

(II) Congenital structural anomalies of major organs or systems, including the cardiovascular, respiratory, renal, hepatic, neurological, or musculoskeletal systems.

(III) Acute illnesses with a high probability of rapid mortality.

(3) DETransition TREATMENT.—The term “detransition treatment” means any treatment, medical intervention, or surgery, that stops, reverses the effects of, or aids in the recovery from the effects of, a prior covered intervention.

(4) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL.—The term “health care professional” means an individual who is licensed, certified, or otherwise authorized by the laws of a State to administer health care in the ordinary course of the practice of his or her profession or performing such acts which require such licensure.

(5) PARTICIPATE.—The term “participate”, with respect to acts constituting a covered intervention as defined in paragraph (1), means directly engaging in the planning, authorization, prescription, administration, or performance of any such act, including any of the following:

(A) Prescribing puberty blockers, sex hormones, or related medications with the intent to delay, halt, or interrupt an individual’s puberty or to alter an individual’s physical appearance or reproductive function to align with an identity differing from his or her sex.

(B) Administering medications or treatments described in subparagraph (A) with such intent, whether by injection, oral delivery, or other means.

(C) Performing surgical procedures that attempt to transform an individual’s appearance to no longer correspond to the individual’s sex as part of a covered intervention.

(D) Authorizing or directing such covered intervention as a supervising health care professional or institutional representative.

(E) Knowingly planning or coordinating the provision of treatments or procedures described above in subparagraph (A), (C), or (D) with the intent to facilitate a covered intervention.

(6) SEX.—The term “sex” means a person’s immutable biological classification, determined at the moment of conception, as either male or female, as follows:

(A) The term “female” is a person who naturally has, had, will have, or would have but for a congenital anomaly or intentional or unintentional disruption, the reproductive system that produces, transports, and utilizes the large gamete (ova) for fertilization.

(B) The term “male” is a person who naturally has, had, will have, or would have but for a congenital anomaly or intentional or unintentional disruption, the reproductive system that produces, transports, and utilizes the small gamete (sperm) for fertilization.

SEC. 303. PROHIBITION ON COVERED INTERVENTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—No health care professional, hospital, or clinic shall, in a circumstance described in subsection (b), participate in a covered intervention on a child, and a health care professional, hospital, or clinic may commence participation in a treatment that qualifies as an exception specified in clauses (i) through (iii) of section 302(1)(B) only after determining that clear and convincing evidence supports a determination that the treatment so qualifies.

(b) **CIRCUMSTANCES DESCRIBED.**—The circumstances described in this subsection are that—

(1) the defendant or child traveled in interstate or foreign commerce, or traveled using a means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, in furtherance of or in connection with the participation in the covered intervention;

(2) the defendant used a means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce in furtherance of or in connection with the participation in the covered intervention;

(3) any payment of any kind was made, directly or indirectly, in furtherance of or in connection with the participation in the covered intervention using any means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce;

(4) the defendant transmitted in interstate or foreign commerce any communication relating to or in furtherance of the participation in the covered intervention using any means, channel, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce by any means or in any manner, including by computer, mail, wire, or electromagnetic transmission;

(5) any instrument, item, substance, or other object that has traveled in interstate or foreign commerce was used to perform the covered intervention;

(6) the covered intervention occurred within the District of Columbia, the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or any territory or possession of the United States; or

(7) the covered intervention otherwise occurred in or affected interstate or foreign commerce.

SEC. 304. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual subjected as a child to a covered intervention prohibited by section 303, or the parents or legal guardians of such individual, may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States for damages against any health care professional, hospital, or clinic, who participates in the covered intervention on that child. Such a cause of action shall be available regardless of whether the alleged covered intervention occurred before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **DAMAGES.**—Damages available pursuant to such an action may include—

(1) compensatory damages, including all economic damages associated with undoing, correcting, or ameliorating the effects or results of any covered intervention;

(2) non-economic damages for emotional distress and pain and suffering; and

(3) punitive damages, if the claimant proves by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant against whom punitive damages are sought acted maliciously, intentionally, fraudulently, or recklessly.

(c) **STRICT LIABILITY.**—Any health care professional, hospital, or clinic whose participation in a covered intervention on a child after the date of enactment of this Act is proven by clear and convincing evidence shall be strictly liable for damages for any

such intervention. If a treatment qualifies under an exception specified in clauses (i) through (iii) of section 302(2)(B), and that is raised as an affirmative defense to a violation of this title, the health care professional, hospital, or clinic shall bear the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that such exception applies.

SEC. 305. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

In this title:

(1) No liability for a health care professional under these provisions may be waived.

(2) Any ambiguities shall be resolved against any party found to have engaged in participation, as defined in section 302(5), in the covered intervention on a child.

(3) In any cases in which a covered intervention on a child is shown to have occurred before the date of enactment of this Act, there is limited deference to prevailing standards of care to the extent that such standards contradict the intent of this title and it is shown that the health care professional knew or should have known that such standards of care were in serious, scientific, and medical dispute at the time of the covered intervention.

(4) Nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit a health care professional from providing information about all available treatment options, discussing risks and benefits, or expressing professional medical opinions, so long as such actions do not constitute participation in a covered intervention.

SEC. 306. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

An action under section 304 may be brought within 25 years from the date of the eighteenth birthday of an individual subjected to a covered intervention as a child or within 4 years from the time the cost of a detransition treatment is incurred, whichever date is later.

SEC. 307. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, or the application of such a provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title, and the application of the provision held to be unconstitutional to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

SA 4458. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3183, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to improve safety standards for wildland firefighters, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Department of Justice shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the House of Representatives, and make available on the public website of the Department, a report that includes the following information:

(1) All records reflecting or relating to communications between any official of the Office of the Pardon Attorney, Office of the Attorney General, or Office of the Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Justice and any White House official regarding the December 1, 2025, formal pardon of Mr. Juan Orlando Hernández, former President of Honduras, who was convicted of drug trafficking and related crimes and sentenced to 45 years in prison.

(2) Any records in the possession of the Department corroborating any claim that the prosecution of Mr. Hernández was politically motivated or otherwise unsupported by evidence of criminal conduct.

(3) Any evidence of legal errors, procedural defects, or evidentiary insufficiencies in the prosecution or conviction of Mr. Hernández.

(4) A narrative description of how any evidence exonerating Mr. Hernández overcomes the weight of the evidence introduced at trial, such as—

(A) pictures of Mr. Hernández with drug traffickers at the 2010 World Cup despite his claims he did not know them;

(B) the audio recordings of members of the MS-13 gang discussing their payments to Mr. Hernández;

(C) the ledgers of the trafficker-witness who was murdered in prison; and

(D) phone data showing co-conspirators physically visited the presidential palace of Mr. Hernández at least twice.

(5) A summary of the timeline of the Federal law enforcement investigation into Mr. Hernández and his associates.

(6) A detailed description of the role of Mr. Emil Bove in the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of Mr. Hernández and his associates.

SA 4459. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 3183, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to improve safety standards for wildland firefighters, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FUNDING FOR COPS HIRING PROGRAM.

The Act titled “An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14” (Public Law 119-21) is amended—

(1) in section 100052—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT” and inserting “COPS HIRING PROGRAM”;

(B) by striking “In addition to” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to”; and

(C) in subsection (a), as so designated—

(i) by striking “Secretary of Homeland Security for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement” and inserting “Attorney General”; and

(ii) by striking “September 30, 2029” and all that follows through “removal proceedings” and inserting the following: “September 30, 2030, for grants made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1701(b) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)).”

“(b) **WAIVER.**—For grants made from funds made available under this section, the requirements of section 1701(g) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(g)) shall be waived for the following jurisdictions:

“(1) A county, municipality, town, township, village, parish, borough, or other unit of general government below the State level that employs fewer than 175 law enforcement officers.

“(2) A Tribal government that employs fewer than 175 law enforcement officers.”; and

(2) by striking section 90003 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 90003. EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.

“In addition to any amounts otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Attorney General for the Department of Justice for fiscal year 2025, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to

remain available until September 30, 2029, \$45,000,000,000, for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

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

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 17, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a subcommittee hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 17, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). The Democratic leader.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4124, S. 4125, S. 4126, S. 4127

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand that there are four bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4124) to prohibit funds made available to the Department of Justice from being used to make a personal payment to the President in connection with a claim that is subject to the Federal Tort Claims Act, whether in the form of a settlement or any other payment from the Judgment Fund for the personal benefit of the President.

A bill (S. 4125) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on damages received by certain officers of the United States on account of any civil action filed against the United States, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 4126) to address the ineligibility of Ashli Babbitt for military funeral honors.

A bill (S. 4127) making continuing appropriations for essential Transportation Security Administration pay and operations during the lapse in appropriations beginning on February 14, 2026, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Chairman of the

Senate Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 117-81, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on the National Defense Strategy: General John M. “Jack” Keane, US Army, Retired of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2026

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Wednesday, March 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate resume the House message with respect to S. 1383.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORENO. 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 Senators SCHIFF, LEE, CANTWELL, and myself.

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

The Senator from California.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam President, the author George Orwell wrote about a dystopian future in which the party in power spoke in doublespeak, a language in which up meant down and down meant up, good meant bad, and nothing was as it seemed.

In the language of Orwellian doublespeak, to save something meant to destroy it, which brings me to the so-called SAVE America Act.

This legislation will not save anything about America, but it will destroy something precious about this country. It is not meant to empower people to determine the direction of the Nation but to deprive them of that power; not to encourage citizen participation in government but to discourage it; not to heal a nation that is badly divided but to cause further division, disunion, and democratic decay—because this is perhaps one of the most cravenly political efforts undertaken by Congress in a generation.

The President knows that his policies are deeply unpopular. He knows that his war of choice with Iran is deeply unpopular. He understands that he has betrayed the promises he made to the American people to bring down costs and improve the quality of their lives. He knows that the voters are prepared to hold him accountable in the midterms and vote his party out of power.

But rather than address his many policy failures, he wishes, instead, to prevent people from voting. It is as cynical a device as it is destructive of the foundation of our democracy—the right to vote.

Our Nation is facing a series of challenges that are touching every facet of people's lives. They are paying more at the pump. They are paying more on groceries. They are paying more to heat their home, and this summer, they will pay more to cool it. This is all from a President that has gone from promising to break inflation on day one to now saying, “If prices rise, they rise.” Imagine that. If prices rise, they rise.

But that is not all. If the cost of oil goes up, he declares, that is good because it means we make more money.

Well, maybe he does. Maybe, the oil industry friends do. But the American people who are paying through the nose at gas stations all across the country are not making more money. They are spending it on gas at the pump, and they cannot afford it.

This war of choice is costing America billions. More importantly, 13 brave servicemembers have lost their lives in a new foreign war we were promised would never be started.

Now, we have heard a whole host of rationalizations for this war, explanations for this war. None of them add up. At one point, the President said that we had to go to war with Iran because Iran was 2 weeks away from having a nuclear bomb.

Well, beside the fact that there is no intelligence suggesting even remotely that that is true, the President himself said, only 9 months ago, that we had obliterated Iran's nuclear capability.

Well, it can't be both. The President was either telling the truth 9 months ago or he wasn't; or he is telling the truth now or he isn't. But it can't be both. And, of course, everything we know about Iran's nuclear program indicates they are not 2 weeks away from having a nuclear bomb.

So it was also said by the Secretary of State: We are at war with Iran because Israel was going to go to war with Iran, and we knew that Iran would retaliate against us; and, therefore, we had to go to war with Iran.

But the President disputes that rationale for the war. The President says, basically, that his Secretary of State is wrong, that he forced Israel's hand.

OK, so what is the President's rationale then for this war? Well, we all see that the President and the Secretary say it was necessary to destroy Iran's missile capability because those missiles could soon hit the United States of America, except that isn't remotely true either. The Defense Intelligence Agency concluded that it would not be 9 years before Iran would have that kind of capability. It would take 9 years for that country to develop missiles capable of hitting the United States.

So there was no imminent missile threat to the United States. There was no immediate nuclear threat.

That leaves regime change. The President has said that he wants Iranians to rise up and challenge the regime. At the same time, it is being publicly reported that he was warned that that would be extremely unlikely; that is, that the Iranian people would have the power to overturn this entrenched, murderous, terrorist-sponsoring regime; that this would not be Venezuela; that you couldn't simply take out the No. 1 mullah and expect to replace him with the No. 2 mullah that would do the United States' bidding; that that was not foreseeable, not likely, not probable.

Instead, the President was warned this could lead to an even more hard-line regime. And now, we don't have the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei. We have Mojtaba Khamenei, who is supposed to be potentially even worse.

So this is not about regime change. It is not about the missile program. It is not about the nuclear program. It is not because of Israel.

So what is it that led us into war? What is it that justifies the risk to the lives of our servicemembers? What is it that justifies the tragic reality that 200 of our servicemembers have already been injured in this conflict?

We are left to wonder. We haven't had a single public hearing about this. We have not had the opportunity to put any of these administration figures under oath to explain why we are at war; why the President betrayed his promise to keep us out of foreign war, to keep us out of regime-change wars, to keep us out of another Middle East war; why our servicemembers are bearing the brunt of this; why American consumers are bearing the brunt of this.

There are public reports that General Caine warned the President that Iran might attack our allies in the region, but the President expressed a surprise that this has happened. There is public reporting that the general also warned the President that Iran might seek to close the Strait of Hormuz. And Iran has effectively closed the Strait of Hormuz, and, as a result, we are all paying for that in skyrocketing prices at the pump.

All of this was all too eminently foreseeable. But here we are. Global oil markets and global shipping are seeing the seismic waves of Trump's war in Iran—a war without strategy, a war with different aims depending on the day, a war that some can't even bring themselves to call war because the moment they do—as the President calls it war, as the Secretary of War calls it war—but the moment that we in this Chamber call it war, we are acknowledging our own failure to live up to our institutional responsibility that this is the body with the power to declare war, not the President.

The Founders did something remarkable, at the time, when they entrusted that power to Congress—not the President, not the executive branch—because they feared a President who

would grow too fond of war. And this is exactly what has happened.

Our allies are not standing with us, a predictable outcome since we have not stood with them. The President says that China and Japan and all these other countries are going to join us in ushering ships into the Strait of Hormuz, but none of those countries are volunteering to do that.

We are seeing the time-tested proposition of regime-change wars: You break it, and you own it.

If you travel across California, as I have, you will hear not just about the sticker shock at the grocery store or the gas pump—and grocery prices are going to go up because fertilizer also transits through the Strait of Hormuz. The tariff policies are killing farmers, and the result is we are paying more at the grocery store.

But it is not just the grocery store. It is not just the gas station. You will hear about how there are no homes that average families can afford to buy, no apartments that teachers can afford or first responders. You will hear about the fire or the storm or the flood that turned the community upside down, like the fires we had in Los Angeles, when, a year later, they are still waiting for the Federal help that was promised them to rebuild.

You will hear about the community that is losing its only hospital or having trouble keeping its OB/GYN or recruiting an OB/GYN, its labor and delivery open because of drastic cuts to healthcare. And instead of investing in those critical parts of our community, we are spending \$1 billion a day with this war in Iran.

If you listen closer, you hear a mother ready to enter the golden years of her retirement, worried that her 401(k) won't be enough to get her through, if she is even lucky enough to have a 401(k); or a father in the prime of his working years but worried that Social Security may not be there when he is finally ready to retire; a parent raising a toddler, unable to return to work because the cost of childcare would erase whatever income they would make; a business owner unable to keep up with tariffs that have changed their input costs a dozen times the last 2 months; a farmer finally ready to give in and sell the farm to a big conglomerate after generations of tilling the land because trade wars and immigration raids have made farming impossible; a college student about to earn their degree seeing their world turned upside down by technological revolution and AI, wondering if their years of hard work and exams will amount to anything resembling a career; a high school student seeing a world on fire and wondering if their lives will be anything like what their parents enjoyed, if they can ever afford a home or to retire or have access to healthcare or raise a family or have a job that will sustain them, whether they can still live in a democracy even, or something less, something more sinister, some-

thing where Big Brother is watching and listening, where what they say can cost them their job or their future. I have heard a great many examples of these fears. My constituents have shared their deep concerns with me.

Linda from Moreno Valley wrote:

Dear Senator Schiff, I'm a retired teacher and having to make ends meet by picking up work here and there. 69 years old and for the first time in my life my family did not celebrate Thanksgiving or Christmas holidays 2025! Why?

I am hurting and don't have the money! Groceries, food prices are not down!

Gas prices are not down!

I could not pay the high drug price for prescription mid-month, so I went without. I fix a broken-down car every other month because I can't afford a new or used one right now.

Trump's tariffs have hurt me, and I don't foresee them as doing any good to us in the next three years. Somehow I just don't feel Great! Just sad.

From Leah in Modesto:

While billions are being spent on foreign conflict, many Americans here at home are struggling. I live in California and paid \$7.95/gal for gas today.

Economic inequality is another urgent issue. Current tax policies continue to benefit the ultra-wealthy while everyday Americans are left behind.

Working families need relief, opportunity and a system that feels fair and offers 20-somethings hope for a reasonable future, not one that widens the gap between the top and everyone else.

My 29-year-old daughter is in college, while still working 40 hours/week to survive and is actually thinking about not having children for fear of the inability to provide. That is not the future she wants.

From Sarah in Los Angeles, I heard:

I am writing as a constituent who is struggling under the burden of federal student loan payments that are no longer affordable.

Despite working full time in a helping profession, my monthly loan payment has increased to a level that threatens my ability to meet basic living expenses such as housing, healthcare, and utilities.

This is not a matter of poor planning or lack of responsibility, it is the result of a system that has become financially unsustainable for many working adults.

I urge you to use your position to push for policies that recognize the real cost of living and the long term impact of student debt on mental health, economic participation, and community stability.

Well, Sarah, if we weren't spending a billion dollars a day in Iran, that is a billion dollars a day we could be spending to buy down your student debt, to help other kids go to college and be able to afford it or go through training programs to train themselves for this brave new world of technology and AI that we are entering.

From Valerie in Redwood City, she writes:

I am writing because my [Gas] bill has doubled.

[My gas company] indicates that it has gone down that is not the case at all.

I am not able to retire because my bill has increased. I'm over 70 and a preschool teacher. I live in a condo and cannot afford solar panels. I don't turn on the heaters often I use heating pads on the floor. Thank you kindly for your help in this matter.

From Kiersten in Sausalito, I heard:

My husband is a first responder and law enforcement officer with the National Park Service and has served for 18 years.

He currently works in the Bay area, where income is adjusted for cost of living, but the childcare subsidy is not.

Our household gross income is \$185,000, with my husband earning \$105,000 of that.

Reliable childcare in Marin County costs well over \$3,000 per month, and that figure does not include the basic expenses required to live here, such as housing, food, and other necessities. The average cost of a house in our area is over \$1 million.

If I were to leave my job and stay home full time, we would not be able to afford comprehensive family healthcare through his government plan while also covering our basic living expenses. As it stands now, I am essentially working to cover health care for myself and our child, with the remainder of my income going toward childcare.

I would like to see efforts made to modernize and regionalize childcare subsidies so that families serving the federal government can realistically afford to live and work in the communities they serve.

From Sasha in Sacramento, Sasha writes:

Rent takes more than 43% of my net pay and my biggest fear is that my pets will become sick or injured when I can't afford their medical bills.

My grocery bill went up 33% from 2024 to 2025 and that was with me making changes to cut out expensive foods like fish and red meat.

As a registered voter, I am asking you to focus your attention to fix the economic freefall we are in.

These are the sentiments, these are the anxieties I hear every day at town-halls, in constituent meetings, in college dining halls, and dining room tables, in email after email, letter after letter, and call after call. Our mailboxes are full. People are scared. They are worried. They feel the kinds of anxiety that leaves them awake at night, turning over the numbers in their head and wondering if they will ever truly make ends meet.

We could confront these challenges. We could turn to any one of our legislative committees and take up these issues. We could bring up any number of bills that would lower costs, make our communities safer, bring home our troops from a war that the American people never asked for, but instead, the majority has seen fit to say in the face of all of these challenges that instead of solving them, they will simply take away people's right to vote because the American people are paying attention.

They have noticed that prices have not gone down on day one as the President promised. They have noticed gas prices climbing higher and higher. They have noticed Republicans saying that this is a sacrifice they should be comfortable making.

They have seen their groceries, their gas, their utility bills, their appliances, all rocked by mercurial trade policies and on-again, off-again tariffs. They know this Republican Congress' signature accomplishment—the largest healthcare funding cut in history and billions of dollars in food aid slashed to

fund a tax cut for wealthy people and large corporations—has only made matters worse.

And you know what? I know you have noticed it too. You have noticed these broken promises, and you have noticed that the American people are pissed. And they are ready to exercise that frustration at the ballot box to send a clear message.

But the response of the majority is to try to make it harder to vote. Now that it is their jobs on the line, they are finally trying to make it harder to get fired by doing away with your right to vote.

That is the SAVE America Act for you. It should be called the "Save Our Political Hides Act" because that is exactly what it is, a bill to supercharge the purging of voter rolls; a bill to give the Department of Homeland Security the power to decide who stays registered to vote and who gets kicked off; a bill to kill online voter registration; a bill to kill voter registration drives, to take away your ability to register to vote at the DMV or by mail; a bill that will reject every common form of identification, even your driver's license, if you want to register to vote: a service-member showing their military ID? Nope. That is not good enough if it isn't showing proof of citizenship.

If you are one of the millions of people who changed their names, their last names when they got married, sorry, it is going to be twice as hard for you to get your ballot. Online registration, registration by mail, registering at the DMV, voter registration drives, all these methods of signing up to vote would be illegal under this bill.

Four years ago, less than 6 percent of Americans registered to vote in person—less than 6 percent. Imagine living in rural California, now forced to drive hours away for even the chance to make your voice heard in November. A family vacation will now be used to get to the county clerk's office just to get a ballot, not to mention if you can't afford to take the time off work or if you are not able to get behind the wheel.

But let's say you make it to the county clerk's office, the Republican majority has sworn up and down that all they want for you is to show a driver's license to register to vote, but guess what. A driver's license won't be enough anymore.

If the SAVE America Act passes, neither driver's license or a military ID or a Tribal ID, none of that will be enough to register to vote. And what about that REAL ID, the upgraded license that the Federal Government has been urging Americans to get for the past several years? Nope. That is not good enough either. If that doesn't show proof of citizenship, that is not good enough either.

One in every two Americans don't have the passport needed to register to vote, and millions more won't have another one of the required methods either. Americans born here, voting here

all their lives, denied their ability to exercise their constitutional right by this bill.

Let's say you are just like Melania Knauss. You are a naturalized citizen and wanting to vote this November. You may even want to vote for the Republicans on your ballot. Well, now you discover you are like 69 million other women who have changed their name when they got married, which means that Melania Trump will now have to not only bring her proof of citizenship but also her marriage license to prove she is eligible to vote.

And so in this Republican SAVE America Act world, to even try to register for your constitutional right to vote, you might have to pay \$165 to get a passport, take the hours it will require of you to get to the clerk's office, the wages you will miss by getting there, the gas you will have to buy at a much higher rate now, and, inevitably, the bureaucracy will make you come back once or twice.

But let's assume you get all the way through the process of registering to vote in Trump's new federalized election system. Now, you face the prospect of actually casting your ballot. You go to the White House website right now, it will tell you they plan to use this bill as a basis to ban mail-in voting. That is not hyperbole; whitehouse.gov/saveAmerica, read it: "No mail-in ballots."

That means 47 million voters from the last election would have to find a new way to vote. And it is not just voters in California, which has gone out of its way to ensure your constitutional right is not an impossible one to exercise, nearly 3 million Floridians voted by mail. And that is not just Democrats. About one in five Republicans cast their ballot by mail in 2024—no longer, if the President gets his way.

Why make it so hard for Americans to exercise a constitutional right? Because Donald Trump has admitted the true aims of this bill. If the SAVE America Act becomes law, he says the Republican Party will "never lose a race in 50 years."

This is what this bill is designed to do. It is designed to lock in a Republican majority for half a century by locking you out of the polling place. Former—or soon-to-be-former Secretary Kristi Noem said that we need to make sure the "right people" are voting.

Well, who are the right people? The right people, I guess, are people they expect to vote for the President's party.

It used to be in this country both parties sought to increase voter turnout, that we both recognized it as an unmitigated good that more Americans were participating in elections. Not anymore.

This is nothing less than a deliberate campaign to undermine confidence in our elections.

The Speaker says we have a major voter fraud problem. He cites as his

evidence three Republican House candidates in California who he says were ahead on election day, but as absentee ballots came in, they fell further and further behind. He can't prove it, but to him, it stands to reason there must be fraud.

He knows better than that. That is just a pure falsehood. This is a deliberate campaign to undermine confidence in our elections. The seizing of ballot boxes in Georgia are meant to undermine confidence in our elections. The subpoenaing of records in Maricopa County are meant to undermine our confidence in elections. All the false talk about massive voter fraud is a complete fiction even according to the conservative Heritage Foundation—a complete fiction—and they would use this fiction to take away the legitimate franchise of millions of Americans.

Look, we have serious challenges in this country. We have a war that the American people don't want and don't support. We have the cost of basic necessities increasing all the time. We have a challenge we didn't face in the great recession or even the Great Depression. The problem today is not that people are out of work, although unemployment is rising. The problem today is that people are working, and they still can barely afford to get by.

That is the central challenge facing our country, and I think, until we grapple with that challenge, our democracy will be on fragile ground. When people see the quality of life their parents enjoyed as something better than what they have and when they look at their futures and they find it in doubt for their kids, all too many will entertain any demagogue who comes along and promises they alone can fix it.

But the answer cannot be to simply take away people's right to vote. We need to address that challenge to make the economy work for Americans again. Anyone working hard in this country should be able to provide for themselves and their families. That is what we should be focused on. That is what the President promised to do. Taking away their right to vote and turning us into some kind of—if not an autocracy, something less than a democracy, that is not the answer.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against this "Save our Political Heinies Act" and vote in favor of our democracy, to vote to expand the franchise to more and more Americans, not take it away because of the failure of the President's policies.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I thought I would give my colleague from California some fantastic news. There are so many times in politics we hear bad news, but I am going to give him good news. When he takes a mo-

ment to read the actual bill, you don't have to read much. You just go right to page 1.

It says:

Ensuring Only Citizens Are Registered to Vote in Elections.

It says right here, at the bottom, that you can provide any of the following. I am not a lawyer, but I assume "any" is a pretty comprehensive word that means "any."

It says:

A form of identification issued consistent—

Let me read this slowly—

consistent with the requirements of the Real ID Act of 2005.

He just stated that the Real ID does not count. On page 2, lines 1 through 4, a Real ID absolutely does count as voter ID.

The idea that asking somebody to prove they are a U.S. citizen one time when they register to vote and to show who they are every time they vote is basic common sense. Now, it is not common in California because, in California, they don't require that.

My Democrat colleague is walking out of the Chamber as I say this, but I also would have liked him to have heard even better news—even better news—which is that you can go to Ohio and get gas for a \$1.75 less than in California. Why? Because of California's ridiculous policies. That is what is driving the price of fuel up for his constituents.

Where is the price of gas right now that he was railing about? Twenty-one cents a gallon less than it was at the end of the Biden administration.

I know we get into a lot of arguments here, and I know I am going to have my amazing colleague from Utah go further into this bill, but I just wanted to very briefly debunk two very simple things: California's problems are California's causing. The reason your gas prices are high is because you have basically banned all fossil fuels in your State while begging—by the way, do you want to know how California gets gas today? It leaves the port in Jacksonville on a ship. It goes to the Bahamas. It gets unloaded from that ship onto another ship. It then traverses from the Bahamas, by the way, off the coast of Florida. It goes all the way around the Panama Canal and disembarks in California. Why? Because they refuse to have a pipeline go through their State. That is why the price of oil is high in California. It has nothing to do with what is going on in the Middle East, but yet we digress.

We are here to talk about two simple things: Should you have to prove you are a citizen when you register to vote and should you have to prove that you are who you are when you actually cast a ballot?

With that, I yield the floor to my colleague from Utah, who will go into the 28 pages of common sense that is in a very well-written bill.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we often consider difficult, complicated issues in this Chamber. It happens all the time. In fact, if it is not complicated, we sometimes wonder why we are devoting time to any particular matter. Very often, these are issues that don't enjoy consensus among the American people. We might have a degree of consensus over the existence of a problem but a thousand different ways of tackling that problem. In other instances, there might not even be consensus on whether a problem exists or what that problem might be. This is not one of those moments.

This issue could not be simpler. American elections are for American citizens. This is an assertion that is so elementary that its controversy is itself the only remarkable feature. There are 83 percent of Americans who support voter ID—83 percent. Out of 100 people, 83 of them believe that we need that. That is 95 percent of Republicans and 71 percent of Democrats. That is still 71 out of every 100 Democrats who agree with us.

Now think about that for a minute. How many issues in this country unite 83 percent of all Americans? This is one of them.

For months now, I have been working with colleagues, working with President Trump, and with citizens across this great country—citizens who have rallied behind this effort in numbers and with a degree of intensity that I have not seen in my entire time in the Senate, and I am now in my 16th year here. All of them are begging us to pass the SAVE America Act, not in a nonchalant, haphazard fashion but instead in a way that indicates they really feel it—that they feel it strongly, in fact. They understand the need for this.

I have heard one thing over and over and over again: Why would anyone oppose this? Who would oppose the notion that only American citizens can vote in American elections?

In this room, I can't imagine any of us would think that we, in not being citizens of the United Kingdom or of Yemen or of Japan or of the Philippines, could vote in elections in any of those countries. Why? Well, because we are not citizens of those countries.

If we happened to visit those countries, would that change anything? No, not a thing. What if we lived there for a few years but didn't become citizens? Still not. It still makes no difference. If we are not citizens, we wouldn't dream of being able to vote in their elections. Why should American elections be any different? Why should someone who is not a citizen of the United States of America be able to vote in a U.S. election? Well, of course, they shouldn't.

Look, the SAVE America Act takes those dynamics into account, and it says something very simple. It says that only American citizens should be able to vote in U.S. elections. And it does something very important. It

makes it easy to vote and hard to cheat. You need both of those ingredients to have a good election. It has got to be easy to vote and hard to cheat. You can achieve both at the same time just as you can chew gum and walk at the same time, but this is a whole lot more important than being able to chew gum while walking. In any free society that purports to have a representative government of any form, especially in a constitutional republic like ours, you must have both. You can't cut corners on either one. That is common sense, and yet here we are.

If you don't accept that only Americans should vote in American elections, then what exactly are you defending? Tell us why you want to make it easier for noncitizens to vote in our elections.

But, so far, what we have heard from Democrats is not that. What we have heard from Democrats in the U.S. Senate Chamber—and I say here “in the U.S. Senate Chamber” because that is different than Democrats nationwide wherein more than 7 out of 10 agree that we need reforms like what the SAVE America Act would bring about. It is only here in the Capital City of this great Nation; it is only here in this building—in Congress, in the House of Representatives and in the Senate—that this is considered volatile or somehow unacceptable by Democrats. It is only these Democrats who inhabit these hallways and who serve in these two legislative Chambers who regard this as somehow phenomenally controversial, and what we have heard from these Democrats here is nothing but fearmongering and outright lies.

Now, whether they themselves know that they are lies or they are just believing lies others have told them, that is a topic for a different day. I am not going to try to vet that out here. None of us can know what any other person is thinking or feeling, but I can assure you that these are, at their core, the product of fearmongering and of lies.

They told us that requiring proof of citizenship to vote in U.S. elections is somehow “racist.” The minority leader himself called this bill Jim Crow 2.0. Wow—what an accusation, what a crazy, absurd, ridiculous, and, frankly, insulting accusation. I think he owes the American people an explanation as to how requiring proof of citizenship to vote is tantamount to racial segregation laws. Racial segregation laws, under the banner of Jim Crow, the Democratic Party itself forced on a substantial portion of the American population over many decades in one of the most evil—evil legislative tirades in American history for a prolonged period of time.

Why he would want to draw any parallel to Jim Crow is beyond the ability of this Senator to understand. I don't get it. Frankly, the American people aren't buying it, nor should they.

They have told us that requiring photo ID somehow “disenfranchises” women. I can't think of anything more

racist. I can't think of anything more misogynistic than saying people of color or women, whether married women or otherwise, are incapable of obtaining an ID and proof of citizenship. That is frankly insulting.

It is something that millions of Americans do every single day—often many times a day—to get a job, to board a plane, to open a bank account, to enroll in school, to shovel snow in New York City; for that matter, to go to the Oscars, the Emmys, the Grammys, the Super Bowl, almost any theatrical production, and, yes, to get into the Democratic National Convention. To get into the Democratic National Convention, you have to show photo ID, and you have to establish credentials showing that you have a right to be there and participate in that event.

So if the SAVE America Act is Jim Crow 2.0, then so, too, is the Democratic Party itself; so, too, are the campaign rallies hosted by my friend and colleague the Senator from Georgia, up for reelection this year, who recently advertised a campaign rally and announced on the same website that to get into said campaign rally, you would have to show photo ID.

We are not getting the story. We are not getting the complete story. We are not getting anything close to the complete story, and we are going to talk about that tonight.

Look, millions upon millions of married women navigate documentation requirements every single day for a whole host of reasons. To suggest that Americans, that women, that people of color are somehow incapable of doing something so basic is deeply, fundamentally insulting, and it is beneath the dignity of this Chamber and all who occupy it for these arguments to be raised here in this hallowed Chamber.

I can't think of anything more patronizing, more dismissive, more out of touch than telling Americans that they can't meet the same basic requirements that govern so many other parts of daily life—not just some people's daily lives but the daily lives of pretty much everyone in this country.

This bill does not suppress voters. It protects them. It treats them like capable citizens in a functioning republic and ensures that their votes actually do matter.

And let's be honest. There is only one reason to oppose this bill and what it does—one reason: They want to cheat. This bill makes it easy to vote and hard to cheat. They are happy with exactly half of the equation and not the other half. But you can't have both and have a functioning representative government. You can't have half of the equation and have a successful constitutional republic. It doesn't work.

Here is today's headline from POLITICO. I am not exaggerating this. I don't write the news; I just report it.

Why climate champions are sweating the “SAVE America Act.”

It goes on to say:

If Republicans do ultimately succeed in getting a version of the bill passed, environmentalists and some Democrats fear it could damage the democratic process ahead of November's midterm elections and suppress the will of climate-minded voters and candidates.

The level of hyperbolic panic, of paranoid fantasy from the Democrats and the media enterprises they control is telling, and it is stunning, because the only way this bill changes election outcomes is if those outcomes have been dependent on votes that shouldn't have been counted to begin with. If that is part of the plan, then I can understand the panic. That is the reality.

We are closer than ever to getting this bill across the finish line. Just a few hours ago, we voted to proceed to this bill, and that is because the American people have made their voices heard. They have shown up. They have spoken out. They have demanded that our elections—their elections—be protected.

Failure here is not an option, and it must never become such because if we cannot secure the most basic element of our elections, of any free and fair system of elections, we are inviting a level of distrust that this country cannot afford.

I would say this to my Republican colleagues: If we do not act on an issue that commands this level of support, not just from our own base but from the entire spectrum among the American people—this level of support—we should not be surprised when the American people lose confidence in our willingness to fight for them if we fail to get it done and to do everything along the way in order to ensure its passage.

This is our moment. Stand for a simple principle. Let the American people see who is willing to defend their sacred right to vote and who is not.

I am confident that the principle at the heart of this legislation will, in fact, prevail. It will prevail because it is fair, because it is right, because it reflects the truth, because it reflects how our laws are written and how human nature interacts with our system of laws.

This is the line. We have drawn it, and we must defend it. You are either willing to say that only American citizens should vote in American elections or you are not. There is no middle ground.

Sure, we can talk about whether this word or that word would most capably accomplish what we need it to. We can argue over a semicolon here or a comma there. But unless we are talking about how to achieve the same objective of making sure that only Americans vote in American elections, we will have missed the boat in a very dangerous way.

The American people are, to be sure, paying attention—very close attention, indeed—because they understand what is at stake. They understand that if

their vote is diluted, it is taken from them; if their elections are compromised—if their elections are compromised—their voice is diminished. That is what this bill prevents.

So let's stop pretending this is complicated. It is not. If you believe, as I do, that only American citizens should vote in American elections, then this should be the easiest vote of your entire legislative career—not just that which has passed already but that which you are likely to see ever while you are here.

Now, sure, there are all sorts of votes about, you know, recognizing National Sofa Care Month or this or that awareness resolution, but in the world of actual laws coming into being in this Chamber, you are not going to find something much similar—much more true to this principle of being clear, of getting the message right, than this one, of this being a very simple equation. We have to get this done, and we have to get it right.

While we are on this topic, I want to talk a little bit about why this bill is necessary and walk you through some of the legislative history, some of the history in American law and American society that has made this bill so necessary and so timely today, because there have been times in our history when this wasn't the same risk that it is today. But it will help if we set the table by explaining how we got here and why it is that we need this so badly, so immediately, right now.

Let's start with something that happened about 33 years ago when Congress passed a law back in 1993 called the National Voter Registration Act. It is frequently abbreviated as the NVRA and sometimes known also as the motor voter law.

The NVRA says in essence that in any State that chooses to participate, as the overwhelming majority of States do—nearly every State participates—in any participating State, anybody going into a DMV to apply for a driver's license may simultaneously register to vote if they would like to do so. It made it easier for more people to register to vote doing something that most Americans—the overwhelming majority of all Americans do from time to time, which is get a driver's license.

So you could go in, and while filling out the paperwork, after establishing who it is that you are, you could also say, "I would like, with this same paperwork, to register to vote" because, after all, they have your address, they have your name, and they have other information about who you are.

So the same State that is processing your driver's license application can also in that same moment harness the power of a State to register you to vote. That is one of many things that made the NVRA appealing.

A couple of things have happened since the NVRA passed that warrant our careful consideration of this legislation now and that make this legislation so very necessary.

For one thing, over time, you have seen different trends in States in how they issue driver's licenses, to whom they issue them. There have been times when States didn't necessarily have occasion to even consider the question of whether or under what circumstances to give driver's licenses to those who are either not citizens of the United States or perhaps, in addition to being not citizens of the United States, are here illegally.

As some of this became a little bit more complicated when legislation passed in 2005 dealing with the REAL ID issues, with this move toward establishing a REAL ID driver's license that could have some indication as to whether somebody was a citizen, States have paid careful attention to that.

Most States today—the overwhelming majority of States today will issue a driver's license to a person who is not a citizen of the United States. In I believe 19 States, plus the District of Columbia, you could get a driver's license even if you are not just a noncitizen but a noncitizen who is here without documentation, without legal permission, authority to be here. If you are an illegal immigrant, you can still get one in 19 States, plus the District of Columbia.

So if you can do that, if you can walk into a DMV in any of those jurisdictions and check a box and sign your name, in theory, you can register to vote.

Well, some of this came to a head about 20 years after the NVRA was passed when, in 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States decided a case called *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona*. In that case, the Supreme Court of the United States conclusively interpreted the NVRA as preempting out any State authority that might have otherwise existed when it comes to requiring proof of citizenship of someone registering to vote, using an NVRA form at a DMV while applying for a driver's license.

In other words, they said: Even if a State is worried about perhaps inadvertently registering noncitizens to vote, even if in certain circumstances they might have affirmative reason to believe that one or more voters are not citizens of the United States, they may not ask for any proof of citizenship in that moment.

Now, I believe that interpretation was misguided. I believe it was wrong as a matter of statutory construction. Justice Alito, my former boss, wrote a masterful dissent explaining why the majority got it wrong. Nonetheless, the majority ruling still stands. It conclusively interpreted the NVRA as prohibiting the States from making any effort to figure out whether somebody was a citizen as long as they were using the NVRA-supplied form when registering someone to vote.

This created a big problem—a big problem that a lot of people, myself included, hadn't thought much about

until relatively recently, until just a few years ago. I got involved in this, started writing this bill 2 or 3 years ago when I put all of these pieces together and I realized what it could spell for the American Republic if we didn't solve the problem.

Without regard to what might have already happened and what might be happening today, when you play this forward, even if you were starting from the assumption that none of this ever happens, that nobody ever has registered to vote in the past who was not a citizen or never had voted in any election who was not a citizen—that is an assumption contrary to fact, but even if you were to reach that conclusion, you play this forward, and this could and ultimately will lead to a whole lot of mischief when you put all of those factors into the mix, especially when you consider what happened between 2021 and 2025.

On or about—I don't know—let's say January 20, 2020, through to January 20, 2025, there were policies in place in this country that led to relatively open borders, you might say, in which an estimated 10 to 15 million people entered this country unlawfully, with many of them here to this day.

(Mrs. MOODY assumed the Chair.)

Some people have estimated that the total population of noncitizens inside the United States today stands in the neighborhood of around 30 million people. That is a lot of people—a lot of people who, in most States, could apply for and receive a driver's license, particularly if they live in some States more than others. And all they have to do is walk into a DMV, apply for a driver's license, check a box saying, "Yes, I would like, while applying for my driver's license, simultaneously to register to vote." And all that remains after that is you sign your name. And by signing your name, you are certifying that you are entitled to register to vote, that you are a citizen and not under any kind of legal impediment from voting. And that is done.

So even if you were someone who assumes, contrary to fact—and contrary to more facts that I believe will be coming out in greater detail in the coming days and weeks—even if you were someone who believes that this does not happen, that people don't register to vote if they are not citizens of this country, this still would be a trend, given all of the circumstances that I have just outlined, all the things that have happened since the NVRA became the law of the land back in 1993.

This is something that we should all very much worry about. This should concern us greatly; that is, you don't want people voting in a system in which they are not entitled to vote.

You think about every other circumstance where people vote. It is not just in U.S. Federal elections for Federal office, which is the concern of this particular legislation. In countless interactions—separate and apart from Federal elections, separate and apart

from State elections—people hold elections of one sort or another.

One set of elections that people sometimes encounter are within voluntary organizations or within a homeowners association. They might have elections to decide different issues, to elect their leadership. They might have those on a PTA, on different charitable organizations, fraternal organizations that they might belong to. In every one of those circumstances, you don't want somebody who is not entitled to vote, who is not part of the organization, to be casting a vote.

If it is a homeowners association, you don't want somebody who is not part of that organization, because they don't own a home within the homeowners association's jurisdiction, to be casting a vote. If it is a shareholder election in a corporate context, you don't want nonshareholders casing a vote. Why? Well, they don't have the same interest that the shareholders have.

We sure as heck don't want foreign nationals voting in U.S. elections because what unites us is the fact that we are citizens. We may come to things from different perspectives, different parts of the country, different origins. We might have inherited different language patterns, different languages, belief systems, political beliefs, cultural customs—whatever. But what unites us is that we are American citizens.

If you start inviting in and allowing those who are not U.S. citizens to do it, bad things could happen. You talk about the risk of foreign election interference. It is really significant here, as every American's vote is threatened to be diluted every time this happens.

Now, it is not just there that it matters, that we prove who we are or that we are entitled to do the thing that we want to do. Think of many other circumstances you encounter. When you go to the bank and you are going to withdraw money, we should all hope that any place anybody has money deposited on account isn't going to allow somebody else to show up and withdraw money from that account without having to prove who they are. That would be its own form of chaos.

When people go to pick up a prescription drug, to go to the doctor, to seek medical treatment, to apply for a hunting license or a fishing license, to apply for Social Security benefits, to board a plane, to pick up theater tickets, to do all kinds of things where it matters who you are, your ability to engage in the activity that you want to engage in depends, hinges, on your ability to demonstrate that you are who you say you are and you have the right to participate in the thing you want to participate in.

Harkening back a moment ago to my discussion of the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic National Convention would be crazy to allow people in there who have not been elected as delegates to the Democratic National Convention—same with the

Republicans. And so what do they do? Well, they have to show ID.

What about here? Look, in order to get here, all of us who have been elected to the U.S. Senate had to go through a series of processes and procedures that involved showing who we are and that we are entitled to participate in this process, in several, very meaningful steps.

I remember, the very first time I filed to run for the U.S. Senate, I had to go to the Lieutenant Governor's office. The Lieutenant Governor in Utah, under the Utah Constitution, performs the secretary of state function. It is the Lieutenant Governor who oversees the conduct of elections in our State, and it is the Lieutenant Governor's office that files and processes the candidate filing information.

I had to go to the Lieutenant Governor's office all three times I have run for and been elected to the U.S. Senate, establish who I am, establish my citizenship and my residency in the State. And, of course, there is payment that has to go along with it. And after all of that process, you have the opportunity to be on the ballot. If everything goes well, if you are nominated by your political party or otherwise get on the ballot, then you are considered.

But long before any of us ever showed up here to cast our very first vote or give our very first speech as Senators or even be sworn in, there was other paperwork that we had to process in order to establish who we are and that we have a right to be here and that we have a right to cast a vote.

Obviously, we had to win elections. So there is a very important document without which I wouldn't be here, without which any of us wouldn't be here: our election certificate. In my State, again, that too is issued by the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, performing that secretary of state function, that certifies the election results.

All three times I have been elected to the U.S. Senate, I have had to produce that document, and that document has been sent by the Lieutenant Governor of the State of Utah to the Secretary of the Senate, who had to review that.

I had to produce ID when I showed up here in multiple forms. In fact, I had to, just as everyone does, every time they start a new job as an employee. If you are an American citizen, anytime you start new employment with a new employer, you have to fill out a form. The form is called the I-9. It is not just that you fill out the form. You have to fill out the form, and you have to produce, yes, proof of citizenship—because if you are not a U.S. citizen, then you have to produce a visa, and you have to show that your visa status allows you to have the type of employment from the employer that has hired you. But even if you are just an American citizen, you have still got to prove that.

And the I-9 and the requirements that go with it are very exacting. As I recall, there are a few ways of proving

that. You can prove it by showing up with a U.S. passport. If you don't have a passport, as many Americans don't, then you can show up with a birth certificate and a government-issued photo ID. At some point there has been a Social Security card involved, but not everybody I know carries around their original Social Security card all the time. So there are other ways that allow you to do it without the original Social Security card, but there are other ways of doing it. But it is pretty exacting. And you can't start the job unless or until you have proven who you are and that you are a U.S. citizen.

Now, when we wrote the SAVE America Act, we allowed for those same documents to be used in order to establish your citizenship. But we didn't stop there because even that, in some circumstances, could be more difficult for some people. So we made it even more flexible. Yes, you can establish it by producing a U.S. passport, if in fact you have one, if that U.S. passport establishes your citizenship; likewise, a passport card, if you don't have the whole thing, and that establishes your citizenship. You can do it by a REAL ID-compliant driver's license, if that REAL ID-compliant driver's license also establishes your citizenship conclusively, as some do and others do not. That will also suffice. As with the I-9, you can also do it with the combination of a birth certificate and a government-issued photo ID.

But in addition to all of those things, we also have some catchall exceptions that cover all kinds of territory, including one of my least favorite arguments but one of the most frequently arising arguments that is made, that somehow this is going to disenfranchise women everywhere, especially married women who obviously, at the time of their birth, neither they nor their parents could have had any idea, first of all, when or whether they might be getting married; secondly, if and when they got married later, whether they would choose to take on the last name of their husband, of the person they married, and what that name would be.

This isn't really a problem. I mean, this actually happens all the time in other contexts. Whether it is for your interaction with the Internal Revenue Service, with the Social Security Administration, a driver's license, there are all kinds of ways to deal with that. And the SAVE America Act makes clear, if you have changed your name as a result of getting married, obviously a marriage certificate will suffice. If you change your name through some other mechanism, some record of the change in circumstance, whether that is an adoption certificate, a divorce decree that with it came another change of names, you can supply that.

But it also contains something else that is available not just for people who have changed their name but people in lots of other circumstances in which, for whatever reason, they don't

have the documentation. So imagine, for instance, that you are somebody who had changed your name upon getting married, but you can't find your marriage certificate. No problem. We take care of that as part of the same provision that we take care of those who may have lost all their documentation of all their citizenship. Maybe their house burned down yesterday and everything is gone. Poof, up in flames—it is gone. Maybe your dog ate all of your documentation that you would otherwise use when starting a new job and filling out your I-9 form. Maybe you never had it to begin with. This bill takes care of it. We made clear of that. We went out of our way to make sure that that would be the case.

In this legislation, the House-passed SAVE America Act that we proceeded to just a few hours ago in the U.S. Senate, it can be found at page 12, line 22. Or if you want to look at the Schmitt-Lee substitute amendment that may be discussed later this week, it is on page 14, line 17. Either way, the text says the same thing: If you don't have the documentation, whether of a name change or of any of it, you can supply it by a sworn statement that you yourself can fill out, a sworn affidavit in which you provide the basic details surrounding your birth, if you are a natural-born citizen of this country, describing when and where you were born, to whom and so forth; or if you are a naturalized citizen, the circumstances surrounding and dates involved in your naturalization. You then hand it over to the State election official who is in charge of those things, and it then becomes the burden of the State to confirm or refute what you have submitted under oath, under penalty of perjury, to do this, with the understanding that if it checks out, if you are who you say you are, you are still going to be able to register to vote and, in fact, cast a vote, notwithstanding the fact that you may not have any of those documents, either because your house burned down, your dog ate them, or you never had them or otherwise.

So these arguments are not legitimate, and these arguments, which I see made every single day—sometimes in this Chamber, sometimes on social media or elsewhere—these are false arguments made with knowledge of their falsity or reckless disregard for their truthfulness or both. And they are inexcusable. They do not carry water.

This is all about making it easy to vote and hard to cheat. We have to do both. We must do both.

Now, getting back to what I was talking about a minute ago, when we show up here, by the time we have shown up here, we have had to establish who we are, our right to run for the U.S. Senate, and we have to produce other documentation showing that we have, in fact, been elected to the U.S. Senate.

When we do that, we also have to fill out the I-9 form here and establish,

again, that we are who we are, who we say we are, and that we are, in fact, U.S. citizens. And if we do all of that right, then they give us a sort of cheat code version of the documentation, this pin right here.

I remember when I first got here, the day I was sworn in, January 2011, after my first election had occurred a few weeks earlier in November of 2010, I stood right over there. I was sworn into the Senate.

Right after I was sworn in, they had me sign a little book indicating that I was, in fact, sworn in as a Senator, and they gave me a pen and then they gave me this little pin. I wasn't sure what to think about the pin. I am not really into accessories or jewelry, but it was in a nice little box, and I wasn't sure what to do with it. Because I don't wear such things frequently, I put it in a drawer of my desk and I closed the drawer and I kind of forgot all about it.

After I had been here for a while, I commented to one of my colleagues: Is it me or does everybody get carded a lot here?

When I first showed up, I had a great head of hair, by my standards today. It is gone now. But I looked young. I was 39 years old when I was elected to the Senate. In the Senate, being 39 can feel like you are sort of like 12 years old or something like that.

I got carded a lot, in part, because I didn't—maybe I didn't yet look like a Senator to them. In any event, they didn't recognize me as a Senator, and I found, regularly, that I was having to pull out my ID, you know my Senate ID, and the cops would look at it as I would approach the building, make sure that the tamper-resistant strip was intact, and they would say: Well, I guess we have got to let him in.

I commented to a colleague saying: How long will it take before I stop getting carded every time I come into the Senate?

And this colleague said: Well, you got to wear the pin.

What pin?

Well, when you got sworn in, they gave you that little pin.

Then I remembered the little pin that came in the little jewelry box. I put it in the desk drawer and I closed the drawer and I forgot all about it.

I said: Why do I need to wear the pin?

They said: Well, the security personnel in and around the Capitol recognize that pin because it is worn only by Senators, and it is sort of like your portable ID badge. You won't have to get carded as much.

Ever since then, I have worn the lapel pin, and it works like a charm. I have even named it. I call it my "Sorry, Senator" pin because if I get carded, I point to it, and they say: Oh, sorry, Senator. You can come on in.

I remember one day I was standing over there at one of those desks in between two votes. I had one arm gently resting on the desk in front of me. One of the nonuniformed security personnel came up to me and said in a somewhat

harsh tone of voice: Excuse me, sir. Will you please not lean on the Senator's desk.

I, still being new, I was very sensitive to not want to do anything wrong.

I said: I am terribly sorry. I will try not to put any weight on it—because a lot of these desks are original equipment, which means they are, you know, 150 years old or more, and we want to be careful with them. I thought he was concerned about the fact that I had one arm gently resting on the desk in front of me.

But the inquiry was not over. He wanted to interrogate a little bit further. He then said: Are you with minority?

The Republicans—I am a Republican. We were in the minority party at the time.

Are you with the minority?

I said: What do you mean, on this vote or the next? I often vote with my party. Sometimes they get it wrong. Sometimes I don't vote with my party. I am not sure why you are asking this.

He said: Are you with the minority leader?

And I said: Well, he is our leader. Why wouldn't I be with him? I don't understand your question. Is this a loyalty test?

And then he asked me another question that made me realize what was really going on.

He said: Are you part of the minority leader's staff?

Then I realized, oh, OK. That is why I am getting the third degree.

So I pointed to the "Sorry, Senator" pin, thinking that would be the end of the inquiry. All it got me was a blank stare for some reason.

And at that point, I realized what was happening, and I used my title. I didn't want to use my title. I don't like to use my title. It makes me feel uncomfortable to this day, even after 15, going on 16 years.

So I kind of mumbled the answer. I said: I am Senator LEE.

He said: What?

And I said: OK. My name is MIKE LEE. I come from the State of Utah. It is sort of squarish and chair-shaped. It is in the Rocky Mountains, best snow on Earth, really well-known place to visit.

And then he realized what was happening and what I was saying. And he said to me in one hurried breath: I am terribly sorry for the misunderstanding, sir. My name is Steve if you want to report me.

And then before I could tell him it was OK, Steve was fast, and he got out of Dodge. So he was too quick.

But from then on until the day he retired, I always said hello to Steve, and I smiled. I said: Hi, Steve, just to make sure there were no hard feelings because it was an honest mistake; it was not a big deal.

Steve retired a few years ago, and I miss him. Only recently it occurred to me that his name is probably not Steve. Maybe Steve is somebody he

worked with that he didn't like, but he was looking for that badge of authenticity. And when he finally saw it and contextualized it, he realized, yes, that is worn only by Senators. He can be here.

My point is this: In order for us to be here to make these decisions in this building, in this Capitol, affecting 350, 360 million Americans, we first have to prove that we are who we say we are and that we have a right to be here to make those decisions. So, too, with our elections.

We don't want people choosing those who will make laws on their behalf unless they themselves are the people who are the people referred to in the Constitution who get to make those decisions. So let's get this right.

Let's not get it wrong. Let's not pretend that this is something that it is not. It is fundamentally unfair and dishonest in every way, shape, and form to refer to this as racist, misogynist, as voter suppression. It is none of those things.

This is entirely about one thing, which is making sure that our elections are secure, that they are legitimate, that they are fair. We want to make it easy to vote and hard to cheat.

Yes, we can have both of those things, and we must pursue both of them or in the long run, we will have neither. We will have none of them, and it will become a problem. So let's nip this thing in the bud, and let's get this right.

Let's make it easy to vote, and let's make it hard to cheat.

Nothing short of chaos ensues if we don't have that, especially whereas here we have an existing system of laws that make it so unbelievably, undeniably easy for someone to lie with no further proof, no proof of who they are, no proof of why it is that they have the right to vote.

So how does that happen, and how do they justify it? One of the most amusing, if bewildering, arguments that I hear—and I hear it all the time and have since the day we first introduced the original SAVE Act about 2 years ago—is that we don't need it. We don't need it. Why? Why don't we need it? Because it is already illegal for non-citizens to vote.

In fact, it is a felony offense. So we know it doesn't happen because it is already against law.

Well, let's think about how that would work elsewhere. Let's take a really familiar example. If you want to buy alcohol, you want to go into a bar or convenience store, liquor store, you want to buy alcohol, what can and should and must every American expect? To get carded.

Now, this is as a teetotaler something that I see mostly on TV and in the movies, but I also see it in real life when I see somebody buying something, something that I as a teetotaler don't drink, but you get carded when you buy alcohol.

It doesn't matter where, you are going to get carded. It doesn't matter

how old you are, you are going to get carded.

Now, if it were acceptable there to say it is illegal for a minor to buy alcohol or it is illegal for anyone to sell or otherwise give alcohol to a minor, somebody who is too young to buy alcohol, somebody who is not yet past the age of 21, so they don't do it, so we don't need it because it is already unlawful—well, guess what would happen? There would be a whole lot more procuring of alcoholic beverages in retail establishments by people who are too young to drink. It would happen left and right.

It would be folly to assume: Well, it is already illegal, so it doesn't happen, so we don't need to do anything about it.

So what did we do? Well, we instituted a series of laws to make it so that you have to show ID when you buy alcohol. It doesn't mean that nobody can ever cheat to break their way through it. It doesn't mean that some people don't figure out clever ways of getting a fake ID or going through an intermediary, but there are more steps.

But to assume at the outset that it doesn't happen because it is already illegal, regardless of whether you are taking any steps at all to verify that somebody is who they claim to be and that they are eligible to do the thing that they are trying to do is absolutely ridiculous, and we cannot assume that our laws can be enforced, especially against the backdrop of the vulnerabilities that I have described.

The National Voter Registration Act, coupled with the 2015 interpretation by the Supreme Court in *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona*, coupled with the trend among States to issue driver's licenses to noncitizens, with 19 of those States and the District of Columbia issuing them openly, even to known illegal immigrants, and then with an estimated 10 to 15 million Americans—some people think more—coming into this country unlawfully just in the 4-year period from 2021 to 2025, to say that we would be acting recklessly is a gross understatement.

So, no, this is not some sort of subterfuge to engage in Jim Crow 2.0 any more than the Democratic National Convention or a JON OSSOFF campaign rally is about Jim Crow 2.0—and shame on anyone who stoops to that level of stupidity and dishonesty as to make that argument—nor is this about voter suppression.

If this is about voter suppression, then literally any law that is designed to make sure that there is no fraud, that there is no cheating in elections, would also be voter suppression.

Now does it add a step? Yes, of course, but we add steps all the time to make sure that we don't make it too easy, especially when it matters for somebody to just go in and take something that doesn't belong to them. And by taking something that belongs to others, cheapening it for them, diminishing substantially the value of what

those who actually have that right, who own that thing—namely, U.S. citizenship—would otherwise have access to, you are taking it from them. We can't allow that to happen.

This is why I am proud to be the original author and sponsor in the Senate of this bill, proud to have worked with my House counterpart Congressman CHIP ROY from the great State of Texas on this legislation.

We can get this done. And now that we are on the bill, we are going to debate it. I look forward to hearing the debates. I look forward in each and every instance to being able to refute the absurd arguments against it because, let's face it, there is no legitimate reason to oppose this bill. I stand by that, and I will continue to stand by that in the coming days and weeks. And I am ready for many, many weeks.

We are going to stay on this bill until it damn well passes because the American people demand and deserve nothing less than that. Our Republic will not function, our country will not thrive unless we can protect the sanctity of the elections that determine who makes the laws, who sets the policy in this country.

We can walk and chew gum at the same time. We can make it easy to vote and hard to cheat at the same time. We can, we must, and together we will.

We must pass the SAVE America Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, the hour is late and many people have spoken tonight on this proposal by my colleague from Utah and others. But I just want to add my voice to the many who are very concerned about this legislation.

I listened with great interest to what my colleague had to say about the fact that this was somehow necessary, that somehow things were trending in the wrong direction, and that he did want to make it easy to vote.

I think the fact that he wants to make it easy to vote is the essence of what this debate is about because the U.S. citizen is given a constitutional right to vote in our elections and the States to control the running of our elections. It is hard to imagine how the passing of the SAVE Act would help you on those constitutional rights.

I am here tonight to add my voice. Happy Saint Patrick's Day for those who are here wearing the green, and I am pretty sure you wish you were out of here by now and at some Irish festivities celebrating the day.

But trust me, the Irish in the United States of America appreciate voting rights and appreciate the right to vote, and so do many other segments of American society who have had challenges in the past to get their votes counted.

So I do want to say to my colleagues in the Senate that the Federal law does prohibit non-U.S. citizens from voting. That is a cornerstone to our law.

Now, my colleague thinks that we don't do anything to prove or to require that these people have to say who they are, which is not true. When you basically are part of a registration process, you have to fill out or comply with an attestation and identification of who you are. That is how the system works.

It worked when you were a registrant and knocking on someone's door. It works that way on motor voter. It works that way everywhere, and you have to say who you are.

Your signature becomes the identifiable piece of information that has been used for a long time now, decades and decades and decades, as the proof of who you say you are. Why? Because your signature can be traced.

I always find it very interesting in our State because it is not that fraud hasn't been committed; the question is whether you are going to catch fraud. In an incident in our State where we had a very close election and it got down to several votes, people started admitting that they had voted for somebody who was dead or deceased. Why? Because they knew we were going to catch them because it was based on your signature.

So a man who votes for his wife after she has died to say she was really enthusiastic about that Governor's candidate and really would have wanted to vote for him but died before the election and didn't cast her own ballot, yes, that does not count. And we have caught voter fraud.

The point is, is that States already verify that identity. They do it, as I said, when you register or are a registrant, it says right on the registrant card: If you are not a U.S. citizen, stop right now. Stop right now.

It also, at the motor voter place where it is checking your identification, also you have to say that you are a U.S. citizen. Now, you can say many things about what kind of identification is used, but I like this best because we are a vote-by-mail State, as my colleague from Utah is. And we have very high turnouts, as does Utah.

And what does it take to make sure that you are a U.S. citizen in the State of Washington? So every ballot just like mine that is from a few years ago says: Read the declaration.

It says right here, I can hardly miss this. This is the outside envelope: Read the declaration, sign and date below.

So I have to sign this again, which is matched with my signature at the voters' office. It is on a computer with voters' basically witnesses, looking at my signature; and in my State, they are trained by the State patrol to make sure that signature matches the original signature that you signed up with.

Now, what I like most about this is right above where I have to sign is this

little attestation with these words on it. I know you can't hardly read them, so I am going to make it a little larger for you to understand the whole thing.

It says:

I do solemnly swear under penalty of perjury, I am a United States citizen.

It says it right there. Every time you vote in the State of Washington, you are attesting to that. But the bottom part is what I think is most amazing, "punishable by a maximum imprisonment of five years or \$10,000 in fine." And somehow people on this side of the aisle think that immigrants who won't even go to the healthcare system, won't even go to the grocery store, are afraid to take their kids to school, and somehow you think they are signing up for a felony or \$10,000 or imprisonment of 5 years? No. They are not doing that. Because this system is checked. It is validated. It is verified. You have to attest to it. And so we have very, very, very, very little fraud, and when we do, we catch it.

The point is: Why are we doing this today? Why are we changing a system that has been in place for decades and replacing it because my colleagues say the trend is going in the wrong direction? Which is simply not true.

When you look at this, the SAVE Act, instead of basically protecting our system for decades could disenfranchise over 21 million people. That is why you have seen this out here, because it has been estimated by many people. Think about this, when this goes to the President's desk, it is implemented immediately this year.

It means that you have to start producing additional paperwork. What my colleagues failed to tell you is that the system is based on all the verification up front when you are registered and when you give your signature and identification; and election day is about having the ease of going to vote based on the fact you have already been identified.

But my colleagues would like to throw a big wrench in that and make you find all sorts of documentation in the most unworkable chaos I have ever seen in a system put in a bill.

It is simply not true that this is about ease of voting by them. It is about disenfranchising millions of people and making it very hard for them to vote.

Why do they want to do that? I don't know. Frankly, I don't really—I don't really know why they think that is a good idea. I will tell you what my former Republican secretary of state, who served more than a decade, said to me in a statement.

Neither the President nor Congress should be in the business of micromanaging elections. As a longtime Republican election administrator official, I adamantly support our nation's constitutional framers' decision that the election process be decentralized to states.

Following he says:

I oppose the SAVE [America] Act. It gives the federal government new powers of discre-

tionary regulation. It empowers ideologues to sue election administrators. It forces states to turn over voter rolls to federal overseers. It abolishes vote-by-mail—the preferred system in Washington, Oregon, Colorado, Utah, Hawaii, Nevada, and Vermont.

In my experience, vote-by-mail best fits the modern lifestyles. More importantly, it provides the opportunity for voters to become better informed before casting [their] ballots.

He continues by saying:

I subscribe to my party's fundamental and historic commitment to local control. It is a time-honored Republican principle that "government closest to the people is best."

This, importantly, includes the conduct of elections.

Now maybe that is why the senior Senator from Kentucky is voting with us on this side of the issue, because he understands what States' rights are about. States' rights are about running elections so a demagogue or somebody in the level of government cannot force the Federal Government to say who is eligible to vote and who is not eligible to vote.

The notion that we would turn this over to DHS is preposterous. And the notion that I had a constituent who basically got denied a Social Security check because someone said he was dead, even though he went to the Federal building, to the Social Security Administration and said: I am not dead.

They had already ripped the check out of his, basically, bank account. He basically then proceeded for 3 weeks to continue to tell them he was not dead. He showed up in other places in person. He was on national TV. And did they give him his check back? No. It took him months.

Now, let's say that the Federal Government says the same thing about you and the voter rolls on election day. What are you going to do then? What are you going to do on election day? Not have a vote. What are you going to do, say: No, it is me. I am right here.

But they are going to say: No, you are dead. You are not on my rolls. You can't vote. I don't care how long you have lived at that address. I don't care. You are gone.

I am not turning that over to the Federal Government, and our constitutional Founders did not want that turned over to the Federal Government. They saw mischief then, and believe me, the SAVE Act is mischief now.

The League of Women Voters, the ultimate organization for finding and pursuing policy to get people in America to vote basically said this about the SAVE Act:

[This] is a coordinated effort to make voting harder for eligible Americans.

Now, if you can't trust the League of Women Voters here, I don't know who you can trust because they are the ones who have had an organization that is about nothing but getting people to participate in elections.

They are not Democrat; they are not Republican. They basically are a great

organization that holds all of us accountable, and they basically do not like the SAVE Act.

This is why part of this effort is about protecting States and protecting our rights. As I said, our constitutional Fathers have basically said: This is what we should be doing, and this is why, here now, turning this over, I object to the fact that the Homeland Security is going to collect personal information demanding that a secretary of state turn that personal information over to them for a massive database by the Federal Government. I object to that.

I am not turning personal information over to people who just have other things to pursue. Or maybe it is going to be like DOGE, and they are going to sell it to other organizations and make money off of our personal information. I object to that.

But now, if basically a secretary of state or an auditor basically doesn't agree with Homeland Security, what are they going to do? This bill also has a private right of action to say that you can sue them on a private right of action. So now, we are going to create all of this chaos and mischief at a level when somehow Homeland Security, which they have gotten it wrong before on the vote, on information about who and what information—the Federal Government has got it wrong before—now all of a sudden, you are going to get it wrong again and what are you going to do?

So as I mentioned, Sam Reed, he is not the only Republican I have talked to. We had a Republican on a press conference today who was an auditor. There are Republicans standing up.

I don't see any Democrats agreeing with you on the SAVE Act, but I see lots of Republicans across America agreeing with us that it is a bad bill.

But as Sam Reed said, former Republican secretary of state:

Neither the President nor Congress should be in the business of micromanaging elections.

Why? Why? It has never been given to us.

But let's talk about this. My colleague seems to think that there is a trend going in some direction. OK. What is the trend? Because the Heritage Foundation, a group I am pretty sure you believe in, pretty sure you quote them a lot, basically said in my State since 1982—since 1982 till now—there have been 15 cases of voter fraud.

OK. In our State, in the State of Washington, 15 cases. OK. So hardly—hardly, a big trend moving in the other direction. Hardly a big trend.

Similarly, the Heritage Foundation found that in the United States of America, that noncitizen voter fraud is basically .00007, so that turns out to be seven-millionths of a percent. It is not 1 percent. It is not .1 percent. It is basically .00007. So seven-millionths of 1 percent voter fraud in the United States of America based on the system that we have today.

And you want to propose a system that would disenfranchise millions of Americans by making it more complicated. And, yes, I don't know why you don't want to stand up for vote-by-mail, but trust me, I am standing up for vote-by-mail. Your last election had 84 percent turnout in the State of Utah. You had 90 percent in 2020. I think that is a prideful thing for a State.

I am prideful that our State has one of the highest turnouts too. It is not probably 83 percent in a Presidential election. I don't remember exactly what it was in the year 2000, but that is what we strive for in the United States of America, a voting system where everybody participates so when the outcome is something that other people don't like, you can at least say the American people decided.

But if all of a sudden you start sowing doubt into the system, then you have a problem; and that is where President Trump is. He is saying he wants to eliminate mail-in voting, but one in three voters in this country use it.

He is the one who is inspiring my colleagues to write this legislation. He is the one who is inspiring the details. He would go much further, I agree, than what the SAVE Act is.

But let's hear what third parties are saying around the United States of America.

Let's hear what editorial boards who read the same judgment, the same discussions that we have had here, and what have they said?

In my home State, where we have had one of the closest elections in a congressional district, they basically said the SAVE Act is a threat to our democracy.

What did the Seattle Times say? It said, "Congress should reject SAVE Act as unconstitutional voter suppression."

That is not Democrats saying that; that is a newspaper saying that.

What did they say in the Maine Herald?

Maine Voters do not wish to be "saved" by the SAVE Act.

So now we know that third-party validators—who are pretty expert in voting. Women Voters don't want this. Newspapers that basically have looked at this issue are also calling this for what it is: suppression. And I ask my colleagues to turn this down.

Now, if my colleague wants to continue to debate, I will stand here as long as he wants to stand here to debate this issue. I will stand here and get more facts and figures to show him that this voting system today has empowered Americans, it has increased opportunities for Americans to have their votes cast, and it has gotten rid of generations of suppression that existed before. But if he wants me to talk about all of the voter suppression that has existed in the United States, starting with laws that basically disenfranchise various segments of our popu-

lation, I am happy to talk about them because every generation should be about fighting to get the voters to cast a vote, have a robust democracy, and distinguish the United States of America from other countries as a beacon of democracy where free and fair elections stand and where we are confident about the results.

We don't need the SAVE Act. It will cause chaos. What we need to do is to continue to fight for democracy and continue the path forward for a vote-by-mail system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I appreciate the skill and the passion that my friend and colleague the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington brings to the table on this. I appreciate her thoroughness in making the case that she has made to the Senate. I would like to address a few of those items which I think call for a response.

One of the arguments that she points to—all of the arguments that she points to in one way or another—reminds me of how important it is to turn back to the central objective of what we are trying to achieve here: Let's make it easy to vote but hard to cheat.

Again and again, she refers to the desire to make it easy to vote, but as to the "hard to cheat" point, she goes off on a number of tangents, and I would like to address a number of those right now to make sure we set the record clear.

One of the arguments she makes right out of the gate has to do with the fact that this is a constitutionally protected right, and she is right there. We have a number of freestanding constitutional protections in various parts of the Constitution that protect your right to vote.

The fact that it is a constitutionally protected right doesn't mean that it doesn't matter that we make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. In fact, it makes it that much more important to do it.

The fact that something is a constitutionally protected right doesn't mean that it has to be uninhibited. In fact, very often, as is the case with voting, if we make it easy to cheat, then your constitutionally protected right to vote will mean less and less with each passing election, and our failure to take these risks seriously further undermines the public's perception of the legitimacy of the rights in question.

Now, the mere fact that something is a constitutionally protected right doesn't mean you can't make it harder for people to break the law in gaining access to it. Otherwise, there would be all sorts of things that would be off in our society.

Take for example the Second Amendment, the right to bear arms. Yes, we

have a constitutionally protected right to bear arms, and it is a fundamental right that is available to individuals. Yet, when you decide to exercise that right by going into a federally licensed firearms dealer to purchase a firearm, guess what you have to do? You have to produce identification, and you have to wait a period of time. It might take a few minutes or it might take a few hours, but you have to wait until they run your identification and your information through some databases to make sure you are eligible to purchase a gun. It still is a constitutionally protected right. It doesn't cease to be a constitutionally protected right simply by virtue of doing that.

Never in a million years would you see my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or many in my party, I assume, saying: OK. This is all we need to do in order to deal with this issue since the right to bear arms is protected by the Constitution.

Yes, we have laws about who may purchase what firearm and when and under what circumstance and when they might be disqualified based on a prior conviction or otherwise from purchasing a firearm. All we need is a signature because, according to my colleague's logic, a signature is all the identification you need.

Well, is it? Well, signatures can be forged. With increasing ease, they can be forged. In other circumstances, they can be presumed not to be checked, and in some cases, that might pan out to be more true than in others.

But nobody would seriously suggest—particularly those who like these background check laws—they wouldn't be content with somebody just signing their name even if it said: I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that I am entitled to purchase this firearm, that I am an adult, that I am a U.S. citizen, and that I have not been convicted of a felony offense which would disqualify me under 18 USC section 922(g); nor do I trigger any of the other exclusionary factors articulated in various subsections of 922(g) or under any other Federal law.

The signature wouldn't do it there, and that is a constitutionally protected right.

This is a constitutionally protected right, but we are still making it, yes, easy to vote and hard to cheat. You have to have both. You don't get that if you have a mere signature.

It is so, too, with the purchase of alcohol or tobacco by minors. Even if you had people sign something saying, "I hereby attest by signing this under penalty of perjury that I am, in fact, entitled to purchase alcohol; I am, in fact, at least 21 years old"—we wouldn't do that. Why? Well, it would be really hard to enforce the law at that point.

When we turn to the examples—and I tried to count the number of times she said it, but I think she said "very, very, very, very, very, very little fraud in elections." OK. I understand

that. Election fraud is extremely difficult to detect and therefore is rarely prosecuted. There have been very few cases of voter fraud actually having been discovered—detected—and prosecuted through to completion. Well, likewise, with other laws, if all you were required to do was to check a box and sign your name, there would be a lot of other instances of legal wrongdoing that would also be very hard to detect if that would be all you had to provide.

We have this known vulnerability in our laws here, and Heaven help us all if we don't acknowledge the vulnerabilities that we face and take reasonable steps to close those loopholes.

The fact that we are requiring documents here—yes, it adds a step. Now, there are a couple of things I need to be clear about.

No. 1, if you are already registered to vote, this doesn't undo your existing voter registration. We are not going to make hundreds of millions of Americans who are already registered to vote go back and start the process over again—that wouldn't make any sense—but it would apply to new voter registrations. If you move or if you register to vote in a new State or a new precinct and you have to establish a new voter registration file after this becomes law, then, yes, you would have to do that.

But, again, if you are an American who has ever had a job anywhere or who has started any new job at any point in your career with a new employer, you have already had to supply the same documentation. In fact, you have had to supply a much more rigid set of documents than what this requires because this, unlike that, allows you to prove it even if you have not a single document—not a single one of those.

Again, going back to page 12, line 22, and the sentences and paragraphs that follow, it makes it abundantly clear. Even if you are missing all of it, we have taken that into account, and we can put the onus back on the State to go back and prove you wrong. That is very different than just checking a box and signing your name.

Even if it does have some warnings attached to it, that is very different than having to supply the necessary information about how and where you were born. If you are a natural-born citizen, meaning if you were a U.S. citizen as of the moment of your birth, based on the circumstances surrounding your birth—either born on U.S. soil or born elsewhere to U.S. citizen parents—then you have to establish that. That is very different than simply checking a box and signing your name.

Yes, signing your name can be used to identify a person under some circumstances, but it is a lot less information than we are required to provide elsewhere.

She then makes this about what she refers to as States' rights. I don't like

to use that term because I think it is a misnomer. It also conjures images of a bygone Jim Crow era in which the Democratic Party subjected substantial swaths of the American population to a set of racist, evil, exclusionary laws. It has a George Wallace connotation to it that I don't like.

Besides that, States don't have rights; they have authority. "Authority" is sort of the inverse polar opposite of a right. It is the ying to the yang that is a right. States have authority; people have rights. Rights are a check on authority, and that is what we are talking about here.

Regardless of whatever you want to call that—State sovereign authority, federalism, whatever you want to call it—it is not implicated here.

Remember, this objection is coming from the same party that, no less than 5 years ago, through a vehicle that, in the Congress empaneled between 2021 and 2023, was run by Democrats during a Democratic administration, under the auspices of a bill commonly known at the time as H.R. 1, tried to undertake a wholesale takeover of our Federal voting and election system.

Among other things, it would have subjected every voting jurisdiction in the United States to the status that today we equate only with section 5 jurisdictions. What that means is, anytime any voting jurisdiction in the United States anywhere—no matter how large or small, whether Tribal, local, State, or otherwise—wanted to redistrict, they would have to go to a political appointee at the U.S. Department of Justice and obtain preclearance. It is a "Mother, may I?" of sorts from Uncle Sam and Aunt Sam. It is something that is as fundamentally un-American, something as fundamentally contrary to federalism as we know it. This is the same party that is now making the federalism objection to this.

While we are on this Federal objection to this, let's remember the whole reason this is necessary in the first place is because of an existing Federal law passed in 1993 by Congress—the National Voter Registration Act. So the whole reason it is necessary to begin with is because of an existing Federal law.

Don't tell me this is an insult to federalism, especially if you are one of those people from that party who supported a wholesale takeover of our entire electoral system as recently as 4 or 5 years ago.

None of us should be surprised that leftist media establishments in the mainstream news media have come out against this because, let's face it, they are leftists; they are hardcore Democrats. Of course they don't want this, and of course they use this inflammatory language in their headlines.

"Ah, this is a threat to our democracy everywhere." "This will disenfranchise 21 million American voters." Do you want to change that sentence to make it correct? Well, it could

be a whole lot of people who are not citizens. The only people we don't want voting are those who are not citizens and are not eligible to vote. That is all this does—easy to vote, hard to cheat—using documentary standards that are far more generous, far more flexible, and far more easy to comply with than any other system we have access to.

You can still do it. You can still satisfy this standard of proving citizenship even if all your documents have suddenly disappeared. You supply the necessary information under oath, under penalty of perjury, and then it becomes the State's burden to either confirm or refute those things, but with this specificity, we find it a lot easier to prevent fraud.

As far as chilling voter activity, we have data from a number of different studies showing that in States that have adopted voter ID laws, you don't drive down voter participation. In some cases, it goes up. It works out perfectly well.

We need not, we ought not, we must not fear this. If we fear this particular issue, we risk running afoul of that which we hold most dear about our electoral system.

Sometimes we get confused about what we ought to fear. We see this in nature. We fear the snake. We don't fear the deer. Yet, a few years ago, my wife and I were having this conversation. I don't know how we got off on this tangent, but we decided to look up your chances of dying as a result of an interaction with a rattlesnake as compared to your chances of dying as a result of an interaction with a deer.

Now, deer are cute. Who doesn't love Bambi and Bambi's mom and Bambi's dad? You know, it is all so great.

Your chances are way higher of being killed by Bambi than they are by a rattlesnake. Yet we fear the rattlesnake because it is creepy and it is scary.

When we fear the wrong things, we leave ourselves vulnerable to that which can harm us.

And perhaps we don't fear enough what happens when our elections lose their credibility because we don't take reasonable safeguards to make sure that only those who are legally entitled to vote in them are, in fact, allowed to vote.

So as far as the private right of action goes, that private right of action exists under previously enacted laws. I believe that one applies as a result of the original NVRA, and, possibly, some of it could be under the Help America Vote Act. But there are existing Federal laws that make that exact private right of action available, and all this does is it extends it to the obligations that arise under the SAVE America Act.

And those, too, are generous. They are generous to those State officials that are complying with them. If somebody identifies a problem with the way that the law is being implemented, if they are not complying with the terms of the SAVE America Act, there is a notice requirement to the State elections official in question. And it gives a certain period of time. I don't remember whether it is 30, 60, or 90 days. I think some of it may depend on the exact context. They have the ability to cure the harm or make the argument back as to why they are not, in fact, violating it.

So there is nothing scary about this private right of action. It is just a way of, without growing the bureaucracy, making sure that there is a means by which you can procure a court order requiring compliance with the law so that it doesn't become dead letter.

Look, on personal information—the Department of Homeland Security wielding personal information—well, if that is the case, there are all kinds of things. And if that is on the table—I mean, a lot of Americans don't much like how much personal information the IRS has, and that gets leaked sometimes. A lot of people don't like

how much personal information can be found in the databases that are used in connection with the background checks that one has to go through when purchasing a gun.

That is just the beginning of it. There are all kinds of things where people are not comfortable with the government having access to too much information. Look, I get it. I am one of those people. I don't like it either.

But the fact is the government does have that information. Why not allow the government to use that information lawfully to make sure that those who have a particular right are the only ones who are allowed to wield it, so that it doesn't get cheapened or diluted or bastardized by those who would flagrantly violate the law.

At the end of the day, this is, in fact, about making it easy to vote and hard to cheat.

The Democrats in this Chamber seem, so far, to be very comfortable with the first half of that equation but not the second half. We have to pay attention to both. We ignore either to our own detriment and the detriment of those we represent.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:04 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 18, 2026, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 17, 2026:

THE JUDICIARY

ANNA ST. JOHN, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MORGAN HERITAGE

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Morgan Heritage, and include in the RECORD the following proclamation in its honor:

Whereas, Morgan Heritage, comprised of the iconic trio Peetah Morgan, Gramps Morgan, and Mr. Mojo has carried forward the musical and cultural legacy of their father, the late Hon. Ras Denroy Morgan, Sr., by becoming one of the most globally recognized ambassadors of reggae music; and

Whereas, over the course of more than three decades, Morgan Heritage has released twelve studio albums earning critical accolades and commercial success, including three Grammy Awards and multiple international honors, solidifying their legacy; and

Whereas, deeply rooted in both Jamaican and African ancestry, Morgan Heritage has used music as a powerful vehicle for unity, resistance, humanitarianism, and love; promoting conscious music, while fostering connections between the Caribbean and the African nations through collaborations and cultural engagement; and

Whereas, Morgan Heritage has proudly represented both Brooklyn, New York, and Jamaica on the world stage, becoming cultural stewards and artistic visionaries whose music transcends borders and unites people across nations; and therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Florida's 20th Congressional District, in recognition of Caribbean-American Heritage Month, do hereby honor Morgan Heritage for their extraordinary musical contributions, their dedication to preserving and evolving reggae music, and their unwavering commitment to global cultural exchange and unity, peace, and love.

HONORING SCOTT O'DELL

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Scott O'Dell on being named New Teacher of the Year by the Michigan Association of Career and Technical Education (MI ACTE). This distinguished honor reflects his exceptional leadership in the classroom and his steadfast commitment to preparing the next generation of aviation mechanics.

In just over two years at the Northwest Education Services Career Tech Center, Mr. O'Dell has quickly established himself as a leader in Michigan's Career and Technical Education community. Prior to entering the classroom, he worked in the aviation industry training new employees. It was there that he discovered his passion for teaching. In 2023, he became North Ed's first instructor of the Aviation Maintenance program, bringing hands-on, real-world experience directly to his students.

His expertise in aviation mechanics fosters a classroom environment where theory meets real-world practice, an impact that Assistant Superintendent Pat Lamb has noted significantly enhances student engagement and success. His dedication helps ensure that Michigan's workforce remains strong and that young men and women are well prepared for meaningful, high-demand careers.

Mr. Speaker, let us all join in recognizing Mr. Scott O'Dell for earning the distinction of New Teacher of the Year from the Michigan Association of Career and Technical Education. On behalf of Michigan's 1st Congressional District, I congratulate him on this outstanding achievement and thank him for his commitment to shaping the future of our skilled workforce.

HONORING TODD BONLARRON

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Todd Bonlarron, a distinguished public servant, and to congratulate him on his retirement after an exceptional career serving the people of Palm Beach County.

For the past decade, Todd served as Assistant Administrator for Palm Beach County, helping to skillfully manage the day-to-day operations of a community of more than one million residents. His steady leadership touched every aspect of daily life—from clean drinking water and reliable infrastructure to strong public services and well-supported first responders—consistently delivering results through effective partnerships at every level of government.

Todd's commitment to service extends far beyond his professional role. As a co-founder and President of The West Palm 100, he helped raise more than \$600,000 for local nonprofits and contributed over 50,000 volunteer hours to strengthen our community. He also served on the National Association of Counties Contribution and Retirement Advisory Board, the South Florida Fair Board, and the Palm Beach County Anti-Defamation League Board.

A proud Floridian, Todd is a graduate of both the University of Florida and Florida State University. He began his career in the Florida House of Representatives, working for Representatives Bert Harris and Joe Spratt—where I first met him more than 25 years ago. I have had the privilege of watching Todd grow from an eager young staffer into an exemplary leader in our community—and a devoted husband and father.

Todd Bonlarron's career is defined by dedication, integrity, and a deep commitment to public service. His leadership has made Palm Beach County stronger, safer, and more resilient. I am proud to recognize his contributions and wish him all the best in the next chapter.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SAM PAREDES

HON. VICTORIA SPARTZ

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Sam Paredes, who spent more than four decades of his life advancing the cause of liberty and defending the Second Amendment.

Sam Paredes dedicated his life to Gun Owners of California, serving as Executive Director since 1998. A tireless defender of the Second Amendment, Sam was also a member of the Board of Directors and Secretary/Treasurer of Gun Owners of America and Gun Owners Foundation, where he served as a national spokesman and trusted voice for freedom.

Under Sam's leadership, Gun Owners of California became a relentless force in protecting and preserving the rights of law-abiding citizens in California. Sam testified in hundreds of legislative committee hearings and advocated fearlessly before the California Fish and Game Commission, the Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Department of Justice. His work was marked by conviction, courage, and an unwavering belief that constitutional rights are God-given and non-negotiable.

Sam's expertise was sought after by virtually every California news outlet, as well as national and international media such as Fox News, ABC World News Tonight, the Wall Street Journal, New York Times, Washington Post, Univision, Telemundo, BBC, and many others. He was a frequent guest on podcasts and radio shows, a popular speaker at events across the country, and taught numerous workshops on "Confrontational Politics." He also formerly co-hosted Sacramento's Just Guns radio show.

In addition to his work with the Gun Owners of California, Sam was appointed by Governors George Deukmejian and Pete Wilson to serve in the Trade and Commerce Agency, where he worked in both administrations.

Born in Los Angeles to immigrant parents, Sam was the second of three children. He attended Pepperdine University on scholarship and graduated with a degree in political science, later pursuing studies at the Foundation for Economic Education in New York.

Sam was a certified firearms instructor, an avid outdoorsman, and a man who relished the beauty of God's creation—whether hunting, fishing, golfing, or traveling. He also served as a volunteer firefighter and on board of his local fire protection district in El Dorado County.

Above all, Sam was a man of deep faith. His love for Jesus Christ guided his life and shaped his mission. He leaves behind a legacy of faith and freedom, inspiring countless others to stand courageously in defense of liberty.

• 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.

One thing Sam told me that I will never forget is: "No matter how difficult it sometimes is for you, please remember that many of us stand behind you and count on you." Sam was a true freedom fighter. Sam was the proud father of three children, a devoted grandfather to eight, and the loving husband of his wife, Laurie. Sam made his home with his family in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada, where his presence will be dearly missed but his impact will never fade.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Sam Paredes and extending heartfelt condolences to his family and friends.

HONORING KHADINE "MISS KITTY" WILKINSON

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Khadine "Miss Kitty" Wilkinson and include in the RECORD the following proclamation in celebration of Caribbean-American Heritage month:

Whereas, Khadine "Miss Kitty" Wilkinson is considered one of the most influential voices in the Caribbean, exemplifying excellence as an attorney-at-law, media personality, keynote speaker, and advocate for social change; and

Whereas, through her dynamic presence across radio, television, and live events, Mrs. Wilkinson has consistently used her platform to inform, educate, and uplift audiences, while promoting Caribbean culture, identity, and values on a global scale; and

Whereas, as a cultural ambassador and media icon, "Miss Kitty" embodies the vibrant spirit, resilience, and innovation of the Caribbean people, and serves as a beacon of inspiration to the Caribbean diasporic communities around the world; and

Whereas, through her philanthropic work, she has awarded scholarships to fourteen students at The University of the West Indies, promoting educational advancement and opportunity for the next generation of Caribbean leaders while also organizing critical health initiatives, particularly voluntary blood donation, that in turn provide high-impact support to public health in Jamaica and the wider region; and

Whereas, her contributions have earned her prestigious accolades, including the Governor General's 30th Anniversary Award for Community Development and The UWI 75th Anniversary Outstanding Volunteer Award, as well as the distinction of serving as Patron of the inaugural European Union-Jamaica 5K Road Race in 2023; and

Therefore, be it resolved that we, Florida's 20th Congressional District, in celebration of Caribbean-American Heritage Month, do hereby recognize and honor Khadine "Miss Kitty" Wilkinson for her unique contributions to the preservation, celebration, and elevation of Caribbean heritage, and commend her for her enduring service to culture, education, and community.

HONORING BILL SWEET ON BEING NAMED VETERAN OF THE YEAR BY THE GRAND TRAVERSE AREA VETERANS COALITION

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Bill Sweet on being named Veteran of the Year by the Grand Traverse Area Veterans Coalition. This well-deserved distinction reflects his steadfast dedication to his fellow Servicemembers, the communities throughout Northern Michigan, and our Nation.

In May of 2025, Mr. Sweet embarked on an extraordinary 116-mile walk over the course of ten days to raise awareness for Veterans' mental health in partnership with Reining Liberty Ranch, a local Veterans nonprofit. Inspired by fellow Veteran, Travis Snyder, who was unable to complete his annual walk around Lake Michigan promoting awareness for Veterans' mental health and suicide prevention, Mr. Sweet chose to carry forward the mission by walking the M-22 stretch from Manistee County to Traverse City.

With a sturdy pair of walking shoes and an American flag resting on his shoulder, Mr. Sweet set out to accomplish what he humbly described as "a little bit of a selfish goal." Yet his journey was anything but selfish. As he traveled along the M-22 highway, he reflected on his family and friends and on the greater purpose of his walk: drawing attention to the challenges Servicemembers face long after their time in uniform has ended.

His efforts embody the very best of American values: selflessness, determination, and an unwavering commitment to community. His walk serves as a powerful reminder that service does not end with one's final military contract; it continues in our dedication to supporting those who have sacrificed for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let us all join in recognizing Mr. Bill Sweet for being named Veteran of the Year by The Grand Traverse Area Veterans Coalition. I thank him for his enduring commitment to our Veterans, his community, and our great country.

RECOGNIZING THE TRINIDAD "TRINI" GARZA EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL AT DALLAS COLLEGE MOUNTAIN VIEW CAMPUS

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the ribbon cutting of the Trinidad "Trini" Garza Early College High School at Dallas College's Mountain View Campus.

This milestone represents an important investment in the future of our students and our community. Early College High Schools provide a powerful pathway for young people to earn both a high school diploma and college credit simultaneously, helping them graduate with the skills, experience, and confidence is needed to succeed in higher education and in the workforce. Programs like this open doors

of opportunity for students across Dallas by reducing barriers to college access and creating new pathways to economic mobility.

The Trinidad "Trini" Garza Early College High School is named in honor of former Dallas City Councilmember Trinidad "Trini" Garza, a dedicated public servant and longtime advocate for education and opportunity in the Oak Cliff community. His leadership and commitment to uplifting young people and strengthening neighborhoods left a lasting legacy in Dallas. It is fitting that a school designed to expand educational opportunities bears his name and continues his vision of empowering future generations.

The partnership between Dallas College and the Dallas Independent School District demonstrates what can be achieved when educational institutions collaborate to support students and families. By expanding access to early college opportunities, this initiative will help students build strong academic foundations while preparing them for careers in the rapidly evolving economy of North Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the educators, administrators, community leaders, and partners who made this project possible and who continue to invest in the success of our students. Their dedication ensures that young people in Dallas have access to the tools and opportunities they need to thrive.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the ribbon cutting of the Trinidad "Trini" Garza Early College High School at Dallas College's Mountain View Campus and in recognizing the positive impact this institution will have on students and families for generations to come.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ELIJAH BILES

HON. AARON BEAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Elijah Biles, a young man whose life was only just beginning. At 22 years old, Elijah had earned his associate degree and was looking ahead with hope and determination toward the future. By day, he worked at UF Health Jacksonville. By night, he poured his heart into what he loved most: gaming, drawing, and streaming alongside his dad, uncles, friends, and the online community he was building.

He was a devoted son, an incredible big brother, and one of the most compassionate souls you could ever meet. Elijah found joy in the steady rhythm of work, family, creativity, and connection.

Then, in June of last year, everything changed. Elijah was diagnosed with Grade 4 glioblastoma, an aggressive and inoperable brain cancer. One of his earliest symptoms was the loss of use of his right arm, devastating for someone whose passion was art and gaming. As the cancer progressed, weakness spread, and he faced severe cognitive decline and difficulty communicating.

His father, Robert Biles, a Navy veteran of 24 years, set aside his own plans to become Elijah's full-time caregiver, rearranging his work, traveling for treatments, and standing by his son every step of the way.

On February 24, 2026, Elijah was placed in hospice care on Amelia Island, surrounded by loved ones, with his father and mother constantly at his side enduring something no parent should ever have to face. On March 1st, Elijah passed away, succumbed to his illness, bringing an end to a beautiful life. He left behind a family and community who loved him deeply.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to the Biles family and to all who were touched by Elijah's life. May we remember his creativity, his kindness, and the light he brought into the lives of others.

HONORING THE DEERFIELD BEACH BLACK HISTORY MONTH BAN- QUET HONOREES

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the outstanding achievements and enduring contributions of a remarkable group of individuals at the City of Deerfield Beach Black Heritage Banquet, which took place on Saturday, February 28, 2026, at the Johnny L. Tigner Center.

This annual celebration recognizes the leadership, dedication, and cultural impact of community members whose work uplifts and strengthens the City of Deerfield Beach. It is a testament to the power of Black heritage, civic engagement, and the unifying strength of community.

Following a review process, this year's honorees were selected by the African American Heritage Board for their significant contributions and leadership within the city. These distinguished individuals exemplify service, mentorship, and advocacy, setting a standard for excellence and inspiring others to give back.

I include in the RECORD the following 2026 Community Honorees:

Retired Deputy James Nichols, Jr.—Recognized for his lifelong dedication to public safety and mentorship within the community.

Dorothy Gregory—Honored for her steadfast advocacy and unwavering commitment to community service.

Nyla Knowles—Celebrated for her emerging leadership and contributions to the local cultural landscape.

Sandra Jackson—Distinguished for her tireless efforts in community development and social impact.

These honorees represent the heart of Deerfield Beach. Their service, leadership, and dedication ensure that Black heritage and culture remain vibrant and celebrated in our community. Their achievements inspire current and future generations to embrace civic responsibility, cultural pride, and the pursuit of a more inclusive society.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and celebrating these remarkable individuals for their leadership, contributions, and commitment to the City of Deerfield Beach. Their work exemplifies the strength, resilience, and enduring legacy of Black heritage.

Their dedication and accomplishments not only enrich the City of Deerfield Beach but also serve as a lasting example of the impact

one can have through service, leadership, and a commitment to community. By honoring these individuals, we celebrate the enduring legacy of Black heritage and the vital role it plays in shaping a more vibrant, inclusive, and connected society.

COMMENDING JAMES AND WENDY FALKNER ON THE PURCHASE OF KILWINS IN TRAVERSE CITY, MICHIGAN

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate James and Wendy Falkner for their many years of dedication to Kilwins Chocolates, Fudge, and Ice Cream, and to commend them on their recent purchase of the Kilwins store in Traverse City, Michigan.

James and Wendy's story is one that is rooted in hard work, perseverance, and a deep appreciation for their community. James began working for Kilwins in 1994 as a summer employee at the Mackinaw City store while pursuing a degree at Michigan Technological University. A year later, Wendy began working at the Mackinac Island Kilwins store as a summer employee while pursuing her studies at Kuyper College in Grand Rapids. What began as a summer job would later turn into a lifelong calling.

After completing their college education, James and Wendy initially went to work in their respective fields of study. However, their passion for selling ice cream, making fudge, and spreading joy throughout their community quickly brought them back to Kilwins in Holland, Michigan, as part time employees. Another opportunity soon followed when they took full-time positions managing the Kilwins of Frankenmuth. Later, they co-operated a Kilwins in Charleston, South Carolina, where they honed their skills in leadership and business.

In 2015, James and Wendy took the next step with the Kilwins franchise by purchasing their very own store in Mackinaw City, and a few years later, they proudly restored Kilwins presence on Mackinac Island. Recently, they have expanded their business ventures with the purchase of the Kilwins in Traverse City. Under their leadership, Kilwins stores have become gathering places for celebrations of all kinds, such as wedding anniversaries, family vacations, academic achievements, and victories after a baseball or softball game. In an era defined by technology and automation, James and Wendy have managed to preserve something fleeting: genuine human connection.

Mr. Speaker, let us all join in congratulating James and Wendy Falkner for their outstanding service and continued commitment to communities across the great State of Michigan.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION AND ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 16, 2026

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3971, the Small Business Innovation and Economic Security Act.

S. 3971 reauthorizes the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) programs to unleash American innovation. SBIR and STTR provide federal Research & Development (R&D) funding to small technology companies. These programs are collectively called "America's Seed Fund" because they help startups develop their ideas and grow their businesses, bringing them to market.

This bill provides these companies with vital research and development grants from federal science agencies that support their work while also having robust research security provisions in place to safeguard from malicious actors.

I am happy that the Small Business Committee has successfully coordinated with the Science, Space, and Technology Committee—both majority and minority—on this legislation and that we all support it. These past few months have left this vital program unauthorized, leading to devastating real-world impacts for small businesses that desperately need funding and stability to thrive.

The entrepreneurial spirit is a quintessentially American tradition, and it has helped make our Nation great. Supporting small businesses is as American as it gets. It also keeps our economy competitive, which is critical for the United States to stay ahead of foreign adversaries like the Chinese Communist Party that seek to dominate the global marketplace.

This bill will empower small businesses, support this age of American innovation, and help entrepreneurs continue developing the ideas of tomorrow. I urge all of my colleagues to support S. 3971.

HIGHLIGHTING THE DEMOCRAT SHUTDOWN CHARADE

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, due to weather-related flight cancellations, the following is a one-minute speech I was unable to deliver in-person.

I include in the RECORD the following editorial The New York Post correctly editorialized yesterday:

The United States saw four terror attacks on its soil in just the two weeks since the Iran war began, yet Democrats voted yet again last week to #Defund Homeland Security.

Are they trying to help the terrorists?

They also seem to hate TSA workers and flight passengers: Chaos has reigned at airports around the nation, with hours-long security lines; the shutdown has prompted 300 agents to quit and others to take unscheduled leaves rather than work without pay.

The defunding's latest horror: The Department of Homeland Security's Office for Bombing Prevention just canceled a training class on how to handle IEDs.

Actually, it's unthinkable: Airport misery and flight safety are bad enough, but defunding bomb prevention—at a time like this?

Dems are holding the nation's security and air travel hostage in a purely symbolic protest to prove their hatred of ICE to their base.

The funding cutoff doesn't even hit ICE, which already got ample cash in last year's Big Beautiful Bill Act.

It's well past time for Democrats to end the games and think about everyday Americans for a change.

Appreciated former House Foreign Affairs and Homeland Security Committee Chairman MIKE MCCAUL has correctly warned that Democrats are being irresponsible by shutting down the Department of Homeland Security during an increased threat from Iranian terrorists, and that they will have "blood on their hands" by not preventing attacks.

Provocative insightful Sean Hannity stands with Trump exposing isolationists as either dumb or evil.

Coordinating with determined Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel, destroying the capability of eleven nuclear bombs boasted by Iran to Envoy Steve Witkoff is existential for Western civilization. Iran building intercontinental ballistic missiles puts all of Europe and South and Central Asia at risk with drone attacks already our valued NATO member Türkiye, along with Azerbaijan.

In conclusion, God Bless Our Troops as the Global War on Terrorism continues. Trump is reinstituting Peace Through Strength, revealing war criminal Putin lies, insulting and mocking Trump as Putin provides targeting directions to Iran to murder Americans.

RECOGNIZING MR. THOMAS "MUCKA" McGRATH

HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mr. Thomas "Mucka" McGrath, President of the South Boston Citizens Association, a steadfast steward of Boston's history and a tireless champion of community in South Boston, Massachusetts.

For years, Tom McGrath has stood at the center of some of our city's most meaningful traditions, including the annual Evacuation Day commemorations at Dorchester Heights. As organizer and guiding force behind this and many other events, Tom has worked diligently to ensure that the legacy of March 17, 1776—the day British forces evacuated Boston following General George Washington's successful fortification of the Heights—is duly honored and celebrated.

This year marks the 250th anniversary of that historic moment. It is a milestone in the history of Boston, and in the founding story of our great Nation. Through Tom's leadership, the Evacuation Day ceremonies have grown into a fitting tribute to the courage and sac-

rifice of those who secured one of the first major victories of the American Revolutionary War. He has helped transform remembrance into renewal by bringing together veterans, elected officials, students, families, and neighbors in a shared celebration of American independence and Boston pride.

Tom's work extends far beyond event planning. As President of the South Boston Citizens Association, he has dedicated himself to strengthening civic life in our community. He understands that history is not simply something we commemorate once a year; it is something we live out in how we serve one another. Under his leadership, the South Boston Citizens Association has continued its longstanding mission of promoting civic engagement, neighborhood pride, and respect for the traditions that define South Boston. In a rapidly changing city, Tom McGrath has been a steady hand, ensuring that progress does not come at the expense of memory and that future generations understand the sacrifices that built today's community. His commitment reflects a deep love of neighborhood and country, and an abiding belief that local traditions are the foundation of our national identity.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said that our freedom was secured at Dorchester Heights. Thanks to leaders like Tom McGrath, the spirit of that victory endures 250 years later.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Thomas "Mucka" McGrath for his service to South Boston and to the City of Boston, and in thanking him for preserving and honoring the legacy of Dorchester Heights for generations to come.

HONORING STATE SENATOR LORI BERMAN

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Florida State Senate Minority Leader Lori Berman and congratulate her on her retirement after 16 years of exceptional public service in the Florida Legislature.

A proud voice for Palm Beach County, Senator Berman has been a fearless advocate—fighting for the fundamental priorities her constituents care about: reproductive freedom, voting rights, strong public schools, affordable health care, economic growth, climate action, and commonsense gun safety.

Born in New York, Senator Berman graduated magna cum laude from Tufts University and went on to earn advanced degrees from George Washington University and the University of Miami School of Law. She built a successful legal career in South Florida before bringing her talents and tenacity to public service.

From her first election to the Florida House in 2010 to her election to the Senate in 2018, Senator Berman has led with integrity, purpose, and heart. Her colleagues recognized that leadership when they unanimously elected her Senate Democratic Leader in 2025. Her long list of honors—from Legislator of the

Year to Champion of Florida's Middle Class—reflects not just achievement, but impact.

But titles alone do not capture who Lori Berman is. She is a principled leader. A relentless advocate and a trusted voice for fairness and opportunity. As she retires, we honor not only her years of service, but the values she has carried into every fight—integrity, compassion, and a deep commitment to justice.

Please join me in thanking Senator Lori Berman for her extraordinary contributions to Florida and wishing her continued success in the years ahead.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF WILLIAM HUSTON GNODTKE

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of William Huston Gnodtke, a steadfast public servant, devoted husband and father, and a tireless advocate for the State of Michigan, who passed away on February 16, 2026, at the age of 87.

Prior to starting his long career in politics, Mr. Gnodtke proudly served our Nation for two years as a communications specialist in the United States Army. His military service reflected the same sense of duty, patriotism, and discipline that would define his commitment to public service.

After his military service, Mr. Gnodtke became a respected fixture in Michigan politics, spending 18 years on staff with the Michigan House Republican Caucus, including a two-year stint as executive director. He later served as finance director for the Michigan Republican Party. In each of these roles, he worked diligently to shape policy and strengthen Northern Michigan leadership in Lansing. In 1988, he founded Gnodtke & Associates, a fundraising and political consulting firm that supported Republican candidates and conservative causes across our great state.

Mr. Gnodtke's involvement with the Republican Party ran deep. He served as a Michigan presidential elector for President Gerald Ford in 1976, state party treasurer, and for more than 30 years as a precinct delegate and county party officer in Ingham and Clinton counties. In addition to his party leadership, he served on the Michigan Board of State Canvassers and as a Clinton County commissioner, always seeking to improve the communities he called home.

After retiring to Northern Michigan in 1997, Mr. Gnodtke began what would become an impressive 21-year tenure on the Mackinaw Bridge Authority, including 16 years as chair. His steadfast and principled leadership ensured that the Bridge's operational and financial independence remained firmly intact.

Mr. Speaker, let us join in recognizing Mr. William Gnodtke, whose life was marked by service to his country, his party, and fellow neighbor. On behalf of Michigan's 1st Congressional District, I extend my deepest condolences to the entire Gnodtke family.

RECOGNIZING THE OXFORD HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE AHSAA CLASS 6A STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Oxford High School boys' basketball team for winning the AHSAA 6A State Title. The team's record is 30–4 and is coached by Joel Van Meter.

On Saturday, March 7, 2026, at the Birmingham Jefferson Convention Center's Legacy Arena, the Oxford High School team beat the Cullman High School team 68 to 44. Tournament MVP Jaylen Alexander scored 11 points, had eight assists, and had five steals. Chris Latson scored 21 points, Marcus Perry, Jr. scored 17 points, and Caileb Wilson scored 10 points. This is Oxford High School's first basketball state title in school history.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebration as we congratulate the team, coaches, students, faculty and fans at Oxford High School on this exciting occasion. Go Big O.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF RONALD W. SURIN, II

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Ronald W. Surin, II. I include in the RECORD the following Proclamation honoring his life and legacy:

Whereas, Ronald W. Surin, II, born on April 2, 2003, in Pembroke Pines, Florida, was a bright light to all who had the pleasure of knowing him. The beloved son of Ronald and Shebella Surin, Ronald lived a life marked by faith, determination, love, and kindness far beyond his 22 years; and

Whereas, Ronald's spiritual journey began at a young age, culminating in his baptism on Easter Sunday, April 5, 2015, shortly after being diagnosed with juvenile diabetes. Despite life's challenges, he faced each day with courage, grace, and an unwavering faith in God; and

Whereas, a proud graduate of Pines Carter High School and a senior at Florida International University, Ronald pursued his pas-

sion for Sports Management and Physical Therapy with the dream of one day following in his father's footsteps and attending law school. He also demonstrated his commitment to responsibility and service through his work with Target Corporation; and

Whereas, known for his calm, cool, and collected demeanor, Ronald touched countless lives with his infectious smile, his warm and loving spirit, and his genuine, friendly nature. An exceptional athlete, Ronald excelled in football, basketball, and track and field, and was especially known for his speed on the track. His dedication, discipline, and sportsmanship inspired all who knew him; and

Whereas, Ronald was deeply loved by his family, friends, classmates, co-workers, and community. He leaves behind a legacy of kindness, strength, and love that will never be forgotten. He will be dearly missed by his parents, Shebella and Ronald; his siblings, Shenelle, Wellington, and Ronald; his grandmothers, Ella and Otelia; his great-grandmother Fannie; his girlfriend Sara; his aunts Miriam, Nanotte, Kechide, and Naucie; and a large extended family of cousins, uncles, nieces, nephews, and friends, as well as the many families he was connected to, including the Sarin, Poitier, Antoine, Cave, Jean-Pierre, Coachman, Sean-Mary, Gilles, Darbouze, Jackson, Lee, and Beavers families; and therefore, be it

Proclaimed That we, the 20th Congressional District of Florida, do hereby honor and celebrate the life of Ronald W. Surin, II. His legacy of faith, kindness, resilience, and joy will continue to uplift and inspire those who knew him. May his memory forever serve as a beacon of hope, strength, and love within our community and beyond.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF MR. ALGER BURNETT BIZOR

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 17, 2026

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Mr. Alger Burnett Bizer, a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and respected member of the Dallas community, who passed away peacefully on March 3, 2026, at the age of 81.

Mr. Bizer was born on June 27, 1944, in Crockett, Texas, to the late Terry Bizer, Sr. and Annie B. Bizer. He was raised in Tyler, Texas, in the Jones Valley community, where he developed the strong values of faith, family, and hard work that would guide him throughout his life. In 1952, he accepted Jesus Christ

as his Lord and Savior when his family joined Sandflat Baptist Church. He was later baptized at Liberty Baptist Church in Tyler, and his faith remained a steady foundation throughout his life. Mr. Bizer was a devoted member of Denley Drive Missionary Baptist Church until his passing.

He attended T.J. Austin Elementary School and Emmett Scott Junior High School and graduated from Emmett Scott High School in 1964. Throughout his career, Mr. Bizer worked diligently in the service and production industries, including positions with Sterling Faucet, General Electric, and Piggly Wiggly, which later became Minyard's Grocery Stores. After retiring, he continued to serve his community as a school crossing guard, a role that allowed him to make a meaningful impact in the lives of local children. Ensuring their safety and seeing their smiles brought him great joy.

Mr. Bizer was known for his generous spirit, strong work ethic, and deep devotion to family. He believed in creating a home rooted in love, perseverance, and gratitude. His grandchildren and great-grandchildren were the light of his life, and he took great pride in bringing his family together. Sundays were often spent gathered with loved ones, sharing laughter, conversation, and his favorite meal—fried catfish.

Although a lifelong resident of Dallas, Mr. Bizer proudly supported the Los Angeles Lakers wearing their purple and gold with pride and cheering on his team each season.

Mr. Bizer is survived by his beloved wife, Rena Bizer; his daughters Sonya Renee Bizer, Wanda LaGail Wilson, and Kimberly Bizer Tolbert; his stepsons Marvin Castle and Patrick McDonald; his stepdaughter Tawana Castle; his brothers Charlie Bizer and Terry Bizer, Jr.; his sisters Marilyn Rainey and Evelyn Embry; as well as many grandchildren, great-grandchildren, extended family members, and friends. He was preceded in death by his parents, his brother Freddie Bizer, his sister Sallie Mae Gossett, and his sons Christopher Bizer and Martin Cokes.

Mr. Speaker, Alger Burnett Bizer lived a life defined by faith, service, and love for his family and community. His legacy will continue through the many lives he touched and the generations of family who will carry forward the values he instilled.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Alger B. Bizer and in extending our deepest condolences to his family and loved ones. He will be deeply missed but never forgotten.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1059–S1158

Measures Introduced: Twenty-three bills and nine resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4105–4127, S.J. Res. 125–129, and S. Res. 645–648. **Pages S1090–91**

Measures Considered:

Save America Act—Agreement: Senate began consideration of the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1383, to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, taking action on the following amendments and motions proposed thereto: **Pages S1066–88**

Pending:

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill. **Page S1067**

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to bill, with Thune (for Schmitt) Amendment No. 4420 (to the House amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1067**

Thune (for Tuberville/Blackburn) Amendment No. 4421 (to Amendment No. 4420), to protect women and girls in athletics. **Page S1067**

Thune motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration, with instructions, Thune Amendment No. 4422, to change the enactment date. **Page S1067**

Thune Amendment No. 4423 (to the instructions (Amendment No. 4422), of a perfecting nature. **Page S1067**

Thune Amendment No. 4424 (to Amendment No. 4423), of a perfecting nature. **Page S1067**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to Legislative Session. **Page S1066**

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 57), Senate agreed to the motion to lay before the Senate the House message to accompany the bill. **Page S1066**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the House message to accompany the bill at approximately 12 noon, on Wednesday, March 18, 2026. **Page S1146**

Appointments:

Commission on the National Defense Strategy: The Chair, on behalf of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 117–81, appointed the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on the National Defense Strategy: General John M. “Jack” Keane, US Army, Retired, of Virginia. **Page S1146**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 51 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 56), Anna St. John, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana. **Pages S1059–66, S1158**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 48 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 55), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S1064–65**

Messages from the House: **Page S1088**

Measures Referred: **Pages S1088–89**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S1089**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S1089, S1146**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1089–90**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1091–93**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1093–95**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1095–S1146**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1146**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—57) **Pages S1065–66**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:03 p.m., until 12 noon on Wednesday, March 18, 2026. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1146.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

WORLD RADIOCOMMUNICATION CONFERENCE 2027

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Media concluded a hearing to examine the World Radiocommunication Conference 2027, focusing on strategy and challenges ahead of Shanghai, after receiving testimony from Grace Koh, Ciena, Hanover, Maryland; and Stephan A. Lang, Crest Hill Advisors LLC, Michael Calabrese, New America, and James A. Lewis, Center for European Policy Analysis, all of Washington, D.C.

WATER AND POWER LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine S. 1034, to establish the Southwestern Power Administration Fund, S. 1242, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to carry out watershed pilots, S. 2437 and H.R. 3857, bills to amend the Snow Water Supply Forecasting Program Authorization Act, S. 2753, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to authorize certain extraordinary operation and maintenance work for urban canals of concern, S. 3409, to reaffirm that the Bureau of Reclamation retains exclusive ownership, operational control, and financial responsibility for the Lower Yellowstone Fish Bypass Channel, ensuring long-term conservation of the endangered pallid sturgeon and other native aquatic species in the Yellowstone River while protecting the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation Project and District from undue financial and operational burdens, S. 3500, to amend the Federal Power Act to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to annually submit to Congress a report on the status of ongoing hydropower relicensing applications, S. 3518, to amend the Federal Power Act to address certain alterations in, and the maintenance and repair of, project works, to provide for the licensing of micro hydrokinetic energy projects, S. 3635, to reauthorize the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000, S. 3684, to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to reauthorize water power research, devel-

opment, demonstration, and commercial application activities, S. 3693, to extend the authorization for a large-scale water recycling and reuse grant program, S. 3723, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a project to supply municipal, rural, and industrial water from the Missouri River to the Western Dakota Regional Water System, S. 3725, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a project to supply municipal, rural, and industrial water to expand the capacity and reach of the Lewis and Clark Rural Water System, Inc. (doing business as “Lewis & Clark Regional Water System”), in the States of Iowa, Minnesota, and South Dakota, S. 3732, to amend the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act to authorize assistance under the storage program, S. 3736, to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of constructing a project to supply municipal, rural, and industrial water to the Dakota Mainstem Regional Water System service area in the States of South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Minnesota, S. 3737, to amend the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 to provide financial and technical assistance to eligible entities for the conduct of innovative approaches to voluntary water partnership agreements among multiple water users and projects conducted by individual agricultural entities, S. 3738, to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to reauthorize the large-scale water recycling and reuse program, to establish a Water Conveyance Improvement Program, S. 3743, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a feasibility study on a selective water withdrawal system at Glen Canyon Dam, S. 3792, to provide for the establishment of a Water Project Navigators Program, S. 4040, to amend Public Law 89–108 to modify the authorization of appropriations for State and Tribal, municipal, rural, and industrial water supplies, and S. 4041, to reauthorize the Cooperative Watershed Management Program, after receiving testimony from David Palumbo, Deputy Commissioner of Operations, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and Terry L. Turpin, Director, Office of Energy Projects, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 7953–7969; and 4 resolutions, H. Res. 1118–1121 were introduced. **Pages H2550–51**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2551–52**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative McClintock to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2533**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:34 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H2537**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:07 p.m. and reconvened at 3 p.m. **Page H2544**

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to the following measures. Consideration began Monday, March 16th.

Mitigation Action and Watermen Support Act of 2026: H.R. 4294, amended, to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish a pilot program with respect to the sale of blue catfish caught within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 320 yeas to 66 nays, Roll No. 88; and

Page H2545

Small Business Innovation and Economic Security Act: S. 3971, to extend the SBIR and STTR programs, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nays vote of 345 yeas to 41 nays, Roll No. 89. **Pages H2545–46**

Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act, Deporting Fraudsters Act of 2026, and Bill to Outlaw Wounding of Official Working Animals Act—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 1115, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 556) to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1958) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that aliens who have been convicted of defrauding the United States Government or the unlawful receipt of public benefits are inadmissible and deportable; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4638) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an alien who has been convicted of harming animals used in law enforcement is inadmissible and deportable; and relating to consideration of motions to suspend the rules, by a

recorded vote of 196 yeas to 193 nays, Roll No. 91, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 196 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 90.

Pages H2538–44, H2546–47

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yeas-and-nays votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2545, H2545–46, H2546–47, and H2547.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS DAY (DAY 1, MORNING SESSION)

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness Day (Day 1, Morning Session)”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the U.S. Capitol Police. Testimony was heard from Michael G. Sullivan, Chief, U.S. Capitol Police.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representative Arrington and public witnesses.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held an oversight hearing on the National Institutes of Health. Testimony was heard from Jay Bhattacharya, M.D., Director, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.

HEARING—AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE PUBLIC WITNESS (DAY 1, AFTERNOON SESSION)

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled “Hearing—American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness (Day 1, Afternoon Session)”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a budget hearing on the U.S. House of Representatives. Testimony was heard from the following U.S. House of Representatives officials: Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk; William P. McFarland, Sergeant at Arms; Anne M. Dressendorfer Binsted, Acting Chief Administrative Officer; Matthew Berry, General Counsel; Christen Stevenson, Inspector General; Brian Lindsey, Law Revision Counsel; and Warren Burke, Legislative Counsel.

U.S. MILITARY POSTURE AND NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES IN NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “U.S. Military Posture and National Security Challenges in North and South America”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Defense officials: General Francis Donovan, Commander, U.S. Southern Command; General Gregory Guillot, Commander, U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command; and Joseph Humire, Performing the Duties of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas Security Affairs, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

FISCAL YEAR 27 STRATEGIC FORCES POSTURE HEARING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “FY27 Strategic Forces Posture Hearing”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Defense officials: Marc Berkowitz, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Admiral Richard Correll, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command; General Gregory Guillot, Commander, U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command; Robert Kadlec, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Deterrence, Chemical, and Biological Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense; and General Stephen Whiting, Commander, U.S. Space Command.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Education and Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 7894, the “Truman Scholarship Clean House Act”; H.R. 7890, the “Science of Reading Act of 2026”; H.R. 7891, the “Student Aid Fraud Oversight and Accountability Act of 2026”; H.R. 7892, the “No Aid for Ghost Students Act of 2026”; H.R. 7893, the “FAFSA Verification Efficiency Act”; H.R. 7661, the “Stop the Sexualization of Children Act”; and H.R. 6084, the “ERISA Litigation Reform Act”. H.R. 7894, H.R. 7890, H.R.

7891, H.R. 7892, H.R. 7893, H.R. 7661, and H.R. 6084 were ordered reported, as amended.

WINTER STORM FERN LESSONS: SUPPLYING RELIABLE POWER TO MEET PEAK DEMAND

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Winter Storm Fern Lessons: Supplying Reliable Power to Meet Peak Demand”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

PROTECTING PATIENTS AND SAFEGUARDING TAXPAYER DOLLARS: THE ROLE OF CENTERS FOR MEDICARE AND MEDICAID SERVICES IN COMBATTING MEDICARE AND MEDICAID FRAUD

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Protecting Patients and Safeguarding Taxpayer Dollars: The Role of CMS in Combatting Medicare and Medicaid Fraud”. Testimony was heard from Kimberly Brandt, Deputy Administrator and Chief Operating Officer, U.S. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

UPDATING AMERICA’S FINANCIAL PRIVACY FRAMEWORK FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Updating America’s Financial Privacy Framework for the 21st Century”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REFORMING AMERICA’S DEFENSE SALES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Reforming America’s Defense Sales”. Testimony was heard from Stanley L. Brown, Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State; Michael P. Duffy, Under Secretary of War for Acquisition and Dismantment, Department of War; and Michael F. Miller, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense.

WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: LESSONS LEARNED AND CHARTING A PATH FORWARD

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Oversight and Intelligence Subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Waste, Fraud, and Abuse in Foreign Assistance: Lessons Learned and Charting a Path Forward”. Testimony was heard from Adam Kaplan, Deputy Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General, U.S. Agency for International Development; and

Elates Love-Grayer, Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office.

**DEEPSEEK AND UNITREE ROBOTICS:
EXAMINING THE NATIONAL SECURITY
RISKS OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, ROBOTICS,
AND AUTONOMOUS TECHNOLOGIES AND
BUILDING A SECURE U.S. TECHNOLOGY
BASE**

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection held a hearing entitled "DeepSeek and Unitree Robotics: Examining the National Security Risks of PRC Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, and Autonomous Technologies and Building a Secure U.S. Technology Base". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**PIER PRESSURE: REGULATION AND
COMPETITION IN MARITIME SHIPPING**

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Administrative State, Regulatory Reform, and Antitrust held a hearing entitled "Pier Pressure: Regulation and Competition in Maritime Shipping". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

**OVERSIGHT OF THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE:
THE FINANCIAL FUTURE UNDER
POSTMASTER GENERAL STEINER**

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled "Oversight of the U.S. Postal Service: The Financial Future Under Postmaster General Steiner". Testimony was heard from David Martini, Director, Physical Infrastructure, U.S. Government Accountability Office; and David Steiner, Postmaster General, U.S. Postal Service.

**FORCE DESIGN OR FORCE IN DECLINE:
REVIEWING READINESS**

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing entitled "Force Design or Force in Decline: Reviewing Readiness". Testimony was heard from Admiral Thomas G. Allan, Jr., Vice Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard.

**ADVANCING AMERICA'S INTERESTS AT
THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION'S
14TH MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE**

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing entitled "Advancing America's Interests at the World Trade Organization's 14th Ministerial Conference". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2026

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine platform power as section 230 turns 30, 10 a.m., SR-253.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water, to hold hearings to examine challenges and opportunities with implementing the Endangered Species Act, 10 a.m., SD-562.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to receive a closed briefing on the current situation in the Middle East, 10 a.m., SVC-217.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Markwayne Mullin, of Oklahoma, to be Secretary of Homeland Security, 9:30 a.m., SD-342.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: to hold hearings to examine sunshine week, focusing on bringing secret government spending to light, 2:30 p.m., SR-428A.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: business meeting to consider S. 342, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize an individual who is awarded the Purple Heart for service in the Armed Forces to transfer unused Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to a family member, S. 410, to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, S. 649, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to members of the National Guard who perform certain full-time duty, S. 1116, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the provision of certain additional burial benefits for individuals for whom an urn or plaque is furnished, S. 1657, to amend title 38, United States Code, to limit the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to deny the claim of a veteran for benefits under the laws administered by such Secretary on the sole basis that such veteran failed to appear for a medical examination associated with such claim, S. 1665, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure veterans of secrecy oath programs receive the full benefits they have earned, S. 1726, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify that the Department of Veterans Affairs definition of "medical services" includes medically necessary automobile adaptations, S. 1868, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand access by veterans to critical access hospitals and affiliated clinics under the Veterans Community Care Program, S. 2061, to require the Interagency Working Group on Toxic Exposure to conduct research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of descendants of individuals exposed to toxic substances while serving

as members of the Armed Forces, S. 2220, to expand presumptions of exposure by members of the Armed Forces to toxic substances, S. 2264, to improve the emergency management capabilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 2309, to direct a physician or nurse practitioner employed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to certify the death of a veteran not later than 48 hours after such physician or nurse practitioner learns of such death, S. 2328, to authorize the use of veterans educational assistance for examinations and assessments to receive credit toward degrees awarded by institutions of higher learning, S. 2333, to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit supplementation of health records of deceased veterans, S. 2397, to require implementation by the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain recommendations relating to the provision of health care through community care providers, S. 2683, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Veterans Scam and Fraud Evasion Officer, S. 2807, to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the applicability of the authority to reconsider decisions of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of the Army to inter remains or honor the memory of a person in a national cemetery, S. 2981, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of prosthetic and rehabilitative items and services by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 3033, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish partnerships between medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and medical facilities in rural areas, S. 3119, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make temporary lodging facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs available for members of the Armed Forces, other individuals on active duty, and family members of such individuals on a space-available basis, S. 3138, to amend title 38, United States Code, to include adaptive prostheses and terminal devices for sports and other recreational activities in the medical services furnished to eligible veterans by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, S. 3303, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to establish or enhance a community integration platform for services for veterans, to require the collection from veterans of information related to social determinants of health, S. 3758, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make opioid overdose rescue medications available to veterans and their caregivers, and a committee resolution, 4 p.m., SR-418.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine worldwide threats; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SH-219, 10 a.m., SH-216.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness (Day 2, Morning Session)”, 9 a.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Government Accountability Office and Congressional Budget Office, 9 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, budget hearing on the Architect of the Capitol, 11 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “American Indian and Alaska Native Public Witness (Day 2, Afternoon Session)”, 1 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Military Posture and National Security Challenges in Europe”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces; and Subcommittee on Readiness, joint hearing entitled “Posture and Readiness of the Mobility Enterprise”, 3 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations, hearing entitled “U.S. Special Operations Forces and Command—Challenges and Resource Priorities for Fiscal Year 2027”, 3:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing entitled “Strengthening Federal Workers’ Compensation Programs: Ensuring Integrity, Efficiency, and Access”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Lowering Health Care Costs for All Americans: An Examination of the U.S. Provider Landscape”, 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “Securing U.S. Leadership of Communications Technology”, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on National Security, Illicit Finance and International Financial Institutions, hearing entitled “Oversight of the Export-Import Bank”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Task Force on Monetary Policy, Treasury Market Resilience, and Economic Prosperity, hearing entitled “Revisiting the Treasury-Fed Accord”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Restoring Mission Focus at the State Department: Authority, Accountability, and the Role of the Foreign Service”, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 6028, the “Legislative Branch Agencies Clarification Act”; and H.R. 5891, the “Withhold Member Pay During Shutdowns Act”, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government, hearing entitled “Immigration Policy by Court Order: The Adverse Effects of Plyler v. Doe”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled “The Legal Basis for Action Against Venezuelan Drug Traffickers”, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 3286, the “Mammoth Cave National Boundary Adjustment Act of 2025”; H.R. 4290, the “Downwinder Commemoration Act of 2025”; H.R. 4716, to transfer administrative jurisdiction of certain Federal land in Saratoga Springs, Utah, from the Secretary of the Interior to the United States Postal Service for construction of a post office, and for other purposes; H.R.

5555, the “Monterey Bay National Heritage Area Study Act”; H.R. 6062, to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain parcels of federal land in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, and for other purposes; and H.R. 7031, the “Making National Parks Safer Act”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 6916, the “Federal Program Integrity and Fraud Prevention Act of 2025”; H.R. 428, the “Bonuses for Cost-Cutters Act of 2025”; H.R. 1722, the “Billion Dollar Boondoggle Act of 2025”; H.R. 4642, the “Fiscal Contingency Preparedness Act”; H.R. 2069, the “Stop Secret Spending Act of 2025”; legislation on the Settlement Agreement Information Database Act of 2026; H.R. 2766, the “Special District Fairness and Accessibility Act”; H.R. 5525, Stop DC Capital Authoritarian Motorvehicle Enforcement and Restoration of Autonomy Act”; H.R. 6399, to direct the United States Postal Service to designate a single, unique ZIP Code for Highland City, Utah; and H.R. 6247, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13355 North Lon Adams Road in Marana, Arizona, as the “Mayor Ed Honea Memorial Post Office”, 10 a.m., HVC–210.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7813, the “NOAA Weather Radio Modernization Act”, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Connecting SBA to Main Street: Examining the SBA Office of Field Operations”, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5688, the “Dalilah’s Law”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 6733, the “VISN Reform Act of 2025”; H.R. 6580, the “VA National Formulary Act of 2025”; H.R. 6755, the “Accountable Leadership for Veterans Act of 2025”; H.R. 6599, the “Leasing and Infrastructure Act of 2025”; H.R. 6583, the “Research Reform Act of 2025”; H.R. 6549, the “VA Contracting and Procurement Act”; H.R. 6740, the “VA TRUST Act”; H.R. 6764, the “Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee Oversight Act of 2025”; H.R. 6904, the “Veterans Readiness and Employment Improvement and Accountability Act of

2025”; H.R. 6843, the “Establishing the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration Act of 2025”; H.R. 6861, the “Consolidating Veteran Employment Services for Improved Performance Act”; H.R. 6833, the “Acquisition Reform and Cost Assessment Act of 2025”; H.R. 2303, the “Board of Veterans’ Appeals Attorney Retention and Backlog Reduction Act”; H.R. 10, the “Dental Care for Veterans Act”; H.R. 3183, the “SAFE STEPS for Veterans Act of 2025”; H.R. 5203, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to update directives of the Department of Veterans Affairs regarding the management of acute sexual assault, and for other purposes; H.R. 4114, the “EVEST Act”; H.R. 3869, the “Every Veteran Housed Act”; H.R. 1732, the “GUARD VA Benefits Act”; H.R. 2722, the “VA Funding and Workforce Protection Act”; H.R. 1391, the “Student Veteran Benefit Restoration Act of 2025”; H.R. 4876, the “Reproductive Freedom for Veterans Act”; legislation on the Get Justice-Involved Veterans BACK HOME Act; legislation on the Toxic Exposure Advisory Committee Establishment Act; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Advisory Committee on Toxic Exposure of the Department of Veterans Affairs; legislation on the Honor Vets Act; legislation to provide for the modernization of the electronic health record system and other health information technology activities and systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, 10:15 a.m., 360 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Improving Kidney Health Through Better Prevention and Innovative Treatment”, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, Full Committee, hearing entitled “From the Science Lab to the Medicine Cabinet: How China Is Cornering the Market on Our Medicines”, 10 a.m., 390 Cannon.

Joint Meeting

Joint Economic Committee: to hold hearings to examine keeping promises, focusing on labor inflows, maintaining competitiveness, and supporting an aging population, 2:30 p.m., SH–216.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Wednesday, March 18

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will continue consideration of the House message to accompany S. 1383, SAVE America Act.

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 1958—Deporting Fraudsters Act of 2026. Consideration of H.R. 556—Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act. Consideration of the following measure under suspension of the Rules: H.J. Res. 139—Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring a balanced budget for the Federal Government.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E225
Bean, Aaron, Fla., E224
Bergman, Jack, Mich., E223, E224, E225, E226

Cherfilus-McCormick, Sheila, Fla., E223, E224, E225, E227
Frankel, Lois, Fla., E223, E226
Lynch, Stephen F., Mass., E226
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E227

Spartz, Victoria, Ind., E223
Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E224, E227
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E225



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.