



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2026

No. 56

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 25, 2026.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RILEY M. MOORE 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.

HONORING CURTIS ANGST

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to solemnly honor the life of an American hero who gave his life in service to his country.

On Thursday, March 12, 2026, while deployed as part of Operation Epic Fury, six crewmembers were killed when the U.S. Air Force KC-135 aerial refueling tanker crashed in Iraq's airspace. Two crewmembers were from our Buckeye State, and one was from my district: Captain Curtis Angst of Wilmington.

Curtis was a standout student, earning honors from both Wilmington High School, where he graduated in 2014, and at the University of Cincinnati, where he earned a degree in aerospace engineering.

Curtis had a great love for aviation, which began in his childhood. Curtis' mother, Lisa, remembers how Curtis would play with toy airplanes outside of his family's home. Curtis' father, Matt, was a private pilot and took Curtis up in the air for the first time when he was just a toddler. Lisa worked as a flight attendant for airlines, so Curtis seemed destined to take flight when he got older.

Captain Angst was only 30 years old when he made the ultimate sacrifice. During his final mission, he was serving as a pilot for the 166th Air Refueling Squadron at the 121st Refueling Wing at Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base in Columbus. With a decade of service, Captain Angst had completed 880 flight hours and 67 combat hours, leaving behind a legacy of selfless service and a deep commitment to protecting our Nation.

Earlier in his career, Captain Angst had also deployed in 2015 in Operation Spartan Shield and was responsible for flying worldwide for air refueling, aeromedical services, cargo transport, and passenger operations.

Captain Angst leaves behind a loving wife, Mary. My heart goes out to her and the rest of Curtis' family as they navigate this unthinkable loss. This tragedy is a solemn reminder that freedom is not free and that we owe a debt of gratitude to Curtis and the other servicemembers who have given their lives in service to this country.

I continue to stand resolutely behind our courageous servicemembers and their families as they prove time after time that America is the land of the free because of the brave.

Captain Angst's service and sacrifice will never be forgotten. I salute Cap-

tain Angst for his courage and speak on behalf of southern Ohio when I say that he will be remembered as an American hero.

My prayers and deepest condolences will continue to be with Captain Angst and his family in the months ahead.

RECOGNIZING GREATER CENTENNIAL A.M.E. ZION CHURCH

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the community presence of Greater Centennial A.M.E. Zion Church, a beacon of faith and service in the city of Mount Vernon, New York.

Under the spiritual leadership of the Rev. Dr. Stephen Pogue, Greater Centennial traces its founding to 1896, 130 years ago. 'Those founders' vision has been realized in today's Greater Centennial: dynamic weekly worship services, Bible study classes, weekly prayer call, Sunday school and programs for young people, Wellness Wednesday programs, and in the outreach to assist those of the community in need with food and clothing, as well as seniors in need of companionship and care.

Dr. Pogue has led Greater Centennial for over a decade, having served in the ministry previously from Harlem to Oakland, California. He holds master's and doctoral degrees in divinity studies. His service extends beyond the congregation as a chaplain for the Mount Vernon Police Department, vice chair of the Westchester County Human Rights Commission, and membership in prominent African-American organizations, including president of the United Black Clergy.

From the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, we salute the Rev. Dr. Stephen Pogue and the church that he shepherds, Greater Centennial A.M.E. Zion Church in Mount Vernon.

□ 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.

H2679

RECOGNIZING CHANCE MULLEN

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to extend happy birthday wishes on April 4 to Pelham Mayor Chance Mullen, who is showing talent and leadership in the public sector, as well as in the private nonprofit world.

Chance was elected as mayor of the village of Pelham in 2019 and is serving in his fourth term. He served previously as a trustee on the village board.

Chance is the chief elected official for Pelham Village, a community of 7,000 people, with all the municipal responsibilities and headaches that come with the position of mayor: the responsibilities for police, fire, sanitation, and the like.

Through all of that, Mayor Mullen has done an exemplary job, but that is not his only job. In his professional life, Chance serves as the executive director of the Housing Action Council, a regional nonprofit organization dedicated to expanding housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households.

Finally, Chance Mullen is an active Pelham volunteer: Cub Scouts, Little League baseball, the Picture House, Pelham Civic Association, and more.

From the floor of the House of Representatives, I wish a happy birthday to Mayor Chance Mullen and encourage him to take a break for at least one day.

RECOGNIZING ELECTION WINNERS IN NEW YORK

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, March 18, was a day for democracy in New York State.

Voters in many of our villages went to the polls to elect leaders to serve their home communities, running the village governments that provide basic services in their area: police, fire, sanitation, recreation, snow removal, land use authority, and the like.

In Westchester's 16th Congressional District, let me salute those who have won.

In the village of Bronxville, Helen Knapp and Vanessa O'Friel were elected as trustees to the Bronxville Village Board. William Prince was elected village justice.

In the village of Elmsford, Nelson Lopez and David Signor were elected as trustees to the Elmsford Village Board.

In the village of Scarsdale, Tim Foley, Ron Schulhof, and Scott Silberfein were elected as trustees to the Scarsdale Village Board.

These elections were held without controversy or incident. There were no claims of illegal voting or stolen elections but just simply democracy at work.

I congratulate the winners and thank all who competed in their service to the communities.

HONORING ERIC F. MELGREN

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Judge Eric F. Melgren

of the United States District Court for the District of Kansas and to recognize his distinguished service on the Federal bench.

Today, the district of Kansas unveiled Judge Melgren's official portrait and celebrated his lasting legacy after nearly two decades of active judicial service. As of September 1, 2025, Judge Melgren has assumed senior status, which he will continue to serve with the same dedication and commitment that have defined his entire career.

Judge Melgren's story is a Kansas story. Raised on a cattle and wheat farm in southwest Kansas, he is a first-generation college graduate who went on to lead as student body president of Wichita State University and later earned his law degree from Washburn University.

From private practice in Wichita to serving as United States Attorney for the district of Kansas and, ultimately, to his appointment to the Federal bench by President George W. Bush, his career reflects a life rooted in hard work, service, and leadership.

Over 18 years on the bench, including his time as Chief Judge, Judge Melgren has upheld the rule of law with integrity and a deep respect for the Constitution. He has also given back to his community, leading organizations like United Way of the Plains and Leadership Wichita, and remaining closely connected to the people and institutions that helped to shape him.

In the Big First District and across Kansas, we value those who serve with humility, lead with principle, and stay grounded in their roots. Judge Melgren embodies those values.

I thank him for his service, congratulate him on this milestone, and wish him the very best as he continues his hard work on the bench.

HONORING MICHAEL HINTON

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a proud Kansan whose work honors the legacy of American agriculture and the generations who built it.

Michael Hinton of Hutchinson has dedicated his life to preserving the history and heritage of rural America through antique tractors, but his work goes far beyond restoring old equipment. It is about telling the story of the men and women who have worked the land, provided for their families, and helped feed the world.

Through his creation of Antique Tractors Preservation Day and the launch of talkingtractors.com, Michael has built a platform that brings agricultural history to life and connects generations through a shared appreciation for hard work, innovation, and community. His efforts have earned recognition across Kansas and the Nation.

This year, Michael was inducted into the National Agricultural Hall of Fame, joining the ranks of some of the most influential figures in our Nation's agricultural history, from George Washington to John Deere. He is now

one of only a handful of Kansans to receive this distinguished honor.

In the Big First District of Kansas, agriculture is not just our way of life. It is our legacy. Leaders like Michael Hinton remind us that preserving that legacy matters while we continue to build its future.

I am grateful for his work, proud to call him a fellow Kansan, and congratulate him on his well-deserved recognition.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH RAMIREZ

(Mrs. RAMIREZ of Illinois was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a fierce advocate for justice and a tireless champion for gun violence prevention, Elizabeth Ramirez.

On a tragic night almost 15 years ago, Elizabeth's son, Harry Rodriguez, was fatally shot, giving his life to protect his family members when a masked assailant opened fire during his 23rd birthday celebration.

From the depths of unimaginable grief, Elizabeth transformed her pain into purpose. She cofounded Parents for Peace and Justice in Belmont Cragin, in Illinois-03, to not only advocate for stronger gun violence prevention measures but to provide essential support to families who have been impacted by gun violence.

Elizabeth provides courtroom support for families. She organizes peace walks and hosts vigils throughout communities to ensure that no family member has to navigate the profound pain of losing a loved one to violence alone.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, I am proud to commend Elizabeth Ramirez for her relentless hope and for her essential work to help our communities recover from violence and loss.

I thank Elizabeth, and may her son rest in peace and power.

RECOGNIZING JESSICA ESQUIVEL

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Dr. Jessica Esquivel.

Jessica is a queer, Afro-Latine, particle physicist, disruptor, author, and visionary who has made it her personal mission to ensure the success of underrepresented communities in the sciences.

As one of the few Afro-Latine, queer women in the world of STEAM, Jessica embraces all facets of her identity, unapologetically existing in spaces that have historically excluded people who look like her or identify as she does.

Through her work as an associate scientist at Fermilab, her leadership as cofounder of Oyanova Enterprises, and her creation of Twitter movement #blackinphysics, she has fostered opportunities for Black and Brown leaders to thrive through culturally relevant STEAM programming, mental

health advocacy, and countless other initiatives.

Jessica's work reveals the critical intersection of science, identity, and culture, demonstrating how diverse perspectives are essential to solving the challenges of our time.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my honor to commend Dr. Jessica Esquivel for blazing trails and reminding us that all is possible when we lift others as we climb.

I congratulate Dr. Esquivel on her success.

RECOGNIZING MARY SANTANA

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mary Santana, a visionary whose leadership has built transformative, creative spaces that uplift our young people in Illinois-03 and beyond.

Mary is the founder and executive director at the Miracle Center, an organization that reflects her belief that community, creativity, and care have the power to change lives. The Miracle Center is a beacon for diverse youth and families, offering mentoring, coaching, training, and academic support, all grounded in the arts.

□ 1015

What started as a small day camp run out of her basement apartment has, over the last 30 years, grown to impact over 20,000 young people across Chicago. Mary has ensured that The Miracle Center nurtures diverse local artists, showcases BIPOC artistry, and uplifts unique perspectives. Under her leadership, The Miracle Center has grown, acquiring a dedicated building near my district office offering Latino artists a platform for performance.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, I am proud to commend Mary Santana for bringing the power of art to our communities and establishing The Miracle Center in Illinois Three as a space where young people can explore their creative dreams and know that nothing is impossible when you dream and you have community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mary and congratulate and commend her on this House floor.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SERGEANT BENJAMIN N. PENNINGTON

(Mr. CRANK of Colorado was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CRANK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the nation in mourning the loss of Sergeant Benjamin N. Pennington, assigned to the 1st Battalion, 1st Space Brigade in my district at Fort Carson in Colorado Springs.

A Kentucky native, Benjamin had the drive to serve instilled in him from a young age. Even as a kid, he knew he wanted to be an American soldier. Here beside me is one of his drawings he made in kindergarten where he wrote: "I love America because I want to fight for my country," at 5 years old. He

would even spend all day outside playing Army man with his friends and with his neighbors, dreaming of the day he would be able to wear a uniform. He enjoyed watching the Military Channel and reading books about the military. Even his childhood bedroom was decorated with Army prints and military planes hanging from the ceiling.

As a teenager, Benjamin enjoyed playing sports, but he dedicated most of his time to Boy Scouts, later proving his dedication to serving by achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

In growing up, many of his teachers recognized all the qualities of an American hero. With his determination, his compassion, and his natural charismatic demeanor, no act of service was ever too small.

In 2017, at age 18, just one month after graduating high school and his Eagle Scout ceremony, Benjamin enlisted in the United States Army as a supply unit specialist, where he quickly earned the trust of his colleagues and senior officials.

He spent much of his career stationed at Fort Polk in Louisiana, and he served a tour in Korea before ultimately being stationed at Fort Carson. While there, Benjamin fell in love with the beauty of the nature and the mountains of Colorado Springs. It was there that he also found the comfort of home in church, giving his life to Christ through baptism in January of this year.

While talking to Benjamin's father, Tim, a great man, he told me that Benjamin enjoyed going to Major League Baseball games and had the goal to see a game at every MLB stadium.

Benjamin was deployed in support of Operation Epic Fury, answering the call to defend our freedoms from those who sought to harm our country. Tragically, on March 8, Benjamin was only 26 years young when he gave the ultimate sacrifice, succumbing to his injuries during an enemy attack at Prince Sultan Air Base in Saudi Arabia. His sacrifice is a grave and sobering reminder of the dangers our men and women in uniform face in the Middle East and across the globe to defend our Nation and our freedoms.

During Benjamin's time in service, he earned many honors, including the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal and the Army Commendation Medal. In recognition of his true bravery and his true sacrifice, the United States Army has announced that he will be posthumously promoted to the rank of staff sergeant, an enduring testament to the courage and sacrifice to our Nation that will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in honoring Sergeant Pennington's noble sacrifice.

THE WAR IN IRAN

(Mr. DOGGETT of Texas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, before departing the Capitol last week, I stood at this very spot with Democratic and Republican colleagues, three separate times, to honor, with moments of silence, American servicemembers who have fallen in Trump's reckless war in Iran. If congressional Republicans continue to remain silent, the only result will be more of those ceremonies and more deaths of innocents like the 168 children and teachers who were killed by a U.S. bomb.

An arrogant Hegseth dismisses all of this with a shrug as "bad things happen." To Trump, he sees it as a fundraising opportunity as he solicits money using the pictures of these fallen heroes.

But for the families who lost a father, a son, or a daughter, a spouse, it means an empty seat at Thanksgiving. It means a bride walking unaccompanied down the aisle. It means an untouched pillow on the bed. It means years of grief without the good advice, the laughter, the hope, and the bear hug that will never come.

While Iran certainly has a tyrannical regime that has murdered thousands of its own citizens and in prior years was responsible for the deaths of some Americans, Iran posed no imminent or immediate threat at the time President Trump chose to suddenly abandon negotiations and launch an assault. Republicans are rubber-stamping a war that lacks any plan or any set goal. More than 200 American servicemembers have already been wounded, and Trump is certainly not dispatching more ground troops to the area for the sunshine.

We are now in week 4 of what he told us was a 4- to 5-week war. All we have to show for it is death and destruction, a depleted weapons supply, soaring gas prices, and an Iranian regime that is intact and more hardline than ever.

Israeli officials have advised that any Iranian protestors will be "slaughtered" by a brutal regime that is "not cracking." What is much worse about this is that Trump knew. He was told by close advisers that this would be the outcome before this war began. As one said: "It wasn't just predictable, it was predicted."

Instead of acknowledging this complete failure, Trump continues to endanger all of us. Now, he is submitting to this Congress a bill for American taxpayers of \$200 billion. Let's face it, Iran has grabbed Trump by the Hormuz, with no path out of a quagmire that could be like Iraq where we lost 4,400 servicemembers and wasted over \$2 trillion.

With Trump's \$200 billion bill, about 22 million Americans could have affordable access to healthcare, not just this year, but with restored tax credits for the next 7 years. Our veterans, 9 million veterans could get their VA healthcare paid for for the next 2 years. With \$200 billion, we could double the National Institutes of Health budget to explore research for Alzheimer's and

other dreaded diseases. We could fully fund Pell grants and educational opportunities for 7 million Americans over the next 7 years, actions that could have been taken here at home, but Trump yielded to pressure from abroad.

We know that under Trump it is Netanyahu first and Americans second. Too weak to prevent this war by saying no to him, he continues to blindly follow strongmen. Amazingly, when Trump is told that war criminal Vladimir Putin is helping Iran target American servicemembers, he shrugs it off. He is so desperate that he has now not only lifted sanctions on Russian oil, fueling the Russian war machine to attack innocents in Ukraine, he has actually removed sanctions on Iranian oil to fund the Iranian Government and the missiles that they continue to send our way.

While Trump declares himself the “acting president of Venezuela” and says that he can do “anything I want” to Cuba, while one of his many lies contradicts the next one, he really believes that he is not just king of America, but king of the universe. Yet, it is Americans that will pay the very severe price for his gigantic ego and constant whims that embark us in danger around the globe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY'S ROAR PROGRAM

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

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, we celebrated World Down Syndrome Day. Today, I rise to honor a program that reflects that spirit of inclusion—Washington State University's ROAR program—and to celebrate one of its newest admitted students, Cole Rodgers.

Cole has a dream shared by many young people: to go to college, study alongside great students, and cheer on the Cougs. He is energetic, kind, and passionate about serving others, and he brings a love of music, basketball, and Cougar sports wherever he goes. He hopes to study communications and government affairs, build his public-speaking skills, and explore career paths that will help him live independently.

WSU ROAR makes those dreams possible. As part of a federally-supported initiative under the model Comprehensive Transition and Postsecondary Programs for Students with Intellectual Disabilities, otherwise known as TPSID, ROAR reflects a proven model being implemented successfully on campuses across the country.

The program provides inclusive coursework, on-campus living, hands-on internships, and real preparation for life after college, opening doors for students with intellectual and develop-

mental disabilities to learn, grow, and thrive. Just last week, ROAR received a \$2.48 million Federal grant, funding I was proud to help secure.

WSU ROAR opens up doors for students like Cole and other students across campus to develop the skills and experience needed to contribute meaningfully to our communities and economy.

Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of Cougar Nation, I know what it means personally to be a Cougar. Cole is a Cougar, too, and programs like WSU ROAR ensure that every student with a dream has a chance to pursue it.

CONGRATULATING SERGEANT MIKE SWIM

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sergeant Mike Swim of Stevens County on his well-earned retirement after 29 years with the Stevens County Sheriff's Department.

Sergeant Swim has spent his entire life in service, from Explorers Search and Rescue at age 12, to the U.S. Navy, to nearly three decades protecting the community he loves.

His courage was tested on September 27, 2017, when a suspect fired nine rounds into his patrol vehicle at point-blank range. Miraculously, he survived. The bullet-ridden door he keeps in his garage is a powerful reminder of both the blessings and the dangers that law enforcement faces every day.

Even in retirement, Sergeant Swim will continue serving as a special deputy, assisting with crime scenes, cold cases, and emergency response.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Sergeant Swim for his extraordinary dedication and wish him the very best in his next chapter.

CONGRATULATING GONZAGA BULLDOGS AND UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO VANDALS BASKETBALL TEAMS

Mr. BAUMGARTNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Gonzaga Bulldogs and the University of Idaho Vandals, both men's and women's basketball teams, for outstanding seasons. It has been incredible to watch them bring true determination and passion to the court.

Like many young people who grew up in the Inland Northwest and on the Palouse, I followed all of our local sports teams, including the Cougs, the Zags, the Eags, the Vandals, and the Whitworth sports teams.

This year, the Zags and Vandals gave us plenty to cheer about. The Gonzaga men's team showed their relentless Bulldog spirit, powering through the season with a 31-4 record and a WCC championship. The Gonzaga women's team delivered a thrilling season of their own, finishing 24-10 and capturing their 11th WCC championship title.

I also recognize the Vandals men's team for an impressive 21-15 season that kept fans on their feet and their appearance in the NCAA Tournament. Finally, I recognize the Vandals women's team that lit up the court with a phenomenal 29-6 record, earning their first NCAA Tournament appearance

since 2016, capped by a huge 60-57 win over rival Montana State.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all of these teams for an electric season and their truly remarkable performance. Go Zags. Go Vandals. All of the fans of the Inland Northwest should never forget how spoiled they are with all of our wonderful teams.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Member from Delaware (Representative MCBRIDE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend and pastor, the Reverend Dr. Gregory Knox Jones, and to congratulate him on his retirement after 22 years leading Westminster Presbyterian Church in Wilmington, Delaware.

I have had the pleasure of seeing Reverend Jones' ministry up close, as a lifelong member of Westminster where I have been witness to a community shaped by his dynamic leadership, incisive mind, eloquent sermons, and his big heart.

Since joining Westminster in 2004, Reverend Jones has led with compassion, putting his faith into action time and time again. He has tirelessly centered peace and justice in his ministry both here in the United States and around the world from Central America to the Middle East.

Throughout his ministry, he has followed the example of Christ by welcoming the stranger and building bridges with those too often cast into the shadows of society. At a time of deepening divisions, he has fostered interfaith relationships and partnerships across Delaware's Christian, Jewish, and Muslim communities.

His tireless devotion to his neighbors is matched only by his faithful counsel of our Westminster community, supporting congregants and their families through love and loss—a privilege he has delivered with exceptional care and grace. My own family and I are eternally grateful for his guidance and support through the challenges we have faced in our own lives.

While he has served as pastor to a First Lady and a U.S. Senator, Reverend Jones has been there personally and professionally for all of God's children, no matter who they are, where they come from, how they look, or whom they love. As Westminster enters its 140th year, Reverend Jones' impact is deep, and his example is profound.

I thank Reverend Jones and Camila for their remarkable stewardship of Westminster, and I wish them all the best in their next chapter.

I congratulate Greg on a well-deserved retirement.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Ms. MCBRIDE. Mr. Speaker, this week marks 16 years since the Affordable Care Act became the law of the land. And for millions of Americans,

including tens of thousands of Delawares, the ACA has meant the difference between getting care and going without.

The ACA had an ambitious but necessary goal: ensuring more Americans have access to the healthcare they need to live and thrive in our country.

Because of the ACA, more than 50 million Americans have gained health coverage. People with preexisting conditions have been protected from losing their insurance, and Medicaid expansion has helped families get the care they need.

When people have access to care, lives are saved, families are more stable, and communities are stronger.

But since its passage, the one through line of every Republican Congress has been their concerted and coordinated effort to sabotage the ACA and strip people of their healthcare.

Since this current Congress convened last January, the ACA tax credits have expired, and the majority passed the single largest cut to Medicaid in American history. They eviscerated the American healthcare system, gutting coverage and financial support that makes it possible for families to get care. They raided the healthcare of the American people to fund this President's mass deportation machine and to give massive tax breaks to his billionaire donors.

The consequence is a tax on working people, a tax on our most vulnerable neighbors.

When you force working families to pay more out of pocket for basic healthcare, that is a tax. It is a tax on getting sick and a tax on staying alive.

Families across the country have already started losing coverage, and millions more are facing skyrocketing premiums that are unsustainable.

Government should be working to make life easier for the people we serve, not making healthcare harder for them to afford.

The right to lifesaving care is a foundational right, one that makes all other rights possible. Americans will never truly be free until every single one of us can get the healthcare that we need.

So, on this anniversary, we shouldn't just celebrate the ideals of the ACA of 16 years ago, but we should also recommit ourselves to ensuring that the promise of quality, affordable healthcare becomes a reality for today's family.

RECOGNIZING NATHAN MARTIN

(Mr. WALBERG of Michigan was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nathan Martin, a dedicated cross-country coach and substitute teacher at Jackson High School, who has earned national recognition by winning the 41st Los Angeles Marathon.

Nathan's story is one of grit, heart, and perseverance.

During the race he told himself: I can't give up. It was a simple but powerful motto that carried him to pass the international leader and cross the finish line as the champion in the final seconds of the race.

However, Nathan's impact extends far beyond his own personal achievement. As a coach and substitute teacher, he inspires young runners and students, teaching them the values of discipline, resilience, and believing in themselves.

His victory is a win for the entire Jackson community and for every student he has encouraged along the way.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Nathan on his remarkable and historic accomplishment.

FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS

(Ms. BROWN of Ohio was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, more and more I am troubled by a simple question: Will Donald Trump be the last President ever elected by a free and fair election?

That certainly seems to be the plan. In 2024, Donald Trump said: Get out and vote, just this time. You won't have to do it again.

In 2023, he said that he would be a dictator on day one.

In 2021, after he lost, he tried to overturn the election, which led to people attacking this Chamber where we stand right now.

When Donald Trump talks about elections, he does not hide what he wants. He keeps talking about taking over elections, and his number one legislative priority is the SAVE Act. The only one thing that this bill is designed to save is Donald Trump's political future.

This bill would create a paperwork nightmare for millions of Americans. The SAVE Act requires documents that millions of citizens do not have in order to vote.

That is right. Even the new REAL ID drivers' licenses we all had to get don't meet the standard. Even military IDs wouldn't count. You will need a passport, which costs you about \$160 and takes weeks to receive, or your birth certificate.

Mr. Speaker, did you know that half of the country does not have a passport, and millions more don't have access to their birth certificate?

Then there are married women who might have changed the name on their documents, and so now they don't match because they changed their name.

The SAVE Act also ends online and by-mail voter registration. Good luck registering to vote if you have a job, have a family, or live far from your county seat or board of elections.

Add it all up, and millions of American citizens will lose their right to vote.

This bill is designed to give the Stephen Millers of the world every oppor-

tunity they can to find or kick people off voting rolls.

If Congress passes the SAVE Act, it will be the first time since Jim Crow that our legislature has acted to make our democracy smaller, not larger.

Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump is many things, but a mystery he is not, nor is what he is trying to do.

FUNDING CHOICES

Ms. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. In 2003, it was tax cuts for the wealthy and a war we were told would be quick and necessary. Trillions of dollars later, the American people were left holding the bill, and here we go again.

Did you know demand for private jets is booming after President Trump gave tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans last year? Now, the President wants \$200 billion more to fund an unauthorized and unacceptable war in Iran, a war that is already jacking up costs from the gas pump to the grocery store. That is \$200 billion, \$200 billion.

Again, let's talk choices. Let's talk priorities.

We were told there is no money for healthcare, so Republicans gutted Medicaid and refused to extend Affordable Care Act tax credits.

We were told there was no money to help people to put food on their table, so Republicans passed their big, ugly law cutting \$186 billion from nutrition programs.

We were told there was no money for education, so they cut student loan programs, and at the same time they delivered more tax breaks at the top while everyone else falls further behind.

For war, for the wealthy, suddenly there is always money. There are billions for conflict. There are billions for ICE. There are billions for billionaires. We were told there was no money to help families afford groceries, to educate our kids, or to lower healthcare costs.

These are the choices being made: higher costs for you, bigger checks for war, and more tax breaks at the top.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: This isn't really about priorities or scarcity, is it? It is about actually your priorities, and right now the priorities are upside down.

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

RECOGNIZING THE OIL CITY DERRICK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize The Oil City Derrick, which published the final print edition of The Derrick and The News-Herald on March 20.

The Derrick opened at 1871 under its prior name of the Daily Derrick by C.E. Bishop & Company. The publication covered the latest stories in Oil City.

When Edwin Drake struck oil in western Pennsylvania, The Derrick quickly became a national news outlet, and it was best known for its coverage of oil prices.

The newspaper was a key source of information for journalists like Ida Tarbell, who reported the oil wars of the 1870s.

Patrick C. Boyle, a prominent figure in the oil industry, bought The Derrick in 1885. Patrick helped to establish other newspapers, including the Bradford Era and the Oil and Gas Journal.

The newspaper was owned by the Boyle family for four generations. Patrick Boyle passed away in 1920, and ownership of the newspaper was passed on to his son, Edward Boyle, who served as a publisher until his death in 1938.

For more than 100 years, the Boyle family was influential in the newspaper's success. From Patrick Boyle's purchase of the outlet in 1885, the family's stewardship ensured that for 154 years The Derrick never once missed a day of publication—an incredible accomplishment.

The pages of The Derrick served as the record for the region's history. Major events included President Ulysses S. Grant's visit to the area and the Great Fire and Flood of 1892.

The Derrick didn't just witness change. It lived through it. Through every win and loss of the oil boom to the dawn of the industrial revolution to the emergence of the digital age, this newspaper adapted and prevailed.

The Derrick stood as a constant for 154 years, capturing the evolution of our community and the very way that we share the news.

Mr. Speaker, it is never easy when we see our local institutions close, especially those that have played such an important role in our communities like The Derrick has for more than a century.

My heartfelt thanks go out to the staff who have worked diligently over the years to deliver the news to the people of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District.

For 154 years, The Derrick has been there, and we are all grateful for that.

BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPION

(Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, March indeed has been maddening for eastern North Carolina.

We have had exciting basketball and incredible powerhouse teams who have brought back the State championship title to eastern North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, Kinston High School clinched its 12th 3A State basketball championship with a dominant 80-54 victory over Walkertown.

MVP Jamarion Washington and Keyshawn Herring, who each scored an impressive 21 points, propelled the team to victory.

A heartfelt congratulations to Coach Tyndall and the entire team for their remarkable performance.

□ 1045

RECOGNIZING GOLDSBORO HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Goldsboro High School Cougars won the 3A girls' title with a 54-46 victory over East Surry.

MVP Aziyah Boyer shone brightly with 11 rebounds, carrying on her grandmother's legacy.

Kudos to the team, Coach Bryant, and to all the amazing coaches and the community for this outstanding win.

CONGRATULATING NORTHERN NASH HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, what a super exciting game.

The Northern Nash High School Knights came out on top, claiming the 2026 North Carolina High School Athletic Association Class 6A boys' basketball State championship in a heart-pounding overtime thriller.

They edged Kings Mountain with a nail-biting score of 61-60, and we are incredibly proud to congratulate Coach Drake, the Knights, and such dedicated fans, who were there to bring home this honor for the first time since 1968.

WILSON PREP MAKES HISTORY

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Wilson Prep has made history. The talented and dynamic Tiger girls' basketball team won the 1A State championship. It was their first-ever State title, as they beat Robbinsville 58-44.

CONGRATULATIONS TO COACH WARD AND THE TIGERS.

To all of our athletes: Thank you for making eastern North Carolina so proud and representing our communities on and off the court with excellence.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST PLAN FOR EMERGENCIES

(Mr. CLINE of Virginia was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize bipartisan legislation that I have introduced called the Fiscal Contingency Preparedness Act, which has garnered widespread support from Members on both sides of the Chamber. Just this week, the bipartisan Problem Solvers Caucus endorsed the bill.

At its core, this bill reflects a simple principle: Just as American families plan ahead for emergencies, the Federal Government must do the same.

Whether facing a natural disaster, an economic crisis, or a national security threat, Washington must understand its financial readiness to respond effectively.

For too long, the Federal Government has failed to seriously assess its ability to weather major national emergencies. Families across Virginia save for unexpected expenses and prepare for uncertainty. It is only reasonable that the government entrusted with safeguarding the Nation apply the

same level of responsibility and foresight.

This bill would require the Federal Government to conduct regular stress tests and publicly report on its capacity to respond to major emergency situations, ensuring transparency and sound decisionmaking during times of crisis.

Preparedness should never be a partisan issue. By identifying risks ahead of time, we can strengthen our response and protect taxpayers from avoidable failures during moments of national urgency.

Mr. Speaker, the Fiscal Contingency Preparedness Act is about responsibility and readiness. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort and take a meaningful step toward ensuring that our government is prepared to meet tomorrow's challenges.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MILDRED SCOTT

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great lady, Mildred Scott, a dear friend and a remarkable Virginian whose dedication to her community, her church, and civic life left a lasting impact across the Roanoke Valley and Virginia's Sixth Congressional District.

Mildred passed away on March 6 of this year at the age of 97, remaining as witty and spirited at the end of her life as she was throughout her nearly 100 years.

Originally from Roanoke, Mildred graduated from Jefferson High School and studied finance at Roanoke College. Mildred built a successful career in banking before continuing her service in the Roanoke County Treasurer's Office and later with the town of Vinton.

For more than four decades, she was devoted to her church family at Thrasher Memorial United Methodist Church, raising funds for missions through cooking and catering. Known across the region for her exceptional baking, she created countless cakes for weddings and community gatherings at the Vinton War Memorial.

Mildred also devoted well over 30 years to the Roanoke Valley Republican Women's Club, serving as president, vice president, and treasurer, and helping organize numerous Sixth District Republican galas and Roanoke County shrimpfests and baking those wonderful cakes for them.

Mildred Scott will be remembered as a pillar of her community whose generosity, work ethic, and joyful spirit touched countless lives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her life and legacy.

RECOGNIZING JORDYN MILLER

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary young athlete whose grit, discipline, and determination exemplify the very best of our next generation.

Mr. Speaker, 15-year-old Jordyn Miller of Clarke County recently captured the 2025 NASCAR Youth Series Heavy Honda Dirt National Championship,

leading every lap when it mattered most.

Jordyn's success is no accident. It is the result of years of hard work, countless hours studying her craft, and a deep family bond forged at racetracks across the country. With the guidance of her father, Jason Miller, a veteran racer himself, Jordyn learned not just how to drive fast but how to compete with focus, resilience, and humility.

In a sport defined by pressure and precision, Jordyn rose to the challenge, winning 17 races this past season. As she prepares to take the next step in her racing career, we celebrate her achievement and wish her continued success.

Mr. Speaker, Jordyn Miller reminds us that dreams, when met with effort, can turn into championships.

SULPHUR SPRINGS VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE WINS NRECA

(Mr. CISCOMANI of Arizona was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative in southern Arizona for receiving the 2026 Electric Cooperative Purpose Award from the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Electric cooperatives are unique. They are owned by the people they serve. Every customer is a member-owner. Every member has a voice. Decisions are made locally by neighbors who understand their communities' economic realities. This creates accountability, transparency, and a relentless focus on safety, reliability, and affordability.

In 2022, when global fuel prices surged, families and small businesses across Cochise County felt the impact. Energy costs rose sharply, pressuring household and business budgets. SSVEC's board and leadership team needed to protect the very members who own the cooperative while maintaining long-term stability, and that is exactly what they did.

They responded with ingenuity and resolve, launching direct communication with members, working with its cooperative partner AEPSCO to establish a fuel hedging program, and directing 100 percent of its annual operating margin to buy down more than \$8 million in member fuel bank debt. That action delivered immediate bill relief.

Behind the decision were employees who stayed focused on service to their members during a period of uncertainty. Now, SSVEC is stronger and better positioned to manage future volatility. Families and businesses in southern Arizona saw how local ownership translates into local solutions.

I congratulate the board of directors, the employees, and the member-owners of Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative. I thank them for their commitment to protecting affordability and serving rural Arizona.

SALPOINTE HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' SOCCER WINS 4A STATE TITLE

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Salpointe High School girls' soccer team on winning the 2026 4A State Championship title.

The Lady Lancers were led by Coach Jessica Rushton, a Tucson native who graduated from Salpointe in 2008. Rushton continues her coaching career at Salpointe following time spent at Pusch Ridge Christian Academy.

Despite the loss of their beloved and longtime coach, Kelly Pierce, only a few months before the start of the season, the team gave all they had under the leadership of Coach Rushton and earned yet another State championship title.

After an intense game, Salpointe defeated Mesa High School with a score of 5-4. Senior keeper Ani Jimenez was named the 4A championship MVP after an amazing save that sealed the Lancers' victory.

I congratulate Coach Rushton, the whole team, and everyone who made this win possible. Their hard work has made their school and our entire community very proud.

The Lancers should enjoy their victory. They have earned it. Here is to another successful season and to many, many more to come.

THREE MEMBERS OF CIENEGA HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING WIN STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Cienega High School wrestling team and its three 2026 State champions.

For the first time in Cienega history, the Bobcats have three State wrestling champions.

Daesiah Varner became Cienega's first-ever three-time State champion. Varner made history by becoming the first wrestler in the school's program to finish an entire season undefeated, going 36-0 and finishing her run with the State championship.

The other two champions, AJ Berryhill and Luke Ferguson, beat the record for the most wins in a season with a total of 50.

This championship caps off an amazing season of growth and commitment for the entire team, where each student worked day in and day out to improve their skills and strength.

I congratulate Coach Cole Hickey, the whole team, and everyone who made this win possible. Their hard work has made their school and our entire community very proud.

The bobcats should enjoy their victory. They have earned it. Here is to another successful season and to many, many more.

HONORING PHIL DECKARD

(Mr. BAIRD of Indiana was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Phil Deckard, the former mayor of Martinsville, Indiana, who passed away at the end of last year.

Phil dedicated 57 years of his life to public service and leadership in Morgan County and served four terms as the mayor of Martinsville.

Phil also served as the voice of the Martinsville Artesians, announcing football and basketball games at Martinsville High School.

Phil Deckard also served in the United States Navy as an airman from 1958 to 1959, before serving in the United States Air Force for another 4 years. He was honorably discharged as an E4 Airman First Class.

I am grateful for Phil's service to Indiana and our Nation. Our condolences and prayers go out to his family during this difficult time.

HONORING JOE ROOT

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Joe Root, who has served Clinton County as a veteran service officer for 25 years and served with the Clinton County Sheriff's Office for 20 years.

He served in the United States Marine Corps from 1966 to 1970 and eventually became a VSO in 2001 to advocate for fellow veterans and ensure our veterans receive the benefits they rightfully deserve.

Joe Root's commitment to our veterans in Indiana does not stop there. He helped establish the Clinton County War Memorial at the courthouse and has led Memorial Day veteran services and honored veterans with 100-year birthday celebrations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Joe Root for his selfless service to our country and to our Clinton County communities as well as his tireless advocacy on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

REMEMBERING DR. PHILIP LOW

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Philip Low, a remarkable scientist and teacher from Purdue University, who worked on breakthrough studies in drug discovery and cancer research. Dr. Low recently passed away at the age of 78.

In his career, he served as Purdue University's Presidential Scholar for Drug Discovery and the Ralph C. Corley Distinguished Professor of Chemistry. He held over 100 U.S. patents and is listed on 600 other patents and 145 invention disclosures. He received some of the highest honors that can be given by Purdue University.

Those who knew him well said "he cared about everybody," and "he spent every minute trying to do good." He certainly did, and his work truly helped save lives.

I offer my condolences to his family and friends during this time. Dr. Low was an outstanding Hoosier. May he rest in peace.

□ 1100

CATHERINE MYERS CELEBRATES 20 YEARS IN COMMUNITY JOURNALISM

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Catherine Myers from Hendricks County, who recently achieved a historic milestone, celebrating 20 years of publishing community journalism.

Catherine Myers and her husband, Rick, started a community newspaper

publishing business in 2005 when they launched the Business Leader, a newspaper featuring local businesses and business leaders in Hendricks County.

They went on to acquire additional newspapers in other counties in central Indiana. Unfortunately, Rick Myers passed away from cancer in 2021. After Rick's passing, Catherine Myers dedicated herself to launching a new community paper, the Hendricks County Community CONNECT, which serves Avon, Brownsburg, Danville, and Plainfield.

Catherine Myers has dedicated her life to bringing fresh perspectives and relevant content to our central Indiana communities. I thank her for her commitment to delivering local news, and I congratulate her on 20 years in the industry.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

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

We wait patiently for You, O Lord. Well, maybe not as patiently as we think, for rarely is there a day that passes when we do not find ourselves wishing things would speed up, that the answers we want would arrive, or that the situations we endure would pass quickly.

Incline Your ear to our concerns and hear our petitions for Your presence in our everyday issues and for Your peace in our lives.

Put a new word in our mouths, words that demonstrate our trust in Your steadfast guidance, words that reveal our trust in Your divine will.

For happy are those who trust in You, who do not turn to voices of pride or power or to the false gods that promise easy fixes and short-term gain.

Throughout history, time and again, You have multiplied Your wondrous deeds, deeds more numerous than the trials any or all of us have faced. Countless are Your thoughts toward us, thoughts deeper and more sincere than the many prayers we have offered to You.

As we reflect on all that You are and all that You have done for us, may we give unto You all that holds us back from putting our hope in Your deliverance.

In Your merciful name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces its approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BURCHETT 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

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

PRESIDENT TRUMP APPRECIATES THE IRANIAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Tehran regime is the leading sponsor of global terrorism, responsible for the cowardly murder of Iranians. Yet, the courage of the Iranian people continues, inspiring President Donald Trump to take action for the Iranian people to be liberated, ending 47 years of war on America and Israel.

Beginning in December, nationwide protests against the Iranian dictatorship grew as consumer prices soared with crushing inflation. The regime responded in shutting down the internet and began murdering demonstrators. More than 30,000 Iranians have been mercilessly murdered.

Fanatically, the regime continues killing its citizens as gruesomely evidenced last week, hanging 19-year-old Iranian wrestling champion, Saleh Mohammadi. Previously, beautiful Neda Agha-Soltan was shot and left to bleed to death on a street in Tehran.

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 Trump, mocking Trump. This week, he was mass murdering Ukrainian civilians in apartment buildings as exposed today by The Washington Times.

Mr. Speaker, I wish a happy Greek Independence Day, and I welcome Antonis Alexandridis, our new Ambassador from Greece and Athens to the United States.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MIKE MELVILL

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

Mr. WHITESIDES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great pilot and an even greater human being, Mike Melvill, who passed away last week at the age of 85.

Mike was a pioneer whose courage and skill helped open the final frontier. In 2004, the world watched in awe as he piloted SpaceShipOne into space, not once, but twice. In doing so, he earned the first FAA Commercial Space Astronaut Wings and became the first person to travel into space aboard a privately-developed spacecraft.

While the world knew him as a legendary test pilot, I saw firsthand that he was also a man of deep human decency and profound kindness.

Behind every record-breaking flight was a beautiful lifelong partnership. Mike and his wife, Sally, shared a wonderfully happy marriage that began as childhood sweethearts in South Africa and carried them through the early days of Mojave past the edge of space.

Mike was as humble as he was talented. He opened up space for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my deepest condolences to Sally and the Melvill family, and I wish Mike blue skies and tailwinds.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF WES RUCKER

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Wes Rucker, who tragically lost his life on February 19.

Wes was an award-winning journalist covering athletics at the University of Tennessee beginning in 2000 for, I believe, The Daily Beacon at UT.

Wes began his career freelancing across East Tennessee, covering the Vols and other professional sports. In 2011, he joined "CBS Sports" as a senior writer and also hosted two radio shows on ESPN Radio Knoxville. Wes also hosted multiple podcasts, was a Heisman Trophy voter, an AP football and basketball poll voter, and a contributor to the AP All-American Team and All-SEC selections.

Most recently, Wes joined WBIR in August of 2025 as a guest columnist and began hosting a weekday sports show in November of 2025.

Wes' legacy will live on through Knoxville and the University of Tennessee. He was known as a wonderful guy who loved every second of his job and being with the UT family every day.

I ask that if you get a second today to please say a prayer for his wonderful wife, his young son, and his unborn

baby. His wife lost her husband, and his son and unborn baby lost their daddy. I can't even imagine the hurt that that would cause, so please say a prayer for them.

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, teen hunger is an often overlooked problem, and this Congress must be doing more to help teens access the nutritious food that they need to succeed.

That starts by talking directly with them. Recently, I joined my friend, Representative JAKE AUCHINCLOSS, on a visit to the Boys and Girls Club of Metro South as part of my statewide End Hunger Now tour. There, under the leadership of CEO Derek Hime, we toured the Blue Spoon Community Kitchen where meals are prepared for families in need, and we visited the freight farm, which teaches the community about healthy eating and local food.

The highlight of our visit was the time we got to spend with the teen ambassadors. They are amazing young people who shared with us how important the Boys and Girls Club is to their health and well-being.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of Congress to take some time during the upcoming recess to visit with youth leaders in their communities. Learn from them about how we can improve their food security and end hunger now.

□ 1210

RECOGNIZING JACOB FINE ON HIS 18TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, 18 years ago at 6:08 this morning, my son Jacob Fine was born. Six years after he was born, inspired by what he dealt with as a first grader, I decided to run for office, and 12 years later, here I am today.

Members of Congress give up a lot in order to serve, but it is their families that give up even more.

Today, as Jacob turns 18, he is home in Florida, and I am here doing the people's business, but I would be remiss if I did not wish him a happy birthday and let him know of all the things that I and his mother will accomplish in our lives, nothing will be more important than having brought him and his younger brother into this world and preparing them to be the amazing adults that I know that they will both turn out to be.

So Jacob, happy birthday. I love you, and I look forward to seeing you on Friday.

DEPLOYING TROOPS WHILE DESTROYING THEIR BENEFITS

(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, I rise today as President Trump is preparing to deploy thousands of troops to the Middle East.

President Trump has no issue sending our sons and daughters overseas, putting their lives on the line for a war that no one asked for while decimating the care they receive when they come home.

He is gutting their healthcare, eliminating the positions of thousands of doctors and nurses, and making the severe staffing crises we are seeing at VA hospitals across the country even worse.

His massive cuts to healthcare in his so-called one big, beautiful bill put already strained hospitals that more than 700,000 servicemembers, their families, and veterans rely on at even greater risk of collapse.

This is not how we treat the brave men and women who put their lives on the line to defend our democracy and our freedom.

Deploying troops while destroying their benefits is a disgrace and a betrayal of our solemn duty to care for them when they come home.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE POTENTIAL CREATION OF A NATIONAL MUSEUM OF ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FINE). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2(b)(2) of the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture Act (Public Law 117-140) and the order of the House of January 3, 2025, of the following individual on the part of the House to the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Mr. Anh "Joseph" Cao, Metairie, Louisiana

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business effective

March 25, 2026. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Respectfully,

TROY DOWNING,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee effective March 25, 2026. It has been an honor to serve in this capacity.

Sincerely,

MAX L. MILLER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: As I prepare to re-take my seat on the Homeland Security Committee, I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Small Business Committee effective March 25, 2026.

It has been an honor to serve in this capacity under Chairman Williams' leadership, especially.

Sincerely,

NICK LALOTA,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: I write to respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, effective March 25, 2026.

Serving on this Committee has been an honor and a responsibility that I have never

taken lightly. As a Marine and a physician, I have always believed that when duty calls, you show up, and I have tried to do exactly that on this committee.

I remain fully committed to the security of this nation, the strength of our alliances, and ensuring America leads on the world stage. That mission does not end with this letter.

I look forward to continuing to serve the people of Georgia's 7th District and this great country.

Sincerely,

RICH MCCORMICK, MD, MBA,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1135

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY: Mr. LaLota (to rank immediately after Mr. Crane).

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Valadao.

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES: Mr. Downing.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Yakyim (to rank immediately after Mr. Ezell).

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. McCormick.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Mr. Miller of Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8029, PAY OUR HOMELAND DEFENDERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1128, EXPRESSING THE SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5103, MAKE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL ACT OF 2026; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7084, DEFENDING AMERICAN PROPERTY ABROAD ACT OF 2026; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1131 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1131

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8029) making appropri-

tions 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 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. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 1128) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the Department of Homeland Security. The amendments to the resolution and the preamble printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security or their respective designees.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5103) to establish a program to Beautify the District of Columbia and establish the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform 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 Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7084) to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to the types of vessels that may enter or operate in navigable waters of the United States or transfer cargo in any port or place under the jurisdiction of the United States, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure 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 Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Section 8 of House Resolution 707, agreed to September 16, 2025, is amended by striking "March 31, 2026" and inserting "the remainder of the One Hundred Nineteenth Congress".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. 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

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1220

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee met and produced a rule, House Resolution 1131, providing for the House's consideration of four pieces of legislation.

First, the rule provides for H.R. 8029, the Pay Our Homeland Defenders Act, to be considered under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Second, the rule provides for H. Res. 1128, expressing support of the House of Representatives for the Department of Homeland Security, to be considered under a closed rule. It provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Homeland Security or their respective designees.

Third, the rule provides for H.R. 7084, the Defending American Property Abroad Act to be considered under a closed rule. It also provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Last, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5103, the Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act of 2026, under a closed rule. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, or their designees, and provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying legislation.

At a fundamental level, this rule addresses our core responsibilities: maintaining public safety at home, defending American interests abroad, and ensuring the continuity of essential national security operations.

The underlying bills represent a consistent theme: America First. This White House and Republicans in Congress have never wavered from that ideal.

Let me begin with the Department of Homeland Security funding bill. We are now more than 1 month into the Democrats' shutdown of one of the most critical Departments in the Federal Government, the second longest shutdown in history. The consequences are real, and they are growing.

During the State of the Union Address, President Trump challenged Members of Congress to stand if they support the principle that the first duty of American Government is to protect American citizens, not illegal aliens. The majority of Democrats remained seated.

Let's be clear about what the Democrat shutdown means for the American people. It means Democrats are putting the interests of illegal aliens over our own citizens, and they, unbelievably, do this again and again. It is clear their policies are wildly unpopular, with not even 66 percent support from Democratic voters. It is no wonder they want illegal aliens to count in the Census and vote.

House and Senate Democrats have voted seven times—seven times—against funding DHS, and already the shutdown has resulted in \$2.5 billion in economic losses.

Across the country, essential workers are continuing to report for duty without pay. These individuals are responsible for airport security, disaster response, cybersecurity, and a range of other missions that affect public safety. At the same time, other employees have been furloughed, delaying important work and placing additional strain on those who remain on the job.

In total, over 100,000 DHS employees, including TSA officers at our airports, Coast Guard personnel, and FEMA staff, have been directly impacted by the Democrats' shutdown. That is roughly \$1 billion in unpaid wages every month, and thousands of DHS personnel who, thanks to the Democrats, have worked with no pay for 49 percent of this fiscal year.

The ripple effects extend far beyond the workforce itself. Travelers are encountering longer and longer wait times, with some airports reporting 4- to 6-hour lines to clear security. Staffing shortages are becoming more and more pronounced. Experienced personnel are leaving, including 450 TSA agents, and replacing them is neither quick nor easy.

Meanwhile, agencies tasked with responding to emergencies are being forced to scale back planning and recovery efforts. All of this is happening while uncertainty continues, with no clear resolution in sight.

The burden of the Democrats' stunt continues to fall on Federal employees and the American public. That is not how critical national security functions should be managed.

Regardless of political differences, there should be a shared understanding that maintaining the operations of agencies responsible for protecting this country is essential. That includes our

border security and our ICE agents. Delays and disruptions of these functions carry real risks—risks to efficiency, to morale, and, most importantly, to safety.

It is irresponsible and easily reversed. Democrats should vote to fully fund DHS when they have the opportunity to do so for the eighth time this week.

This rule also provides for consideration of a resolution expressing support for the Department of Homeland Security, led by my good friend from Pennsylvania, Congressman RYAN MACKENZIE.

Now more than ever, we need to stand with the men and women carrying out the mission of DHS. While our military is engaged abroad, Democrats have shut down the agency responsible for securing the homeland, and Americans are less safe because of it. Ending this shutdown and passing this resolution makes clear we stand with those who protect this country, not the politics that undermine them.

I turn now to the Defending American Property Abroad Act. For generations, the United States has stood for the principle based in liberty that individuals and businesses should be able to invest, operate, and compete under the protection of clear and predictable rules. Respect for private property is essential to that system. It is what allows markets to function, innovation to thrive, and economic relationships to grow. However, those principles are not always honored beyond our borders.

There have been repeated instances where American companies have seen their assets seized or undermined in ways that are inconsistent with international commitments. When that happens without consequence, it doesn't just harm a single business. It sends a signal that these agreements can be ignored. When there are no meaningful consequences, the problem grows.

Existing agreements establish expectations, but expectations alone are not enough. They must be backed by credible enforcement.

This legislation is designed to fill that gap, and I thank Representative PFLUGER for his work on it. It creates a more structured and timely way for the United States to respond when American-owned property is treated unfairly abroad. It strengthens our ability to deter such actions before they happen and to respond more effectively when they do.

It also reinforces the basic idea that access to the benefits of economic engagement with the United States comes with responsibilities. If foreign actors expect to participate in our markets, then they must also respect the rules that govern fair treatment of American businesses.

Failing to respond when these standards are violated doesn't preserve stability. It undermines it. This bill represents a measured and necessary step toward protecting American interests

and reinforcing the integrity of the global economic system.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to the Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act. Washington, D.C., is where Americans come to connect with their history, where visitors from around the world come to understand our values, and where we, as elected Representatives, carry out the work of the people.

Because of that, the condition and safety of our Capital matters, not just to those who live there, but to the country as a whole. Yet, for too long, too many people have experienced a different reality when they visit Washington. Concerns about public safety, disorder in public spaces, and the condition of key landmarks became more and more visible and pressing.

When we take public safety seriously and stop being soft on crime, we see results. After President Trump deployed the National Guard, crime dropped significantly. In the first 30 days alone, total crime fell by roughly 18 percent compared to the same period the year before. Violent crime dropped by nearly 50 percent. Carjackings fell by more than 80 percent.

Those trends have continued. This year, thanks to President Trump, violent crime is down more than 30 percent; robberies have been cut by more than one-half; and homicides are down sharply compared to last year. That is what happens when we support law enforcement and restore order.

Addressing these challenges requires more than temporary measures. It requires a sustained, coordinated effort that brings together relevant agencies and ensures that responsibility doesn't fall through the cracks.

That is what this bill is intended to do.

Public safety should not be a partisan issue. The majority of Americans want safer streets, cleaner public spaces, and a Capital that reflects the strength and beauty of this country, especially on her 250th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Indiana for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Oh, my God, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty unbelievable that this is what House Republicans are spending time on right now. Wow, I mean, every time I think they can't do any worse, my Republican friends always defy expectations.

People are standing in long lines at airports. Flights are delayed. Travelers are confused, and they are frustrated. TSA officers are stretched thin, exhausted, being jerked around because Republicans cannot govern responsibly even though they control everything.

Now, let me set the record straight from the outset. Democrats are ready

to fund the people and agencies that actually protect the public: TSA, FEMA, and the Coast Guard. We agree they need full funding, and I think there are more than a few Republicans who would join with us in that.

Just last night in the Rules Committee, two Republican Members, including the gentlewoman from Indiana, voted with Democrats on a motion to fund the TSA. I thank her for doing that, but that vote failed because Republicans voted against making it in order. Clearly, there has to be some bipartisan appetite to try to get this thing resolved.

I mean, take for instance Senate Majority Leader JOHN THUNE, the Republican who offered a deal to fund the Department outside of ICE which, by the way, already has years of funding due to the Republicans' big, ugly bill. You know the big, ugly bill, the bill that gave millionaires and billionaires tax cuts, that cut SNAP by \$200 billion, that cut Medicaid by a trillion dollars. They actually snuck in more funding for ICE and CBP in that.

The Republican-manufactured crisis could have been over, but that deal was shot down by Trump who said, in Republican Senator JOHN KENNEDY's words: "No deals with the Democrats." He continued: "It would have worked. We could have had TSA paid by the end of the week, but the President said, 'no deal'."

What is wrong with him? What is going on here? Let's be clear about what happened over the past few days. The Republican President tanked a deal offered by the Republican Senate Majority Leader to get us out of this crisis. This is the worst kind of politics, and it is why people are sick and tired of this Republican Congress.

TSA agents continue to go unpaid, and FEMA and the Coast Guard continue to go without funding, all because President Trump decided to throw another temper tantrum. But Democrats are not in charge. Republicans control the House. I wish they didn't, but they do. Republicans control the Senate. I wish they didn't, but they do. Republicans control the White House. It is a disaster for America that a Republican controls the White House, but it is the reality.

If they wanted to solve this, they could solve it.

Now Trump is causing further chaos by sending ICE into airports. ICE agents are not trained to do TSA's job. Sending immigration agents into airports does not fix a staffing crisis. It makes things more chaotic, more intimidating, more ridiculous.

Passing the same DHS bill today—for a third time—is a gigantic waste of time. Now, there is a clear solution to this crisis, but it means my Republican colleagues need to stand up to Trump for once in their lives.

In addition to failing to fund the Department of Homeland Security, this rule does a whole lot of nothing when it comes to helping regular people. It

includes a nonbinding resolution to say that Congress supports DHS. Boy, that is just what TSA agents want, a non-binding resolution to say: Hi, how you doing? I mean, that will pay the bills. Give me a break.

Also included are a bill about a single port in Mexico and another bill about graffiti in D.C. I mean, are you kidding me? Are they serious when they bring this stuff to the floor? I hate to tell you, but costs are up and anxiety is up. The country is in trouble, and the President's recklessness abroad is making an already difficult economic picture even more dangerous for working families here at home.

Donald Trump has dragged this country into another stupid, illegal war in the Middle East, and there is no doubt about it, working people are going to pay the price. Gas prices are already up \$1 a gallon because of this nonsense. For what? For what?

Yesterday, Trump was bragging that we "won." We won what? Reuters reported at the same time that his administration was preparing to send thousands more U.S. troops into the region. I mean, that is not a strategy. That is not strength. That is a President pretending the war is over while taking steps to drag us in deeper.

Let's not forget the dishonesty here. Last Friday, Trump acted like further bombing might be held off because substantial talks were happening. Talks with whom? Iran has denied there were direct negotiations. They say talks hadn't even begun.

Once again, this administration says whatever it thinks the markets want to hear, whatever it thinks the public wants to hear, and the truth comes later, if it comes at all.

That is what is so infuriating about all of this. These guys, they don't care that regular people are hurting. They don't care that families are barely keeping their heads above water. They don't care that parents are worried about prices or that military families are worried about where their sons and daughters are being sent and why. These guys don't care that TSA officers have been left hanging while Republicans play games with basic funding.

Let me say this as clearly as I possibly can: Republicans own this. They own this. They have the power of agenda-setting. They could fix this in a nanosecond. If they put a bill on the floor today to fund TSA or FEMA or any of the law-abiding agencies, it would pass the House and it would pass the Senate. But that is not what the House leadership is doing. It is a choice, and Republicans own it.

I do want to just say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. I mean, when the gentlewoman and other Republicans talk about how much they care about our Federal workforce, I have got to tell you, it rings hollow. Where on Earth have Republicans been for the past year and a half when Donald Trump has repeatedly gone after hardworking

Federal employees? Where have they been?

Trump has said Federal workers are "destroying this country." He called them "crooked" and "dishonest." Russell Vought, Trump's own Director of Management and Budget, said he wanted Federal workers "to be traumatically affected. When they wake up in the morning, we want them to not want to go to work, because they are increasingly viewed as the villains." That is this administration.

Where have my Republicans been defending Federal workers? These are hardworking Americans, Mr. Speaker. They help ensure that we have clean water. They help our veterans get healthcare. They help older adults access the Social Security benefits that they have earned. They help small businesses thrive. They have been treated like garbage by this administration, and nobody on the other side bothers to stand up for these Federal workers.

On day one of this administration, Trump and his DOGE goons laid out their plan to tear apart our Federal workforce. They went on a witch hunt, carrying out mass terminations across government and cruelly forcing long-time, upstanding Federal employees out of their jobs.

Republicans in this Chamber cheered that on, even though it caused harm to everyday Americans, people that they represented. Where was everybody? Where the hell were they all?

Where were my Republican colleagues—and this is rich—when Kristi Noem said she was going to get rid of FEMA, abolish FEMA? They are on the floor today saying we have got to pay our FEMA workers. Where were they when Kristi Noem was saying we should abolish the entire agency? How about when Trump abruptly fired 400 DHS employees at the beginning of 2025? Where were they all? Where have they been as Trump is tearing apart the U.S. Department of Agriculture, shuttering offices, forcing longtime staff out of their jobs to the detriment of our farmers, hungry families, and food supply?

I mean, House Republicans are supporting this nonsense, this theater that we are dealing with here today on the House floor.

□ 1240

Let me be clear: I want TSA workers to get their paychecks. I want FEMA fully operational. That is why I have been on record for weeks trying to reopen these agencies. That is why Democrats have continuously forced votes on reopening all of these lawful agencies and departments.

Please, don't pretend that Republicans have always been on the side of Federal workers. Trump has made their lives unbearable through the chaos he has inflicted upon them, and Republicans in this Chamber haven't done a damn thing to stop him.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will remind my colleague that they can stop all of this pain at our airports by voting this week for our bill, the Pay Our Homeland Defenders Act.

Let us remind the American people that the Democrats have voted seven times against funding TSA. Seven times they have had an opportunity to fund TSA, and seven times they have voted against funding TSA.

This causes the second longest shutdown in history. 100,000 DHS workers are going without pay, 450 TSA agents have quit, and 49 percent of the fiscal year 2026 TSA agents have worked without pay. Seven times the Democrats have voted against funding TSA. They have an eighth opportunity to fund it this week. I hope they will vote in favor of the Pay Our Homeland Defenders Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HARIDOPOLOS).

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, I like that recent quote I heard on the floor just a few minutes ago: Let us not forget the dishonesty here. That is a very rich comment. I see the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee is here. They worked out a deal in order to fund DHS, not part of it but all of it, and the one part they keep leaving out is the idea about ICE.

ICE is somewhat important. Ten million people entered this country illegally and so many of them—as we have seen on the website, wow.dhs.gov, which has outlined clearly the crimes that were committed. You need ICE agents to actually go after people who committed the crime, not just of coming here, but crimes committed once here.

Many of these are violent crimes. We can go through name after name of tragedies, destroyed lives. They want to play politics with this.

This idea of we are wasting time—we are wasting time for one simple reason: They won't fully fund DHS, all of it. The reality is, right now, not just 10 million people have entered this country, but we are in a conflict overseas. We have seen twice in Michigan, once in Texas, and once in Virginia that the homeland is under attack, and they play politics. As a person who has been here since 1996, the rules are pretty simple. We all know them. You need 60 votes in the Senate to pass anything, and they play this game like we didn't take a history class.

As a history teacher myself, let's go back and teach history the right way instead of playing games. More importantly, let's actually fund the homeland so that we can keep our people safe because there are people in harm's way and we need ICE agents, not just playing whack-a-mole with different agencies.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel like my head is about to explode with all this nonsense that is being thrown out here.

Let's just state for the record that ICE has years of funding because of the big, ugly bill, tens of billions of dollars that they put in that bill, again, the bill that gave millionaires and billionaires tax cuts and that screwed over poor people by cutting SNAP by \$200 billion. They cut Medicaid by a trillion dollars in that bill where they snuck in tens of billions of dollars.

The gentleman doesn't respond. He left. That is fine. I get it, but that is just the reality. I don't know what the hell he is talking about.

To the extent that maybe there was an informal agreement on how to proceed, there might have been, but that was before ICE murdered U.S. citizens, before they murdered U.S. citizens.

I am sorry that people on the other side don't think that that is outrageous or terrible or awful, but we do. We do, our constituents do, and I know your constituents do.

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

Mr. Speaker, the entire mess at DHS is caused by one man, Donald Trump, the guy they are all afraid of, who said that he would rather leave TSA agents unpaid than negotiate with Democrats.

Democrats have repeatedly shown that we are ready to fund TSA, FEMA, the agency that Kristi Noem, Trump's head of the DHS, wanted to eliminate and Republicans didn't say anything about. But we want to fund FEMA, the Coast Guard, CISA, and all the agencies acting lawfully.

Under this administration, ICE and CBP have not made it over that bar. President Trump's ICE and CBP are out of control. According to the Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court in Minnesota, ICE has violated 96 court orders in 74 different cases in 2026 alone, likely more violations than "some Federal agencies have violated in their entire existence."

American citizens have been murdered. This is the root of Democratic opposition. These lawless agencies need to be reined in before they receive any further funding. Yes, that is what Republicans want. They want further funding.

Ranking Member DELAURO's bill does not defund ICE or CBP because, again, these lawless agencies sadly were given plenty of money in the big, ugly bill. Even the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, TOM COLE, admitted last night in the Rules Committee that ICE and CBP are "substantially funded."

All Democrats are saying is that we should not shower these agencies with even more money until real reforms, not BS reforms but real reforms, are put into place to protect American citizens. These are commonsense reforms.

Mr. 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. Mr. 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. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the bill at issue in this rule today is not a serious legislative effort. It is, once again, political theater. It is a bill that has already been brought up several times and has gone nowhere.

This would be the third time, and the third time is not a charm. If I take a look at the definition of insanity, it is doing the same thing over and over again with the same outcome. This is madness, what we are engaged in here, and, yes, a waste of time.

Unlike the bill the Republicans have put forward, I have a measure that was introduced before the shutdown that actually has a good chance of becoming law if only Republican leadership would stop blocking it from receiving a vote.

They keep saying no to paying TSA employees. Understand this: 85 percent of ICE and CBP agents are already being paid, so what is the administration doing? They are picking and choosing whom they want to pay. They are holding these other employees hostage for political gain. They view it as a political strategy. They want to continue to fund lawless and rogue agencies.

What my bill would do is fund TSA, fund FEMA, fund the Coast Guard, cybersecurity, Secret Service, and other parts of the Department of Homeland Security, on which there was broad agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I have to just say, please, spare me your concern over Federal employees. Where were my Republican colleagues when this administration proposed eliminating FEMA entirely? Not a peep. Where were they when the President proposed cutting cybersecurity by \$500 million? Not a peep. Where were they when the President unilaterally eliminated the collective bargaining rights for the TSA workers? They were silent. Where were they when Kristi Noem spent \$20,000 to rent a horse so she could sit on the saddle of this horse for her political ads that were sanctioned by the President

of the United States? Where were they when she spent \$200 million of Coast Guard money for two luxury airlines?

Give me a break. They care not a whit about what is happening to Federal employees. Yes, they don't have a paycheck. Maybe if we didn't have a paycheck, we would treat this differently.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

□ 1250

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, they think our constituents are going to forget that it has been 2 months removed since the murder of Alex Pretti. This administration hopes we are going to forget about the harassment, the violence, the chaos, simply because it is not much in the news anymore. Wrong.

These are our constituents, our communities. These protections are essential, but the Republican leadership is so opposed to any protection that they refuse to pay Federal workers.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up my bill, H.R. 7481, so that Members can vote to fund the parts of DHS we all agree on without any of the controversial components we do not agree on.

I filed a discharge petition that would bring up my measure for a vote. I encourage my Republican colleagues to sign on. I know some of my Republican colleagues in the rank and file do not agree with what their leadership is doing. They hear from Federal workers, TSA agents, and constituents. They know there is no practical need to condition funding for TSA on funding for ICE. They understand we can continue to negotiate on immigration enforcement reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman's time has again expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DeLAURO).

Ms. DeLAURO. I invite my colleagues to join me. We can fund TSA, we can pay these workers, and we can do it today. We can end the long lines at airport security. We can continue to negotiate on ICE and CBP to find common ground on reforms that the vast majority of the American people support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that they, too, can vote to fully fund DHS. They have an eighth opportunity to do that today. They have declined funding DHS seven previous times.

I remind my colleagues that there are real reforms in this bill that were negotiated with the other side: reforms including mandates for body cameras and de-escalation training for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection per-

sonnel. They are asking us to not fund ICE and to not fund CBP. That is just not something that we are going to do.

They are choosing, again and again, illegal aliens over American citizens.

I understand that they have put forward this idea that we could piecemeal funding for DHS, but we are just not going to do that. It is a critical time and public safety is a factor, but also so is protecting our American citizens from violent criminal aliens and removing them from the country after Joe Biden and the Democrats let them in with a wide-open southern border.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, western North Carolina is still recovering from Hurricane Helene. Families are rebuilding homes, small businesses are getting back on their feet, and our communities are repairing critical infrastructure.

A Department of Homeland Security shutdown threatens critical disaster recovery efforts in my district. Each day that the Department of Homeland Security goes unfunded, funding in the Disaster Relief Fund is drained, putting recovery efforts at risk. Once that money is gone, recovery comes to a halt, leaving families and communities waiting even longer just as they are trying to get back on their feet.

We can't let politics get in the way of disaster recovery. Every day that DHS is shut down is another day that families, schools, and roads in western North Carolina are left waiting.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, please, fund DHS now. Let's help ensure western North Carolina communities can continue to rebuild. We simply cannot wait.

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

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we want disaster relief more than anybody. We have been fighting for that. We have been fighting to protect FEMA.

Again, where were the Republicans when Kristi Noem and this administration were leading the effort to actually eliminate FEMA and get rid of everybody? I mean, where were you?

The gentlewoman says we need to fund unlawful agencies like ICE and CBP to protect American citizens? I mean, are you kidding me? I mean, was that real? I can't believe I heard that.

ICE has gassed schools. It has detained off-duty police officers. It shot and murdered two American citizens. I mean, that is your idea of protecting the American people?

ICE right now has more money in their bank account than most of the world's militaries spend in a year. I will say that one more time: ICE already has more money in their bank account than most of the world's militaries spend in a year. Yet, they are asking that we give them more.

The reforms that the gentlewoman talks about, give me a break. I mean, we have raised issues about masks. We

believe that you ought to have judicial warrants before you break down somebody's door. We believe that ICE agents ought to identify themselves and the agencies that they are with. We don't believe you should be able to deport U.S. citizens. We want those written into the law. I don't think any of those ideas are radical.

Yet, the gentlewoman talks about reforms? I mean, come on.

Again, we have an opportunity right now to fund all of the lawful agencies. Your beloved ICE and CBP unfortunately still have tens of billions of dollars that you guys gave them in the big, ugly bill. They still have money.

We can fund everything right now, and we can support our TSA agents and FEMA, the Coast Guard, and everybody that we believe we all say we want to help. We can do that right this second, and, yet, that is not happening.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, apparently the only people the Democrats want to mandate that they not wear masks is ICE and CBP.

These are very challenging times, but the gentleman from Massachusetts said it himself: We have already funded ICE and CBP in the One Big, Beautiful Bill Act, which makes their vote against fully funding DHS as an entire Department entirely performative. They are not standing on anything. This is political theater, and the American people are suffering from it.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues again they will have an eighth opportunity to vote in favor of funding our TSA agents, FEMA, Coast Guard, and cybersecurity. They will have an eighth opportunity to do that this week. I hope they will vote in favor of the Pay Our Homeland Defenders Act when it comes to the floor.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman just admitted the sad reality that ICE and CBP have billions of dollars already. I guess it doesn't bother her that two Americans were killed and murdered or that we have seen the excesses of ICE and CBP time and time again breaking into people's homes without judicial warrants. I am sorry that the gentlewoman feels that it is somehow a radical idea to ask somebody who may detain you who they are and who they are with. I don't know why that is such a radical idea.

What we are saying is: Why do you want to give them billions of dollars more? ICE already has more money than most countries spend on their militaries in a year, and you want to give them more money?

Here is the deal. What we are doing here in the House is a joke. I mean, it is embarrassing. I am embarrassed for this House and for this institution because my friends know full well that this is not going to pass in the Senate.

They know how we get to “yes,” and that is to exempt ICE and CBP from this bill. Everything else gets funded. If you want Democratic votes, that is what you need to do.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, Republicans control everything. They control the House, the Senate, and the White House. I love it. They are in control of everything, and they blame everything on Democrats, on somebody else. They take no responsibility.

I am really surprised that the gentlewoman hasn't blamed Joe Biden yet in her speech, which my Republican friends always do. I think they will go back to Bill Clinton in the not-too-distant future because they always find people to blame, but they take no responsibility.

If you are in charge, you have the responsibility not only to set the agenda but also to lead. That is what the American people are asking for: some leadership, some truth, and some honesty. We are not getting any of that.

Mr. Speaker, I will talk about something different right now. I realize that I may sound like a broken record talking each week about the dysfunction of this Republican-led Congress, but, unfortunately, for you and for my colleagues across the aisle and for the American people, it just seems to be getting worse and worse as this Republican majority keeps setting one terrible precedent after another.

Mr. Speaker, this rule that we are talking about right now blocks privileged floor consideration of resolutions of inquiry for the rest of the Congress. Why? It is because they don't want Democrats to have any tools to shine the light on the corruption of this lawless administration.

I know one thing. I don't want to hear any complaining from Republicans the next time we are in charge if this privilege that they are killing today never comes back.

Last fall, Republicans gave us the longest government funding lapse in American history. This week, they have managed to give us the second longest lapse, as well. What an accomplishment.

Last year, this Republican-led Congress held the fewest votes in the first session of Congress in decades. Republicans wonder why nearly 70 percent of the American people don't trust Congress. Give me a break. This place is not working for them.

Last night, I offered a motion to add a bill, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. HOUGHIN), to pay the TSA. While she supported my motion, her Republican colleagues voted that motion down. We can't even debate or vote on that on the floor today.

The gentlewoman's support of this rule, despite that embarrassment, I think, is yet another piece of evidence that rank-and-file Republicans have given up all of their power. This rule contains another four closed rules,

which means no amendments can be offered, bringing their total to a new all-time record of 125 closed rules this Congress.

By the way, it is not just Democratic amendments that get rejected. It is the majority of Republican amendments that get rejected.

Mr. Speaker, that is more than 85 percent of all rules brought to the House floor: no amendments, no debate, no real democracy. In fact, Rules Committee Republicans have not allowed a single amendment to be debated on the House floor in more than 2 months, but rank-and-file Republicans keep voting for the rules that block their own amendments. I don't get that, but anyway.

Republicans have not allowed a single Democratic amendment in 3½ months, and it has been more than 6 months since the last bipartisan amendment was debated on the floor.

Let's stop pretending that this is the people's House because it is certainly not functioning like the people's House. Republicans are ruining this Chamber, turning it into a rubberstamp for whatever Donald Trump wants whenever he wants it. Their vision for this body is the Russian Duma, a legislative body in name only. That is disgraceful. That is dangerous. Frankly, it is a threat to our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from MS NOW titled: “It's already a record-setting Congress—for all the wrong reasons.”

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[From MS NOW, Mar. 23, 2026]

IT'S ALREADY A RECORD-SETTING CONGRESS—
FOR ALL THE WRONG REASONS

(By Kevin Frey)

Congress already set one record last fall with a 43-day government shutdown: the longest government funding lapse in U.S. history. Now, with the ongoing shutdown at the Department of Homeland Security surpassing the 35-day shutdown of President Donald Trump's first term, lawmakers in this Congress can claim another distinction: the second-longest funding lapse in modern history.

By multiple measures, this Congress is breaking records—largely for dysfunction.

For instance, in the first year of the 119th Congress, the House held the fewest number of roll-call votes in the first session in decades—362, according to congressional records. The next two lowest on the list? The first year of the 102nd Congress, which held 439 roll-call votes throughout 1991, and the 117th Congress, which held 449 throughout 2021. (Democrats controlled the chamber both of those years.)

By comparison, during the 118th Congress—when the GOP also controlled the House—the chamber cast 724 roll-call votes in the first year, ranking among the busier first sessions of the past few decades.

Some of the roll-call disparity—undoubtedly—is driven by the House GOP's strategy during last fall's shutdown, when House Republican leaders opted to keep their caucus

out of Washington for weeks rather than work on other legislation or cast additional votes, as Senate lawmakers worked to land a shutdown-ending deal.

But congressional data also shows that in the first year of the 119th Congress, the second-fewest number of bills became law since at least the 1970s: 45. That is surpassed only by the 29 in the 118th Congress, when the GOP led the House and Democrats controlled the Senate and White House. (In the 1970s, some Congresses saw upwards of 200 bills become law in the first year alone.)

Rep. Jim McGovern, D-Mass., who serves as the top Democrat on the House Rules Committee, argues that these data points demonstrate the GOP's “poor leadership” of the chamber.

Of course, Republicans argue that this is not a fair metric, noting the number of disparate measures they swept up into their massive single reconciliation bill, which included an extension of tax cuts, significant reductions to Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and increased funding for immigration enforcement.

Republicans were proud of the legislation, arguing that its passage would “spark massive economic growth, wage increases, and take-home pay.” In the short term, though, that has not happened. Less than two weeks ago, the Bureau of Economic Analysis revised its estimate of economic growth in the fourth quarter of 2025, calculating that the economy grew at an anemic 0.7%—down from 4.4% in the third quarter, when the bill was passed. Nominal wages also didn't go up much, despite lawmakers and the president enacting a bill that will cost \$3.4 trillion over the next decade.

But lawmakers have also earned other ignominious merits during this Congress—particularly when it comes to legislating and not following the will of the majority.

The House has already set a record for the successful deployment of a rarely used, last-ditch parliamentary maneuver called a discharge petition—a tool that allows House lawmakers to go around leaders to force votes on legislation that has majority support.

So far in this Congress, four pieces of legislation have clinched the 218 signatures needed to force floor action in the House—more than any Congress going back decades.

Notably, because of the composition of the House, reaching 218 signatures meant that a handful of Republicans had to buck their own party's leadership and join Democrats in signing on to the petitions.

The bills that got sufficient support included legislation by Rep. Thomas Massie, R-Ky., to release the Epstein files and a bill by House Democratic Leader Hakeem Jeffries of New York to extend expired enhanced Affordable Care Act subsidies for three years.

Jeffries—who aims to become speaker during the next Congress—has touted this metric, arguing that it's proof Republican leaders have lost control and that Democrats “are governing in the minority on behalf of the American people as if we're in the majority.”

A spokesperson for House Speaker Mike Johnson, R-La., declined to comment for this article.

But Johnson's desire to avoid votes on proposals that have the backing of the majority has also forced him to deploy a more closed legislative process than ever before.

Although steeped in parliamentary procedure and largely overlooked by the public, the House Rules Committee holds a great deal of power on Capitol Hill—serving as a gatekeeper for legislation before it is considered on the House floor by the entire chamber.

The members of the panel determine what amendments get—or don't get—a vote, thereby shaping the contours of the debate on major pieces of legislation.

Democrats on the Rules Committee, however, argue that Republicans have effectively stymied the opportunity for amendments—breaking yet another record in the process.

A report compiled by committee Democrats shows that the GOP made zero amendments in order for 95 separate pieces of legislation throughout the first year of the 119th Congress—setting, they argue, a record for so-called closed rules in the first year of any Congress ever.

The report also finds that roughly 80% of amendments offered have been blocked—“up from 61% in the 115th Congress and nearly 70% in the 118th Congress during the previous two Republican majorities.”

McGovern, the top Democrat on the panel, argued that these records are the result of the GOP being afraid to cross the president—and demonstrate that Congress has essentially turned into a rubber stamp for the president's wishes.

“Speaker Johnson is scared of the White House,” McGovern told MS NOW. “He's afraid that bills could be—might be—amended in a way that gets broad bipartisan support.”

Of course, Johnson became speaker in part by promising to return the chamber to “regular order”—“member-driven” and committee-led—rather than implementing a “top-down” approach.

So how does this reliance on “closed rules” comport with those promises?

Rep. Chip Roy, R-Texas—one of the most outspoken defenders of “regular order” in the House—declined to directly answer when asked if he believed the speaker was standing by his promise. Instead, he defended the speaker, saying it's “a tough circumstance with a two-seat majority.”

“It just is what it is,” he added. “I try to give a whole lot of grace on how you manage through this process and complex environment.”

Republicans on the Rules Committee, for their part, say the Democratic data is at best lacking in nuance.

A spokesperson for the Republicans on the panel noted that only a portion of the rules was reported out as “closed” at the discretion of the committee itself.

For instance, the spokesperson said, of the 95 pieces of legislation the Democrats invoke, 25 were Congressional Review Act measures, which are not amendable. (The CRA allows Congress to overturn federal agency regulations.)

Members also never offered amendments for 20 of the bills in question.

“There's a lot of nuance here,” Rules Committee Chairwoman Virginia Foxx, R-N.C., told MS NOW.

As for McGovern's accusation that Republicans are merely shutting down debate at the behest of the president, Foxx said “both parties do that.”

“Don't live in a glass house and throw stones,” Foxx said.

To be sure, the suggestion that Congress is not living up to its Article 1 constitutional mandate is nothing new. For years, observers have written about a branch that is increasingly less interested in legislating and more interested in partisan messaging.

Former Rep. Fred Upton, a Republican who represented Michigan in the House for 36 years, recently bemoaned to The Washington Post that, despite learning in ninth grade that there are three branches of government, “right now, the Congress is not one of them.”

“It abdicated everything to the White House,” Upton said.

In Congress' lawmaking absence, presidents have turned to executive orders—and Trump's record-breaking 2025 only serves to underscore the point. Throughout his first year back in office, Trump signed 225 executive orders, according to the Federal Register.

That towers over the 77 executive orders Joe Biden signed in his first year and the 55 Trump signed back in 2017—the first year of his first term.

But there are other, qualitative indications that the 119th Congress is one that's less interested in legislating than previous Congresses.

For the better part of a year, the House GOP used a procedural trick to block any votes to renege the president's global tariffs—despite the economic pressures back home.

And a majority of Republicans have repeatedly voted against placing restrictions on Trump's military authority. That, in particular, has been proof for at least one GOP lawmaker that something has changed with the legislative branch.

“This is a Congress without ambition,” Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., told reporters as the Senate voted down a war powers resolution on Iran. “This is a Congress without a belief structure in defending legislative prerogative. They just are a rubber stamp for whatever a president tells them to do.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the final thing I am going to say before I reserve is that the amendment that Ms. DELAUNO just talked about was blocked in the Rules Committee last night, as well.

I just say to my Republican colleagues that if they don't want to support a bill that funds only the lawful agencies within DHS, that is fine. They can vote “no” on it, but they won't even allow it to be brought up as an amendment. They won't even allow us to have a debate and to deliberate on it. They blocked it.

If they are so right on all of this, then they shouldn't be afraid to allow other points of view to be brought to the floor. That is what this place is supposed to be about. We are supposed to be a deliberative body, and my Republican colleagues are ruining that. They are ruining that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will clarify a few things. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) made a claim about ICE raids in schools. Contrary to fear-mongering by the media and sanctuary politicians, ICE does not target schools or children. Media is force-feeding the public stories, causing people to be scared, but there are no raids occurring at schools and no raids targeting schools.

My colleagues across the aisle also want to decry the tolling of days for resolutions of inquiry, but when the roles were reversed, they seemed completely content with then-Speaker PELOSI's iron grip on floor procedure. For over 600 days in the 116th and 117th Congresses, resolutions of inquiry were blocked from coming to the floor by the Democratic majority.

In fact, every Democratic member of the Rules Committee voted to extend such provisions, despite protests from Republicans. While they may contend that this was during the COVID pandemic, the reality is that committees were working and operating for quite some time. We have operated this Congress without the use of resolutions of inquiry, and it has had no impact on the minority's ability to conduct oversight of the administration.

What is good for the goose is good for the gander. As was done under the Democratic majority, we will utilize this tool as necessary.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that I have a little bit of a Massachusetts accent, and so sometimes I may be hard to understand for the gentlewoman. I didn't say that ICE agents raided schools. I said that they gassed students. They gassed schools.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a news story titled: “Witnesses say agents arrest Minneapolis school staff, tear gas students; DHS claims no tear gas was used.”

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

There was no objection.

[From KARE 11, Jan. 8, 2026]

WITNESSES SAY AGENTS ARREST MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOL STAFF, TEAR GAS STUDENTS; DHS CLAIMS NO TEAR GAS WAS USED

(By Lydia Morrell, David Griswold)

MINNEAPOLIS—Federal agents descended on Roosevelt High School in Minneapolis on Wednesday, just hours after an ICE agent shot and killed a woman near Powderhorn Park.

The Department of Human Services (DHS) said Border Patrol agents were in the school zone after a five-mile pursuit while they were conducting an immigration enforcement operation. In a statement, DHS said that a U.S. citizen was “actively trying to impede operations” and claimed that it escalated to the individual ramming their vehicle into a government vehicle.

A chase ensued until the driver stopped in the school zone. DHS said a person who identified themselves as a teacher “proceeded to assault a border patrol agent,” and a crowd began to form. DHS said people began throwing objects and spraying paint on officers and their vehicles.

DHS said no tear-gas was used, but witnesses told KARE 11 that tear gas was indeed used, and some staff and students may have been taken into custody. Minneapolis Public Schools canceled classes for Thursday and Friday, citing “safety concerns.”

A video shows agents spraying an individual with a backpack who threw a snowball with a chemical irritant. KARE has followed up to ask what irritant was used.

Daniel, who asked that his first name only be used, is a senior at the school and captured a video that has been shared widely online. He says the person in the video throwing the snowball was a student.

“Sad, shocked, I don't know, scared for other students and my whole family,” said Daniel.

DHS shared on X on Thursday that more law enforcement would be coming to Minnesota and ICE operations will be “accelerating.”

Evan Johnson was walking his dog near the school around 3:30 p.m. when he heard sirens and what sounded like a car crash. He said dozens of ICE agents gathered in front of the school, and “skirmishes” between agents, students and staff began to occur.

“All of a sudden, a few high school-age kids came running and looking scared and maybe even tearful,” Johnson said. “And—there was a woman right next to me, who was going to head over and start filming herself. And she told this little boy to get into her car—she asked him first if he was afraid of what’s going on. And he just said, ‘ICE is here.’”

“At no point was a school, students, or staff targeted, and agents would not have been near this location if not for the dangerous actions of this individual,” DHS said in a statement.

Minnesota Public Radio reported ICE agents handcuffed two staff members.

One student, who asked to go by Braeden, identified the man who seemed to be tackled by agents as a teacher of the school.

Protestors gathered outside the school, blowing whistles and raising signs, Johnson said. As for the sound of the car crash, Johnson said he saw four ICE SUVs surrounding a car that appeared as if it had been T-boned on the passenger side. Johnson said the crashed car looked like a civilian car, not like the SUVs that ICE agents were driving.

Minneapolis Public Schools provided this statement on Wednesday’s events:

“Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) is aware of an incident that happened after school yesterday, outside of Roosevelt High School. This incident involved federal law enforcement agents and is currently under investigation. We are working with our partners including the City of Minneapolis and others to support the individuals directly impacted. Minneapolis Public Schools is committed to maintaining a safe and welcoming learning environment for all of our students. All MPS schools are closed today, January 8 and tomorrow, January 9 out of an abundance of caution.”

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, this is what it comes down to: The American people need help, and this Republican majority has nothing to offer them.

People are worried about affording groceries. They are worried about gas prices. They are worried about what this war means for their family budgets, their jobs, their kids, and their future.

Military families are worried about their loved ones being sent into danger with no clear mission and no clear plan.

TSA officers have been forced to live with uncertainty while doing one of the toughest jobs in public service. Even Republican Senator JOHN KENNEDY admitted on FOX News that we could have TSA paid by the end of the week, but President Donald Trump has said no deal.

Instead of fixing problems, Republicans waste time. They recycle the same old bills. They posture. They distract. They try to change the subject, and, yes, cruelty is part of it, too.

When people are hurting, and leaders see the pain and still choose chaos and still choose stunts like this, still choose political games over actually helping anybody, that is not just incompetence. It is callousness, and it is cruelty.

One day, Trump says one thing. The next day, his administration does the opposite—more troops, more escalation, more confusion—and regular people are left to absorb the consequences.

They do not care that this war could send the cost of living even higher. They don’t care that supply chains are getting hit. They don’t care that their farmers are getting screwed over. They do not care that working families are one more price spike away from disaster. The American people want to stop being jerked around.

The reality is that Republicans do not care. If they cared, we would be debating bills to lower costs; we would be demanding answers about this war; we would make sure that we paid people who keep this country safe; and they would be acting with urgency and seriousness.

That is not what we are getting. Instead, we are getting a Republican majority that is deeply incompetent, deeply unserious, and far too comfortable with making ordinary people pay the price for its failures.

The American people deserve better, and I think I understand why Republicans are working overtime to make it harder for people to vote before November. I understand the SAVE Act because the State legislative district that includes Mar-a-Lago flipped blue last night.

The American people are sick of this. They are not going to put up with this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question and on this rule. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1310

Mrs. HOUCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I note that the Department of Homeland Security is composed of several agencies, not just TSA, not just FEMA, not just the Coast Guard, and not just ICE and CBP.

When my colleagues on the left are defunding or not funding, refusing to fund the Department of Homeland Security, they are refusing to fund the agency in its entirety, which includes U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, the Transportation Security Administration, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency protecting our critical infrastructure from cyber and physical threats, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, U.S. Secret Service, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, and the Federal Protective Service to protect our Federal buildings and our employees.

Those are just some of the things under the Department of Homeland Security. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is true, we don’t want to partially fund the Department of Homeland Security. We want to fully fund every part of it. That is why we are not going to do this in piecemeal. The people who are working at the Department of Homeland Security, whether they are working for ICE to try to rid this country of criminal illegal aliens, or they are working for TSA to protect our airports, or they are engaging in protections for the cybersecurity of our homeland, they deserve to be paid for their work.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will again, this week, have the opportunity to vote an eighth time to fully fund DHS, and I hope they will join us on behalf of all of the Federal workers that work under that agency.

Mr. Speaker, these four bills that we are going to consider in the rule have a common thread. They protect Americans at home and abroad. They stand behind the personnel who keep this country safe. They enforce agreements we have made and defend the values we have built. They reflect a simple principle: the United States Government exists to serve the American people.

I look forward to moving these bills out of the House this week, and I ask my colleagues to join me in voting “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. 1131 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

After the resolved clause strike the first section, insert the following, and renumber the subsequent sections accordingly:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8029) 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. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 7481, as introduced, 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 Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8029.

SEC. 3. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 8029 no later than three calendar days passage.

Mrs. HOUCHIN. 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 on the resolution.

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 will be postponed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Matthew Hanley, one of his secretaries.

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 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EDWARDS) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes 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:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1131; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1131, if ordered.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8029, PAY OUR HOMELAND DEFENDERS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1128, EXPRESSING THE SUPPORT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5103, MAKE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL ACT OF 2026; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7084, DEFENDING AMERICAN PROPERTY ABROAD ACT OF 2026; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

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. 1131) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8029) making ap-

propriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1128) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the Department of Homeland Security; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5103) to establish a program to Beautify the District of Columbia and establish the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7084) to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to the types of vessels that may enter or operate in navigable waters of the United States or transfer cargo in any port or place under the jurisdiction of the United States, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 210, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—212

Aderholt	Fedorchak	LaLota
Alford	Feenstra	Langworthy
Allen	Fine	Latta
Amodei (NV)	Finstad	Lawler
Arrington	Fischbach	Lee (FL)
Babin	Fitzgerald	Letlow
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Loudermilk
Baird	Fleischmann	Lucas
Balderson	Flood	Luna
Barr	Fong	Luttrell
Barrett	Fox	Mace
Baumgartner	Franklin, Scott	Mackenzie
Bean (FL)	Fry	Malliotakis
Begich	Fulcher	Maloy
Bentz	Garbarino	Mann
Bergman	Gill (TX)	Massie
Bice	Jimenez	Mast
Biggs (AZ)	Goldman (TX)	McCaul
Biggs (SC)	Gonzales, Tony	McClain
Bilirakis	Gooden	McClintock
Boebert	Gosar	McCormick
Bost	Graves	McDowell
Brecheen	Griffith	McGuire
Bresnahan	Grothman	Messmer
Buchanan	Guest	Meuser
Burchett	Guthrie	Miller (IL)
Burlison	Hageman	Miller (OH)
Calvert	Hamadeh (AZ)	Miller (WV)
Cammack	Haridopolos	Miller-Meeks
Carey	Harrigan	Mills
Carter (GA)	Harris (MD)	Moolenaar
Carter (TX)	Harris (NC)	Moore (AL)
Ciscomani	Harshbarger	Moore (NC)
Cline	Hern (OK)	Moore (UT)
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Moore (WV)
Clyde	Hill (AR)	Moran
Cole	Hinson	Murphy
Collins	Houchin	Nehls
Comer	Hudson	Newhouse
Crane	Huizenga	Norman
Crank	Hurd (CO)	Nunn (IA)
Crawford	Issa	Obornolte
Crenshaw	Jack	Ogles
Davidson	Jackson (TX)	Onder
De La Cruz	James	Owens
DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Palmer
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (SD)	Patronis
Donalds	Jordan	Perry
Downing	Joyce (OH)	Pfleger
Dunn (FL)	Joyce (PA)	Reschenthaler
Edwards	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (AL)
Elizy	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Emmer	Kennedy (UT)	Rose
Estes	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Evans (CO)	Kiley (CA)	Roy
Ezell	Kim	Rulli
Fallon	Kustoff	Rutherford

Salazar	Stefanik	Van Epps
Scalise	Steil	Van Orden
Schmidt	Steube	Wagner
Schweikert	Strong	Walberg
Scott, Austin	Stutzman	Weber (TX)
Self	Taylor	Webster (FL)
Sessions	Tenney	Westerman
Shreve	Thompson (PA)	Wied
Simpson	Tiffany	Williams (TX)
Smith (MO)	Timmons	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Turner (OH)	Womack
Smith (NJ)	Valadao	Yakym
Smucker	Van Drew	Zinke
Spartz	Van Duyne	

NAYS—210

Adams	Golden (ME)	Olszewski
Aguilar	Goldman (NY)	Omar
Amo	Gomez	Pallone
Ansari	Gonzalez, V.	Panetta
Auchincloss	Goodlander	Pappas
Balint	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Barragan	Gray	Perez
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Peters
Bell	Grijalva	Pettersen
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pingree
Beyer	Hayes	Pocan
Bishop	Himes	Pou
Bonamici	Horsford	Pressley
Boyle (PA)	Houlihan	Quigley
Brown	Hoyer	Ramirez
Brownley	Hoyle (OR)	Randall
Budzinski	Huffman	Raskin
Bynum	Ivey	Riley (NY)
Carbajal	Jackson (IL)	Rivas
Carson	Jacobs	Ross
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Ruiz
Casas	Jeffries	Ryan
Case	Johnson (GA)	Salinas
Casten	Johnson (TX)	Sánchez
Castor (FL)	Kamlager-Dove	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Cherfilus-	Keating	Schneider
McCormick	Kelly (IL)	Scholten
Chu	Kennedy (NY)	Schrier
Cisneros	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Landsman	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Cohen	Latimer	Simon
Conaway	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Correa	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Courtney	Levin	Stansbury
Craig	Liccardo	Stanton
Crockett	Lofgren	Stevens
Crow	Lynch	Strickland
Cuellar	Magaziner	Subramanyam
Davids (KS)	Mannion	Suozi
Davis (IL)	Matsui	Sykes
Davis (NC)	McBath	Takano
Dean (PA)	McBride	Thanedar
DeGette	McClain Delaney	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	McCollum	Titus
Deluzio	McDonald Rivet	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	McGarvey	Tokuda
Dexter	McGovern	Tonko
Dingell	McIver	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Elfreth	Menefee	Trahan
Escobar	Menendez	Tran
Espallat	Meng	Underwood
Evans (PA)	Mfume	Vargas
Fields	Min	Vasquez
Figures	Moore (WI)	Veasey
Fletcher	Morelle	Velázquez
Foster	Morrison	Vindman
Foushee	Moskowitz	Walkinshaw
Frankel, Lois	Moulton	Wasserman
Friedman	Mrvan	Schultz
Frost	Mullin	Waters
Garamendi	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garcia (CA)	Neal	Whitesides
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Williams (GA)
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Gillen	Ocasio-Cortez	

NOT VOTING—10

Cleaver	Knott	Swalwell
Hunt	LaHood	Wilson (SC)
Kean	Lieu	
Khanna	Stauber	

□ 1358

Mrs. DINGELL and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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 214, noes 210, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

AYES—214

Aderholt	Jimenez	Mills
Alford	Goldman (TX)	Moolenaar
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (AL)
Amodei (NV)	Gooden	Moore (NC)
Arrington	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Babin	Graves	Moore (WV)
Bacon	Griffith	Moran
Baird	Grothman	Murphy
Balderson	Guest	Nehls
Barr	Guthrie	Newhouse
Barrett	Hageman	Norman
Baumgartner	Hamadeh (AZ)	Nunn (IA)
Bean (FL)	Haridopolos	Obernolte
Begich	Harrigan	Ogles
Bentz	Harris (MD)	Onder
Bergman	Harris (NC)	Owens
Bice	Harshbarger	Palmer
Biggs (AZ)	Hern (OK)	Patronis
Biggs (SC)	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Bilirakis	Hill (AR)	Pfluger
Bost	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Brescheen	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Bresnahan	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rose
Burchett	Hurd (CO)	Rouzer
Burlison	Issa	Roy
Calvert	Jack	Rulli
Cammack	Jackson (TX)	Rutherford
Carey	James	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Schmidt
Ciscomani	Jordan	Schweikert
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Self
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Sessions
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Shreve
Collins	Kennedy (UT)	Simpson
Comer	Kiggans (VA)	Smith (MO)
Crane	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NE)
Crank	Kim	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Knott	Smucker
Crenshaw	Kustoff	Spartz
Davidson	LaHood	Stefanik
De La Cruz	LaLota	Steil
DesJarlais	Langworthy	Steube
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Strong
Donalds	Lawler	Stutzman
Downing	Lee (FL)	Taylor
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Tenney
Edwards	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Ellzey	Lucas	Tiffany
Emmer	Luna	Timmons
Estes	Luttrell	Turner (OH)
Evans (CO)	Mace	Valadao
Ezell	Mackenzie	Van Drew
Fallon	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Fedorchak	Maloy	Van Epps
Feenstra	Mann	Van Orden
Fine	Massie	Wagner
Finstad	Mast	Walberg
Fischbach	McCauley	Weber (TX)
Fitzgerald	McClain	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Westerman
Fleischmann	McCormick	Wied
Flood	McDowell	Williams (TX)
Fong	McGuire	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Messmer	Wittman
Franklin, Scott	Meuser	Womack
Fry	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Fulcher	Miller (OH)	Zinke
Garbarino	Miller (WV)	
Gill (TX)	Miller-Meeks	

NOES—210

Adams	Goldman (NY)	Olszewski
Aguilar	Gomez	Omar
Amo	Gonzalez, V.	Pallone
Ansari	Goodlander	Panetta
Auchincloss	Gottheimer	Pappas
Balint	Gray	Pelosi
Barragan	Green, Al (TX)	Perez
Beatty	Grijalva	Peters
Bell	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Bera	Hayes	Pingree
Beyer	Himes	Pocan
Bishop	Horsford	Pou
Bonamici	Houlahan	Pressley
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Brownley	Huffman	Randall
Budzinski	Ivey	Raskin
Bynum	Jackson (IL)	Riley (NY)
Carson	Jacobs	Rivas
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Ross
Casas	Jeffries	Ruiz
Case	Johnson (GA)	Ryan
Casten	Johnson (TX)	Salinas
Castor (FL)	Kamlager-Dove	Sánchez
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Scanlon
Cherfilus-	Keating	Schakowsky
McCormick	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Chu	Kennedy (NY)	Scholten
Cisneros	Khanna	Schrier
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Scott, David
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sewell
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Conaway	Latimer	Simon
Correa	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lee (PA)	Sorensen
Courtney	Leger Fernandez	Soto
Craig	Levin	Stansbury
Crockett	Liccardo	Stanton
Crow	Lofgren	Stevens
Cuellar	Lynch	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Magaziner	Subramanyam
Davis (IL)	Mannion	Suozi
Davis (NC)	Matsui	Sykes
Dean (PA)	McBath	Takano
DeGette	McBride	Thanedar
DeLauro	McClain Delaney	Thompson (CA)
DeBene	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
Deluzio	McCollum	Titus
DeSaulnier	McDonald Rivet	Tlaib
Dexter	McGarvey	Tokuda
Dingell	McGovern	Tonko
Doggett	McIver	Torres (CA)
Elfreth	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Escobar	Menefee	Trahan
Españat	Menendez	Tran
Evans (PA)	Meng	Underwood
Fields	Mfume	Vargas
Figures	Min	Vasquez
Fletcher	Moore (WI)	Veasey
Foster	Morelle	Velázquez
Foushee	Morrison	Vindman
Frankel, Lois	Moskowitz	Walkinshaw
Friedman	Moulton	Wasserman
Frost	Mrvan	Schultz
Garamendi	Mullin	Waters
Garcia (CA)	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Whitesides
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Williams (GA)
Gillen	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Golden (ME)	Ocasio-Cortez	

NOT VOTING—8

Boebert	Hunt	Stauber
Carbajal	Kean	Swalwell
Cleaver	Lieu	

□ 1406

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.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO TRADE PRACTICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO LARGE AND PERSISTENT ANNUAL UNITED STATES GOODS TRADE DEFICITS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-142)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14257 of April 2, 2025, is to continue in effect beyond April 2, 2026.

The circumstances related to this emergency continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat, which has its source in whole or in substantial part outside the United States, to the national security and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14257.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

□ 1410

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIED HARMFUL FOREIGN ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-143)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202 (d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622 (d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation declared in Executive Order 14024 of April 15, 2021, which was expanded in scope in Executive Order 14066 of March 8, 2022, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 14039 of August 20, 2021, Executive Order 14068 of March 11, 2022, Executive Order 14071 of April 6, 2022, Executive Order 14114 of December 22, 2023, Executive Order 14329 of August 6, 2025, and Executive Order 14384 of February 6, 2026, is to continue in effect beyond April 15, 2026.

Specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation—in particular, efforts to undermine the conduct of free and fair democratic elections and democratic institutions in the United States and its allies and partners; to engage in and facilitate malicious cyber-enabled activities against the United States and its allies and partners; to foster and use transnational corruption to influence foreign governments; to pursue extraterritorial activities targeting dissidents or journalists; to undermine security in countries and regions important to United States national security; and to violate well-established principles of international law, including respect for the territorial integrity of states—continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14024 with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH SUDAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-144)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the na-

tional emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan is to continue in effect beyond April 3, 2026.

The situation in and in relation to South Sudan, which has been marked by activities that threaten the peace, security, or stability of South Sudan and the surrounding region, including widespread violence and atrocities, human rights abuses, recruitment and use of child soldiers, attacks on peacekeepers, and obstruction of humanitarian operations, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 with respect to South Sudan.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT MALICIOUS CYBER-ENABLED ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 119-145)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, Executive Order 13984 of January 19, 2021, Executive Order 14110 of October 30, 2023 (revoked by Executive Order 14148 of January 20, 2025), Executive Order 14144 of January 16, 2025, and Executive Order 14306 of June 6, 2025, is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2026.

Significant malicious cyber-enabled activities originating from, or directed by persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 with respect

to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

MAKE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL ACT OF 2025

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1131, I call up the bill (H.R. 5103) to establish a program to Beautify the District of Columbia and establish the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1131, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5103

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act of 2025”.

SEC. 2. PROGRAM TO BEAUTIFY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter the “Secretary”) shall develop a program to beautify the District of Columbia (hereinafter the “Program”).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary, when establishing the Program, shall consult with each of the following:

- (A) The Attorney General.
- (B) The Secretary of Transportation.
- (C) The Mayor of the District of Columbia.
- (D) The United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.
- (E) The Administrator of General Services.
- (F) The heads of such other Federal departments and agencies and District of Columbia officials as the Secretary deems appropriate.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Program is to establish and implement a plan for Federal and local officials to—

(1) coordinate, and maintain, the cleanliness, of Federal and District of Columbia facilities, monuments, land, public spaces, sidewalks, parks, highways, roads, transit systems, and other commonly visited areas within the District of Columbia, including through the removal of graffiti;

(2) restore, to the extent practicable, District of Columbia and Federal public monuments, memorials, statues, markers, and similar properties that have been damaged or defaced or inappropriately removed or changed; and

(3) encourage private-sector participation in the efforts of the Program.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate

that includes a summary of the progress of the Program and the plan as described in subsection (b).

(d) **SUNSET.**—This section, and the Program established by this section, shall terminate on January 2, 2029.

SEC. 3. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SAFE AND BEAUTIFUL COMMISSION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the executive branch a District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission (hereafter the “Commission”).

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall be comprised of representatives of each of the following entities:

- (A) The Department of the Interior.
- (B) The Department of Transportation.
- (C) The Department of Homeland Security.
- (D) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (E) The United States Marshals Service.
- (F) The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

(G) The United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Columbia.

(H) The United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Maryland.

(I) The United States Attorney’s Office for the Eastern District of Virginia.

(J) The Executive Office of the Mayor of the District of Columbia (as defined in section 3(3) of the Governmental Reorganization Procedures Act of 1981; sec. 1-315.02(3), D.C. Official Code).

(K) Such other entities of the Federal government as may be determined by the Chair of the Commission.

(2) **DESIGNATION OF MEMBERS.**—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this section (or, in the case of an entity described in subsection (b)(1)(K), not later than 45 days after the Chair of the Commission designates the entity), the head of each entity described in subsection (b)(1) shall designate a representative of that entity to serve as the representative of the entity on the Commission.

(c) **CHAIR.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the President shall designate a senior level official from the Executive Office of the President to serve as the Chair of the Commission.

(2) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Chair shall perform functions that include the following:

(A) Developing a schedule of meetings for the Commission.

(B) Designating entities who shall be represented on the Commission under subsection (b)(1)(K).

(C) In consultation with the members of the Commission, developing a charter for the Commission and, not later than 7 days after the date on which the charter is completed, submitting the charter to the appropriate committees of Congress.

(d) **FUNCTIONS AND AUTHORITIES.**—

(1) **FUNCTIONS.**—The functions of the Commission are to recommend actions, and review the effectiveness of such actions, with respect to, but not limited to, the following:

(A) Developing and encouraging the implementation of policies which will direct the maximum enforcement of Federal immigration law within the District of Columbia, including policies to encourage the redirection of available Federal, State, or local law enforcement resources to apprehend and deport illegal aliens.

(B) Monitoring the District of Columbia’s sanctuary-city status and compliance with the enforcement of Federal immigration law.

(C) Facilitating the prompt and complete accreditation of the District of Columbia’s forensic crime laboratory.

(D) In collaboration with its leadership and union, ensuring that the Metropolitan Police

Department of the District of Columbia is provided with assistance to facilitate the recruitment, retention, and capabilities of its officers and facilitating the provision of Federal personnel, resources, and expertise to reduce crime.

(E) Collaborating with appropriate local government entities to provide assistance to increase the speed and lower the cost of processing concealed carry license requests in the District of Columbia.

(F) Reviewing and, as appropriate, recommending revisions to Federal prosecutorial policies on pretrial detention of criminal defendants to ensure that individuals who pose a genuine threat to public safety are detained to the maximum extent permitted by law.

(G) Collaborating with appropriate local government entities to provide assistance to end fare evasion and other crime within the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority system.

(H) Facilitating the deployment of a more robust Federal law enforcement presence, and in coordination with local law enforcement agencies, facilitating the deployment of a more robust local law enforcement presence (as appropriate) within the District of Columbia, including the National Mall and Memorial Parks, museums, monuments, Lafayette Park, Union Station, Rock Creek Park, Anacostia Park, the George Washington Memorial Parkway, the Suitland Parkway, and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

(2) **COORDINATION WITH OTHER AUTHORITIES.**—The Commission may, to the extent permitted by law, request operational assistance from and coordinate with Federal and local officials as appropriate, including the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and the Amtrak Police.

(e) **REPORT.**—The Commission shall submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress which includes a summary of the functions and authorities carried out pursuant to subsection (d), and shall include in the report such recommendations for legislation as the Commission considers appropriate.

(f) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(g) **SUNSET.**—This section, and the Commission established by this section, shall terminate on January 2, 2029.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. McGUIRE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WALKINSHAW) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. McGUIRE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I support the Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act of 2025, which codifies core components of President Trump’s Executive Order No. 14252 titled: “Making the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful.”

Our Nation’s Capital is a direct reflection of our great country and should be a symbol of pride for the American people and a safe and beautiful location for all who reside and visit. Violent crime in Washington, D.C., has been far too high for far too long.

The Oversight and Government Reform Committee’s investigation into D.C. crime has shown that lawlessness and violence on D.C.’s streets are not an inevitability. It is a policy choice.

Specifically, we show that D.C. leadership pressured and, at times, directed police commanders to manipulate crime data in order to maintain the appearance of low crime in the Nation’s Capital.

You have to ask yourself: Why would the Democratic D.C. Council do that? They sought to deceive the American people because their misguided policies hurt American citizens.

Unfortunately, years of soft-on-crime policies have turned Washington, D.C., into a city with high crime rates, rampant homelessness, and graffiti on historic buildings and monuments. Symbols of our great Nation, such as the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the World War II Memorial, have all been vandalized and defaced over the years.

President Trump and congressional Republicans are tackling crime in Washington, D.C., head-on.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5103 establishes the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission, made up of key Federal law enforcement and other Federal partners, to focus on ensuring the safety of District residents and visitors through full enforcement of Federal and local laws in the District.

The commission will develop recommendations on how to prioritize the safety of the District’s residents and visitors. This bill also requires the development and implementation of a D.C. beautification plan.

Key Federal and local leaders will be tasked—I will repeat that one. Key Federal and local leaders will be tasked with coordinating the cleanliness of the District’s facilities, infrastructure, and parks. These leaders will also work to restore Federal public monuments, statues, markers, and similar properties that have been defaced.

Every day, my constituents from Virginia’s Fifth Congressional District visit D.C. for work, travel, and my office coordinates tours for them. My constituents, as well as all who work or live in or travel to D.C., should feel safe while walking down the street.

Today, congressional Republicans will again show that we are the party

of law and order by voting in support of H.R. 5103.

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

□ 1420

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act. This is yet another example of the majority wasting our time here, dictating local decisions in D.C., instead of doing our jobs focusing on the real issues affecting the American people.

As we speak, President Trump has us engaged in an unconstitutional, reckless war with Iran. Gas prices are at \$4 a gallon. TSA lines are approaching 4 hours. Republicans have stripped healthcare from millions of Americans while giving big tax cuts to billionaires. Masked Federal agents have killed Americans on our streets.

So what legislation do Republicans bring to the floor today? Legislation to bring down the high costs that American families are struggling with? No. Legislation to address the healthcare crisis and the fact that in our own Commonwealth of Virginia, nine rural hospitals are at risk of closing? No. This is a bill to further the President's seeming desire to make himself the king of the District of Columbia.

In this Congress, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has spent a lot of time meddling in local D.C. matters and none holding the Trump administration accountable for corruption, its coverup of the Epstein files, and for the failure to deliver the lower costs that the President promised.

If President Trump wants to run the District of Columbia, he should resign from the Presidency and run for Mayor. I think there is an opening.

If congressional Republicans want to micromanage the District of Columbia, they should resign from Congress and run for the D.C. Council.

Let's talk specifically about the bill in front of us on which it is important to note the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has not held a single hearing. The bill creates a Federal commission to oversee the District of Columbia, with mass deportation as its first priority. The commission is required to develop policies to "direct the maximum enforcement of Federal immigration law within the District of Columbia, including policies to encourage the redirection of available Federal, State, or local law enforcement resources to apprehend and deport illegal aliens."

It is to redirect law enforcement. Redirect law enforcement from the worst of the worst and, presumably, toward detaining more hardworking folks and children on top of the thousands of children that this administration has detained.

At the same time, the commission is required to support efforts to speed up

and lower the costs of concealed carry permits in D.C., increasing the risk of gun violence.

My friend, the gentleman from Virginia, talked about crime in the District of Columbia. It is true that violent crime across this country spiked during President Trump's first term, but the good news is that it is way down in D.C. today. In fact, violent crime is at a 40-year low. Now, one crime is one crime too many, but it is at a 40-year low in the District of Columbia today. In fact, dozens of cities in red States, represented by my friends on the other side of the aisle, have higher violent crime rates than the District of Columbia.

The bill also requires the Secretary of the Interior to "develop a program to beautify the District of Columbia."

As a former member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I know a little bit about efforts to improve quality of life within local communities in partnership with those communities, and that is not what this bill does. The so-called beautification project is not intended to improve the lives of the 700,000 people who call D.C. home. It is an instruction to the Secretary of the Interior and the commission to transform D.C. into Mar-a-Lago on the Potomac for President Trump's benefit.

If my friends on the other side were serious about making D.C. safer and more beautiful, they wouldn't have blocked the District from spending its own tax revenue last year. They blocked the use of \$1 billion in local D.C. funds, funds that could have gone towards locally-directed efforts that would have made D.C. safer and more beautiful for its residents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation and instead support efforts that respect local officials here in D.C. and across the country who work to make our communities safer and more beautiful.

D.C. residents are among the only Americans who have all the responsibilities of citizenship in this country but don't enjoy all the benefits. If Republicans want to legislate on D.C. matters, let's pass D.C. statehood and give them all the benefits of citizenship.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there was a great debate in 1790 with Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison. Many here may remember the play "Hamilton." At the end of the day, they came up with the idea of having Washington, D.C. At the time, they wanted the seat of Federal Government to be in Pennsylvania or in New York. What that would have done is that would have given us a superstate where all of the money and all of the priorities would have gone.

Maryland ceded a little bit of land, Virginia ceded a little bit of land, and we came up with Washington, D.C.

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, we are Congress, and we, by the Con-

stitution, have complete authority over Washington, D.C. It is not a State, because if it was, it would be a superstate, which would have all of the money and all of the power for the country, and it would take away voices from the other States.

Now, as I have been in Congress for 14 months, I have been around the District of Columbia talking with law enforcement and people that have lived here for years. In just 14 months and into the first year of President Trump's term, I have a lot of anecdotes.

I ran into a young woman, who went into a Subway, and a homeless woman said: Let me get the door for you. So the homeless woman opened the door. As she walked in, this woman punched her in the back of the head, nearly knocked her out. When she came to, that woman that knocked her out went to jail. She got a phone call just a few hours later from a detective saying: Hey, we put that woman back on the street, but don't worry, she is not going to harm anyone.

It seems like the policies coming out of the D.C. Council indicate to the American citizens visiting and living here that police are bad, criminals are good, and nobody cares about the victim. They have made a mockery of the criminal justice system.

Again, that authority is Congress, and this bill codifies that.

My bill codifies many elements of President Trump's successful executive order until 2029, ensuring there isn't a backslide into lawlessness in the city.

I had a young woman come up to me and say: I walk my dog at 8 p.m. I didn't understand what that meant. What she then said is: 2 years ago, I would not walk my dog in the dark. That is just in 14 months, and we need to codify that.

This bill is not partisan. It is common sense. Whether you are Democrat, Republican, Independent, we are all Americans, and I think we all want to live, work, and raise our family in peace. It should be nonpartisan. Wanting our Nation's Capital to be safe and beautiful, again, is not political. It is in the best interests of all who travel to and call D.C. their home.

When people come to Washington, D.C., they are not just visiting a city. They are visiting our Nation's Capital, the greatest country with the greatest people in the history of Earth. We may not be perfect, but we have lifted more people out of poverty, given more people freedom, and given more people opportunity than any country on Earth. Even in our worst days, everyone around the world wants to come to America because of our freedom.

What they see in The National Mall, the memorials, in our parks, and transit quarters shapes their pride and our shared heritage. If those spaces aren't clean, safe, and cared for, we all feel it—residents, commuters, small businesses, and millions of visitors who power D.C.'s local economy. When people visit D.C., they should feel safe

while taking in the scenery and historic landmarks, not scared to walk two blocks because of the crime or confronted with a homeless encampment while walking on The National Mall.

□ 1430

One young staffer told me that she takes an Uber if she has to walk more than two blocks, but in the last 14 months she now walks 20 minutes to work. So, we are making progress, and we need to codify that.

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

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I hear my friends on the other side often talking about the constitutional authority that this Congress has to legislate with respect to the District of Columbia, and I would make two points.

One, I think the question isn't can we. The question is should we. Should we substitute our judgment based on the anecdotes we might have heard for the judgment of the District of Columbia's elected representatives who are connected to their communities each and every day and if they aren't responsive to those communities can be unelected by those communities.

I would submit that they are in a better position than us to determine the policies for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), an elected Representative of the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this bill. I include in the RECORD letters opposing this bill from the District of Columbia Mayor and every member of the D.C. Council.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025.

Hon. JAMES COMER,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COMER AND RANKING MEMBER GARCIA: As Mayor and Chief Executive Officer of the District of Columbia, I am proud of the work we have accomplished to invest in our people, strengthen our neighborhoods, and drive down crime. Building on this progress, my Administration established the Safe and Beautiful Emergency Operations Center to coordinate public safety and beautification efforts as the presidential emergency declaration ends. This structure ensures that DC will remain proactive—bringing together local and federal partners to sustain momentum on reducing crime and improving quality of life for every resident.

We have worked collaboratively with this Committee on shared priorities, including public safety, the federal Return to Work, implementing a DC budget Fiscal Year 2025 fix (which is still pending in the House) and revitalizing the RFK campus; but I write now to ask you to reject 13 of the DC bills before you today that encroach on DC's Home Rule:

Bills like H.R. 5183, the District of Columbia Home Rule Improvement Act, make the District less efficient, competitive, and responsive to the needs of a highly complex unique local government that serves local, county and state functions. Boggling down

legislative and executive action only adds costs and uncertainty, making it more difficult to handle the economic headwinds and growth opportunities ahead.

Bills like H.R. 5214, the District of Columbia Cash Bail Reform Act, make DC less safe. Replacing our very effective pre-trial detention regime, which focuses on charged violent offenses and repeat violent offenders, not just on cash bail. I credit recent changes to our laws related to pre-trial detention for helping to drive down violent crime in the last two years.

And the bills to abolish the Judicial Nominations Commission and to convert the elected DC Attorney General to a Presidentially appointed legal officer for the District are both less democratic and untenable for District operations. The Judicial Nomination Commission, with seven members appointed by the Mayor, DC Council, President, US District Court for DC, and the DC Bar, works. As recently as last month, President Trump nominated three federal judicial nominees who were selected from the Commission's candidate pool—a process that demonstrates the value of maintaining local input. DC residents also voted to elect an Attorney General who represents the public interest. Changes to these charter agencies would significantly undercut the already thin ties to autonomy that limited home rule provides.

Finally, I urge you not to up end our three-part education funding SOAR Act. I have long supported the program to expand opportunity for DC students. However, my support has always been contingent on parity among all three education sectors—public, private, and charter—and this approach is working. We will not support changes that tip the scales away from this core principle of fairness for DC families. As the fastest improving urban school system, DC has become a model for urban education. We outpace the national average on all tested subject areas. We boast free, full-day Pre-K access serving more than 13,200 young learners—an investment which supports our children and our workforce. DC ranked top of the nation in parental satisfaction regarding school choice. Mayoral control, council oversight, and deep, targeted investments in our students, teachers, and buildings made these remarkable achievements possible.

I look forward to continuing a productive partnership with the Committee—one that respects the will of DC residents and honors the principles of home rule. Together, we can build on our successes while protecting the autonomy that, as history reflects, has made our city stronger.

Sincerely,

MURIEL BOWSER,
Mayor.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND LEADER JEFFRIES: We write to express our strong opposition to H.R. 5103, the *Make D.C. Safe and Beautiful Act*. This bill is unnecessary and duplicative and, if enacted, could actually erode public safety in the District. We urge all House members to vote against the bill this week.

We appreciate the interest H.R. 5103's sponsors have in promoting cleanliness in Washington, D.C. That said, the Secretary of the Interior does not need new legislation like H.R. 5103 to improve the appearance of federal land, parks, and monuments in the Dis-

trict. He certainly does not need four years, as the bill proposes, to remove graffiti and repair statues on federal property. He can do that work now, and, in fact, is doing that today in locations like Freedom Plaza and Columbus Circle. If he needs more resources, he should request them.

H.R. 5103's creation of a federal "Safe and Beautiful" commission is also a concern. This commission would, among other things, be charged with encouraging immigration enforcement in the District, reviewing District criminal justice policies, and facilitating federal law enforcement deployment in the city. Such a commission would, in some ways, duplicate coordination work already underway on areas of mutual interest to the federal government and the District, including issues like trash collection and joint crime prevention activities. Establishing and funding a new government body focused on issues like immigration that are not a source of public safety concerns in the District would be wasteful.

Finally, we must express serious concerns about the provision in H.R. 5103 intended to encourage and speed the issuance of concealed carry licenses in the District. Our local police already manage a straightforward and safety-focused concealed carry program. Putting more guns on our streets more quickly would be a step backwards at a time when D.C. police and their federal partners are working together daily to get firearms out of the hands of dangerous individuals.

Sincerely,
Chairman Phil Mendelson,
Councilmembers Anita Bonds; Christina Henderson; Brianne K. Nadeau; Matthew Frumin; Zachary Parker; Wendell Felder; Robert C. White, Jr.; Doni Crawford; Brooke Pinto; Janeese Lewis George; Charles Allen; and Trayon White, Sr.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, D.C. is a world-class city, yet this bill seeks to codify and encourage President Trump's efforts to control and transform D.C., as well as to demonize D.C. and its 700,000 residents, the majority of whom are Black and Brown. President Trump already has called for the repeal of D.C. home rule, federalized the D.C. police department, deployed troops and masked Federal agents on D.C.'s streets, terrorized immigrants in D.C., demolished the East Wing of the White House, removed the nonprofit managing the public golf courses in D.C., and announced the closure of the Kennedy Center. This bill will only embolden him.

This bill would establish in the executive branch the D.C. Safe and Beautiful Commission. The commission's responsibilities include increasing civil immigration enforcement in D.C., deploying more Federal law enforcement officers in D.C., and increasing the number of people carrying guns in D.C.

The commission's top priority is to increase civil immigration enforcement in D.C. Specifically, the commission is required to ensure the "maximum enforcement of Federal immigration law within the District of Columbia, including policies to encourage the redirection of available Federal, State, or local law enforcement resources to apprehend and deport illegal aliens," and to monitor D.C.'s "compliance with the enforcement of Federal immigration law." The commission is also

required to facilitate the “deployment of a more robust Federal law enforcement presence” in D.C. and to “increase the speed and lower the costs of processing concealed carry” permits in D.C.

However, D.C. does not want masked Federal agents terrorizing communities, separating families, and destroying the community trust needed for effective local policing or more guns on the streets.

This bill would also require the Secretary of the Interior to “develop a program to beautify” D.C., even though D.C. is already one of the most beautiful cities in the world.

This Congress, Republicans have filed over 100 bills, amendments, and riders to repeal, amend, or block D.C. from carrying out local laws and policies. The House has already passed 10 of those bills.

D.C. residents have all the obligations of American citizenship, including paying Federal taxes, serving on juries, and registering with the Selective Service, yet Congress denies them full local self-government and voting representation in Congress. The only solution to this undemocratic treatment is to grant D.C. statehood.

Congress has the authority to admit D.C. as a State. The D.C. statehood bill, H.R. 51, would reduce the size of the Federal district from 68 square miles to 2 square miles, consisting of the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, and The National Mall. The residential and commercial areas of D.C. would be a new State.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on H.R. 5103.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter opposing this bill from Brady United Against Gun Violence.

MARCH 25, 2026.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Founded in 1974, Brady works across Congress, courts, and communities, uniting gun owners and non-gun owners alike, to take action, not sides, and end America's gun violence epidemic. Our organization today carries the name of Jim and Sarah Brady. As you know, Jim was shot and severely injured in the assassination attempt on President Ronald Reagan. As victims of gun violence and life-long gun owners, Jim and Sarah dedicated the rest of their lives to passing federal legislation requiring background checks for gun sales. Brady continues to uphold Jim and Sarah's legacy by uniting Americans from coast to coast, red and blue, young and old, liberal and conservative, to combat the epidemic of gun violence.

This week, the House will consider the Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act of 2026 (H.R. 5103), which establishes in the federal executive branch the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission, consisting entirely of federal officials. This bill is yet another example of federal overreach into the affairs of the District's residents, imposing unnecessary and unwanted criminal and civil reforms. Most egregiously, the bill would direct the commission to seek to “increase the speed and lower the cost of processing concealed carry license requests in the District of Columbia.” Brady stands in strong opposition to H.R. 5103 and urges Members to oppose this dangerous overreach of federal authority

over the District of Columbia and its residents.

Every American should have a say in how they can best prevent gun violence and violent crime in their own communities; that is at the very core of the system of federalism our founding fathers fought a revolution to create. Yet, when it comes to efforts to pass public safety laws, citizens of our nation's capital are often at the mercy of federal legislators with little interest in their needs, and attempts by the District's leaders to keep their communities safe are continuously tossed aside by lawmakers with no stake in those communities.

The District's residents are among the only Americans who bear all the responsibilities of citizenship without fully realizing their benefits. The District has a population larger than two states that enjoy full representation in Congress. D.C. residents pay higher taxes than residents in all but 2 states and have the highest per capita federal tax rate in the nation. Yet, D.C. Home Rule is limited—Congress has the power to review and block local legislation, impose their own legislative prerogatives, control the budget, and appoint judges.

The District of Columbia, guided by interest in preserving public safety for its residents and visitors, has implemented a concealed firearm carry licensing process that ensures prospective licensees meet the necessary legal requirements for firearm and concealed carry possession, including the completion of an MPD-approved range training, within the District. Under H.R. 5103, the federal government would meddle with the District's laws regarding who can carry concealed handguns in public, undermining its ability to enforce laws in service of public safety.

District residents deserve autonomy over their home and over how they choose to combat violent crime. The federal government should not abuse its oversight of the District of Columbia to interfere with home rule policies and practices. As such, Brady calls on Members to oppose H.R. 5103 and any other bill that restricts the autonomy of the District of Columbia or overrides the District's criminal justice laws.

Best regards,

MARK A. COLLINS,
Director, Federal Policy.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, reckless D.C. Council policies have caused citizens from all over the United States and in D.C. to be robbed, raped, and murdered. They are reckless. They are not getting the job done, which is why we need to do this bill.

In the Oversight Committee we pointed that out. Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia Chief Pamela Smith actually resigned immediately following the release of the Oversight Committee's report. Why would they cover up these crimes? It is to trick the American people so they don't understand how bad their policies are.

In 2023, there were 274 homicides in D.C., a 20-year high.

In 2024, D.C. had the fourth highest homicide rate in the country.

While these crime statistics are troubling on their own, they significantly understate the level of crime in the D.C. area.

Last year, an investigation into D.C.'s crime statistics by the Oversight

Committee revealed that D.C. leadership pressured and at times manipulated crime statistics to maintain the appearance of low crime in our Nation's Capital. This pressure demoralized the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department making the city less safe.

President Trump's crackdown on violent crime in D.C. last year resulted in a significant drop in crime and increased arrests.

My bill, H.R. 5103, facilitates the deployment of more robust Federal law enforcement presence in D.C. in coordination with local law enforcement, providing vital support to ensure that both Federal and local laws are being followed to keep D.C. safe.

Now, sanctuary cities are sanctuaries for criminals. If you are a criminal, would you rather go to a city where local and Federal police authorities cooperate, communicate, and work as a team, or would you rather go to one where they don't work as a team? They have not been working as a team in D.C., and it is causing people to die.

That is unacceptable.

On the concealed carry permit aspect of the bill, D.C. has some of the most complicated and strict gun laws in the country.

Law-abiding residents who wish to protect themselves and their loved ones are forced to wait 4 months on average for a concealed carry permit appointment. This is unacceptable and, frankly, infringes on their Second Amendment rights, which are enshrined in our founding documents.

Criminals don't care about the law.

My bill establishes the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission which will collaborate with appropriate local government entities to speed up and reduce the cost of D.C.'s concealed carry permit process.

Criminals do not care about the law. You can create whatever law you want and try to get guns out of D.C. The criminals do not care. They are always going to get a gun, and you are making law-abiding citizens helpless victims.

The only people who are affected by D.C.'s complicated process are law-abiding residents. Streamlining concealed carry permits will decrease crime by allowing law-abiding citizens to better protect themselves and their families.

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

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

With respect to the concealed carry permit and streamlining the process, one of the aspects of the District's process that does take a little bit of time is the requirement for range training. I suspect that what the gentleman means when he says he wants to streamline the process for concealed carry permits in D.C. is he wants folks to have a concealed carry permit without completing range training. I know some people have that philosophy. I don't think that would make the District of Columbia safer.

With respect to the crime data manipulation, as the gentleman noted, last year the Republicans on the Oversight Committee investigated alleged crime data manipulation in D.C. By the way, it is the same crime data that today they and President Trump celebrate as he claims to have eliminated violent crime in the District of Columbia.

□ 1440

The investigation backfired on my Republican friends almost as soon as it began, thanks in large part to the testimony of every one of the eight current and former D.C. police commanders who sat down for transcribed interviews. That investigation proved, I think, not what they hoped it would prove.

The evidence was that President Trump was not telling the truth and is not telling the truth about crime in D.C. to justify his federalization of the D.C. police and deployment of troops on D.C. streets. It undermined Republican attacks on home rule by showing that D.C. was successfully reducing crime before the Federal intervention.

Every single one of those commanders testified that D.C. was experiencing a sustained decrease in crime over 2 years, well before President Trump's administration. Commander after commander testified that the data recording this trend wasn't manipulated. In fact, it was the very data they were using every day to help successfully drive down crime.

With respect to the argument that President Trump has made D.C. safer, in 2024, the year before President Trump began his second term, violent crime in D.C. was down 35 percent, a 30-year low. In 2025, it was down 29 percent, which is smaller than 35 percent, so the reduction in crime slowed down after President Trump's intervention.

As I noted before, homicides in D.C. and across the country did spike during President Trump's first term, but they have been falling for years, and the reduction in homicides in D.C. began before President Trump's second term.

We heard some anecdotes that the gentleman has heard from his staff and others. According to a poll conducted by The Washington Post, 80 percent of D.C. residents opposed President Trump's federalization of the D.C. police department and the deployment of the National Guard and Federal law enforcement in D.C. They disagree with the majority's view that President Trump and Federal troops have made D.C. safer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. MCCLELLAN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5103, the Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act of 2026.

For this reason, and at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. My amendment would stop unethical donations for Federal Government projects to alter any public property, building, or fixture at the White House, the Naval Observatory, or other public property locations primarily used by the President and the Vice President.

During the longest shutdown in our Nation's history, the Trump administration clearly showed the American people where its priorities lay and began demolishing the 123-year-old East Wing to build a gilded ballroom similar to that of his private billionaires' club at Mar-a-Lago.

Not only does the demolition undermine historical preservation without a public review process, but it also constitutes another ethical violation by the administration, as private donors fund the construction without input from the National Park Service.

This bill is just one in a series of the majority's and this administration's misguided priorities, whereby their answer to solving our immigration problems is advancing policies that would subject the District and cities across the Nation to a brutal and indiscriminate crackdown on immigrant communities.

While stating that he would go after "the worst of the worst," the President has, instead, targeted families, permanent residents, refugees, students, and asylum seekers. Instead of taking actions that make us safer, the administration has opted for showy displays of force, all to jack up his detention and deportation numbers.

The Trump administration, in its relentless drive to use ICE and Customs and Border Patrol as an instrument of cruelty toward immigrant communities, has abandoned the Department of Homeland Security's core mission of keeping the homeland safe.

Hundreds of intelligence officers with DHS' intelligence office have been directed to focus on immigration enforcement, resulting in fewer intelligence briefs reaching local officials and police departments.

At a time when the President has dragged us into his war of choice with Iran, which puts our servicemembers in harm's way with no clear long-term strategy, we absolutely cannot afford to leave ourselves so vulnerable to attack.

With gas prices now on the rise and the cost of groceries, rent, and utilities skyrocketing for millions, we are left to question why this administration would rather pursue vanity projects and its campaign of terror than deliver on the promises it made to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, crime statistics coming from the other side, obviously, I can't see them being reliable, especially as a member of the Oversight Committee. We talked about the D.C. Metropolitan Police Department. Chief Pamela Smith resigned immediately following the release of the Oversight Committee report, where they had a clear coverup on crimes to make it look like D.C. crime is not accurate.

Since President Trump's Federal enforcement action, the D.C. crime, especially violent crimes, has truly drastically decreased. Carjackings have dropped 87 percent. This is proof that increased Federal and local cooperation is essential to reducing crime in D.C.

Again, if you are a criminal, Mr. Speaker, you would rather go to a city where they don't cooperate, communicate, and work as a team. We are ensuring that they cooperate, communicate, and work as a team, and they will be less attracted to D.C.

Mayor Bowser herself stated that she appreciated the surge of Federal law enforcement officers as it enhanced the Metropolitan Police Department's law enforcement efforts. In contrast, the D.C. Council has proven time and time again that they prioritize dangerous criminals over the law-abiding residents of D.C. and the thousands of tourists who visit our Nation's Capital every day.

My bill will ensure coordination between Federal and local law enforcement continues, providing local police the additional Federal resources and personnel they need to combat crime in the District.

Again, on the concealed carry permit, nowhere in the United States do you have to wait 4 months, Mr. Speaker. That is an infringement on our Second Amendment, for whatever excuse they have.

Thankfully, not only is President Trump making America great again, he is making Washington, D.C., great again.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, \$4 a gallon gas, 4-hour waits at TSA lines, millions of Americans losing their healthcare, rural hospitals set to close, and tariffs driving up costs for hardworking American families. Those are the challenges that our constituents across the country are facing. Those are the challenges that we here as Members of Congress are supposed to address, yet we are meddling in the District of Columbia's affairs.

Let's do our job in this Congress and work together to bring down costs for the American people. Let the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the District council do their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues, my friends on the other side, will consider the priority of the safety of American citizens in D.C. and the rest of the country, and keep the city that represents our great Nation safe and beautiful.

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, Congress has a constitutional duty to ensure the District of Columbia is safe, secure, and beautiful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 5103. As a proud cosponsor of H.R. 5103, I stand with Representative McGuire and my Republican colleagues to deliver on President Trump's vision for our Nation's capital. This bill codifies Executive Order 14252 and turns words into law to make Washington, D.C., safe, clean, and beautiful once again.

The bill creates the bipartisan "District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission," comprising federal law enforcement leaders from DHS, the FBI, ATF, the U.S. Marshals, and the U.S. Attorneys for D.C., Maryland, and Virginia. This commission will work directly with D.C. officials to crack down on crime, enforce federal immigration law, and support the Metropolitan Police Department. American taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize lawlessness in the seat of our government.

This legislation also directs the Department of the Interior to launch a comprehensive beautification program to clean up monuments, memorials, parks, sidewalks, highways, and public spaces. Our capital should reflect American pride and history, not graffiti and decay.

Both the Commission and the beautification program sunset on January 2, 2029, ensuring focused action and regular congressional oversight through required progress reports. This is targeted, time-limited leadership, not another permanent bureaucracy.

As the seat of our federal government and a symbol to the world, Washington, D.C., must be safe for tourists, workers, residents, and Members of Congress alike. Crime, filth, and disrespect for our monuments undermine national morale and our global image. H.R. 5103 fixes that.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5103 today. Let's show the American people that we are delivering on law and order and restoring the beauty and dignity of our Nation's capital.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1131, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. McClellan of Virginia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5103 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The material previously referred to by Ms. McCLELLAN is as follows:

Ms. McClellan of Virginia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5103 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H.R. 6085, as introduced in the House of Representatives on November 18, 2025.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will record their votes by electronic device. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 214, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—207

Adams	Crockett	Green, Al (TX)
Aguilar	Crow	Grijalva
Amo	Cuellar	Harder (CA)
Ansari	Davids (KS)	Hayes
Auchincloss	Davis (IL)	Himes
Balint	Davis (NC)	Houlihan
Barragán	Dean (PA)	Hoyer
Beatty	DeGette	Hoyle (OR)
Bell	DeLauro	Huffman
Bera	DeBene	Ivey
Beyer	Deluzio	Jackson (IL)
Bishop	DeSaulnier	Jacobs
Bonamici	Dexter	Jayapal
Boyle (PA)	Dingell	Jeffries
Brown	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Brownley	Elfreth	Johnson (TX)
Budzinski	Escobar	Kaptur
Bynum	Espallat	Keating
Carbajal	Evans (PA)	Kelly (IL)
Carson	Fields	Kennedy (NY)
Carter (LA)	Figures	Khanna
Casar	Fletcher	Krishnamoorthi
Case	Foster	Landsman
Casten	Foushee	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Friedman	Latimer
Cherfilus-	Frost	Lee (NV)
McCormick	Garamendi	Lee (PA)
Chu	Garcia (CA)	Leger Fernandez
Cisneros	Garcia (IL)	Levin
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Liccardo
Clarke (NY)	Gillen	Lofgren
Clyburn	Golden (ME)	Lynch
Cohen	Goldman (NY)	Magaziner
Conaway	Gomez	Mannion
Correa	Gonzalez, V.	Matsui
Costa	Goodlander	McBath
Courtney	Gottheimer	McBride
Craig	Gray	McClain Delaney

McClellan	Peters	Stanton
McCollum	Pettersen	Stevens
McDonald Rivet	Pingree	Strickland
McGarvey	Pocan	Subramanyam
McGovern	Pou	Suozzi
McIver	Pressley	Sykes
Meeks	Quigley	Takano
Menefee	Ramirez	Thanedar
Menendez	Randall	Thompson (CA)
Meng	Raskin	Thompson (MS)
Mfume	Riley (NY)	Tlaib
Min	Rivas	Tokuda
Moore (WI)	Ross	Tonko
Morelle	Ruiz	Torres (CA)
Morrison	Ryan	Torres (NY)
Moskowitz	Salinas	Trahan
Moulton	Sánchez	Tran
Mrvan	Scanlon	Underwood
Mullin	Schakowsky	Vargas
Nadler	Schneider	Vasquez
Neal	Scholten	Veasey
Neguse	Schrier	Velázquez
Norcross	Scott (VA)	Vindman
Ocasio-Cortez	Scott, David	Walkinshaw
Olzewski	Sewell	Wasserman
Omar	Sherman	Schultz
Pallone	Simon	Waters
Panetta	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Pappas	Sorensen	Whitesides
Pelosi	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Perez	Stansbury	

NAYS—214

Aderholt	Fong	Mast
Alford	Fox	McCauley
Allen	Franklin, Scott	McClain
Amodei (NV)	Fry	McClintock
Arrington	Fulcher	McCormick
Babin	Garbarino	McDowell
Bacon	Gill (TX)	McGuire
Baird	Gimenez	Messmer
Balderson	Goldman (TX)	Meuser
Barr	Gonzales, Tony	Miller (IL)
Barrett	Gooden	Miller (OH)
Baumgartner	Gosar	Miller (WV)
Bean (FL)	Graves	Miller-Meeks
Begich	Griffith	Mills
Bentz	Grothman	Moolenaar
Bergman	Guest	Moore (AL)
Bice	Guthrie	Moore (NC)
Biggs (AZ)	Hagaman	Moore (UT)
Biggs (SC)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Moore (WV)
Bilirakis	Haridopolos	Moran
Boebert	Harrigan	Murphy
Bost	Harris (MD)	Nehls
Brecheen	Harris (NC)	Newhouse
Bresnahan	Harshbarger	Norman
Buchanan	Hern (OK)	Nunn (IA)
Burchett	Higgins (LA)	Oberholte
Burlison	Hill (AR)	Ogles
Calvert	Hinson	Onder
Cammack	Houchin	Owens
Carey	Hudson	Palmer
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Patronis
Carter (TX)	Hurd (CO)	Perry
Ciscomani	Issa	Pfluger
Cline	Jack	Reschenthaler
Cloud	Jackson (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Clyde	James	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rose
Collins	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Comer	Jordan	Roy
Crane	Joyce (OH)	Rulli
Crank	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Schmidt
Davidson	Kennedy (UT)	Schweikert
De La Cruz	Kiggans (VA)	Scott, Austin
DesJarlais	Kiley (CA)	Self
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Sessions
Donalds	Knott	Shreve
Downing	Kustoff	Simpson
Dunn (FL)	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Edwards	LaLota	Smith (NE)
Ellzey	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)
Emmer	Latta	Smucker
Estes	Lawler	Spartz
Evans (CO)	Lee (FL)	Staub
Ezell	Letlow	Stefanik
Fallon	Loudermilk	Steil
Fedorchak	Lucas	Steube
Feenstra	Luna	Strong
Fine	Luttrell	Stutzman
Finstad	Mace	Taylor
Fischbach	Mackenzie	Tenney
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Thompson (PA)
Maloy	Tiffany	Timmons
Fleischmann	Mann	Turner (OH)
Flood	Massie	

Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner

Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

Cleaver
Horsford
Hunt
Kamlager-Dove

Kean
Salazar
Swalwell

Titus
Williams (GA)
Womack

□ 1522

Messrs. EZELL, PATRONIS, ELLZEY, ROGERS of Alabama, COLLINS, LOUDERMILK, Mses. FOXX, DE LA CRUZ, Messrs. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and FEENSTRA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MATSUI, Messrs. PAPPAS, and JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 206, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—218

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodel (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
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
Golden (ME)
Goldman (TX)
Gonzales, Tony
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Gray
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger

Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
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
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick

McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perez

Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Staub
Stefanik
Steil

NAYS—206

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
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)
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espaillat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Goldman (NY)

Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Olszewski

Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Cleaver
Hunt
Kean

Lieu
Miller (OH)
Salazar

Swalwell
Womack

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1529

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

HONORING ALLEGHENY MOUNTAIN CHAPTER OF TROUT UNLIMITED

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for 60 years, the mission of the Allegheny Mountain Chapter of Trout Unlimited has been focused on protecting, conserving, and restoring local cold-water resources.

The Allegheny Mountain Chapter has been critical in ensuring Pennsylvanians can enjoy the Commonwealth's waterways and natural resources.

For more than half a century, volunteers and community members have helped to tackle issues impacting the waterways. Over the years, the group has partnered with Penn State, the National Guard, and the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to reduce damage on the region's waterways and the ecosystems found therein.

While the group focuses on completing projects, the chapter has spent many years educating younger generations. Members of the chapter initiated an environmental day at the DuBois Area Middle School and Punxsutawney Area Elementary.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Allegheny Mountain Chapter of Trout Unlimited for their dedication to preserving our natural resources. Their efforts are critical in allowing us to enjoy the natural beauty of the Commonwealth. I congratulate them on celebrating 60 years.

RECOGNIZING DEBORAH LOEB BOHREN

(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, I rise to recognize and congratulate the outstanding artistic talent of Deborah Loeb Bohren, a resident of Greenburgh, who has established her artistic vision through the photographer's lens.

Deb worked for many years in corporate life in strategic communications, marketing, and public affairs. She even did a stint as district office

director for Congresswoman Nita Lowey. However, her lifelong passion since being a student growing up in Yonkers has been in photography, at the level that includes exhibiting her works at galleries and in art shows from Europe to California to New England.

She has opined that “the essence of photography is the art and science of painting with light.” She uses a camera as an artist would use a paint brush—a transformation. While she has exhibited her work across the globe, here at home locally sites such as the Upstream Gallery in Hastings-on-Hudson have exhibited her works.

She shares her talent in photography as a guest presenter at camera clubs throughout the country and teaches a range of photographic courses.

Mr. Speaker, from the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, I salute the masterful photography and talent of Deborah Loeb Bohren.

HONORING EDNA JACKSON

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a trailblazer who has given a lifetime of service to the people of Georgia, representative Edna Jackson.

Born in Savannah in 1944, Edna began her journey in the civil rights movement at just 9 years old, marching with the NAACP Youth Council for justice and equality across the South.

She graduated from Savannah State University, earning degrees in sociology and political science education, then dedicated decades to public service as a social worker, director of alumni affairs, and a steady leader in Savannah city government.

She served three terms as an alderman-at-large and two as mayor pro tem before making history in 2012 as Savannah's first African-American female mayor. In 2021, she won the state-house district 165 seat, where she fought tirelessly for her community.

Now, as my friend bids farewell after many years under the Gold Dome, we thank her for a lifetime of leadership rooted in courage and commitment to progress. May her next chapter be filled with the same grace and purpose that defined her remarkable career.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mayor Jackson.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

(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, the Department of Homeland Security has been shut down for over a month, and my Republican colleagues refuse to fix it.

Thousands of dedicated public servants like TSA agents keep us safe in the air and on the ground, and they are working without pay. These workers are showing up every single day to protect our airports, respond to emergencies, and keep our communities safe.

Now, my colleagues and I have put forth solutions to reopen and fund the government, while calling for ICE reform. Yet, my Republican colleagues won't come to the table to negotiate. I believe they are choosing political leverage over public safety, and they are choosing political games over Americans.

While I believe they keep pointing fingers, these workers and their families are left wondering how they will pay their bills, and travelers are left dealing with unnecessary delays.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Republicans to stop playing games and start showing up for the safety and security of the American people.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SHERIDAN GORMAN

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

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of Sheridan Gorman of Yorktown Heights, New York, who was tragically murdered at just 18 years old.

Sheridan was a proud member of the Yorktown community and a freshman at Loyola University Chicago, studying business. Her life was stolen in a senseless act of violence at the hands of an illegal immigrant, leaving her family, her friends, and the entire Yorktown community at a complete loss.

A 2025 graduate of Yorktown High School, she was an athlete and young mentor, known for her warm kindness and limitless compassion. Sheridan inspired those around her, competing in field hockey, lacrosse, and bowling, and giving back by coaching young athletes through the Yorktown Athletic Club.

Sheridan was a lot like the Northern Lights she went out to find with her friends on the early morning of March 19—the kind of light that shows up quietly, bringing a bit of color to what is otherwise darkness. We are lucky to witness it for the short time it is visible in the night sky.

Doina and I extend our deepest condolences to her parents, Jessica and Thomas; her sister, Madelon; the entire Gorman family; and all who loved her. May her memory be a blessing, and may she rest in eternal peace.

□ 1540

COMMENDING TSA WORKERS

(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, there is no clear end in sight as Democrats and Republicans struggle to find common ground, leaving TSA workers and their families in distress.

Airport delays are rising, and TSA employees are expected to show up for work without pay. Some have called in sick, while others have left their positions entirely.

I commend those who continue to show up to serve communities across our Nation, despite the length of the line they face. Frustration is building among the hardworking people of eastern North Carolina who are rightfully demanding reasonable oversight of law enforcement and to pay our TSA workers.

We must put aside all political differences and prioritize putting people first.

Together, we can keep our Nation safe.

RECOGNIZING 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREER

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

Mr. TIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very special milestone in South Carolina's Fourth Congressional District, the 150th anniversary of Greer.

Founded in 1876 along a railroad line connecting Greenville and Spartanburg, Greer began as a small depot town built on opportunity and hard work. Over the years, it has grown into a thriving community and a key driver of economic growth in the upstate.

Today, Greer is home to hardworking families, small businesses, and world-class industry. But what truly defines this city is its people, neighbors, who take pride in where they live and invest in its future every day.

The yearlong Greer150 celebration is a chance to honor that history, bring the community together, and look ahead to what comes next.

As the Congressman representing this great city and home to our district office, I am proud to celebrate Greer's legacy and its bright future.

To the people of Greer, I congratulate them on 150 years. The best is yet to come.

AMERICANS NEED RELIEF

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, everyone in New Hampshire is talking about the cost of living and skyrocketing gas prices as a result of the war in Iran.

Higher gas prices are forcing families and small businesses to make difficult decisions. The average cost of a gallon of gas in America is now \$3.98, a 35 percent price jump in just under 30 days.

That is simply unsustainable for the people of my district who are already

facing record-high grocery costs due to President Trump's tariffs and the doubling and tripling of health insurance premiums because of the failure to extend ACA premium tax credits.

Granite Staters are taking it on the chin, and it is time to get something done to help.

That is why I introduced the Gas Prices Relief Act of 2026 with Senator MARK KELLY of Arizona to suspend the Federal gas tax through September and provide Americans with lower costs at the pump.

This bill maintains funding for our roads and bridges and holds the oil and gas companies accountable if they fail to pass along the savings to consumers.

These soaring prices mean that every school drop-off, every trip to the doctor or drive to work takes a bigger bite out of a family's budget.

I urge Congress to take up this legislation and provide Americans with the lower costs they deserve.

SKYROCKETING PRICE OF FERTILIZER AND DIESEL

(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, in northwest Ohio and across our Heartland, farmers are hurting. After 2 years of record drought, a year of reckless Trump tariffs, their export markets are drying up abroad.

Now comes the war in Iran.

One-third of the world's fertilizer supplies pass through the Strait of Hormuz. Its cost just rose.

Mr. Speaker, 25 percent of the world's oil supply passes through this narrow channel off the Iranian coast. Much like oil, fertilizer is traded on a global market, and a disruption on either side of the globe impacts Ohio farmers, producers, and growers.

This comes at the worst time as planting season is upon us. Our agriculture sector is teetering on the brink. Hello. Family farms hang in the balance. For many, this is a make-or-break year.

On top of skyrocketing fertilizer costs, the national average for diesel just hit a record \$5.37 per gallon.

If costs don't stabilize soon, the Heartland is in for a reckoning. We don't want one. We don't want one. Is the White House—hello, are you paying attention?

CHAMPION OF THE WEEK

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

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Jada Haines as Ohio's 13th Congressional District's Champion of the Week.

Jada grew up on the west side of Akron, and as a student-athlete, she began her basketball journey with Ladies First Akron.

She then went on to a successful career at St. Vincent-St. Mary High School and continued playing at the University of Northwestern Ohio and the University of Indianapolis.

Through it all, she credits Ladies First Akron with helping instill in her the love for the game.

Today, she has returned home to coach with Ladies First Akron, mentoring the next generation of young women student-athletes. She recently helped organize the organization's first Life After Sports Summit, connecting students with local universities for project-based learning opportunities.

Now in its 16th year, Ladies First Akron serves girls in grades three through eight across the greater Akron area. It is not just about basketball, it is about mentorship, life skills, and preparing young women for success beyond the court.

Jada's leadership reflects the spirit of our community and is a shining example of why our community is known as the birthplace of champions.

Jada is not only a champion in her own right, but she is helping train the next generation.

Again, I thank Jada for giving back to our community and commend her on being named Champion of the Week.

VOTER SUPPRESSION

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

Ms. TLAIB. No matter how Republicans try to spin it, the SAVE Act is voter suppression. This isn't about election security, Mr. Speaker. It is about election takeover.

President Trump and Republicans know that their policies are deeply unpopular with the American people.

So what are they doing? They are trying to rig the elections. They want to force Americans to produce a passport or birth certificate just to register to vote.

They know full well that only about half of Americans have a passport. They know it costs money. They know it takes time. That is the point.

They want to make it harder for many of our neighbors to be able to vote. Nearly 70 million married women do not have a birth certificate matching their legal name.

This bill is a direct attack on our right to vote, and Republicans don't want people like us voting. It would also increase purges of registered voters who literally are getting kicked off of these lists who are legally allowed to vote, and we must stop it.

RECOGNIZING MEDAL OF HONOR DAY

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. MOORE of Utah was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Ms. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNOTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Ms. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues for joining me on this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF).

HONORING STEVE STAMSON

Mr. KUSTOFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the life of a really good friend, Steve Stamson, who was a devoted public servant and a veteran whose record left a lasting mark on Shelby County in west Tennessee.

Steve passed away just a few weeks ago on March 11 surrounded by his family in Florida.

Steve Stamson was born in Memphis, Tennessee, and he lived a life grounded in faith and commitment to others.

Steve served in the United States Marine Corps during Vietnam. He was a rifleman. Steve's time in uniform shaped his character in lasting ways and informed how he approached the rest of his life.

I do want to note that during his military service, Steve received the Meritorious Mast, recognizing performance and leadership that went above and beyond. This distinction reflected the character and the standard that he held himself to each and every day.

When he came home, Steve continued to serve his community. He worked for International Harvester before starting a long and distinguished career in Shelby County government.

□ 1550

He served in the Shelby County Court Clerk's Office. He served in the Juvenile Court Clerk's Office and in the General Sessions Court Clerk's Office. In 2002, the people of Shelby County elected him to be the juvenile court clerk, to which he was reelected in 2006, and he served until 2010.

I think about Steve's time in public service, and if you had a dictionary, Mr. Speaker, and looked up the term "public servant," there would be a photo of Steve Stamson right there in the dictionary. He went and did whatever he could for anybody, and it didn't matter who they were or what side of town they lived on.

I will note that Steve's career in public service did not end after his time as juvenile court clerk.

Following his retirement, if you will, Mr. Speaker, Steve was appointed as an election commissioner for Shelby County, and he served as chairman of the Shelby County Election Commission.

On all sides of the aisle, Steve was widely respected for his dedication to election integrity and the responsibility that comes with the right to vote.

Steve also gave his time to civic and community organizations, including the Boy Scouts of America, the Scottish Rites, and the Al Chymia Shriners. He was active in his political life in the local and State Republican Party.

I want to note that Steve took on roles that carried significant responsibility, and he always led with a steady hand. I think about Steve, that he made time for others and was always willing to step up when it was needed.

This morning, I talked to our mutual friend, Joy Touliatos. Joy Touliatos succeeded Steve as the juvenile court clerk of Shelby County. She was a longtime friend of Steve and his wife, Debbie, who was also a longtime public servant in Shelby County. When I asked Joy her thoughts about Steve, I wrote them down word for word. She said: "If you knew Steve, you knew his door was always open; his handshake was sincere; and his word actually meant something."

Beyond his work, Steve was absolutely devoted to his family. I have a photo of Steve and his wife, Debbie. They shared 45 years of marriage, and Debbie was his equal partner and his best friend. Steve was a proud father to Chris and to Clay, and I know he was a proud grandfather to Keelie and to Hunter.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that Roberta and I are deeply saddened by Steve's passing, but we are thinking about Debbie. We remember all the good times, how full of life and how much Steve gave to everybody he cared about and to the entire Memphis and Shelby County community.

Steve's warmth and his generosity will be greatly missed.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his remarks. I appreciate his friendship and working on all of our issues on the committee together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Medal of Honor Day and the American heroes who have earned our highest military decoration.

Over 40 million Americans have served in the U.S. Armed Forces since the Civil War, but fewer than 4,000 have been awarded the Medal of Honor. This award not only commemorates the bravery of those who earned it but also honors their humanity, patriotism, and sacrifice for the United States and her people.

Although each Medal of Honor recipient earns their medal through different acts of heroism, they all have one thing in common: They never sought heroism, yet they embodied it through their risk, sacrifice, and actions to protect others.

I would like to honor a few recipients from my home State of Utah.

Petty Officer George Edward Wahlen was awarded the Medal of Honor on October 5, 1945. Despite being repeatedly wounded during the battle of Iwo Jima, Petty Officer Wahlen refused evacuation and continued risking his life to rescue and treat comrades under intense enemy fire.

Private Jose Valdez was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1946. Private Valdez held his ground against overwhelming German forces, engaging enemies at close range and singlehandedly covering his patrol's retreat under intense fire, facing more than 200 enemy soldiers.

Lieutenant Brian Miles Thacker, whom we are lucky to still have with us today, was awarded the Medal of Honor on October 15, 1973. During a fierce assault at a fire base in the Vietnam war, Lieutenant Thacker directed airstrikes and artillery from a dangerously exposed position for hours, organized the withdrawal, and remained behind alone to provide covering fire. Although wounded and unable to escape from the area himself, he successfully eluded the enemy forces for 8 days until friendly forces regained control of the fire base.

I think President Harry S. Truman put it best: "We do not go to war for gain or for territory; we go to war for principles, and we produce young men like these. . . . I would rather have that medal . . . than to be President of the United States."

One of the first initiatives I worked on when I came to Congress 6 years ago was to authorize a National Medal of Honor Monument here in Washington, D.C. That bill passed Congress and was signed into law in December 2021.

The next and final step is to pass the Hershel "Woody" Williams National Medal of Honor Monument Location Act to authorize the monument's permanent place on The National Mall. This bill was one of the first bills that passed the House in the 119th Congress, and it passed by a vote of 414-0.

I am grateful to my friend from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for working on both of these bills with me.

It is time for the Senate to do their job and join the House in coming together in a bipartisan way to provide these heroes and these heroes' families with the monument on our National Mall that they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator JUSTICE for his tireless work to move this bill through the Senate process, and I urge the Senate to come together on National Medal of Honor Day, pass the Hershel "Woody" Williams National Medal of Honor Monument Location Act, and move it one step closer to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I thank America's Medal of Honor recipients for their patriotism and for setting an example, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRED W. SHAVER, JR.

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. CARTER of Georgia was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of legendary coach and lifelong educator Brigadier General Fred Wil-

liams Shaver, who passed away on February 24, 2026, at 91.

Fred was born in Garden City, Alabama, where he later attended the University of North Alabama. For 7 years, he served as head football coach at Southeast Bulloch High School, where they coined his lifelong nickname as Coach Shaver.

As coach, he led the Bulloch Yellow Jackets to consecutive Georgia State titles in 1972 and 1973. Coach Shaver later transitioned to the Bulloch County Board of Education, where he became assistant superintendent, spending a total of 35 years with the Georgia school systems.

Outside of school, he served 34 years in the Georgia National Guard as a field artillery officer, obtaining the rank of brigadier general.

While his professional success was immense, Coach Shaver was most known for his caring spirit, leadership, guidance, and sense of humor.

His remarkable character will make his memory unforgettable.

□ 1600

HONORING AGNES WEST

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Agnes Marie Patrick West, who peacefully passed away at the age of 89.

Mrs. West was a woman of deep faith, kindness, and strength. She was born in Dooly, Georgia, and later moved to Savannah, where she attended Commercial High School and built a life centered on family and community.

For over 60 years, she was a faithful member of Calvary Baptist Temple, where she taught Sunday school and formed lasting friendships. Her church was an important part of her life, and she touched many people through her service and devotion.

Mrs. West was a loving wife, mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother. She shared 73 years of marriage with her husband, Pat West.

Mrs. West leaves behind a strong and loving family, and a legacy of faith, compassion, and dedication. Her impact on the Savannah community will not be forgotten. We honor her life and the example she set for others.

HONORING FREDDIE POWELL SIMS' LEGACY OF SERVICE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of service that Freddie Powell Sims has left during her time representing Georgia's 12th District.

Senator Sims announced on Monday that she is resigning. Elected in 2008, she has served in the State legislature on various committees, including leadership roles on the Education and Youth Committee and the Interstate Cooperation Committee.

Before her time under the gold dome, she was a lifelong educator, retiring as a middle-school principal. It was during this time that she married her husband, Norman Sims, who she cites as the reason for her resignation, as he is very ill.

I respect Senator Sims' decision and share her sentiment that family comes first. Her impact on Georgia will not be forgotten, and I am confident her commitment to service will continue in other ways. I had the honor and privilege of serving with Senator Sims in the Georgia State Senate.

My thoughts and prayers are with Senator Sims and her husband as they go through this most difficult time.

CONGRATULATING ASA HIGH

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Asa High, director of golf course and grounds at Frederica Golf Club on St. Simons Island for his appointment as vice chairman of the board of trustees for the Georgia Golf Environmental Foundation.

Since joining the Foundation in March of 2020, Asa has been a tireless leader, serving as chairman of both the research and finance committees as well as secretary and treasurer.

His elevation to vice chairman is a well-earned recognition of his dedication, expertise, and the deep respect he commands among Georgia's golf course superintendents.

The Georgia Golf Environmental Foundation plays a vital role in our State, funding cutting-edge turfgrass research, promoting environmental stewardship, and providing education that keeps our golf courses sustainable and world class.

Asa's continued service ensures Frederica Golf Club stays at the forefront of innovation and responsible land management.

I commend Asa High on his distinguished appointment and wish him every success as vice chairman. I congratulate Asa. Georgia's golf community is better because of his leadership.

RECOGNIZING CHRIS CRAWFORD FOR 20 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Chris Crawford for his outstanding service on Capitol Hill, having been here for 20 years and counting.

Chris has been my chief of staff for 12 of those years. He has truly been a blessing to me, my family, and our office. Chris currently serves as my chief of staff, leading my office and its efforts to serve the people of Georgia's First District ever since we took office in 2015.

He is a senior Stennis fellow, where his commitment to organizational effectiveness and steady leadership was honored with the Chief of Staff of the Year award.

Chris is a native of rural northeast Georgia, having grown up on the coast of Tybee Island. A graduate of the University of Georgia, Chris is a rabid Dawgs fan and is rarely seen without his own French bulldog Luigi, who regularly makes his rounds through the halls of Rayburn and in my office, I might add.

It is without a doubt that I say he has made a positive impact on me, my office, and the State of Georgia, as well

as those who have had the privilege of working with him here in D.C.

I commend Chris for his service, and I wish him continued success. Chris is with us today with a number of his friends. He also served with my predecessor, Jack Kingston. He was a lot younger back then; I can tell you that.

Chris has truly been a blessing, as I say, to all those who have been around him. He has led our office and done an outstanding job. I commend him for 20 years of service. That is not an easy task here at this Capitol, but certainly something that we should all be appreciative of and certainly something he should be proud of.

I thank Chris for his service.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 24, 2026, the following bills were presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.R. 3377. To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to James Capers, Jr., for acts of valor as a member of the Marine Corps during the Vietnam War.

H.R. 7211. To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John W. Ripley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7194. To authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Kareem N. Dockery for acts of valor as a member of the Army while serving in Afghanistan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 26, 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-3135. A letter from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting the Commission's March 2026 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1396(b)(1)(C); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XIX, Sec. 1900 (as amended by Public Law 111-148, Sec. 2801(a)(1)(A)(iv)); (124 Stat. 329); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3136. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Register Certifying Officer, Policy Bureau, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eliminating Regulations Contemplating Collaboration With USAID To Train Foreign Participants in Census Procedures and General Statistics [Docket No.: 260108-0014] (RIN: 0607-AA67) received February 18, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3137. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of

Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updating and Streamlining the Department of Commerce's Privacy Act Regulations [Docket No.: 260107-0008] (RIN: 0605-AA84) received March 15, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3138. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting two notifications of an action on nomination and discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3139. A letter from the Regulations Branch Lead, Policy Office, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas Resources (RIN: 0596-AD33) received March 2, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3140. A letter from the Research Director, Administrative Conformance of the United States, transmitting recommendations adopted by the Assembly of the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 84th Plenary Session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3141. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revision of the Negative Option Rule, Withdrawal of the CARs Rule, Removal of the Non-Compete Rule To Conform These Rules to Federal Court Decisions (RIN: 3084-AB60) (RIN: 3084-AB72) (RIN: 3084-AB74) received March 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 the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HILL of Arkansas: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2071. A bill to prohibit Federal funds from being made available to international financial institutions for the purposes of financing foreign shrimp farms, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 119-571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 4171. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to provide small issuers with a micro-offering exemption free of mandated disclosures or offering filings, but subject to the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 7127. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt off-exchange secondary trading from State regulation where such trading is with respect to securities of an issuer that makes publicly available certain current information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 8070. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to establish or expand programs to implement evidence-aligned practices in health care settings for the purpose of reducing the suicide rates of covered individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 8071. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to require the Defense Production Act Committee to conduct a discussion-based simulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 8072. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to test and certify each automatic dependent surveillance-broadcast out transponder system on a Department of Defense aircraft that is operated in United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 8073. A bill to authorize grants to establish a national education protection and advocacy program to enforce the rights and protections under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. IVEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. MENEFE, Mr. BELL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. TONKO, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. LIEU, and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 8074. A bill to end preventable maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity in the United States and close disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to direct the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the National Credit Union Administration to establish emergency transaction account guarantee programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BUDZINSKI (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. MAGAZINER):

H.R. 8076. A bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to prohibit covered individuals from trading on prediction markets, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. BIGGS of Arizona):

H.R. 8077. A bill to amend section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to make the entering into of memorandums of agreement with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement a condition of eligibility for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 8078. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Workforce, and 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. COLLINS (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. HAGEMAN, Mrs. LUNA, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WIED, and Mr. EZELL):

H.R. 8079. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of laws relating to the installation, certification, and maintenance of emissions control devices under the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. IVEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. MENEFE, Mr. BELL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SOTO, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 8080. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health data collection processes and quality measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 8081. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee

on Ways and Means, 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. GROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. FULCHER):

H.R. 8082. A bill to ensure competition in health insurance markets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. NUNN of Iowa, and Mr. CISCOMANDI):

H.R. 8083. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective oral contraceptive drugs intended for routine use, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on Federal funding of contraceptive methods; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Natural Resources, and 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 Mrs. HINSON (for herself, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, and Mr. CISCOMANDI):

H.R. 8084. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on contraceptive access at community health centers in health care deserts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. BEYER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELUZO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. FOUSHEE, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. IVEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. TOKUDA, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 8085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the net value of assets of a taxpayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. BAUMGARTNER):

H.R. 8086. A bill to establish a National and Nuclear Risk Reduction Center within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 8087. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide deposit insurance for noninterest-bearing transaction accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEUSER:

H.R. 8088. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to update the inflation adjustment applicable to deposit insurance and share insurance; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. MCIVER, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. IVEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, Mr. MENEFE, Mr. BELL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. CLARKE of New

York, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. LATIMER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 8089. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to grow and diversify the perinatal workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 8090. A bill to require the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the National Credit Union Administration to carry out an analysis to determine whether insurance coverage should be raised on covered transaction accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 8091. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize payments for ambulatory surgical centers under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCIVER (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCBRIDE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. SIMON, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mrs. RAMIREZ):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution recognizing the duty of Congress to meet the needs of working women; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. HOUCHIN:

H. Res. 1135. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FOUSHEE:

H. Res. 1136. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Long COVID Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIGAN (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. McDOWELL, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mrs. KIM, Mr. ROSE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. RULLI, Mr. KNOTT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MILLS, Mr. BOST, and Mr. STAUBER):

H. Res. 1137. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., and commending its work establishing industry standards that ensure the safe interoperability of firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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 Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 8070.

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

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

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 8071.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18).

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 8072.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 8073.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 8074.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 8075.

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

Article I Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Ms. BUDZINSKI:

H.R. 8076.

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

Article 1, Section 8 and Article 1, Section 5

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 8077.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CLYBURN:

H.R. 8078.

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

Article I, Section 4

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 8079.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 8080.

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

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

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 8081.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 8082.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 8083.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 8084.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. JAYAPAL:

H.R. 8085.

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

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

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 8086.

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

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 8087.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. MEUSER:

H.R. 8088.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8089.

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

Based on Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 8090.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 8091.

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

Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 138: Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 210: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 219: Mr. DELUZZO.
H.R. 284: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 516: Ms. POU and Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 663: Mr. MOYLAN.
H.R. 664: Mr. MOYLAN.
H.R. 722: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 729: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1004: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1011: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 1014: Mr. ELLZEY.
H.R. 1178: Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina.
H.R. 1227: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 1351: Mr. LANGWORTHY.
H.R. 1411: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 1521: Mr. WHITESIDES and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1845: Mr. DELUZZO.
H.R. 1877: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1902: Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. ROSS, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. VINDMAN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KEAN.

H.R. 2055: Ms. DEXTER.
H.R. 2089: Mr. BARRETT and Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 2162: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2253: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 2411: Mr. GARCIA of California.
H.R. 2547: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 2581: Mr. JACKSON of Texas.
H.R. 2585: Mr. HUNT and Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 2618: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2729: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 2851: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2883: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H.R. 2979: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
H.R. 3028: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 3043: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 3045: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 3059: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. DUNN of Florida, and Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 3076: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
H.R. 3105: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 3110: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3227: Ms. SALINAS.
H.R. 3276: Mr. LATIMER and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

- H.R. 3280: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 3409: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 3694: Mrs. LUNA.
H.R. 3821: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 4037: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4119: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 4167: Mr. WHITESIDES.
H.R. 4168: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 4282: Mr. WHITESIDES.
H.R. 4392: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H.R. 4422: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4852: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 4914: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 4915: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 4917: Ms. BALINT.
H.R. 4936: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia and Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 5325: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 5366: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H.R. 5369: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
H.R. 5475: Mr. LANGWORTHY and Ms. TOKUDA.
H.R. 5490: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 5509: Mr. SCHMIDT and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 5639: Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 5688: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
H.R. 5731: Mr. WHITESIDES.
H.R. 5775: Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
H.R. 5966: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 6035: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 6070: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 6078: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 6137: Mr. WHITESIDES.
H.R. 6225: Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina.
H.R. 6280: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 6356: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 6423: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 6617: Mr. LANDSMAN and Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H.R. 6619: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 6635: Mr. LANGWORTHY and Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 6731: Ms. PETTERSEN, Mrs. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 6766: Ms. FEDORCHAK, Mr. THANEDAR, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 6783: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 6858: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6976: Mr. VINDMAN and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 6998: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas and Mr. FLOOD.
H.R. 7026: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 7034: Mr. HURD of Colorado.
H.R. 7087: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 7094: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 7095: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 7120: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 7143: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 7188: Mr. DELUZIO.
H.R. 7198: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BISHOP, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 7346: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.
H.R. 7390: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 7393: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 7417: Ms. MCCLELLAN.
H.R. 7540: Mr. LALOTA and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 7548: Mr. SHREVE and Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 7618: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.
H.R. 7651: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MANN, Mr. MCDOWELL, Mr. KUSTOFF, Mr. MOORE of North Carolina, Mr. DONALDS, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 7676: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 7681: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 7685: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 7730: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 7745: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
H.R. 7747: Mr. TAYLOR.
H.R. 7767: Ms. ANSARI, Ms. STANSBURY, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 7816: Mr. HARRIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 7942: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 7955: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 7975: Ms. SCHOLTEN.
H.R. 8000: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 8028: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 8046: Ms. SEWELL.
H.R. 8064: Mr. SELF.
H.J. Res. 144: Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. BERA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. SORENSEN, Mr. MENEFE, Mr. CASTEN, and Ms. GOODLANDER.
H. Res. 70: Mr. LANGWORTHY.
H. Res. 358: Mr. SHREVE.
H. Res. 971: Mr. LIEU.
H. Res. 1110: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H. Res. 1122: Mr. SHREVE.
H. Res. 1128: Mr. COLLINS.
H. Res. 1134: Mr. MURPHY and Mr. MULLIN.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2026

No. 56

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable PETE RICKETTS, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Matchless Heavenly Father, we praise You for this wonderful day, for Your countless blessings, and for our loved ones whose support has given us strength. Lord, provide us the wisdom, courage, and faith in these uncertain times so that we will stay within the circle of Your will.

We acknowledge that only You know what tomorrow holds. We ask You, therefore, to elevate our Senators, world leaders, and committed citizens to continue to seek solutions for the living of these days. From every grain of Florida's sand to the currents of the Potomac, from sea to shining sea, give us gratitude for Your generous beneficence. Lord, use us to bring peace to these turbulent times.

We pray in Your majestic Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 25, 2026.

To the Senate:

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

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN VOTER ELIGIBILITY ACT—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message with respect to S. 1383, which the clerk will report:

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 1383, a bill to establish the Veterans Advisory Committee on Equal Access, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill.

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Thune (for Schmitt) amendment No. 4420 (to the House amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute.

Thune (for Husted) amendment No. 4732 (to amendment No. 4420), to require voters to provide photo identification.

Thune motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration, with instructions, Thune amendment No. 4772, to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 4773 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 4772), of a perfecting nature.

Thune amendment No. 4774 (to amendment No. 4773), of a perfecting nature.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2026—Motion to Proceed—Resumed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are on day 40 of Democrats' shutdown of Department of Homeland Security—day 40. And that is on top of Democrats' recordbreaking 43-day full-government shutdown in the fall.

Altogether, thanks to Senate Democrats, a lot of DHS employees have been working without pay for more than 80 days so far this fiscal year.

That is shameful. It is no wonder TSA agents are quitting in droves—anyone would be if they had been working without pay for almost 50 percent of the fiscal year so far.

My Democrat colleagues, of course, are working with pay, having rejected a Republican proposal to stop Senators' pay while DHS continues to be shut down. I am hoping that Democrats can at least envision what it is like for stressed-out Homeland Security workers wondering if they will be able to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1589

pay their rent, and I hope they will recognize the situation can't continue.

Homeland Security workers are hurting; travelers are beyond fed up with the disastrous situation at U.S. airports; and we cannot continue to keep this critical Department unfunded. Democrats have a proposal before them with legislative text—the latest serious offer from Republicans to get this Department back up and running.

Democrats have repeatedly said that they want to pay TSA, Coast Guard, FEMA, and employees who defend America from cyber attacks. This bill would do it. I hope Democrats will work with us to finalize an agreement and reopen the Department of Homeland Security this week.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. President, since we began debate on the SAVE America Act, my Democrat colleagues have spent a lot of time hedging. And that has been particularly evident on the issue of voter ID—something that Democrats have spent years decrying as a tool of voter suppression but are now suggesting they somehow support.

Democrats can read the polls as well as any of us, and I suspect that Democrats are not eager to be seen as on the 20-percent side of an 80-20 issue, so they are trying to have their cake and eat it too.

So the Democrat leader is out there claiming Democrat support for voter ID—as long, of course, as he doesn't have to vote for any ID proposal that we actually put forward.

On Thursday, the junior Republican Senator from Ohio offered an eminently reasonable voter ID proposal. All that it would have done is require a photo ID for voters when they go to the polls—a driver's license, military ID, Tribal ID, passport—the types of IDs that are sitting in wallets right now that the American people use on a regular basis.

Democrats said: No, we don't like that. And so they blocked it.

And more than blocked it. The junior Senator from Oregon offered an alternative bill that would have actually banned voter ID for absentee ballots.

And then yesterday—yesterday—Democrats said the quiet part out loud. The Democrat leader came down to the floor and made it clear when Democrats say they support voter ID, they mean that they support voter ID just as long as the ID requirements in question are meaningless.

That is right. The Democrat leader brought up a bill Democrats introduced a few years that included a voter ID requirement—well, sort of.

Let me read a few of the IDs that the Democrats' bill would have accepted: A debit card, a lease or mortgage document, a utility bill, any document containing the individual's name—name, not photo—issued by a government, or a photocopy of any one of the above.

Now, sure, Mr. President, some of these things are accepted or requested as adjunct documents when you are

trying to get something like a driver's license or a library card—along with, you know, things like photo ID or a birth certificate. But just showing a utility bill to prove your identity? Give me a break.

If someone asked you for an ID in any other circumstance, are you going to pull out your electric bill? Can you get into a bar by showing your lease? Can you prove eligibility to work at your new job by pulling out the water bill? No, you cannot. Now, I would like to see someone try to get on a plane by presenting a photocopy of their debit card.

When Republicans say voter ID, we mean an actual ID with a picture issued by a government. The kind of ID that is required for a whole bunch of things in our daily lives—starting a new job, driving a car, doing an early pickup at school, opening a bank account, getting a library card.

The Democrat leader suggested that photo IDs are somehow out of reach for voters—that they need “inclusive” voter ID options. How does the Democratic leader think Americans are navigating all of the scenarios I just mentioned? Well, I will tell him: With their photo IDs. And yet, it is somehow an intolerable burden to ask Americans to bring those IDs with them to the polls.

Give me a break. Requiring a photo ID isn't onerous. It is common sense, and the American people agree. Poll after poll shows that Americans of both parties strongly support requiring a photo ID at the polls. And just to reassure my Democrat friends, a 2019 study published by the National Bureau of Economic Research found:

[S]trict ID laws have no significant negative effect on registration or turnout, overall or for any subgroup defined by age, gender, race, or party affiliation.

Democrats are going to have another chance tomorrow to support election integrity by implementing a common-sense photo ID requirement. Will they stand with Americans, or will they continue to oppose any meaningful ID requirement at the polls?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this morning, Democrats sent Republicans our counteroffer on legislation to reopen DHS, pay TSA workers, while at the same time rein in ICE with commonsense guardrails. Our offer is a reasonable, good-faith proposal that contains some of the very same asks

Democrats have been talking about now for months.

Leader JEFFRIES and I have spoken about this agenda, and he agrees we need these strong reforms.

Now, over the last day, Republicans have made the outrageous and bad-faith claim that Democrats are somehow moving the goalposts back in these negotiations. They are saying Democrats changed the ask. They are saying Democrats are backtracking and suddenly introducing new demands at the last minute.

This is nonsense—nonsense.

Democrats and the American people have been very clear from the beginning about what we need in order to move forward. We have been talking about ICE reforms from day one. These are not new demands. These are not surprise demands. They are not things we came up with yesterday.

They are commonsense reforms, reasonable reforms, reforms that police departments across America follow every day. These are reforms the American people overwhelmingly support and things that Republicans know perfectly well we have been seeking since these negotiations began—since these discussions began as well.

So for Republicans to now act as though Democrats have changed our position as though we have moved the goalposts is poppycock, bad faith. And for Republicans to send us a proposal that has no reforms is bad faith as well and will only slow things down. They know it is bad faith.

In fact, over the weekend Democrats had constructive conversations in person with our Republican colleagues. They—the Republican colleagues—conceded that some of the reforms, verbally, that we have been looking for, they said: These make sense.

We thought there might be a path forward on some of the ways to reform ICE and to get some of the things everybody knows ought to be in Federal legislation. We thought there had been some progress.

But then Republicans sent us their offer yesterday, and it contained none of what had been talked about, none of the reforms we had been discussing. So if anyone is slowing down negotiation and hurting TSA workers, it is the Republican leadership who did not include one single reform.

Republicans, frankly, are struggling to get on the same page among themselves. That is probably why they have been so erratic here.

Moderates in the Republican caucus say one thing; conservatives say another. Donald Trump is all over the place, seemingly without a clue of what is going on. They are still worried about and afraid of what he might say or do. That is what this is all about.

So let me say this: We are ready to discuss these issues at a moment's notice with Republicans. We will not walk away. We are not walking away, and we want to get to a solution.

We now have given Republicans our response. It is a serious offer, and time

is of the essence, I say to my Republican colleagues. The Easter holiday is coming. Families are going on spring break. TSA lines are literally stretching out the door at airports. People are exhausted. And our TSA agents need to be paid.

Enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to drill down and work with us to solve this thing. We have asked the Republicans nine times already to support TSA. We have told Republicans: Just support TSA while we settle these disputes with ICE, and they have refused nine times. They say they want their position on ICE met first before they do anything to fund TSA and pay our workers.

The way to pay TSA is to vote to send their paychecks now while we settle this dispute regarding ICE. We can and must do both—negotiate reforms to ICE but vote to pay our TSA workers now.

That is why, today, for the 10th time—10th time—Democrats will go to the floor so that we can pay TSA immediately as we negotiate ICE. We hope our Republican colleagues will finally see the light and join us.

Let me say it again: Enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to drill down and work with us to solve this thing.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. President, finally, on the SAVE Act, which seems to have now been intertwined in these negotiations because of Donald Trump and Republican obeisance to him, let me say this to our Republican colleagues: If you want to shove the SAVE Act into reconciliation, then have at it. We are going to fight you tooth and nail throughout the reconciliation process every step of the way.

You are going to find it very difficult to jam massive changes to the American election system, to turn the American election system inside out, as it were, by using a process that was never designed for that purpose. Reconciliation was not, is not, and will not be intended to be a backdoor for sweeping election law; that is not what it is for.

So if Republicans want to head down that road, they should understand it will be a hard road. Democrats will fight them every—every—step of the way on that road, and it will not go the way they think or want.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as you and we can all see, the cherry blossoms are popping out along the Potomac River and around the Capitol and are approaching peak bloom.

We all know what comes next; we get a lot of visitors who come to the Nation's Capital at this wonderful time of year to see the cherry blossoms. They come during spring break, and it is good to see friends from back home come to the Nation's Capital to visit and learn more about how our govern-

ment functions or sometimes how it doesn't function as well as we would like.

Families taking a vacation, as well as elementary, middle, and high school groups, are learning about civics, which is a good thing. More of our kids need to know how our government works because they are going to be the leaders of tomorrow.

So I am glad the Senate is still debating a very important piece of legislation called the SAVE America Act because it really goes to the very foundation of self-government.

All it says is that in order to be an American citizen—excuse me, in order to vote, you need to be an American citizen, and in order to cast a ballot, you have to produce a voter ID.

So it makes you wonder, with the polling showing that 70 to 80 percent of people polled—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike—support both of those provisions, why is it that our Democratic colleagues oppose it?

Surely, it can't be because they want people other than American citizens to vote or they want to make it easier to cheat. But sometimes I struggle to figure out what the reason is that they reflexively oppose even commonsense provisions like this.

By now, we have heard the argument on both sides. Our Democratic colleagues argue that the SAVE America Act is just too hard for ordinary Americans to comply with. They are claiming that the same people who can present a valid government ID to board a plane, buy a beer, drive a car, rent a hotel room, or open a bank account simply won't be able to do the same to cast a ballot.

We know that is not true, and it just doesn't make any sense. It is clear that this is just a pretext to say that they apparently don't care whether illegal aliens vote in our elections. Republicans, on the other hand, believe that every illegal vote cast dilutes your vote and undermines the integrity of the election system.

We want more people to participate in the election system. We need to build confidence that it is going to work and operate with integrity. So by resisting commonsense measures like demonstrating American citizenship and producing a voter ID—which would contribute to building confidence and thus, hopefully, get more people to participate in our elections—that is something they apparently are not interested in.

President Trump, I think, is right to make this a priority, but I am sure like me, he scratches his head and wonders, What is the contrary argument?

If we don't stop illegal aliens or non-citizens from voting in our elections, it is not long before we will have a country that is not representative of the American people.

You know, the very basis for our form of government is as stated in the Declaration of Independence: The authority that we exercise on behalf of

the people who vote for us in elections is based on consent of the governed. The power doesn't come top down, it comes bottom up. And if people who are not qualified because they are not citizens to vote in our elections—it undermines that very basic foundation and compact between the people and those who exercise power on their behalf here in Washington, DC.

I am committed to doing whatever it takes to muscle this through the Senate, including using the reconciliation process, if necessary, to get around Senate Democrats' obstruction, but at the same time, we are not giving up on moving it through regular order here on the Senate floor.

Our colleague Senator LEE from Utah has been a proponent of using the talking filibuster; in other words, not letting people sit on their hands and just object and stop progress on important bills like this but to force people to talk and debate because I think the American people need to hear the arguments—pro and con—and they can make up their mind whom they agree with and what they believe.

That is what the world's greatest deliberative body was supposed to be all about, which is otherwise known as the U.S. Senate.

So if Democrats really don't believe that illegal aliens should be able to vote, they need to come to the floor and prove it.

If they think we should not make it easier to cheat in elections by not requiring people to show a photo ID, they need to come to the floor of the Senate and debate it. I would love to hear the arguments to the contrary.

As I said, a recent Harvard-Harris poll showed that 71 percent of voters, including 50 percent of Democrats and 69 percent of Independent voters, support the SAVE America Act. It is hard to find that kind of consensus anywhere in America today, as polarized as we are. But this means that Senate Democrats are defying the wishes of their own voters, their supporters.

Now, we have heard this nutty idea that somehow the SAVE America Act will disenfranchise voters. Well, the only people it will disenfranchise are people who are not qualified to vote.

But if you extend that logic a little further, in other words, 70 to 80 percent of people polled support the SAVE America Act; and if you believe it will disenfranchise voters, that means that 70 to 80 percent of people polled are willing to disenfranchise themselves—again, what a silly, absurd, and false argument.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. President, it is beyond shameful that Senate Democrats have continued to keep the Department of Homeland Security unfunded and shut down.

I would have thought, by now, with some of the lines at the TSA security checkpoints in places like the Houston International Airport—the Bush International Airport—that finally people would wake up and say: You know, we

are causing too much needless pain and collateral damage to people who have nothing to do with this fight.

We know that essential operations of ICE, or Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, like the Homeland Security Investigations, which is an important office that conducts operations to prevent human trafficking, are hamstrung; and we know TSA workers are continuing to work without pay. These are not wealthy people. These are public servants who are performing an important function keeping us all safe, and they have to show up. They are showing up and working without pay.

But then there are some who simply can't outlast the political stunts here in Washington, DC, and more than 300 of them have left their jobs. And you can't blame them. If you are not getting paid because of the politics here in Washington, DC, you may not be able to wait that out. You may just have to look for a job—another job.

But each new hire to replace a TSA agent requires 4 to 6 months of training and certification, and I can't imagine that there is a long waiting list of people who want to become TSA agents if they have this sort of environment to look forward to. So it certainly doesn't help with recruiting new people to fill the gaps.

But we know that President Trump, left with no other alternative, has asked ICE to assist and help out at the airports. And some Democrats are getting downright hysterical about the fact that now ICE is necessary to help process people through the airports.

Some are even saying that the traveling American public is in danger when these professional law enforcement officers are working to help assist people to move through these security checkpoints at our airports.

Meanwhile, the truth is, as we have seen in videos and social media, ICE agents are handing out water bottles to travelers and helping keep the flow of traffic organized and hopefully expedited.

I think it is encouraging that these men and women are willing to jump in and become team players, even in this difficult and charged environment where Democrats continue—this is the party of “defund the police” or “abolish ICE.”

Now they have found a new way to try to prevent the enforcement of our immigration laws by saying: We are not going to fund ICE.

That is not what the American people voted for last November—in November 2024. The reason why President Trump was elected, among other reasons, was because of open borders and 40-year-high inflation. And, of course, we know President Trump has effectively secured the border, but now Democrats have found a new way to prevent people from—who got here in the first place, who don't deserve to be here—from being removed from the country by saying: We are simply going to refuse to fund immigration enforcement.

And then, of course, we know that, despite the fact that the President was elected by the American people, having won the electoral vote and the popular vote in every single swing State, Democrats continue to try to oppose the duly elected President of the United States out of a demonstration of what has become known as Trump derangement syndrome.

In other words, whatever he proposes, they oppose. It is just reflexive. More than 70 percent of Americans support his efforts to remove criminal illegal aliens from our country. And almost daily we hear of tragedies, of innocent individuals being killed or harmed, as a result of some of the people that were let into the country during the Biden administration that need to be removed.

Well, I am hopeful that we are moving closer to a deal which will help these good men and women that work at the Department of Homeland Security get a paycheck. President Trump knows how to make a deal, and I am confident that, under his leadership, we will find a way. Unless the Democrats continue to move the goalposts, which the minority leader continues to try to do, I am optimistic that we will find a way to get them paid by the end of the week.

These antics are not a way to govern. We need paychecks for our TSA agents and secure elections, both. This is what the American people chose during the last Presidential election, and I am confident, under the President's leadership, we will accomplish these priorities and, finally, after more than a month, reopen the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today having heard the minority leader talk about the ongoing problem that the country is seeing before their very eyes, which is the shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security caused by the Democrats.

Republicans have continually come to the floor to vote to open the Department of Homeland Security, and working with the Democrats, there have been a number of proposals, one of which the Democrats actually agreed to the other day. And yet today, on the floor the Senate, the minority leader said: Oh, no, that is just “poppycock.” That was his word.

The Democrats have continued to move the goalposts over all of this time when we were talking about the importance of funding the Department of Homeland Security—a Department that was set up after 9/11 to deal comprehensively with our Nation's security.

There are issues of border security, cyber security, flight security. The TSA is part of that. This has gotten so bad. I saw on the news this morning that there are members of the Depart-

ment of Homeland Security, who are not getting paid, who are working every day, and who are now donating their plasma—not donating it but giving it to get paid.

That is what the Democrats—they talk about getting blood out of it. That is what the Democrats are doing. Blood is on their hands. We are seeing this today with the unfunding of the Department of Homeland Security.

Americans are rising up to say to the Democrats: We care about these people that are working and not getting paid.

My own Rotary Club in Casper, WY, came out today with an email to all the Rotarians. One of the members of the club has offered a matching donation of up to \$2,000 for supplies and gift cards to be donated to TSA employees at the airport. Now, these people have been working without pay because of the shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security.

It says: Please consider supporting the local TSA personnel and help secure the matching donation by donating supplies or gift cards.

It goes on to say: Currently, there are approximately 40 TSA employees in Casper who are not being paid. The airport is collecting food and other supplies—dog food, cat food, toilet paper, et cetera—because of what we are facing here and with an offer that we have made, and the Democrats are now saying, well, it is all “poppycock.” They don't seem to care.

The employees cannot accept cash, cannot accept cash-equivalent cards like Visa gift cards. However, they can accept gas cards and gift cards to places like Walmart or Target, which give them the flexibility to purchase what they truly need.

This is what we are seeing here in this Chamber with what the Democrats are doing because they do not want to fund the Department of Homeland Security that keeps our Nation safe.

Well, there is now circulating, and that it is evident, that the Republicans have all seen, which is a Member of the Senate—a Democrat Member of the Senate—on television telling the Nation—this is a clip where a Member of the Senate says—this is a Democrat—the people we care most about, he says, are “the undocumented.”

Not these people who are working every day—the people the Democrats care most about are the undocumented, the illegal immigrants, the people who are not citizens of this country but are here and have been unleashed into this country—10 million or more—during the Biden administration.

And that is what we are talking about here today on the floor, and why we will be voting later today on the proposal that the Republicans have made that the Democrats agreed to 2 days ago. But now they have withdrawn their support because, as we hear from a Democrat spokesman and a Democrat Senator, the people that they care most about are not the citizens of the United States; they are the

undocumented, the illegal immigrants who are here among us today.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. President, I have also heard Senate Democrats on this floor say, when it comes to voting, they are open to the requirement of a photo ID. Senator SCHUMER said, just last week, that his Democrat caucus is not opposed to a photo ID when you show up to vote.

We now have a pending amendment to the SAVE America Act to do just that. It is a straightforward amendment from Senator JON HUSTED of Ohio. It simply requires a photo ID when Americans show up to vote.

Democrats blocked this very bill on this floor last week. Then they offered a counterproposal, a nationwide ban—a ban—on photo ID requirements. I mean, it is the exact opposite of what the American people want. I mean, it is hard to believe, but that is what they said. They wanted to ban photo ID. Democrats did this even though 32 States currently require photo ID. So I guess they want to rip it out of all the States that already have it.

Mr. President, 21 Democrat Senators on that side of the aisle in this very Chamber represent States where voter ID is the law of the land.

They live by it. They vote under it. They were even elected under it. Why do Democrats believe that voter ID is fine for their home States but not for our Nation?

We are going to give every single Democrat in this Chamber the chance to go on the record on that very topic. They are going to have the opportunity to show the American people where they stand on commonsense requirements for photo ID.

The vote is a clear yes or no for Democrat Senators. It doesn't touch voter rolls. It doesn't touch mail-in voting. It is a clean up-or-down vote on whether voters should be required to show a photo ID in order to vote.

The bill offers a clear, broad definition of photo IDs. Voters can use a driver's license. They can use State ID. They can use a U.S. passport. They can use a military ID. They can use a Tribal ID. Those are identifications Americans carry with them every single day. They use it to cash a check, to board a plane, to buy a beer. People use it every day. It is just common sense.

Asking for a photo ID at the ballot box is common sense and a common practice in States all across the country.

As I said earlier, 36 States require or request an ID to vote. Of these 36 States, 32 require a photo ID. That is most of the country. And yes, that includes Democrat States. Of course, we know that there are many large and liberal States that lack voter ID laws—sanctuary States like California, New York, Oregon, Illinois—and they don't protect the voter rolls.

So, once again, we are seeing Democrats angling for illegal immigrants to have an impact on our elections. Why is that? As I said earlier, the people we

care most about, the undocumented. He said, the illegal immigrants who are here among our Nation.

That is who the Democrats will tell you they care most about, not law-abiding citizens but illegal immigrants.

Democrats allowed 10 million illegal immigrants. They flooded in the country. The lesson is clear. We cannot allow illegal immigrants to undermine and erode the integrity of our elections. That is why we are in this shutdown right now because of the Democrats' preference of illegal immigrants over American citizens and the safety and security of our Nation.

But adding photo ID requirements would be a significant step toward restoring confidence in elections in all 50 States.

So I want to thank Senator JON HUSTED of Ohio. Senator HUSTED knows exactly about administering elections, and he knows it better than any Member of this body. He spent 8 years as Ohio's secretary of state. His job was to run fair, safe, and secure elections; and he succeeded at it.

He knows how to do it. He knows what works. And he succeeded in one of the most closely watched battleground States in our Nation. His amendment makes it easy to vote, harder to cheat, and it does so nationwide.

A clean, simple photo ID amendment leaves Democrats with no excuses. They can't claim photo ID is too hard. They can't claim it is too confusing. They can't claim it is too burdensome.

The question before the Senate is, Will Democrats take a reasonable and responsible step toward what most Americans consider common sense?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The minority whip.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, not once, not twice, 10 times we Democrats have brought to the floor of the Senate an opportunity to restore all of the appropriations in the Department of Homeland Security but for one Agency, ICE and a related Agency, Border Patrol. Ten times the Republicans have voted no—ten times. Let's get it done this week and done as quickly as possible.

We proposed this to the point where the Republican leader met with the President and said: We ought to be for this. He said: No, not until you pass this voting bill.

This voting bill is controversial. It seems to change. My friend from Wyoming—he is my friend—the Senator from Wyoming said: We are offering an amendment to change this bill.

This bill has been changed over and over again because it is a mess. Why is it a mess? Because the premise is wrong. The premise that there are illegal aliens voting in the United States in any measurable number is wrong.

We did a survey. We looked at 24 years, 1999 to 2023. How many illegal aliens were caught voting in the United

States? There were 50 million every election cycle who were registered to vote. How many of those were illegal aliens?

Over a period of 24 years, what is your guess? Seven million? You would think so, wouldn't you, from Senator BARRASSO's statements? How about 700,000? How about 70,000? How about 700? How about 77?

That is the exact number that was found. Mr. President, 77 people over a span of 24 years were not eligible to vote as illegal aliens and voted anyway, 77 over 24 years.

So now the Republicans want to change the system. They want people to reregister. This is the first I have heard that they are going to accept a driver's license. Up until now, you needed a passport. How many Americans have passports? Forty-nine percent.

If you wanted to get a passport in time to register to vote for November, what do you have to do? Well, you have to fill out a form and you have to write a check and you have to wait weeks to receive it.

How big is that check that you have to write so you can be sure you vote? Mr. President, \$165 for you to get a passport—\$165. You wait weeks and maybe months before it is delivered to you to prove you are an American citizen so you can vote in November.

What is wrong with this picture? For 77 voters or attempted voters, in 24 years, we are going to require every American to come up with this proof? Oh, there is an alternative. Your birth certificate, you can prove you are an American that way in this reregistration effort by the Republicans.

Have you found your birth certificate recently? I think mine is upstairs in the bedroom closet in a cardboard box. I am not sure. I would have to go look. Some people don't have access at all to them.

Why are we going through all this? The bottom line is: There is a good reason and a real reason. The good reason is to make sure that noncitizens don't vote. I agree with that premise. The real reason is: Donald Trump is scared of this election in November.

Remember when he said: The States give me some more Republican Members of the House? Redistrict your State. Draw up your map, save it for unusual times. He did that because he is concerned about the outcome of the election.

So when you hear this explanation about voter fraud, remember 77 in 24 years, 77 examples. And for that they want to change it.

In terms of showing their driver's license as an ID, I do it every day, and you do it too. It is pretty normal. That is not a problem, but that is not what this bill says. They think they want to change it. Let's see them change it.

In the meantime, let's pay everybody: TSA, FEMA, Coast Guard, and the basic Agencies at Homeland Security except for ICE. We are working

with the White House and negotiating new terms for the ICE agents. Let's get it done this week.

For 10 different occasions, we have come to the floor and said: Fund the rest of the Agencies including TSA. I still think we should be there.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. President, I come to the floor at this time to discuss a separate issue, totally unrelated. Over the course of the time I have served in the Senate, I have pointed out political prisoners jailed around the world. Others have joined me over the years. Our current Secretary of State Marco Rubio joined me on the floor one time to help further history of bipartisan support for those pursuing freedom and democracy around the world.

Sometimes those released as a result in pressure from this Chamber actually come to see me in Washington, and they say how important it is to know that they were remembered.

I want to salute my staffer Chris Homan, who joins me on the floor here. This has been his personal project for many years with great success.

Thanks, Chris.

Today, let me raise a few issues and cases for your consideration. Let me start with the United Arab Emirates. We are one of that nation's top human rights defenders. Ahmed Mansoor tragically has marked 9 years in jail. He was arrested under the guise that his social media posts advocating for human rights threatened social harmony.

Despite the dismal conditions of his incarceration, Mr. Mansoor has remained steadfast in his commitment to human rights, even conducting multiple hunger strikes to protest jail conditions.

We have strong ties and many shared interests with the UAE, but its continued involvement in this horrific Sudanese civil war and jailing Mr. Mansoor complicates the relationship.

Adding to the strain is Emirati Ambassador Otaiba's bewildering refusal to engage on these issues. I appeal to him to finally release Mr. Mansoor.

Next, Azerbaijan. Vice President VANCE recently visited this country. In 2023, anti-corruption researcher and advocate Dr. Gubad Ibadoghlu and his wife were forcibly dragged from their vehicle and severely beaten. His dubious arrest was a tragic result of writings about the rampant corruption stemming from Azerbaijan's oil and gas industry.

While eventually placed under house arrest in 2024, he has still been denied a trial and medical care; and his family continues to suffer harassment.

In fact, his son Emin, who desperately hopes to reunite with his father, is here today in the Senate Gallery. He is one of the many wrongfully detained individuals in Azerbaijan who should be fully released immediately.

In a number of cases in China, starting with Gulshan Abbas, a doctor serving a 20-year sentence—20 years—likely

a result of her sister's advocacy for the Uyghurs.

Hong Kong publisher Jimmy Lai, jailed since 2020, a tragic example of that island's loss of freedom under Chinese rule.

Pastors Jin Mingri and Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, arrested amid a crackdown on religious freedom.

I apologize for mispronouncing the names.

The Chinese have worked with my office on such cases in the past and made some important gestures, but it is time to do something. Release these individuals.

I urge President Trump to raise with Chinese President Xi when he visits China the fate of these prisoners.

In Tunisia, last July, I came to the floor to call for the release of prominent Tunisian lawyer and political commentator Sonia Dahmani. She was arrested in May 2024 for peaceful radio and television political commentary and subjected to appalling prison conditions.

Her sister Ramla was also sentenced in absentia to 2 years in prison, simply for publicly advocating for her sister's release.

While I am glad Sonia was conditionally released last year, the government is still harassing her with non-sense charges.

I urge President Saied to end this vendetta against Sonia and Ramla and take steps to restore press freedom in Tunisia, once a symbol of great democratic hope after the Arab Spring.

Lastly, Equatorial Guinea, an oil-rich African nation with a history of repression and growing ties with the Russian military, human rights advocate Joaquin Elo Ayeto had been arrested in 2019 and eventually released a year later, not long after which he came to meet me in my office here in Washington.

Unfortunately, he was rearrested under new spurious charges in 2024. It is time to end this official harassment against Mr. Ayeto.

I urge President Mbasogo to show the same compassion displayed in 2022 and release him without delay on humanitarian grounds.

What we have here really matters, not just to these individuals and their families. My friend and jailed Russian dissident Vladimir Kara-Murza often reminded me that for political prisoners the worst nightmare is the thought that people have forgotten them.

Let me remind Ahmed, Gubad, Gulshan, Jimmy, Pastors Jin and Gao, Pang, Sonia, Ramla, and Joaquin you are not forgotten, and we will continue to speak out for your freedom.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

IRAN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today nearly a month into President Trump's ill-advised war of choice in Iran, which has obviously destabilized

the region, disrupted global supply chains, degraded our munitions stockpiles, cost the lives of 13 American servicemembers, with more than 200 additional suffering injuries.

Fortunately, it is clear that even though this was a war of choice and can be decided by the President's own timing, he started this with no clear endgame and without adequately preparing for Iran's very predictable response, which obviously would have included the Strait of Hormuz, which obviously would have included Iran attacking other gulf nation-states.

The intelligence on this is consistent and overwhelming for years and, frankly, closes the Strait of Hormuz, which is one of the world's most strategically vital maritime checkpoints.

Now, look at the Strait of Hormuz for a moment.

Way back in the seventies, when we had an oil shock, 7 percent of the world's oil went through the strait. Today, 20 percent goes through. Back in the seventies, no natural gas went through the Strait of Hormuz. Now it is close to 20 percent. So the closure of the strait has wreaked havoc on both the global oil and gas supply chains. As I said, normally, about 20 percent of the world's oil and liquefied natural gas passes through the strait.

Today, traffic through the strait has nearly grounded to a halt. It is literally down 95 percent since the start of the war. The International Energy Agency has already called the effective closure of the strait and all of the other ancillary items coming out of it the worst global energy disruption in history, eclipsing even the Arab oil embargo of 1973—I am old enough to remember that, and the Senator from Maryland is old enough to remember that—which caused huge gas lines and damage all around the world.

So, if we just measure what has happened so far in these 3 weeks-plus—the date of the closure of the strait—it has removed approximately 400 million barrels of oil—around 4 days of the world's supply—from the market. Again, much of the oil that is still getting through had started on tankers before the war started. Those 400 million barrels of oil that have been removed—and that number will rise exponentially now—have led to price increases of around 50 percent for Brent crude. That is the global benchmark for oil.

As well—and this has gotten some coverage in our country but not enough—Iran has also carried out significant strikes on oil and gas facilities throughout the gulf. In total, more than 40 energy sites in 9 countries across the Middle East have been severely damaged due to the conflict, including the world's largest liquefied natural gas facility in Qatar, which is to be closed down. That produces about a fifth of the world's LNG.

Many of the facilities that were not even attacked still took out all of the natural gas from the facilities because, if a missile were to hit them with the

gas in the facility, it would cause a massive explosion. While I am no expert here, I have been told to restart those facilities will take weeks to months. The truth is, even if the President feels in his bones today or tomorrow that we have won the war and he stops the bombing—with no guarantee that Israel will stop or that Iran will stop—and the strait starts to get reopened, we are still going to see economic pain across the globe for weeks, months, or, potentially, a year.

For consumers in the United States, the conflict, obviously, has led to a severe shock at the gas pump. Since the war began, average gas prices in the United States have increased by about \$1 a gallon—30 percent. I will take a bet with anybody in this Chamber that we are going to see an average gas price of \$4 that will be maintained for some time. That \$4 price will be the highest since 2022.

And, here, let's take the optimistic view. Even if the strait is reopened today, the average household in our country will still be expected to pay about \$740 more in gas prices for the remainder of the year. That is just gas.

What about diesel?

While Americans are struggling at the pump, skyrocketing diesel costs are threatening to increase the pain for households across a series of domains. Last week, diesel prices eclipsed \$5 per gallon on average. That was only the second time in history that diesel got above 5 bucks, and that is about 40 percent higher than before the war began. Diesel is the trucking industry's second largest expense, and for most trucking firms, that diesel cost accounts for about 20 percent of the total operating costs. For most freight companies, a 40-percent rise in the diesel cost results in about an overall increase of 10 percent on all the items that are shipped. We depend on the trucking industry to ship goods. If their costs go up 10 percent, they are not going to pay it. That is going to get passed on to consumers. That will mean everything in the supply chain from lumber that is used to construct homes to groceries and everything in between.

And while we Americans are already feeling the impact at the pump, many nations across the globe, particularly in Asia, are facing even more extreme costs. Of the, roughly, 20 percent of the world's oil and gas that goes through the Strait of Hormuz, about 80 percent goes to Asia, and the impacts there have been even wilder. Oil prices have hit 150 bucks a barrel.

As the supply tightens and prices skyrocket, one country, the Philippines—literally because they get 100 percent of their oil from the gulf—has said we can't operate a full economy, so there is a mandatory 1-day-a-week holiday.

Vietnam has urged its residents to work from home. Cambodia and Laos have closed about a third to 40 percent of their gas stations because they just don't have fuel.

Now, we buy a lot of stuff from Asia—from Vietnam, from Bangladesh, from the Philippines, from China, from everywhere. If those costs have gone up 40 percent, all the stuff we buy from those countries are going to go up for American consumers as well. So whether it is electronics, clothes, appliances, if you haven't seen a price increase yet, don't worry. It is coming very shortly, and it will be significant.

Let's talk about jet fuel.

Americans can also expect to pay more on air travel due to the war in Iran as the price of jet fuel has more than doubled since the conflict has begun. In many cases, airlines have already responded by raising fares and canceling flights. Some estimates indicate the airlines have raised fares about 20 bucks each way—going and coming—on average. As a matter of fact, United recently raised its fares 15 to 20 percent just last week. Also, United, which, I think, is a precursor of things to come, has literally eliminated a number of long-haul flights. So, for anyone who is planning on going to Europe, who is planning on going to Asia or who is planning on going to South America—maybe not cross-country flights yet—your choices are going to drop dramatically.

This is all related to oil, natural gas, and jet fuel, but the fact is that the President's war in Iran and the subsequent closure of the Strait of Hormuz is really wreaking havoc on a lot of industries from semiconductors to new cars. Let me tell you why.

For example, the current situation is threatening to upend the global semiconductor industry and other advanced technology industries by impacting the availability of a crucial input—helium.

Now, most of us here at home think about helium as what we use for party balloons. Senator VAN HOLLEN, I know, has used it many times to make his voice sound higher as well, but—and I didn't realize this—helium is also a critical input in many advanced technology industries: chipmaking, medical imagery, aerospace. The truth is, there is no viable replacement for this helium.

Qatar is the world's second largest supplier of helium behind the United States, and they literally produce, approximately, a third of the world's supply—about 63 million cubic meters out of a total of 190 million cubic meters produced globally.

So, if the strait stays closed, you get rid of 27 to 30 percent of the world's supply of helium. Again, it is a global market. Spot prices on helium have already doubled, and the costs could rise another 50 percent if the strait remains closed.

The nations, again, that are going to get hit first on this are Japan, Singapore, and Taiwan, which, again, are home to some of the world's most advanced chip facilities. None of the chips we put in our rockets in the most advanced jet fighters are made in America. They are all made in Taiwan.

So what is going to happen?

The chip facilities in Taiwan and South Korea believe that about 70 percent of their helium comes from the gulf. If it goes away, they can't replace that. There are no such things as helium strategic reserves.

Again, if the President says, OK. He feels it in his bones, "I won the war. I am going to stop," it will take weeks, not days, to restart the Qatar helium production, meaning that, even in these next couple of weeks, with already the spot pricing doubling, there is going to be a supply chain risk that will take place over the coming weeks and months.

Aluminum. This closure is also disrupting the aluminum supply chain—a material essential for construction, transportation, energy generation, and more. The region, again—and I didn't realize this before the war—accounts for, approximately, 9 percent of all global aluminum production. Major smelters—I think there are four in the world, and two are in the region—have been forced to curtail supply due to the continued closure of the strait. Since the war began 3 or 4 weeks ago, global aluminum prices have spiked to their highest rate in the last 4 years.

Again, that is what we have seen so far, and a prolonged closure could see significant impacts here in America. Today, we rely on the Middle East for about 20 percent of our imported aluminum. Even before the war with Iran had started, aluminum prices in our country were at record highs due to the President's tariff policy of putting 50-percent tariffs on aluminum products. So, if you add the tariff policy with already high aluminum prices and shut down some of the smelters, this is going to drive up the cost of aluminum not just around the world but in the United States as well. A lot of aluminum goes into autos. If you are thinking about buying a new car, it may not be a good time. It may be better to buy today than a month from now, but the cost is going to go up.

The President's war of choice in Iran is also threatening global food production and the livelihood of farmers in the United States and across the world. Typically, about one-third of all fertilizer shipped globally passes through the Strait of Hormuz; but not dissimilar to the oil and gas production and transit, that fertilizer exiting the gulf has literally ground to a virtual 100-percent halt just as the spring growing season is starting in America.

I talked to a farmer in Amelia County in central Virginia. His costs have already gone up 40 percent, and that means that the back end when he collects—when his products grow, who is going to eat those costs? American consumers.

The United States relies on the Middle East for about 15 percent of our fertilizer inputs. This has already caused—as I said, in Amelia, it was 40 percent—nationwide, a 30-percent increase in fertilizer prices in America.

That fertilizer shortage has also been already shortened because we are short on nitrogen, and we are short on potash, which we get from Canada, again, because of the tariff policy. So what we grow and what the costs are for this growing season are going to be dramatically affected. Where is that going to show up? Prices at the grocery store.

Now, how has the President responded to this energy crisis caused by his war of choice?

On Truth Social, he stated: When oil prices go up, we make a lot of money. Who exactly is making that money?

It is not ordinary Americans who were paying more than \$380 million a day just on the increased price of gasoline before the war started.

As a matter of fact, if you are going to pick winners and losers at this point, American consumers are losers across five or six different domains. The winners? Russia and Iran.

And this is the one that kind of just blows my mind. In response to rising oil prices, President Trump and his Secretary of the Treasury announced he was lifting sanctions on 140 million barrels of Iranian crude. What does that translate into? That translates into more than \$14 billion to the bad Government of Iran, who is shooting at American soldiers, who is bombing our allies. That \$14 billion could be a lifeline to that government.

I still remember like back under Obama, where I think there was some payment around the JCPOA with \$300-plus million released to Iran. Every one of my Republican colleagues said: Oh my God. This is the worst thing ever—the worst thing ever. How could this happen?

Well, now, in the middle of a war—we weren't in a war at that point—in the middle of a war where Iran is attacking us, this President has given a green light to fund \$14 billion to the Iranian regime—funding our enemies. How is that in America's best interest?

In another master stroke by the “king of deals,” President Trump lifted the sanctions on approximately 130 million barrels of Russian oil, directly helping Vladimir Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

You know, recent reports indicate that Russia has already earned about \$230 million per day on crude oil exports during the first 2 weeks of Iran's war. Since February, that is about \$10 billion. What is that \$10 billion going to buy? It is going to buy Russian drones, Russian tanks, Russian missiles—maybe call me old-fashioned—that are attacking and killing our allies in Ukraine—the allies that, thank goodness, we have supplied military equipment to, and we are funding their enemy.

Now, again, you start a war of choice, you think about these things. You think about the ramifications and the cost increases. You think about how this would affect our allies. You think about, do we really want to benefit our enemies? You think about the fact that

maybe we ought to have a plan to get American nationals out of the Middle East before the war starts. You might even say, maybe I will quietly tell Saudis and Emiratis and others: Hey, store up some oil and natural gas because this war is going to start.

The President says he didn't think they would close the Strait of Hormuz; he didn't think Iran would attack the gulf countries.

I sit as vice chair on the Intelligence Committee. The intelligence community has been absolute not for weeks, months, but for years that if you start a war with Iran—and the Iranians are bad guys. Prior Presidents, including President Trump—I remember one time he was going to bomb Iran in his first term, and he pulled back because of all of the implications of starting that war without enough planning.

So he started into this war of choice with no planning on how we protect Americans, on what this is going to do to American consumers. Hey, does it really make sense in this war to fund our enemies Iran and Russia?

This is what happens when strategy, actual strategy, is replaced with impulse; planning is replaced with wishful thinking; and warning from our intelligence professionals whose job it is to make these predictions, who made the prediction that there was no imminent threat—when those intelligence professionals are ignored instead of heeded.

Now, we can't fully predict the full, long-term impacts of President Trump's war of choice in Iran, but we can make a pretty damn good conclusion at this point on who is going to get hit the worst: working-class Americans.

We all talk about affordability—both sides. You know, it is hard for a single political figure—even the President—to dramatically bring down prices, but it sure is not hard for a single political figure—in this case, the President of the United States—to raise prices: fertilizer, aluminum, helium, jet fuel, diesel fuel.

I just hope everybody will remember every time you go to the gas pump and you look at that price—Lord knows this happened when prices rose under Biden. There were these cute little stickers saying: Joe Biden did this.

Well, there is no doubt in my mind and, frankly, on any factual basis, when you gas up your car every week and you see that extra dollar or dollar-and-a-half increase in price, that price was brought to you by one political figure in America: the President of the United States.

We are going to feel the consequences of this war for a long time to come, and everything I talked about here gets exponentially worse—not on a linear timeline but an exponentially long, worse timeline—if the strait remains closed.

Americans deserve better. Our servicemembers who are in harm's way deserve better. Frankly, the world deserves better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

ENERGY

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I will try to truncate my remarks. I know we have a vote coming up at 2 o'clock. I will try to keep the floor running on time.

I rise today in support of my colleague's effort to overturn the IRS's new rule which is making it harder for wind and solar projects to qualify for critical clean energy tax credits.

Families across the country are already struggling to get by with rising costs—costs that are going up at the grocery store, at the doctor's office, when you are trying to pay the monthly rent or your mortgage, at the pump, and, increasingly, our energy bills.

Since President Trump took office last January, California household electricity costs have increased by 15 percent. That is more than five times the rate of inflation. So it makes no sense that this administration is making it harder to build the very energy projects that would help—energy projects that would increase supply of electricity, energy projects that would help bring down the cost of electricity. One of the many ways they are doing it is with this new IRS rule that is changing the rules in the middle of the game.

For years now, companies could qualify for a clean energy tax credit once they had invested at least 5 percent of a project's cost into the project. It is what we refer to as the “5 percent safe harbor.” That is how businesses make their plans, that is how businesses make their investments, and that is how businesses were able to break ground on a number of necessary projects.

But now, even with projects that are already underway, they may not qualify for the tax credits anymore that they were counting on, that they were planning on. The net result—not project by project but overall—is that fewer of these projects will get built, and the projects that do power through somehow may get to the finish line, but they will be more expensive. That means less energy comes online, and once again the price of that electricity is going to be higher for families and for businesses and for everybody.

I am proud to represent California, where we are leaning in on clean energy production, not just to meet the growing demands on the grid of our growing economy and our growing population but also modernizing in a way that will make us more resilient to the threats of wildfires and extreme heat.

We have experience in this, and we know. I can share with you, colleagues, that building more clean, reliable, and affordable energy projects isn't just an option; it is fundamentally essential.

So we have to recognize the impact of this rule and recognize that it is part of a broader pattern. Over the past year, we have seen repeated efforts to block or delay clean energy projects,

whether it is halting offshore wind, canceling funding, or undermining projects that are already underway, as I just explained. At the same time, as my colleague and friend from Virginia just articulated, global instability is driving up fossil fuel costs even further.

This, colleagues, is a perfect example of why the Congressional Review Act exists. When an Agency takes an action that harms the American people, we in Congress don't just have the authority, we have the responsibility to step in. That is what this resolution does. It overturns the misguided IRS rule, it can restore certainty for business, and it can help get clean energy projects back on track.

So I urge my colleagues to support the energy investment credit CRA.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, let me thank my colleague from California for very important remarks with respect to this issue. And I am very pleased to be able to join Leader SCHUMER and Senator CORTEZ MASTO on the floor to talk about energy costs and particularly clean energy jobs.

Here is what people need to know about our resolution: American families and businesses from coast to coast have been getting battered by rising energy costs. Data centers are gobbling up energy while Americans get roasted during hotter summers and freeze during icy winters.

Donald Trump got back into office last year, and instead of bringing down costs, he and fellow Republicans sabotaged wind and solar—the cheapest and cleanest ways of getting energy on the grid. Then we had to deal with utility costs continuing to rise. The cost of trucking consumer goods shot up around the country. And Republicans looked at a multitrillion-dollar global market for clean energy—absolutely explosive growth and upside for whoever dominates that kind of manufacturing, and they said the United States isn't interested in being a leader. They surrendered to China and the Europeans.

If that wasn't enough incompetence and mismanagement, Donald Trump started a war that is driving energy costs into the stratosphere. Americans didn't even have to think about the Strait of Hormuz before a month ago. Now every time they pull up at the gas station to fill up the tank, they are reminded that Donald Trump singlehandedly created an energy crisis unlike anything we have seen in generations.

And it is not just about the price Americans pay at the pump; this is rippling through our economy. As I noted, utility bills are continuing to rise. The cost of trucking consumer goods? Continuing to rise. The cost of food in grocery stores? Continuing to rise because fertilizer and fuel are more expensive. We could spend the day with more and more examples.

Donald Trump doesn't seem to know or care about this. When he talks about the war he started, it sounds like he is not sure what is going on. When he talks about energy production in our country, it seems like he is stuck in the middle of the last century. It is a nightmare scenario for American families and businesses getting buried by rising costs today.

On top of that, the job market is in sorry shape. The Trump economy isn't producing the jobs Americans need. That is particularly true in manufacturing.

So my colleagues and I are putting forward a proposal that is a first step toward fixing the energy crisis in the country. We believe it is common sense. It would overturn a regulation from the Trump administration that tied up wind and solar projects with a whole lot of additional bureaucratic redtape.

Almost a decade ago, I wrote a set of tax credits for clean energy in the Inflation Reduction Act. It was a very new approach to energy policy. It kicked off a manufacturing boom unlike anything that has been seen in decades.

Donald Trump and Republicans killed much of it in 2025, and they specifically targeted wind and solar. They clobbered those industries by cutting off the tax credits as of 2027. If that wasn't enough, Donald Trump and the Treasury Department tied them up with even more redtape last summer.

So here is what our proposal is all about. Leader SCHUMER, my colleague from Nevada, and I say in our resolution: Let's ditch the extra redtape. That is what I hear Democrats and Republicans say most of the time: Ditch the redtape. That way, more projects could get underway. We would get more energy on the grid helping to fight the cost increases people deal with all around America.

It is a real head-scratcher to me why anybody would oppose this common-sense resolution. If you do, you are voting for higher energy prices for your constituents at home.

My view is, the entire Trump approach to energy production and energy costs ought to go into the dustbin. It is not working. But what my colleagues and I have put forward is not a total rewrite of the law. It is one step—a practical, commonsense step that we believe ought to get support from both sides.

So that is what we are saying on our side: Let's get rid of some system-clogging redtape. Let's get more projects underway and produce more energy, and let's fight these terrible energy hikes.

That is what we are after. That is what my colleagues and I are trying to do. I urge the Senate to support our resolution. And I want to thank Senator CORTEZ MASTO and Leader SCHUMER for their excellent work over many months.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 107.

The resolution seeks to overturn a Trump administration IRS notice intended to prevent abuse of the forthcoming phasedown of tax credits for wind and solar projects by requiring project developers to take meaningful steps toward project construction.

While Democrats assert that reversing this notice would help with affordability issues, the result would actually be exactly the opposite. Overturning this notice would create more uncertainty and unpredictability for current projects and discourage focus on more reliable and affordable energy sources.

Under the Biden administration, the Democrats enacted massive new incentives for “green energy” projects under the Inflation Reduction Act, abandoning secure, reliable American energy sources for unreliable and costly solar and wind projects. As Republicans predicted, the cost of the Biden administration's Inflation Reduction Act subsidies far exceeded predictions. A 2023 report by Goldman Sachs found that the cost of these Green New Deal incentives could exceed \$1.2 trillion—more than three times what the Democrats claimed.

As part of the Working Families Tax Cut Act, Republicans succeeded in reining in these high costs while also preserving tax incentives for reliable baseload power like hydroelectric and nuclear. Congressional Republicans also imposed new, prohibited foreign entity restrictions to prevent the flow of American taxpayers' dollars to Chinese companies and encourage energy supply chains to return to the United States.

This resolution would ultimately disrupt important progress toward achieving President Trump's “America First” energy agenda, create unpredictability by overturning guidance, while also impeding the Treasury Department's official work to implement the Working Families Tax Cut Act.

I encourage my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I know we are waiting for the Senator from Nevada to come to the floor to make a few remarks, and I want to thank Senator WYDEN for his remarks.

I am just looking around the floor here and thinking this would be a great time to propose a unanimous consent request that we fully fund TSA. I won't do it at this moment. I see the chairman of the Finance Committee here. But I want to make the point, Mr. President, that we could get it done right now. We could end the lines at airports around the country, we could fund TSA, we could fund FEMA, and we could fund the Coast Guard as we continue negotiations to rein in a lawless

ICE operation—an ICE operation that took the lives of two American citizens in Minneapolis; a lawless ICE operation that is not focused, as President Trump promised, on the worst of the worst; a lawless ICE operation that is trampling over people's First Amendment rights around the country and due process rights.

So as I was looking around the floor, I didn't see any Republican colleagues for a moment, and I think it is worth making the point to folks watching that we could have gotten unanimous consent to open FEMA, to open TSA, and to open the Coast Guard. That is what we should do, and we should do it now.

I see the Senator from Nevada.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I don't have to stand here and tell Nevadans that energy prices are high. They see it every day at the gas pump and on their electricity bill statements.

In the United States, the average residential energy bill in 2025 was about 30 percent higher than it was in 2021, but the Trump administration seems insistent on making it even harder for working families to afford their energy bills.

Overseas, President Trump's war with Iran is causing oil prices to shoot through the roof, resulting in high costs for Americans at the gas pump.

Add to that this administration's war on clean energy. Specifically, President Trump's IRS recently submitted a rule that makes it harder for wind and solar energy companies to claim a vital tax credit. This rule makes it more expensive to build America's clean energy future, makes it harder for the United States to meet the increased demand for electricity in this country, and will lead to higher energy prices for working families.

But the Senate has the power to do something about this misguided tax policy. That is why today I am leading an effort with my colleagues to pass this Congressional Review Act to overturn this IRS damaging rule.

The clean energy industry is producing some of the fastest growing and most cost-effective new power across the world. We need industries like solar and wind that will help us meet growing demand. It will create jobs—good-paying union jobs—and it will bring down energy costs for American families. It is obvious we should be embracing clean energy and investing in it, but instead, we have seen President Trump do just the opposite by passing regulations that are killing clean energy jobs in the United States.

We know the President's tax law—the so-called Big Beautiful Bill—gives tax breaks to the President's wealthiest friends at the expense of hard-working Americans. It is actually blowing up our national debt by \$4 trillion. It is cutting \$1 trillion from Medicaid and

kicking an estimated 16 million Americans off of their healthcare. What people may not know is that it also decreased incentives for solar and wind companies that are helping keep energy prices down for hard-working American families.

While the Democrats' Inflation Reduction Act that we passed expanded tax credits for clean energy projects, created jobs, and put us on a future of lowering energy costs for families, President Trump gutted them. That alone is estimated—what he has done is estimated to increase electricity prices by up to 18 percent.

The President's tax bill shortened the timeline for when solar and wind companies can claim these tax credits. He did it because he wants to phase them out. He wants to phase them out in favor of fossil fuel. He wants to pick winners and losers.

You know, the only losers in this country because of the picking and choosing of this administration of winners and losers is the American public and these companies.

If these companies want to claim these clean energy production and clean electricity investment tax credits now, they must begin construction on the projects by July 4, 2026—this year. This year, they have to begin construction. If they begin construction after that date, they don't get this tax credit. That was in the Big Beautiful Bill.

Here is where the problem gets worse. To pass his Big Beautiful Bill out of the House, President Trump made a deal with the far-right Republicans in the House to use the IRS to further diminish the solar and wind projects because he just hates them.

Last August, the IRS proposed a new rule to completely change an established standard for what it means to begin construction under the IRS Code on these solar and wind projects.

Now, remember, since 2013, the standard for what was considered beginning of construction included two of the following: You either had continuous physical work on or off the job site as beginning construction or you had a project in which 5 percent of the total costs had been spent, and they called this kind of a safe harbor.

What the new IRS guidance rule does is revoke that second prong. It revokes the longstanding 5 percent safe harbor. What does this mean?

This rule, keep in mind now, is only for solar and wind. Again, this President is picking winners and losers. He doesn't like solar or wind. So this IRS guidance only applies to solar and wind, not for other energy projects.

It is going to have a huge impact in Nevada, where we have solar year-round, and it is going to have a huge impact across the country. Solar and wind projects were already scrambling to stay eligible for the tax credits they rely on after Trump passed his bill, but with the new IRS rule, companies will have to delay their projects or halt them altogether.

This harmful new rule will potentially eliminate thousands of jobs, it will drive up electricity bills for American families, and it will risk power for millions of homes in Nevada and across the country.

It is clear that this action is yet another attempt by this administration to strangle the types of energy that the President personally does not like.

Demand for electricity is higher now more than ever, and we need to prepare for an electrification future that is going to bring us emerging technologies like AI, and we need solar and wind as part of that generation.

That is why I stand before you today and ask my colleagues to join me to revoke this IRS rule. I can't stress this enough. If we as a Congress want to prepare for the future and have the energy needs that we demand as a country, we have to include solar and wind, we have to include clean energy. What this IRS rule does is just the opposite.

So I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this resolution.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today's vote is simple. Will Republicans join us to save good-paying energy jobs, strengthen our grid, and undo the damage from Donald Trump's war on clean energy; or will they bow before the throne of Big Oil once again?

This CRA vote is a necessary step to reverse the damage from Donald Trump's anti-clean energy vendetta. It will overturn the IRS's eleventh-hour rule change that makes it harder for wind and solar companies to claim tax credits needed to expand investment, increase output, and put Americans to work. This IRS rule does nothing but raise taxes on energy producers. Experts have warned this could raise electricity by 10 percent.

Do you hear that, America? What Trump has done is going to raise your energy costs 10 percent just on this alone. It is going up higher because of other things. It also hurts local communities that rely on jobs.

It is nothing but another front in Donald Trump's war on affordable American energy, and in this case—this is a harsh word, but it is a corrupt giveaway to his Big Oil and Big Gas donors.

It was public. It was in the newspapers. They said: If you give us a billion dollars in campaign contributions, we will get rid of all the deregulation and giveaways they could possibly imagine. It is a crooked, corrupt scheme that is raising people's energy costs along the way.

If you are a Senator and you care about good-paying jobs, care about our

grid, and want to lower people's energy costs, support this resolution.

I thank Senators CORTEZ MASTO, WYDEN, and everyone who has shown leadership on this issue, and I want to thank my Democratic colleagues for leading the way.

Last week, Senate Democrats released our newest "Broken Promises" report, exposing how Donald Trump is driving up people's energy bills. Trump made a promise to the American people on the campaign trail: I will cut your energy bill in half. But has he done that? Of course not. Energy prices are up. And they aren't just up; they are rising and at triple the rate of inflation. Some States are seeing double-digit increases over the last year. And now, thanks to Donald Trump's idiotic war with Iran, gas prices are at \$4 a gallon.

We must put a stop to all of this today, and that is what this vote is all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RELATING TO "BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS FOR PURPOSES OF THE TERMINATION OF CLEAN ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDITS AND CLEAN ELECTRICITY INVESTMENT CREDITS FOR APPLICABLE WIND AND SOLAR FACILITIES"—Motion to Proceed

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 363, S.J. Res. 107.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 363, S.J. Res. 107, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service relating to "Beginning of Construction Requirements for Purposes of the Termination of Clean Electricity Production Credits and Clean Electricity Investment Credits for Applicable Wind and Solar Facilities".

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—53

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the cloture vote from March 12 on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Bill Hagerty, Marsha Blackburn, Eric Schmitt, James Lankford, Bernie Moreno, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Steve Daines, Josh Hawley, James C. Justice, Shelley Moore Capito, Kevin Cramer, Ashley Moody, Jim Banks, James E. Risch, Tim Sheehy, Joni Ernst.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a couple of

observations and remarks before this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just say that this obviously is a vote which we have had multiple times now. It is on the House-passed legislation that would fund the Department of Homeland Security in accordance with the agreement that was reached between Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate, some time ago.

But I would say, to reflect on it, there have been a lot of conversations over the past couple of days with respect to how do we get the Department opened up and funded again, and this vote will reflect the amendment that was proposed by Senator COLLINS and others that would fund all of DHS, except the Office of ERO.

So this is the one office that would be—that the Democrats have indicated, particularly over the weekend, this is what they had desired to see happen, and so this vote will reflect that particular provision that was put forward by Senator COLLINS. It is in response to what Democrats have insisted on and said that they wanted all along, which was to fund everything but the Office of ERO, the Office of Enforcement and Removal Operations at the Department of Homeland Security.

So this vote should reflect that, and I hope Members who are interested in getting all of these Agencies within the Department opened up would cast a "yes" vote when the opportunity comes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71.]

YEAS—54

Armstrong	Budd	Cramer
Banks	Capito	Crapo
Barrasso	Cassidy	Cruz
Blackburn	Collins	Curtis
Boozman	Cornyn	Daines
Britt	Cotton	Ernst

Fetterman	Lankford	Risch
Fischer	Lee	Rounds
Graham	Lummis	Schmitt
Grassley	Marshall	Scott (FL)
Hagerty	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Hawley	McCormick	Sheehy
Hoeben	Moody	Sullivan
Husted	Moran	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Moreno	Tillis
Johnson	Murkowski	Tuberville
Justice	Paul	Wicker
Kennedy	Ricketts	Young

NAYS—46

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 46.

Three-fifths of the Senate duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I want to point out these are just texts that allow us to do certain motions here, and I don't need this for the moment.

I want to speak to you—honestly, speak to my Democrat colleagues—from the heart. We have a situation in America today in which 260,000 families are without a paycheck. This fiscal year, they have been without a paycheck for more than half of this year.

Now, in the private sector you look at it and say: Well, why would you not pay somebody? Typically, it is because they didn't do a good job, they didn't show up for work, they didn't punch in properly—and all of those things are very litigated, by the way, meaning, in a private business, if you don't pay somebody what they are entitled to make, you have something called a wage-and-hour lawsuit against you.

And yet, the third time in 6 months this body—this body—that is charged with a simple job, which is the power of the purse to appropriate money to fund the government, we have failed. And I get the political posturing: That side of the aisle would say it is our fault; this side of the aisle will say it is your fault.

I can tell you who, unequivocally, it is not their fault, and that is the men and women of the Department of Homeland Security who wake up every day and go to work; they do their job.

And by the way—you have been there, Mr. President, in your State of Missouri, St. Louis, you have seen them firsthand. Members of Border Patrol, Customs, immigration enforcement, CISA—you have seen them.

We see their work. What should we, as the body here, tell those families? In

fact, there is an expression that says: Explain it to me like I am a 5-year-old. And there are lots of 5-year-olds affected—grandkids, kids, siblings—that are wondering why they can't go to camp because their mom or dad wasn't able to write a check. I don't know what I would say if I were a dad.

You are a dad. You are a great dad, actually. I have seen you with your daughter. What do you say to her if you didn't have money to pay the bills, but you did everything right?

One thing I think would help bring us to the negotiation table is for us to get together and say: Look—I will use the same expression that I used the other day—let's eat our own dog food. If we are OK and we find it acceptable for 260,000 American families to go without pay, then isn't it reasonable for us to say that this body—and this body alone, the U.S. Senate, who makes four, five times as much as they do—for us to go without pay, that our pay be withheld?

Now, I will be honest. I think our pay should be docked, honestly, because that is what would happen in a private sector. We are not going to do that. I am just saying: Hold our pay.

By the way, this is not a bill that I am proposing; it is not a law; it is just a proclamation that says: Every Senator here, all 100 of us, can go to the clerk's office and say: You know what? We can blame whomever we want to blame, but do you know what? I am going to be in shared pain here. Hold my paycheck until we do our job.

What does doing our job mean?

And I look at the minority whip, I have gotten to know. I didn't know you before I came to DC. I think you are a good man, actually. I have had a chance to interact with you in different ways. I think this is a guy who is a serious guy, and he cares, and I know you deeply care about this immigration issue. I remember you telling the story about how you have your dad—I think it was your dad's—naturalization paper in your office. And that resonated with me because I have my naturalization paper in my office. So I know you care. You are a man of good integrity.

And what I am asking that we do is just be able to look ourselves in the mirror every morning when we comply with Senate rules—put on a jacket, put on a tie—come to work and say: Just hold our checks.

Because you know what we should do? Why don't we just get in a room and hash this out?

The way this negotiation has happened is nothing like I have ever experienced in my life. There is a conversation here, a conversation there, a conversation all over the place from 17 different places. Why don't we just get together and deputize one or two people on your side, deputize one or two people on our side, and let's just get this done? I think all of us—I hope, I hope, I actually hope—that we have the moral character in

our heart to say: It is just wrong not to pay 260,000 people.

And, look, let me just say this. If Renee Good or Alex Pretti were my children, I would be horrified. What happened was a terrible, terrible tragedy that two Americans lost their lives, but it is not the fault of the 260,000 people who are just following orders, the vast majority of the people who weren't even there. There are families that have never even been to Minnesota.

Again, explain it to me like I am a 5-year-old.

You go through Customs. I have been to your airport, by the way, at O'Hare—oh my gosh, that is an airport; that is a big one—and you are a TSA worker there or you are a Customs person there because there is lots of international flights. They go home and say: Dad, did you get your paycheck yet? Deposit is due for Disney World. Been planning this trip my whole life.

No, son. The U.S. Senate hasn't done that yet.

That is not right. It is just not right.

So I will make my first motion, and I don't know how persuasive I am. I am going to guess that I wasn't very persuasive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526; further, that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

And what this means is that our checks get held back. We will get the money eventually, like DHS employees do, until we come to a resolution of this national disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving right to object. I say to my colleague from Ohio, I believe you are sincere. I believe you want to find a solution. I share that feeling.

There is a provision in this, which I am not sure that you are aware of. It is very important. It is at the end of the second page, and it says about the effective date of this.

This section shall apply on and after the day after the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2026.

I don't want to wait until November, and I think that is an approach which puts that date in play. It really suggests that we are asking even greater sacrifice of the people who are being disadvantaged.

I will just tell you that eight times now we have brought to the floor a provision which would pay TSA, Coast Guard, pay all the divisions of the Department of Homeland Security, except for the ICE and enforcement divisions.

We can agree to that, and I believe the Senator from Oregon Senator MERKLEY is going to offer that.

Mr. MORENO. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Oh, sure. Go ahead.

Mr. SANDERS. This is totally sincere. I think you are a good man. I really do.

I am probably not supposed to say that.

Mr. DURBIN. You are not supposed to say that.

Mr. MORENO. But I do believe it.

Would you consider modifying the resolution to take that piece out, just to make it clear, the paychecks while we are here, whatever the wording—that you and I sit down and we technically fix that wording so it basically says: During this period of time while DHS is not being funded? Can we just make that amendment and technical fix?

This is not my bill. It is Senator KENNEDY's bill. But would we be willing to do that because I don't want this to fall on a technicality?

Mr. DURBIN. At this point, I am going to object, and we can discuss many of the things which you brought up today. I would just tell you: You will have your chance, within an hour, to vote for JEFF MERKLEY's provision which will pay everybody working for TSA right now. So until you get that chance—and I hope you vote the right way—I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MORENO. I appreciate the Senator from Illinois and his point of view. I will ask Senator KENNEDY to make those modifications, and we will come back out and fix it, but I appreciate, again, your willingness to engage in this conversation.

So let me offer another proposal, just a little bit different proposal. I think we can all agree that our job is—since we are getting paid, we should do it—is to work hard here and stay through whatever it takes, by the way. I would be willing to stay this weekend. I was here all last weekend. I will stay through Easter. I will stay through Fourth of July, whatever period of time it takes until we release the paychecks of 260,000 Americans.

So what I would like my Democrat colleagues to consider is to fund all of DHS, every single part of it, for 2 weeks—just 2 weeks.

We don't leave for Easter break. We spend every single moment together since we don't have planned meetings Friday, Saturday, Sunday for the next 2 weeks. Maybe we have codels and trips and family vacations, but I have a great and understanding wife. I am sure Democrat colleagues have the same thing, an understanding family—you have to, to do this job. And we stay here until we just get together and say: Hey, look. In a 2-week period of time, we can get there.

And I think there has been some negotiations that said: Hey, maybe we can address this. The White House has come to the table unlike any time I have ever seen. They have offered to codify tactics.

And I know, Mr. President, you personally are concerned about that be-

cause you know a lot about law enforcement. You were the attorney general of your State, and you know that if you put tactics into legislation, there is a lot of unintended consequences. You could have law enforcement breaking the law when, in reality, any of us would say: Oh, actually, they are doing the right thing. There is a judgment call. You can't be that granular. Things have to be reasonable.

So I think we can work out that language; it is just 2 weeks.

But here is what this resolution does, if my Democrat colleagues, all they have to do is stay silent. Think about the power. If my Democrat colleagues do not say a word. I don't know how long the Parliamentarian will wait—maybe 7 seconds. If she hears nothing for 7 seconds, for 7 seconds—think about this, for 7 seconds, silence—260,000 people get to go home tonight and tell their kids, their spouses, their brothers and sisters, their mom or dad: I am getting paid. They are retroactively paying me. They get paid for the next 2 weeks.

Nothing is—the world will still be here in 2 weeks. Politics will still exist in 2 weeks. We can beat the you-know-what out of each other for the next 2 weeks, but we have got 260,000 families that get to go home and just—have you ever been in a situation, Mr. President, where you just (inhale/exhale) and you feel like the world is better again—260,000 people, for 7 seconds or less—maybe, say, 3 seconds—just silence.

I hope that we can get there. And by the way, just to be crystal clear, because what I heard from the minority whip was that my colleague from Oregon was going to offer to fund TSA—this does that. This does that. This will fund every single TSA worker in America. Three seconds of silence gets every TSA worker paid, gets every Coast Guard person paid, gets every CISA person paid, gets every FEMA person paid, gets every Customs person, gets every Border Patrol person paid—3 seconds of silence.

Two weeks. Put the burden on us. You won't take away our paychecks. The Senator didn't agree to that. Will the Senator agree to not object, to just say: Let's pay TSA workers right now?

By the way, I think, if there is a chance that C-SPAN2 is on live at the airports and they saw you, Mr. President, say: Hearing no objection, done, Americans would cheer at airports all over America right now. St. Louis, Portland, Cleveland, Miami, Atlanta, for sure, would cheer. My God, TSA workers are going to get paid. Come back to work. We are so sorry. And we are going to spend 2 weeks—that is it, 2 weeks—not 2 years, not 2 months, 2 weeks—to sit down like grown men and women and do our jobs that pay us \$175,000 a year-plus, plus, plus.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 156, H.R. 4553. I further ask that the

substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The timing will start now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate that my colleague from Ohio has come to the floor and said: Wouldn't it be great if we ensure that a paycheck is written for 2 weeks?

I have a better idea. We have far more than 2 weeks left in this particular year. The funding year ends at the end of September, so we are talking about something closer to 26 weeks. While there might be a cheer for 2 weeks, there would also be a lot of dread, and people across the Nation would be going: So the proposal is to fund for 2 weeks while the majority sends us out for a 2-week break.

Mr. MORENO. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. Not until I finish my remarks, but thank you.

And so there are going to be two proposals by my colleague. And in response to one, I am going to suggest that we free TSA as a hostage.

TSA, right now, we are seeing hundreds of TSA agents quit because they are not being paid. We have seen thousands call in and say: I am not available for work today.

They are probably sick from the stress of not receiving paychecks. We can alleviate that completely for the rest of this entire year—this entire fiscal year—with a proposal I will put forward in a moment.

And then if my colleague has another proposal, well, we will consider that as well, but I will probably put forward a suggestion that we do all 26 weeks for TSA and FEMA and the Coast Guard and Cybersecurity.

See, the debate where pushes come to shove is over ICE and CBP, and it is because of the rules of engagement under which they have acted have been so extraordinarily aggressive, terrorizing our communities.

So the conversation still remains and is underway about ICE and CBP and the reforms.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. MERKLEY. When I am done with my remarks.

And so the key here is: Let's release these hostages because TSA is being held hostage by my colleagues across the aisle, and FEMA workers are being held as hostages—

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, point of order of the Parliamentarian: I would ask my colleague to remember rule XIX, in which you are analogizing me to a hostage taker. I find that offensive. I think that is in violation of rule XIX.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). I will remind everyone that no Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, and so I will just put forward the fact. I am not impugning anyone, just the fact that nine times Members of this body have come to the floor and asked unanimous consent to fund TSA.

And an additional 12 times, Members of this body have come to the floor and asked that we fund all four of those Agencies—the Coast Guard and FEMA and Cybersecurity and TSA. So let's not continue to hold these hostages. And TSA, right now, is the one we are—

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, again—again, Madam President—

Mr. MERKLEY.—completely focused on—

Mr. MORENO.—you have warned the Senator from Oregon. He has repeated the exact same statement. I believe rule XIX does now allow him to continue speaking if he is violating that standard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not find the statement by the Senator to be in the context that you are taking it.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Madam President. I will just cut to the chase here. Just as my colleague's heartfelt desire is to get those paychecks written, so I, too, want to see them written. At the moment, we see the TSA agents in high stress. Our airports are causing stress for people all through the Nation, so let's get that piece done right here, right now in this moment.

Therefore, I would ask the Senator to modify your request so the Senate instead proceeds to immediate consideration of Calendar No. 362, S. 4127; that the bill which funds TSA be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, the questions I was hoping the Senator would answer, so they would be more fresh in his mind, were: Is the Senator only suggesting right now, just to be crystal clear—crystal clear—a lot of people's lives are at stake here, by the way.

Let me just clarify that a 2-week continuing resolution would pay people retroactively. See, they are owed almost 40 days of pay. So this would pay them back the money we have taken from them for the last 40 days and give us 2 weeks, not 2 weeks of pay.

I just wanted to make sure he understood because maybe I misspoke. I wanted to make sure the Senator from Oregon didn't misunderstand what I said.

I was suggesting that we fund DHS, which retroactively pays 260,000 people; give us 2 weeks to get a solution; and

never ever do this to a single American family again.

It is a disgrace that we are doing this, and I am not impugning any—I am impugning all of us that we never do this—that we never allow a hard-working American to go without a paycheck because of our politics. I just want to make certain that the Senator understood that.

I also want to make certain that I heard the Senator properly because I don't think his speech matched the resolution.

Is the Senator—so this is a simple yes-or-no question. If the Senator doesn't mind, just give me a yes or no, if he wants to. He doesn't have to. I have the floor. But it is up to the Senator if he wants to answer yes or no, but I am going to frame it as a very simple yes-or-no question.

Is the Senator suggesting that we not also fund FEMA?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, may I respond to my colleague's questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you. To his first question in which he sought to clarify that his proposal is retroactive—

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I was yielding for a yes-or-no answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may answer.

Mr. MORENO. Is the Senator suggesting that we not also fund the Federal Emergency Management Agency? Is he suggesting that we not do that; yes or no? What is his response?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, speaking to my colleague through the Chair in the ancient Senate tradition, the answer to that, as I already pointed out, is that I am going to offer two proposals: One, that we fully fund TSA, and we do it not for 2 weeks but we do it for the balance of this year through September 30.

Mr. MORENO. Thank you. The Senator answered my question.

Mr. MERKLEY. And second proposal—

Mr. MORENO. No, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I have the floor. Thank you for the point of—

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, just because I am answering the question—

Mr. MORENO. Just—I have the floor.

Mr. MERKLEY.—I think I have the floor for a question.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, would you please instruct the Senator from Oregon who has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. MORENO. Please, let's maintain decorum here. I think the American people deserve public officials, who are receiving paychecks while they are not, to have a semblance of decorum and class with each other. I hope that I have displayed that thus far.

Here is what is being proposed, just to be crystal—crystal—clear because this gets very fuzzy: I have proposed a 2-week continuing resolution that would retroactively pay every DHS employee and give us 2 weeks to negotiate.

And with my colleague from Oregon, whether intentional or not, what he is proposing in this modification request—in this modification request—I don't have a crystal ball or a time machine. I have no idea what you are going to propose later. God knows what that is. I have no idea.

But in this proposal, it is saying only fund the Transportation Safety Agency. I don't understand why we wouldn't take the opportunity.

So I am going to ask my colleague back: Would the Senator consider, in addition to funding TSA permanently for the rest of the fiscal year—I love that, by the way. Let's do that, absolutely. Can I have an amen? But in addition, fund the Federal Emergency Management Agency. It seems like a pretty good Agency to fund. These are the men and women that respond to disasters.

You have been there, Madam President, when they have responded to your disasters in your State of Iowa, right? I mean, you probably know these people are unbelievable. Let's fund them. Let's pay them. By the way, let's pay them and say thank you.

Then we look at Cybersecurity, an Agency called CISA. We love acronyms here. The Cybersecurity Agency. What do they do? They make sure that we don't have threats. We are in a major conflict with Iran; 60, 70 percent of them aren't working. Would the Senator also consider funding that? Seems like a good Agency.

Secret Service. Really important Agency. They keep the President of the United States safe. His threat level right now—if you have been to the White House, Madam President, my God, the threat level against the President of the United States right now is at a peak.

We are about to do FIFA, the soccer championship—although, that is also football, which is what we call it in Colombia, but we call it soccer here. We are going to need Secret Service here.

How about Customs? Should we not fund Customs? What is their job? Their job is to inspect packages coming in from other countries, process visitors to your State and my State. Why don't we fund them?

Let's go through here this chart. The Department of Homeland Security USCIS—ugh, another acronym. What do they do? They take people like me who apply to be a U.S. citizen and process my legal immigration status. I love this Agency. I thank them every day because they do a good job—3,300 people. Can we also agree to fund them?

How about this group, look at the name of this Agency: The biological and nuclear threat prevention Agency.

Can I have an amen to fund that Agency for the rest of the year and never ever, ever gamble with that threat?

Now, let's talk about this Agency here: Homeland—you can't read that, but Homeland Security Investigations special agents. If you think of the enforcement officers as the police officers, these guys are like the detectives. These are the guys that chase down the worst of the worst criminals—the guys that machete people's heads off, child traffickers, transnational gangs. These guys have gone without a paycheck the last 40 days, and they are still at the job chasing the worst of the worst. Would anybody here do that job? Would any of you like to put this little badge on and go chase Pablo Escobar on steroids? Because that is what they are doing.

And then let's look at this Agency down here. We talked about them: Customs and Border Patrol. I don't know. I am sure—my Senate colleague has been here a lot longer than I have, and that is true about most of the people here. I am sure he is familiar with Customs.

You know, I am a simple guy so, you know, those are the blue uniform guys. You come in from traveling and "Can I see your passport? Do you have anything to declare," right? Do we not want them on the job? We don't want Customs on the job?

And then Border Patrol. I don't just think we should pay Border Patrol for the rest of the fiscal year; I think we should give those guys a massive bonus. They have cut border encounters in this country by 98 percent.

So to my colleague, to summarize it all—we can skip a step; we are going to skip a step—would the Senator be willing to modify his proposal to adopt instead Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, the DHS Collins amendment? It sounds very fancy, doesn't it? It funds all that stuff.

I have listened to speeches for the last 40 days, and my colleagues have come out saying: Fund this Agency; fund this Agency; fund this Agency. I am agreeing with them. I want them to say: Yes, let's do it; let's fund all of DHS except for the one Agency that is not on there, which is the Enforcement and Removal Operations.

So to my colleague from Oregon who said you want to fund all these things—your words, not mine—for the rest of the fiscal year plus retro pay—would the Senator be willing to change his amendment to my proposal and instead substitute all of this with Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, the DHS Collins amendment?

The Parliamentarian—is he able to respond to that, or do you need me to read the formal text here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator modify his request for modification?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, has my colleague from Ohio objected to funding TSA for the rest of the year?

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I think I have the floor. English is my second language, so I sometimes speak too fast and maybe don't use the right language. So let me just be crystal clear again.

I am suggesting that we fund TSA for the rest of the fiscal year, retroactively pay every worker, and do that for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, for CISA, do that for Secret Service, do that for Customs, do that for Border Patrol, do that for Homeland Investigations, do it for USCIS—we love these guys—and do it for—definitely love these guys—the biological nuclear threat prevention Agency. That is—to be crystal clear—what I am saying.

So to answer your question: Does that include TSA? Yes, it does include TSA. This would fund TSA for the rest of the fiscal year.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, has my colleague from Ohio objected to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio renewed his original request. Is there objection to that request?

Mr. MERKLEY. His objection is heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request from the Senator from Ohio, which he just renewed?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I propose we fund TSA for the rest of the year. My colleague, as I understand it, has refused to agree to that; and, therefore, he has essentially objected. But he has asked for a modification.

I am happy to, at this very moment, propose that we go to a request which funds FEMA and the Coast Guard and Cybersecurity and TSA—essentially everything except ICE and CBP—and the other Agencies are fee funded. I am happy to go to that proposal if my colleague is willing to fund FEMA and Coast Guard and Cybersecurity.

But I think he has been well aware that he keeps putting a poison pill in here. He keeps asking for Customs and Border Protection to be funded without modifying how they are behaving across the Nation, and he keeps asking for ICE to be funded without modifying their actions when they are operating like a secret police.

That is why negotiations are underway with the White House—over that issue. So let's stop holding FEMA and Coast Guard and Cybersecurity and TSA hostage. And I am happy to put forward a proposal right now that would fund all four of those Agencies for the balance of this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, there is an old movie line that says: I think we have a failure to communicate. So let me try one last swing here to make sure that I make it crystal clear. By the way, I absolutely mean this sincerely, absolutely, with

total respect. I know that my Senate colleague from Oregon knows that DHS is more than four Agencies. I know he knows that.

So what I just want to clarify is: In this modification to my modification—yes or no—is the Senator from Oregon including USCIS?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I think my colleague can check and see that that is a fee-funded organization.

Mr. MORENO. So the Senator does not want to fund USCIS?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I think, if my colleague checks, he will find that USCIS is funded through fees. And let me explain what a fee is. A fee is when—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, he answered my question. I was 5 when I learned what a fee was. So the answer to that question is not including USCIS, which is odd because they do have an appropriations line in the appropriations bill, by the way. So the answer to that question is no. So no.

Here is what is ironic. My colleague from Oregon—you can't make this up—wants to not fund the people who are in charge of defending our borders and deporting criminal aliens but does not want to provide funding for the Agency that brings people here legally. Wow. That is a moment.

Let's go to this next one. Will the Senator from Oregon agree to fund the Homeland Investigations unit? In the Senator's proposal, does it include funding for HSI? Yes or no?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, my colleague is engaged in a dialogue here that I would be happy to resume at another moment. He has rejected both my proposal to fund TSA—he has rejected my proposal to fund FEMA and Cybersecurity and TSA and the Coast Guard.

At this very moment, there is a ceremony going on to honor our police officers who protected this Capitol on January 6, and that is to honor a plaque that has been posted by the Senate, in a bipartisan way, and agreed to have put up when it was being hidden by the Speaker of the House in some closet.

And so I understand the points my colleague is making. I think the Senator understands the points I am making. I have countered his proposal with a proposal to fund TSA for the balance of the year. I countered his proposal to fund everything but ICE and CBP. And although the Senator has never said the words "I object," I understand he is objecting through his dialogue. If I misunderstand that, please let the Senator say now that he agrees to my proposals and we will be done with this conversation.

But I really think it would be good for both of us, in a bipartisan way, to go down and honor the officers that protected the Capitol.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, so just to be crystal clear—because, again, this is getting a little deeply

ambiguous—is the Senator from Oregon suggesting that we fund the entirety of the Department of Homeland Security—everything, everything, everything, the entirety of Homeland Security—with the exception of Customs—the people who inspect packages, the people who greet people at Portland International Airport—and Border Patrol and Homeland Investigations and Enforcement and Removal Operations? Is that correct?

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, my understanding is the second proposal funds everything but ICE and CBP is my understanding of the Murray bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio agree to that modification?

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, I would agree to—we are almost there, but this is actually very important. We are making a lot of progress. And I think the plaque will be there for a long, long time.

So here is where we are at, just for a recap. We used to have 10 commandments in my company, and commandment 11 was: Thou shalt recap. So let's just recap where we are.

The Senator from Oregon, on behalf of the Democrat Party, is saying that he is willing to right now fund the entirety of the Department of Homeland Security—everything, every single Agency of the Department of Homeland Security, but—but—but is carving out the Customs and Border Patrol division and the entirety of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which includes these guys, the guys who chase down bad guys.

So I would ask that the Senator take a look at the Collins amendment, H.R. 7147, Calendar No. 311. Let's include the guys that chase the really bad guys. I will agree to the Senator's proposal if he will include the guys who chase the really bad guys—Homeland Security Investigations—and include the guys who greet people at your airport. What the Senator is suggesting is: Don't pay the guy who screens people who are leaving—you want to pay them—but don't pay the people who are taking care of the people coming back in. This is backwards land. Let's fund everybody at the airport. So why wouldn't we fund Customs? In fact, why wouldn't we fund Customs, the guys in the blue—if you have an issue with Border Patrol, the guys in the green jackets—is that what the Senator is saying? You would agree to fund everybody but Border Patrol and Enforcement and Removal Operations? Because I think we are super close. We can finish this dialogue and bring peace and tranquility to 260,000 families.

Is the Senator willing to do that? Is the Senator willing to modify one little tweak just in between—we are there—saying: Hey, let's include HSI, and let's include the guys patrolling our border; let's include the Customs guys? Or are you saying: No; if we pay people at the airport who receive visi-

tors from foreign countries and the people who guard our border, who are doing an amazing job, and people chasing bad guys—because you won't fund those three things—I am saying: Well, good. We will put Enforcement and Removal Operations on the side. By the way, a \$5 billion haircut to this budget, why don't we just do that?

Will the Senator from Oregon accept that? Let's get this done, make the American people very happy, and have glorious news for a lot of American families that are looking—think of the power the Senator has right now, the power you have right now to feed 254,000 American families by the words that are going to come out of your mouth.

I would ask all of us to have the humility to understand how powerful it is, the Senator's next words, because your next words will provide the paycheck for 254,000 American families. Please. I beg you. Please. Please do the compassionate thing, and then we will work on ERO later.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, is that a question?

Mr. MORENO. Yes.

Mr. MERKLEY. I would be happy to answer the question. Twice when I have answered questions, my colleague has reclaimed the floor in the middle of it. Does he intend to actually let me answer the question this time?

He is not responding—

Mr. MORENO. Of course.

Mr. MERKLEY.—which means he is reserving the right to object when I get part way into the explanation to his question.

But let's be clear. Because of the sequence of events in which I proposed two modifications and he rejected two modifications—he rejected and objected to paying through the end of September the TSA. And then I proposed that we fund everything except for CBP and for ICE because those are the two issues under negotiation with the President, and he has again objected. And he is proposing a 2-week extension and then people don't get paid again.

So we are going to bring this to a close because essentially my colleague has asked me to participate in this debate. And it is very clever, and I have willingly done so; but I would think 26 weeks is a whole lot better than 2 weeks.

And so since my colleague objected to paying TSA, objected to paying everyone in Homeland Security except for ICE and CBP—because that is under negotiation with the House and with the President—I have objected to his 2-week extension.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORENO. Madam President, let's just spend 60 more seconds here to recap what we have. So my colleague from Oregon representing the Democrats—who has been given a lot of time to kind to figure out how to come here—has said that what the position

of the Democratic Party today is—to day's position—different Saturday, by the way; different Sunday. By the way, different than Monday morning in which the minority leader went on Joe Scarborough and said that it was President Trump who objected to the idea to fund all of DHS except for Enforcement and Removal Operations. And then, of course, I think President Trump was maybe a genius there—because maybe by him saying no on Sunday, it made the Democrats say yes. And then he said yes on Monday evening. Then the Democrats had to go back to no. Kind of crazy.

What we are doing is not going to fund for the rest of the fiscal year people who keep our country safe because they want to defund the people whose job it is to keep our borders secure and to deport people who broke into our country illegally, including murderers, rapists, transnational organizations. They do not want to fund those Agencies. I just want that to settle in here and point out to the Presiding Officer that what I proposed today—and the Presiding Officer voted yes—54 Republicans—sorry—53 Republicans and 1 courageous Democrat—54 voted for that.

All it would take is 6 Democrats, and 254,000 people would get their paychecks. It is a sad day. I will mark the time, 5:45 p.m. It is a sad day for the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

SENATE BILLS

Mr. JUSTICE. Madam President, you know, I have got to say just this: We have Medal of Honor recipients with us right now, and I fast-forwarded because I had this beautiful speech to give and all that stuff, and there have been some things happened that we will get to in just a second.

But if U.S. Army MG Patrick Brady, just please stand up, just one second, sir. If you would, just stand for just a second, sir.

And U.S. Army LTC William Swenson, please stand, if you would.

And U.S. Navy Command Master Chief Britt Kelly Slabinski, if you would please stand.

And U.S. Army SGM Thomas Payne, if you would stand, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator to suspend momentarily.

Mr. JUSTICE. Madam President, if I violated the rule, it is because I am new to the game, and I don't know all the rules. But I want to thank them for their service in every way.

Medal of Honor winners—it is just unfathomable to think that those folks can grab a live handgrenade and try to throw it away from their comrades, to absolutely charge into enemy fire like you can't imagine.

And I think all the time, and I say to myself: You know, if I were in that situation, could I have that courage?

Could I have that grit? Could I have that love for this unbelievable country and my comrades that are right with me?

I don't know. It takes something that not many have, and we should honor them beyond belief.

The reason I asked these gentlemen to stand was simply just this: Today—today—something happened to me that, to be perfectly honest, I may have thought was getting to be semi-impossible. And that was just this: People from both sides of the aisle actually talked to one another. I had an amazing conversation with Ranking Member MARTIN HEINRICH. We sat, and we built some level of trust and communication.

Now, we are always going to fight with one another; we know that. But at the end of the day, these four—and for all the other 3,500 almost—today, we did something that, in all fairness, these four an hour and a half ago would have thought wasn't going to happen.

So I am going to fast-forward and read something that we all thought was semi-impossible.

But to others on the other side of the aisle—you know, Senator SHAHEEN; you know, Senator PADILLA; to absolutely our great chairman of ENR, you know, Senator LEE, who I am so thankful that we just talked—for God's sakes of living, we just talked, and lo and behold: wham, bam, bam. This monument that we have wanted to put on our National Mall that I am going to ask for your unanimous consent in just a second, absolutely we are there. No one would have believed it. No one really thought it.

These people have given so much, and we needed to stand up for them, and, lo and behold, today, maybe just a lot of lessons—lessons maybe that we all ought to listen to, and that is just this: If we talked and we trusted and we absolutely told the truth to one another, there may just be passage of lots and lots of stuff that we should be doing here.

That is what we should be doing. I always call the voters Toby and Edith. But Toby and Edith need us. They need us in the worst way.

I would say, somehow, somehow, we have got to tone down and stop a little bit of the food fight.

So right now—now, get this; get this—this is what I am reading to you right now.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc; that the substitute-amendment at the desk to S. 858 be considered and agreed to; and that the bills, as amended, if amended, where applicable, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc: my bill, S. 858, the Hershel 'Woody' Williams National Medal of

Honor Monument Location Act, and S. 1142 the Scarper Ridge Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act, from Senator PADILLA.

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

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources was discharged of the relevant bills, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc, as follows:

HERSHEL 'WOODY' WILLIAMS NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MONUMENT LOCATION ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 858) to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work on the National Mall to honor the extraordinary acts of valor, selfless service, and sacrifice displayed by Medal of Honor recipients.

The amendment (No. 4784), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hershel 'Woody' Williams National Medal of Honor Monument Location Act".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MONUMENT LOCATION.

(a) SITE.—Notwithstanding section 8908(c) of title 40, United States Code, the commemorative work authorized by section 1(a) of Public Law 117-80 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note) shall be located within the Reserve (as defined in section 8902(a) of title 40, United States Code).

(b) APPLICABILITY OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—Except as provided in subsection (a), chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the "Commemorative Works Act"), shall apply to the commemorative work.

The bill (S. 858), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SCARPER RIDGE GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1142) to adjust the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to include the Scarper Ridge property, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1142

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Scarper Ridge Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act".

SEC. 2. SCARPER RIDGE BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

Section 2(a)(2) of Public Law 92-589 (16 U.S.C. 460bb-1(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) Land generally depicted as 'Proposed Boundary Addition' on the map enti-

tled 'Golden Gate National Recreation Area Proposed Boundary Addition', numbered 641/193973, and dated July 2024."

Mr. JUSTICE. How about that, guys? Now we are rolling.

So at the end of the day, I could go through this wonderful speech that I had, but really and truly, we are there. God bless each and every one of those unbelievable heroes that have delivered for this great Nation.

And, Madam President, I thank you so much. It has been a big-time honor flying with you. So proud—can't be more proud than I am right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, I so appreciate our colleague from West Virginia and his commitment to our Nation's veterans and today, on Medal of Honor Day, that he was taking the time to recognize them. We are grateful for that and grateful for their service and their sacrifice, and know that we are able to continue the work we do for our great Nation because of the service that they have rendered to our Nation.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Madam President, on Monday, I had the honor of joining President Trump in Memphis. This was his first visit to our great State after launching the Memphis Safe Task Force, last year.

And we were so thrilled with this. The task force has been working in Memphis for the last 6 months. And as we put that task force into place, what we saw is a city that has really transformed for the better.

Now, the reason the task force came to be is because Memphis, TN, in 2024 had the highest per capita crime rate of any city in this country. There were over 100 gangs that were there, vehicle thefts, carjackings, cargo theft. The list went on and on—aggravated assault, violent crime, murder.

What we saw was a rising crime rate, and regardless of how much energy local law enforcement put into this, apprehending criminals, there was a Soros-backed DA. It was a revolving door, and nothing seemed to get better.

Well, as Kash Patel and AG Bondi came before me before their Judiciary Committee hearings, I presented each of them with a crime stat sheet. These were the crime stats of Memphis.

I asked for their help. They committed for their help. At their hearings, they publicly committed for that help. And last summer, we started Operation Viper, and then, what we saw was a success. And because of that Operation Viper success with the FBI working with local police, then, last September, we started the Memphis Safe Task Force.

It is local, State, and Federal elected officials working with local, State, and Federal agencies, all working together: the mayor of Memphis; Chief Davis, the chief of police; our National Guard; Tennessee Highway Patrol; Tennessee Bureau of Investigations; 30 Federal

Agencies; our U.S. marshal; our U.S. attorney. And, yes, a difference is being made.

Residents had talked a lot about Memphis in 2024. They honestly could not walk outside their houses. Kids could not play outside. They were concerned about being robbed, assaulted, murdered, and seeing criminal gangs turn their community into a war zone.

Now, the fact that we have had such success in Memphis in dropping that crime rate by nearly 50 percent—50 percent—we are the example, the model, of how you can get in behind this and change what is happening with crime.

Some of the stats are that we have seen a 40-percent drop in sexual assault in Memphis, a 56-percent drop in robbery, a 68-percent drop in motor vehicle theft, a 36-percent drop in murder.

That is what happens when your mayor, your police chief, and your agencies are working in partnership getting criminals off the streets.

Now, since September, these combined agencies have made over 9,000 arrests, and more than 3,300 of those were for violent criminals, violent offenders.

Among them are hundreds of warrant arrests for domestic violence, aggravated assault, weapons crimes, as well as dozens more for sexual assault and homicide. These criminals are among the worst of the worst.

In late February, in 1 day, the authorities arrested a 26-year-old woman wanted for killing a 2-year-old baby. You know, that is pretty hard to hear. The Presiding Officer and I are grandmamas. We love these little ones. Hard to fathom somebody would kill a 2-year-old. This is the type criminal they have taken off the streets. They also arrested a 23-year-old man facing charges of first-degree murder, aggravated robbery, aggravated assault, and reckless endangerment with a deadly weapon and a 24-year-old man wanted for drug distribution and possession of prohibited firearms.

Members of the task force are working every single day to apprehend these individuals, and while they are apprehending them, they have recovered more than 2,200 illegal firearms, 1,200 stolen vehicles, and—get this—they have rescued more than 150 missing children.

You know, in the Biden administration, they lost track of about 500 children. Everyone said: Well, where are these children? What could have happened?

Because of the good work of these Federal, State, and local agencies and law enforcement, yes, indeed, 150 missing children.

This operation has been so successful in Memphis. It really ought not to surprise anyone in this Chamber. Sixty-two percent of Memphis citizens say the initiative has been effective at reducing crime, and 86 percent support hiring more police officers.

Imagine that. Everybody working together regardless of your political party, regardless of whether you are

State, local, Federal. You have 86 percent of the population of the city saying: Let's do more of this.

Seventy-seven percent say: Let's build a new jail so we can keep these criminals off the street.

I am incredibly optimistic about the future of Memphis.

I am so grateful to President Trump, Director Patel, AG Bondi, and Secretary Hegseth, along with all the other Federal Agencies, for their commitment.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Madam President, you know, as we have heard on the floor today, it is the 40th day of the Democrats' shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security.

This is already one of the longest shutdowns in our Nation's history, and what we know is that our DHS employees have gone 46 percent of this fiscal year without a paycheck. This is something that is immoral.

Our colleagues across the aisle have voted not once or twice but seven times not to fund our DHS employees. So I think that it is incredible that they are doing this because they have two goals, and we know these are their goals because they have been on TV talking about this. They have talked to their base about these goals.

Goal No. 1, abolish ICE. They are all about it. They want to abolish ICE.

Goal No. 2, they want to defund law enforcement. Now, they have been on this for years. They had told their base that they were going to find a way to do this, so they think that not paying TSA workers is a way to do this. They think that not paying DHS employees is a way to get to their goal.

Well, they are sadly mistaken, and the American people are figuring this out, that what they are doing in order to punish ICE for upholding the rule of law and removing violent criminals from communities—that it is OK to make people hurt, to make people suffer. I think that it is so immoral, what they are doing.

Now, of course, they are fully aware that ICE is funded through 2029. If they had read the Working Families Tax Cut, the Big Beautiful Bill, they would be aware of this. But, no, they didn't take the time to read the good things that were in that bill because they had made their minds up. They were going to vote no. Regardless of what happened, they were going to vote no.

So they think it is OK to punish Secret Service agents, TSA officers, coastguardsmen, our cyber security professionals, and our homeland security investigators so that they can try to abolish ICE.

Now, President Trump is doing everything he can to alleviate the pain the Democrats are causing. You see Republicans have made concessions.

It was: We want a change of leadership at DHS.

Well, that change has taken place.

We want to end the Minnesota surge with ICE.

That has ended.

We want to end roving patrols.

That has been done.

We want to change policies around protesters. We want to change policies at detention facilities.

All of that has been done.

Body cameras—that has been done.

What they continue to do is move the goalposts. Nothing is ever good enough because the only thing they want—abolish ICE and defund law enforcement.

So regardless of what we bring forward, regardless of what is offered, they have decided they are a big, fat, whopping no.

They do not give a ripping flip what happens to TSA agents and their families—people that are sleeping in cars, people that can't pay their mortgage, people that can't pay for childcare, people that are not able to go to work because of this. They are not concerned about the 450 agents that have already turned in their badges and said: We can't hack this. We have to have a job where we are paid every time we go to work for every hour we work rather than being paid 46 percent of the time.

I think it is so important that we realize they are standing up for illegal aliens. You know, they are standing up for criminals like Jose Medina-Medina, who was charged last week with shooting and killing Sheridan Gorman, an 18-year-old college student at Loyola University in Chicago who was out walking with her friends.

There was a Chicago alderman who said: This was a kid in the wrong place at the wrong time.

How totally insensitive and disgusting can that be. I will tell you who was in the wrong place—it was an illegal alien who had a rap sheet, who came here under the Biden administration. He goes out and is charged with theft within a couple of weeks of being here, and the revolving door starts for him.

I think you have to look at this—somebody that is a repeat offender. They have no right to be here. And that guy, that alleged killer from Venezuela, should never have been anywhere near that young woman.

I think it is also important that we look at the fact that there is new leadership at DHS.

Our colleagues should be willing to fund DHS and stop repeatedly voting to shut the thing down and support the rule of law in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, only U.S. citizens should be voting in U.S. elections. That is not a controversial statement; that is common sense. And Republicans believe in that statement. We believe we need to protect voting in our elections. But I think our colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to make those elections less secure. This is against the will of most Americans and against the will of their own voters.

The SAVE America Act is simple: It requires proof of citizenship to register to vote and requires a photo ID when you go to cast a ballot. Common sense. It has overwhelming public support, but Democrats stand in opposition.

The polling numbers are clear. A recent CBS News poll shows that 80 percent of Americans support requiring a photo ID to vote, and that includes 65 percent of Democrats. A Pew Research Center poll finds that 83 percent of voters support photo ID at the polls, and that includes 71 percent of Democrats. Sixty-six percent of Americans support requiring documents showing proof of citizenship in order to register to vote.

Proof of citizenship is required when you apply for government benefits. It is required when you join the military. Every single job in this country requires new hires to fill out a form I-9 proving they are eligible to work here. Americans show photo ID to drive a car, to pick up their kids early from school, to check into a hotel, to purchase cold medicine at the pharmacy, to board a plane, and to get a library card. If we expect this of Americans in these instances, why on Earth shouldn't we expect it when they vote?

We have applied this program in my home State of Nebraska. In 2023, Nebraska adopted a law through the voter-driven initiative process requiring voters to provide an ID with their name and photo when they vote. There are a lot of acceptable forms of ID in Nebraska: a driver's license, a State ID card, a U.S. passport, a military ID, a Tribal ID. My State of Nebraska found a sensible way to verify voters' identity without restricting access for eligible voters. In fact, Nebraskans can get an ID and a certified copy of their birth certificate at no cost if they don't have one.

Here in Washington, Democrats have spent the past few weeks waffling on this issue. In fact, Senator SCHUMER recently announced that Democrats do support voter ID. You know, that is great. Vote for it.

My colleague Senator HUSTED, a former chief election official in his home State of Ohio, decided to take Senator SCHUMER at his word.

He offered a clean, basic photo ID bill, just a simple requirement to show voter ID at the polls: a driver's license, a military ID, a Tribal ID, or a passport.

Well, guess what happened? The Democrats blocked it. They are completely unserious on this issue. They are out of step with the majority of Americans. The stakes couldn't be higher. America's election integrity is on the line. The SAVE America Act is a commonsense solution, proof of citizenship to register and photo ID to vote.

Every Democrat will be put on the record, and the American people will be watching. I urge my colleagues to support the SAVE America Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, as we stand here in the comfort of the U.S. Capitol on this beautiful spring day, men and women are in harm's way, serving this country, sacrificing for our defense in the Middle East.

And I emphasize women, as well as men, are bravely and steadfastly sacrificing away from their families, away from their homes, away from the comfort that we take for granted.

Women are the fastest growing demographic in our military. They are performing combat tasks, as well as support. They are serving in every aspect of our U.S. military, and we are the better for it.

We have encouraged more women to join the ranks of our military because of the tremendous talent, energy, patriotism, insight, compassion, and loyalty that they bring to service. And now, we are betraying them. Now, we are constricting the healthcare available to them, purposefully, simply out of ideological bias.

On New Year's Eve, the Trump administration greeted 2026 by quietly, indeed secretly, implementing a near-total abortion ban at the VA. It is a new policy that targets women veterans, many of them survivors of sexual assault or with service-connected disabilities or conditions. Shamefully, they rob those veterans of access to essential healthcare, hundreds of thousands of them, even when their healthcare is at risk or they have been raped.

In the post-Dobbs world, this new policy is dangerous, and it is cruel. It severely jeopardizes women veterans' health and safety. It prioritizes culture wars and political games over our Nation's heroes. It disrespects and endangers more than 462,000 women of reproductive age, and that number is growing because more women are serving. They are enrolled in the VA healthcare system, and they live in States where there are abortion bans or restrictions. So the VA is their only source of healthcare when it comes to abortion.

On behalf of these women, I urge passage today of my Congressional Review Act resolution to overturn this abhorrent new policy, which imposes not only a ban on reproductive rights care but also counseling. It is a gag order imposed on healthcare providers who should be free to advise and guide women in making these life-changing decisions about what to do with their own bodies, and this counseling is necessary for them to make those decisions about what to do with their futures.

And sometimes, they may be advised to have children when they may be doubtful about it. The point is that politicians shouldn't be dictating to our Nation's heroes—our veterans—what kind of futures and decisions about their families they should be making. It should be those women veterans consulting doctors.

A ban with the primary purpose of preventing women veterans to receive

abortion care or counseling, even if they are victims of rape or incest, even if their health is at risk, is absolutely disgusting and dangerous. And keep in mind healthcare should include abortion. Abortion is healthcare. Healthcare is a human right, and it is not just care but also counseling. It is simply no way to treat veterans who have raised their right hand and been willing to die for their country and who right now are, in fact, in harm's way, serving their country.

Last month, I joined women veterans to discuss the practical impact of this rule. I want to talk about some of their stories and read some of what they had to say because they bravely shared the practical impacts, and they highlight the human impact of this administration's archaic and perilous policy.

Alex, for example, is an Air Force veteran and a sexual assault survivor. During her second miscarriage, she was not provided with the care she needed, and it nearly cost her her life.

Alex and her husband are terrified to get pregnant again in light of her experience when she nearly bled to death when suffering a miscarriage and care was denied to her. An OB-GYN finally intervened. She was horrified when she learned the severity of her situation, but it potentially compromised her fertility.

In her own words:

Due to complex service-connected health conditions, pregnancy is very high risk for me. In order to get pregnant again, I need to know I can trust my doctors. I need the ability to have difficult, in-depth conversations with them, that they are with my health and I every step of the way, and will without hesitation step in to save my life and fertility if something goes wrong. However, with this new ban, I no longer have that faith in the VA . . . As a result, my husband and I may never get to realize our dream anymore.

For all of us, both sides of the aisle, both views—or many different views on abortion—this story ought to be heart-breaking. A couple who wants to have children and needs advice and counseling is denied it because of this policy.

Another veteran I met, Lauren, was denied the lifesaving care she needed when experiencing a miscarriage under the VA's previous abortion ban before the administration stepped in to expand veterans' access to healthcare. She was denied care from a community care provider when having a miscarriage. She was eventually able to get that care elsewhere. She stressed the danger of being denied the lifesaving care at the moment she needed it from the VA.

And in her own words:

Unfortunately, this has been a reality for so many across the country, but what's happened to me isn't isolated. As a former combat medic, I hear from so many women veterans with similar reproductive issues triggered during service, ranging from a wide array of environmental and occupational factors to include toxic exposure.

And she said:

I served our country and was promised comprehensive health care for disabilities I

incurred in service, which includes abortion care. Instead, radical ideologies have infiltrated our clinics.

Denying victims of rape or incest the essential care they need is an insult, but it is more than an insult. It is an injury to veterans who put their lives on the line to serve our great Nation, which has made a promise to them. It is a promise it makes to men, as well as women, that they will receive the healthcare they need from the VA. It is a promise that a great Nation cannot break.

Today, we have the opportunity to right this heartbreaking wrong. We can overturn this cruel, misguided policy by passing our Congressional Review Act resolution.

And to my Republican colleagues, let me just say: If you believe women veterans ought to be denied healthcare, if you believe we should break our promise to them, if you believe that this cruel, dangerous policy should be sustained, I understand you will vote against this.

But I am hoping that you believe in protecting women veterans who have been raped or whose health is at risk, and the only way you can prove it is by supporting this resolution. Prove it today because these veterans deserve action, not just words or rhetoric or empty promises.

Open your eyes to the horror of this policy as it affects individual women veterans who need this healthcare. Please join us in overturning this absolutely abhorrent policy.

I am grateful to colleagues who have joined me on the floor today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield to my colleague from New Hampshire Mrs. SHAHEEN if she would like to go before me.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Go ahead.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, for 125 years, women have bravely served in our Armed Forces, risking their lives to defend our country and to protect our national security.

Today, more than 2 million—2 million—women veterans live in the United States—women Trump has ignored. Basically, he has turned his back on them by denying them access to abortion care and counseling.

Abortion care is critical care, often lifesaving healthcare, as noted by my colleague just now. That is why, after the Supreme Court's disastrous Dobbs decision, the VA responded by enabling women veterans to access abortion counseling and care.

But last December, the VA, under different leadership and thinking they could get away with it, quietly implemented a near-total abortion ban at the VA even in cases of rape, incest, or when a pregnancy endangers the veteran's life. It is not an exaggeration to call this change in VA policy yet another front in Trump's war on women.

Over 450,000 of the women veterans of reproductive age who receive VA care

live in States with abortion bans or restrictions. Because of Trump's extreme policy, these women are now out of options and with nowhere to turn, in reality, for abortion care. These are veterans, as I mentioned, who bravely risk their lives for our country, who have the expectation that their country will take care of them when they return to civilian life—not so under this regime. Instead, the Agency tasked with ensuring the health of our veterans is willfully risking their health and lives all because of its ideological agenda.

We owe it to our women veterans and all veterans to provide them with the healthcare they need and earn, not to mention deserve. That is why Senate Democrats have introduced legislation to overturn this life-threatening policy at the VA and restore access to the care our veterans deserve.

Tonight, every Senator will go on the record to make clear whether they care more about the well-being of our veterans or the political cruelty of Donald Trump. As the regime attempts to score cheap political points and place the lives of thousands of women at risk, I urge my colleagues to join in restoring access to essential healthcare for these veterans.

I want to add to the examples provided by my colleague Senator BLUMENTHAL. Our women veterans, in their service to our country, are exposed to toxic fumes and other environmental and surface conditions that require comprehensive healthcare. As I mentioned, they are exposed to conditions that maybe in the normal course, other women who are not in our services are exposed to. So our women veterans require comprehensive healthcare, and that is what we are asking for. Of course, that care includes abortion care.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Hawaii both for her eloquent statements and for her willingness to let me go ahead of her. I appreciate that, but she was here first.

I come to the floor today to join my colleagues Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator HIRONO, and so many others in this caucus because after years of relentless attacks on reproductive freedoms nationwide, what we are seeing from our colleagues here in Congress and the Trump administration is that they have now set their sights on our Nation's veterans, those who have dedicated their lives in service to our country.

The Trump administration's new policy that we are voting to overturn today isn't just extreme; it is flat-out dangerous. Republicans and Democrats alike have committed to doing everything we can to uphold the basic promises we have made to our Nation's veterans. So we have to ask: Why is this administration bending over backward to further erode the freedoms our vet-

erans risk their lives to protect by ripping away the basic, essential healthcare that women need?

After the Dobbs decision, the VA took a basic but critical step to protect the health of veterans and their families by providing them access to healthcare in a very specific set of circumstances—tragic instances like when our veterans have been victims of rape, when they have experienced incest, or when their lives or their health has been directly in danger—because when the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade* and diminished the reproductive freedoms that women have enjoyed for half a century, it was clear that the Federal Government needed to take action to make it easier, not harder, for the hundreds of thousands of young women who have served our country to be able to access basic healthcare when they need it the most—veterans who have often waited until after their military service to start a family and now must question whether it is going to be safe for them to do so, veterans who are now facing the most restrictive abortion ban across the Federal Government.

This policy doesn't just prevent those brave Americans from receiving care under dire and heartbreaking circumstances; it actually prevents them from receiving basic counseling about their health as well. As my colleagues have already pointed out, this ban on abortion counseling means that VA providers can't discuss pregnancy options with their patients.

While the VA claims they will always save a veteran's life, their own internal guidance is so vague that providers will be forced to make impossible decisions. In this case, the lack of planning and specificity will leave it up to the VA to make split-second decisions about an urgent medical need based on very murky guidelines.

At every turn, this administration has pushed forward dangerous policies intended to threaten access to full reproductive care. That is why I am calling on our colleagues across the aisle to show some common sense and to realize that we can't repay those veterans who have already sacrificed so much for their country with a policy that puts their lives in danger, particularly at a time when one in three of our Nation's female veterans has reported experiencing military sexual trauma over the course of their service.

Let me repeat that because I think that is a staggering statistic. One in three of our Nation's female veterans has reported experiencing military sexual trauma during their service.

These brave women deserve better than the carelessness of this administration refusing to give them full access to reproductive health care. We can't sit back and abandon them when they need it the most. We can't sit back and watch as reproductive freedoms slip away because access to necessary, lifesaving reproductive care should not be left to chance or the

split-second decision of a provider. It should be a fundamental right, especially in the United States of America, where we have a Constitution that says that all people are created equal. Now, I know it says "all men are created equal," but I think, since the founding of this country, that has been expanded to the understanding that we are talking about all of the citizens of this country.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in just minutes, we will vote on Calendar No. 338, S.J. Res. 103, which will reverse the indecent, unjust policy that this administration implemented secretly on New Year's Eve.

I ask my colleagues to keep in their minds and thoughts and hearts the women veterans who have devoted so much to this country and who continue to serve and sacrifice as we speak.

I ask them to keep in mind the female service officer who was raped before transitioning out of the military service and who learned she was pregnant after enrolling in the VA's healthcare system. She is no longer covered by the VA to have an abortion. If she were still on Active Duty, the Department of Defense would pay for or perform the abortion. If she worked for the VA, her Federal employee healthcare insurance would pay for the abortion. If she were someone serving in a Federal prison, her abortion would be covered. But because she is an enrollee in the VA's healthcare system after bravely serving this country, she is not even covered for an abortion resulting from rape or if her health is at risk.

That is not right. That is not just. That is not worthy of a great country. It is not matching her service with our staying faithful to her.

So for all these reasons, advocates of women's healthcare, advocates of veterans, and people who simply support healthcare as a human right support this resolution to do the right thing.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS RELATING TO "REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH SERVICES"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 338, S.J. Res. 103.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 338, S.J. Res. 103, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to "Reproductive Health Services".

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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 Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) would have voted "nay."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—2

Curtis Schatz

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 311, H.R. 7147, a bill making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Pete Ricketts, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, Mike Crapo, Joni Ernst, Jim Banks, Todd Young, David McCormick, Jon A. Husted, Mike Rounds, John R. Curtis, Susan M. Collins, Alan Armstrong, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Katie Boyd Britt.

RECOGNIZING THE 205TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 661, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 661) recognizing the 205th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 661) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

HONORING THE MEMORY, SERVICE, AND SACRIFICE OF MASTER SERGEANT NICOLE M. AMOR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 648 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 648) honoring the memory, service, and sacrifice of Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, United States Army Reserve.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the Klobuchar amendment to the preamble be considered and agreed to; that the preamble,

as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 648) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4785) to the preamble was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

In the preamble, strike the second whereas clause and insert the following:

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, 35, of Winter Haven, Florida, Sergeant First Class Noah L. Tietjens, 42, of Bellevue, Nebraska, Sergeant Declan J. Coady, 20, of Des Moines, Iowa, Major Jeffrey R. O'Brien, 45, of Waukeke, Iowa, and Chief Warrant Officer 3 Robert M. Marzan, 54, of Spotsylvania, Virginia;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

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, 35, of Winter Haven, Florida, Sergeant First Class Noah L. Tietjens, 42, of Bellevue, Nebraska, Sergeant Declan J. Coady, 20, of Des Moines, Iowa, Major Jeffrey R. O'Brien, 45, of Waukeke, Iowa, and Chief Warrant Officer 3 Robert M. Marzan, 54, of Spotsylvania, Virginia;

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.

MORNING BUSINESS

TOWN OF CHELSEA 175TH ANNIVERSARY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, In 1851, 31 years after Maine became the 23rd State of the Union, the small, agricultural town of Chelsea was incorporated. Chelsea, named after the town of Chelsea, MA, is known for its peaceful community, with a strong sense of pride in its history. From its humble beginnings to a thriving agricultural center, Chelsea remains a true treasure of central Maine.

The first settlers were farmers, and their fierce determination and hard work made Chelsea an agricultural force. Chelsea became the largest produce market in the county, with apples from the town's sizable orchard a leading fare. By 1856, the first cider mill had been built. In addition, Chelsea shipped more wool than anywhere else in the State during the last half of the 19th century.

Chelsea has also played an important role in honoring those who serve our country. The Togus Veterans Hospital, established by President Abraham Lincoln, was the first Federal facility dedicated to providing care for America's heroes. In its long history, the facility cared for veterans from the American Civil War to the present day.

Thanks to its strategic location on the beautiful Kennebec River, Chelsea served as a significant site in our country's fight for independence during the Revolutionary War. More than 1,000 soldiers followed the Kennebec River north during Benedict Arnold's Quebec Expedition in 1775, using Chelsea as a key staging area to plan and prepare for the long journey.

Aside from the Togus Veterans Hospital, perhaps the building with the greatest historical significance is the Chelsea Grange Hall. Built in 1914, the Grange Hall symbolizes Chelsea's rural heritage and is a place where an organized effort is made to bring people together for good times and to orient the community around family and friendship.

Chelsea's history and its continued service to this Nation make it an absolute pearl of our State. The town of Chelsea has a proud legacy of service, resilience, and close-knit community spirit woven into the heart of rural Maine.

Maine has long played a role in the guidance and leadership of our great Nation. The town of Chelsea, by her safeguarding of our Nation's heroes and her place in our revolutionary history, leads the State of Maine into a future of continued service to neighbors and Nation.

NATIONAL AHEC WEEK

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize this week as National AHEC—Area Health Education Centers—Week.

The AHEC program was originally authorized in 1971 and worked in conjunction with other Health Resources and Services Administration programs to provide health professionals to staff brick-and-mortar community health centers across the country. Today, AHECs offer hands-on and innovative health career curriculums for pre-college level students and are committed to continuing education, clinical training of health professionals, and responding to community health needs. The Nation's 300 AHECs are in nearly every State and in multiple U.S. territories.

AHEC clinical training placements put health professions students in a variety of real-world settings, such as urban and rural community health clinics and health departments that provide healthcare to traditionally hard-to-reach populations. Students, in particular those working through their AHECs, are more likely to remain in the communities where they trained, making it critically important to establish training opportunities in rural and underserved areas.

The need to strengthen the healthcare workforce continues. According to data from the Association of American Medical Colleges, the U.S. could see a shortage of up to 124,000 physicians by 2034, and the American Hospital Association says more than 200,000 new registered nurses are needed each year to meet increasing healthcare needs and to replace retiring nurses. AHECs have continued to work towards addressing workforce shortage areas, especially in rural and underserved communities. Just in the past 5 years, the AHEC program has trained 2 million healthcare professionals.

I have had the opportunity to work closely with the New Hampshire AHEC and have witnessed the amazing work they do. The mission of the New Hampshire AHEC is to support workforce development activities for current and future healthcare workers in the Granite State. In 2025, the New Hampshire AHEC offered continuing education to over 4,500 healthcare workers, improving treatment options for patients suffering from diseases such as diabetes and substance use disorder. In addition to working with providers, they also offer trainings on chronic disease, chronic pain, and diabetes self-management to patients in the community. More than 3,000 individuals have participated in these programs since 2010.

The New Hampshire AHEC team were pioneers in identifying the need for a workforce that bridges healthcare and community. Over the past 28 years, New Hampshire AHEC has focused on building the healthcare workforce by offering both day and residential programs for high school students, while also providing didactics and community-based experiences for health professions students across the State. It cannot be understated how important the New Hampshire AHEC is for our

communities and how important it is that the program continues to receive support from Congress. AHECs not only address current healthcare gaps and challenges, but they recruit, train and bolster our future health workforce. On behalf of my constituents at the New Hampshire AHEC program and the national AHEC program more broadly, I call on my colleagues to join me in recognizing March 23 to March 27 as National AHEC Week.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING HANDS JEWELERS

• Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to honor Hands Jewelers of Johnson County, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Now known as Hands Jewelers, the business was founded in 1853 and bought by John Hands in 1907 after he moved to Iowa City because of the Rock Island Railroad depot. As the family recounts, railroad workers relied on precisely synchronized watches to keep trains on schedule, creating a constant need for skilled repair and craftsmanship. After John's passing, his son Harold Hands took over and married Mary Rupener Nusser. Soon, Hands Jewelers will be owned and operated under its fifth generation of leadership once Bill Nusser, Jr., passes the torch to his son Charlie to continue a legacy built on craftsmanship, trust, and dedication.

For more than 170 years, the business has provided high-quality jewelry and personalized service, helping customers celebrate life's most meaningful moments, from engagements and weddings to anniversaries and family milestones. Through a dedication to excellence and attention to detail, Hands Jewelers ensures each piece tells a story and has earned a reputation as a trusted name across eastern Iowa.

In recent years, Hands Jewelers has demonstrated its ability to adapt and evolve while honoring its long-standing traditions. Through a thoughtful rebranding effort, the business has modernized its marketing, expanded its e-commerce presence, and embraced new ways to connect with customers, ensuring continued success in an ever-changing marketplace.

Beyond its work in fine jewelry, Hands Jewelers is deeply woven into the fabric of the Iowa City community. The Nusser family has remained actively engaged in local leadership and service, including involvement with the Community Foundation of Johnson County, the Englert Theater, and Greater Iowa City, Inc., where they have helped support local economic growth and strengthen the small business community. Their leadership ex-

tends beyond the local level through participation in industry organizations such as Charlie's service on the Centurion Retail Advisory Board contributing to the Centurion Jewelry show, further underscoring their commitment to excellence and deep engagement in the fine jewelry business. With a team of 15 employees, the business supports local jobs while contributing to the vibrancy of Iowa City and the broader Johnson County community.

Today, with multiple family members still involved in the business, Hands Jewelers continues to reflect the values that have sustained it for generations: hard work, integrity, and a deep commitment to community.

I am pleased to recognize Bill and Charlie Nusser, along with the entire team at Hands Jewelers, for their dedication to Iowa City and Johnson County. I look forward to their continued success and wish them the very best in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO KARA COLE

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize Kara Cole of Plymouth as March's Granite Stater of the Month. Kara created a program to teach elementary school students the lifelong skill of sewing.

Kara has always been passionate about sewing, and she believes that the skill isn't just a fun hobby but that it is also an important way to encourage sustainability, foster creativity, and provide a career pathway for students. After Kara realized 4 years ago that many of the students she worked with as a library media specialist for the Franklin School District didn't know how to sew, she decided to roll up her sleeves and change that. Kara went above and beyond her responsibilities and, alongside Cassie Easter, a library assistant in the district, Kara created a program to teach elementary students at the Paul Smith School in Franklin how to sew.

Since establishing the program, Kara has helped hundreds of students learn how to sew. This year, with the help of local donations, Kara helped students sew pillowcases and was even able to ensure that every single student had a pillow to put in their pillowcase. Kara has plans to grow the program in the years to come and hopes to include neighboring schools and organizations as part of her mission.

Kara's desire to go above and beyond to teach others a lifelong skill in her community is a great example of the Granite State spirit of supporting our neighbors. Her passion for helping young people is why I am proud to name her March's Granite Stater of the Month.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hansley, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13694 OF APRIL 1, 2015, WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT MALICIOUS CYBER-ENABLED ACTIVITIES—PM 54

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13757 of December 28, 2016, Executive Order 13984 of January 19, 2021, Executive Order 14110 of October 30, 2023 (revoked by Executive Order 14148 of January 20, 2025), Executive Order 14144 of January 16, 2025, and Executive Order 14306 of June 6, 2025, is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2026.

Significant malicious cyber-enabled activities originating from, or directed by persons located, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694 with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 14257 OF APRIL 2, 2025, WITH RESPECT TO TRADE PRACTICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO LARGE AND PERSISTENT ANNUAL UNITED STATES GOODS TRADE DEFICITS—PM 55

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14257 of April 2, 2025, is to continue in effect beyond April 2, 2026.

The circumstances related to this emergency continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat, which has its source in whole or in substantial part outside the United States, to the national security and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14257.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 14024 OF APRIL 15, 2021, WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIED HARMFUL FOREIGN ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION—PM 56

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the na-

tional emergency with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation declared in Executive Order 14024 of April 15, 2021, which was expanded in scope in Executive Order 14066 of March 8, 2022, and with respect to which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 14039 of August 20, 2021, Executive Order 14068 of March 11, 2022, Executive Order 14071 of April 6, 2022, Executive Order 14114 of December 22, 2023, Executive Order 14329 of August 6, 2025, and Executive Order 14384 of February 6, 2026, is to continue in effect beyond April 15, 2026.

Specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation—in particular, efforts to undermine the conduct of free and fair democratic elections and democratic institutions in the United States and its allies and partners; to engage in and facilitate malicious cyber-enabled activities against the United States and its allies and partners; to foster and use transnational corruption to influence foreign governments; to pursue extraterritorial activities targeting dissidents or journalists; to undermine security in countries and regions important to United States national security; and to violate well-established principles of international law, including respect for the territorial integrity of states—continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14024 with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13664 OF APRIL 3, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO SOUTH SUDAN—PM 57

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive

Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan is to continue in effect beyond April 3, 2026.

The situation in and in relation to South Sudan, which has been marked by activities that threaten the peace, security, or stability of South Sudan and the surrounding region, including widespread violence and atrocities, human rights abuses, recruitment and use of child soldiers, attacks on peacekeepers, and obstruction of humanitarian operations, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 with respect to South Sudan.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 24, 2026.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:05 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 bills and concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2247. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize the use of physical or digital copies of certain certificates for certain Federal Aviation Administration inspections, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2474. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the capability of the Appalachian Regional Commission to include satellites in broadband projects, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3410. An act to allow for the operation of civil supersonic flight in the national airspace system under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4624. An act to amend the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996 to establish requirements for unified boxing organizations, to further enhance the well-being of professional boxers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5663. An act to modify the termination of the aviation consumer protection advisory committee, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6267. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the impediments to digital documentation and verification in the aviation supply chain, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6422. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain EPA geographic programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6427. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit the use of State highway standards for airfield pavement construction and improvement under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6460. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify exceptions for limited recreational operations of unmanned aircraft, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6480. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to submit a report to Congress on the state of the real estate portfolio of the Public Building Service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6481. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Federal Protective Service to establish guidance relating to emergency communication protocols for public buildings, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6618. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a study on drone incursions on wildfire suppression, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7342. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for certain grant eligibility relating to projects that facilitate the relocation, to the United States, of a source of employment located outside the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7388. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convene consultation meetings to identify alternative financing solutions for the construction of new public buildings that will reduce costs to the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2247. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize the use of physical or digital copies of certain certificates for certain Federal Aviation Administration inspections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2474. An act to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the capability of the Appalachian Regional Commission to include satellites in broadband projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 3410. An act to allow for the operation of civil supersonic flight in the national airspace system under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 4624. An act to amend the Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996 to establish requirements for unified boxing organizations, to further enhance the well-being of professional boxers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 5663. An act to modify the termination of the aviation consumer protection advisory committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 6267. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the impediments to digital documentation and verification in the aviation supply chain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 6422. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize certain EPA geographic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 6427. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit the use of State highway standards for airfield pavement construction and improvement under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 6460. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify exceptions for limited

recreational operations of unmanned aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 6480. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to submit a report to Congress on the state of the real estate portfolio of the Public Building Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 6481. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Federal Protective Service to establish guidance relating to emergency communication protocols for public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6618. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to conduct a study on drone incursions on wildfire suppression, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 7342. An act to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to provide for certain grant eligibility relating to projects that facilitate the relocation, to the United States, of a source of employment located outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 7388. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convene consultation meetings to identify alternative financing solutions for the construction of new public buildings that will reduce costs to the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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-3070. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Simplification; Adoption of Standards for Health Care Claims Attachments Transactions and Electronic Signatures" (RIN0938-AT38) (CMS-0053-F) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2026; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3071. A communication from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual management report relative to its operations and financial condition for fiscal year 2025; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3072. A communication from the Agency Representative, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Required Use by Foreign Applicants and Patent Owners of a Patent Practitioner" (RIN0651-AD85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3073. A communication from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2025 Financial Report of the United States Government (Financial Report)"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3074. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General

Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR); FAR Case 2025-007, Trade Agreements Thresholds" (RIN9000-A080) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2026; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3075. A communication from the Director of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2026-01, Introduction" (FAC 2026-01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2026; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3076. A communication from the Director of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2026-01, Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC 2026-01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2026; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3077. A communication from the Chair, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Council's 2025 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3078. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to nominations, vacancies, designations of service in acting roles, discontinuations of service in acting roles and actions on nominations for positions covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2026; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3079. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of the Federal Securities Laws to Certain Types of Crypto Assets and Certain Transactions Involving Crypto Assets" (RIN3235-AN56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3080. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure 2026-17" (Revenue Procedure 2026-17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 24, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3081. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official Exercising the Delegated Authority of the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Record of Decision and Integrated Activity Plan for the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska regarding Public Law 119-47 (2025) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 25, 2026; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3082. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official Exercising the Delegated Authority of the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Record of Decision for the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program regarding Public Law 119-52 (2025) received in the Office of the President

of the Senate on March 25, 2026; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 4185. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end the tax-free treatment of certain corporate reorganizations that involve large corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4186. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to grow and diversify the perinatal workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 4187. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve maternal health data collection processes and quality measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SLOTKIN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 4188. A bill to prohibit a covered individual from engaging in covered transactions involving prediction market contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. KING, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. KELLY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 4189. A bill to reduce the price of insulin and provide for patient protections with respect to the cost of insulin; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIM (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 4190. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the knowledge and skills of principals and school leaders regarding early childhood education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ALSOBROOKS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4191. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to extend eligibility of new moms for the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. RICKETTS:

S. 4192. A bill to amend the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978 to require reports to contain geospatial data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 4193. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a grant program to improve the reliability of the power grid and reduce the risk of wildfires caused by power lines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 4194. A bill to require the inclusion of an accessibility assessment during inspections of overseas diplomatic facilities by the In-

spector General of the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WARNOCK (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4195. A bill to prevent maternal mortality and severe maternal morbidity among Black pregnant and postpartum individuals and other underserved populations, to provide training in respectful maternity care, to reduce and prevent bias, racism, and discrimination in maternity care settings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

S. 4196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to return the estate, gift, and generation skipping transfer tax to 2009 levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Ms. SLOTKIN):

S. 4197. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a program under which the Secretary shall award grants to certain State entities to expand access to structured outdoor recreation programs for veterans that enhance veteran wellness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGERTY (for himself, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. BANKS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 4198. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide deposit insurance for noninterest-bearing transaction accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 4199. A bill to require entities that make artificial intelligence chatbots available to minors to implement certain safe design features, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 4200. A bill to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 4201. A bill to require the Chief of Space Operations to submit a feasibility report on expanding the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4202. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 4203. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 4204. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a rural health center innovation awards program and a rural health department enhancement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4205. A bill to abolish and defund the Cesar E. Chavez National Monument in the State of California, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 4206. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require certain financial institutions to verify the citizenship and legal status of individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. 4207. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote new business innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PETERS, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 4208. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide payments on eligible loans for individuals who are eligible for the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 4209. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to extend the limitations period for certain offenses resulting in death or serious bodily injury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4210. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to establish or expand programs to implement evidence-aligned practices in health care settings for the purpose of reducing the suicide rates of covered individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 4211. A bill to protect the privacy of consumers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 4212. A bill to require contractors of the Department of Defense to prioritize meeting warfighter needs over the purchase of their own securities and executive compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4213. A bill to require data center operators to submit to States or the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretaries of Energy and Agriculture reports on data center energy and water use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 4214. A bill to impose a moratorium on the construction of new data centers until legislation is enacted that safeguards the public from the dangers of artificial intelligence; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S.J. Res. 143. 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 2023-02: Reopening Deposit Accounts That Consumers Previously Closed"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S.J. Res. 144. 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 "Fair Credit Reporting Act; Preemption of State Laws"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S.J. Res. 145. 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; Permissible Purposes for Furnishing, Using, and Obtaining Consumer Reports"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

S.J. Res. 146. 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 "Application of Regulation Z's Ability-To-Repay Rule to Certain Situations Involving Successors-In-Interest"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S.J. Res. 147. 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 "Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition on Abusive Acts or Practices"; 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 Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JUSTICE, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. Res. 661. A resolution recognizing the 205th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. Con. Res. 30. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Ratepayer Protection Pledge announced on March 4, 2026, reflects sound national policy to protect ratepayers in the United States, promote electricity affordability, and ensure that all people of the United States, including households, small businesses, schools, hospitals, and farms, have access to reliable and affordable energy as artificial intelligence and data center infrastructure expands across the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BLUNT, ROCHESTER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PADILLA, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Con. Res. 31. A concurrent resolution recognizing the duty of Congress to meet the needs of working women; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 513

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 513, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish and carry out a grant program to conserve, restore, and manage kelp forest ecosystems, and for other purposes.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) 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. 800

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to modify the Precision Medicine for Veterans Initiative of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

S. 1283

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) 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 Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) 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. 1385

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to amend the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 and the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to direct the Agricultural Research Service to expand organic research, and for other purposes.

S. 1868

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1868, a bill 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, and for other purposes.

S. 2525

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2525, a bill to address transnational repression by foreign governments against private individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2903

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) 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. 3400

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3400, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require coverage of hearing devices and systems in certain private health insurance plans, and for other purposes.

S. 3502

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3502, a bill to establish requirements with respect to the sale of timeshares to improve acquisition transparency, and for other purposes.

S. 3514

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3514, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize the National Firearms Act to account for advancements in technology and less-than-lethal weapons, and for other purposes.

S. 3586

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3586, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to require small business development centers to assist small business concerns with the use of artificial intelligence, and for other purposes.

S. 3697

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3697, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the approval of new abortion drugs, to prohibit investigational use exemptions for abortion drugs, and to impose additional regulatory requirements with respect to previously approved abortion drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 3788

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3788, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require drug labeling to include original manufacturer and supply chain information.

S. 3830

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 3830, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to permit Federal banking agencies to examine qualifying insured depository institutions with under \$6,000, 000,000 in total assets not less than once during each 18-month period, and for other purposes.

S. 3869

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3869, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 3894

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3894, a bill to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from constructing, acquiring, renovating, or operating any new processing site or detention center without providing a mechanism for public comments regarding such activity, entering into a signed, written agreement with appropriate State and local officials, and providing Congress with advance notice of such activity.

S. 3938

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor 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 prepreparation counseling under the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 3953

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3953, a bill to authorize the Director of the National Museum of African American History and Culture to support African American history education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3990

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3990, a bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV.

S. 4039

At the request of Ms. ALSOBROOKS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4039, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reverse the reductions in Federal loan availability for graduate and professional students enacted under Public Law 119-21.

S. 4066

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4066, a bill to provide that the approved application under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the drug mifepristone for the purpose of the termination of intrauterine pregnancy is deemed to have been withdrawn, to establish a Federal tort for harm to women caused by chemical abortion drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 4081

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4081, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to ensure that certain caregiving employees are no longer exempted from overtime and minimum wage protections.

S. 4097

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4097, a bill to establish that a State-based education loan program is excluded from certain requirements relating to a preferred lender arrangement.

S. 4181

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4181, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate certain limitations with respect to pre-production plastic pellet pollution, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 526

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mrs. MOODY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 526, a resolution withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4202. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 4202

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Mental Health Access and Provider Support Act of 2026".

SEC. 2. IMPROVING ACCESS TO MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1833(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395l(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F)(ii), by striking "75 percent of the amount determined for payment of a psychologist under clause (L)" and inserting "85 percent of the fee schedule amount provided under section 1848";

(2) in subparagraph (EE), by striking "1847A(i)(5)(B)" and inserting "1847A(i)(5)(B),"; and

(3) in subparagraph (FF), by striking "75 percent of the amount determined for pay-

ment of a psychologist under subparagraph (L)" and inserting "85 percent of the fee schedule amount provided under section 1848".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to items and services furnished on or after January 1, 2027.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4213. A bill to require data center operators to submit to States or the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretaries of Energy and Agriculture reports on data center energy and water use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S. 4213

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Data Center Water and Energy Transparency Act of 2026".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) DATA CENTER TERMS.—The terms "data center" and "data center operator" have the meanings given those terms in section 453(a) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17112(a)).

(3) ENERGY USE.—The term "energy use", with respect to data centers, means the total quantity of electricity and other forms of energy consumed on site by that data center, as measured in kilowatt-hours.

(4) POWER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—The term "power usage effectiveness" has the meaning given the term in ISO/IEC 30134-2:2026 of the International Organization for Standardization (or a successor standard).

(5) SECRETARIES.—The term "Secretaries" means the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) STATE.—The term "State" means—

- (A) each of the several States;
- (B) a territory of the United States;
- (C) the Federated States of Micronesia;
- (D) the Republic of the Marshall Islands;
- (E) the Republic of Palau;

(F) an Indian tribe included on the list most recently published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 5131); and

(G) the District of Columbia.

(7) UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term "unit of local government" means any county, parish, city, town, township, village, or other general purpose political subdivision of a State with the power to levy taxes, expend Federal, State, and local funds, and exercise governmental powers.

(8) WATER USAGE EFFECTIVENESS.—The term "water usage effectiveness" has the meaning given the term in ISO/IEC 30134-9:2022 of the International Organization for Standardization (or a successor standard).

(9) WATER USE.—The term "water use", with respect to a data center, means the total amount of water consumed on-site by a data center, including water used for cooling, as measured in gallons.

SEC. 3. DATA CENTER MANDATORY REPORTING AND INFORMATION REQUIREMENT.

(a) DATA COLLECTION.—

(1) REPORT TO STATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act but subject to paragraph (2), each data center operator with 1 or more data centers in a State shall submit to that State an annual report that, with respect to each data

center in the State with a peak demand of not less than 25 megawatts operated by that data center operator, describes—

(i) on-site energy use and water use for the preceding calendar year, including—

(I) total energy use during each month of that calendar year;

(II) if the data center relies on behind-the-meter power generation, the method to generate that power;

(III) total water use and the source of that water during each month of that calendar year; and

(IV) annual average power usage effectiveness and water usage effectiveness;

(ii) projected on-site energy use and water use for not less than the following 5 calendar years, which shall include proposals for reducing the energy use and water use of the data center and the increases in efficiency that are anticipated to result from those proposals; and

(iii) such other information as the State may require.

(B) FORM.—A data center operator shall submit a report under subparagraph (A) in such form and in such manner as the applicable State may require.

(C) FEES AUTHORIZED.—A State may, in requiring the reports described in this paragraph, assess fees on data center operators to support data collection under this paragraph.

(2) REPORT TO ADMINISTRATOR AND SECRETARIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State does not have a program to collect the information described in clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) the State shall inform the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly; and

(ii) a data center operator with data centers in such a State shall submit to the Administrator and Secretaries jointly a report that, with respect to each data center in such a State with a peak demand of not less than 25 megawatts operated by that data center operator, describes—

(I) the information described in those clauses; and

(II) such other information as the Administrator and Secretaries may jointly require.

(B) FORM.—A data center operator shall submit a report under subparagraph (A) in such form and in such manner as the Administrator and Secretaries may jointly require.

(3) REPORTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A report to a State or the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be made available to an affected unit of local government on request and, if applicable, in compliance with any program established by the State for the collection of those reports.

(b) REPORTS ON PROSPECTIVE AND EXPANDED DATA CENTERS.—

(1) REPORT TO STATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), each person seeking to construct a data center with a projected energy use of not less than 25 megawatts and each data center operator seeking to expand a data center with a projected energy use of not less than 25 megawatts shall submit to the State in which the new or expanded data center would operate a report that describes—

(i) as applicable—

(I) the projected energy use and water use and the sources of energy and water of the new data center during the first 5 calendar years after the data center begins operation; or

(II) the projected increase in energy use and water use as a result of the expansion of a data center during the first 5 calendar years after completion of the expansion; and

(ii) proposals for reducing the energy use and water use of the data center and the in-

creases in efficiency that are anticipated to result from those proposals.

(B) FORM.—A report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in such form and in such manner as the applicable State may require.

(2) REPORT TO ADMINISTRATOR AND SECRETARIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State does not have a program to collect the information described in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) the State shall inform the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly; and

(ii) a person seeking to construct a data center and each data center operator seeking to expand a data center in such a State shall submit to the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly a report that describes, with respect to the proposed data center or the expansion of the data center, the information described in that paragraph.

(B) FORM.—A person or data center operator shall submit a report under subparagraph (A) in such form and in such manner as the Administrator and Secretaries may jointly require.

(3) REPORTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A report to a State or the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be made available to an affected unit of local government on request and, if applicable, in compliance with any program established by the State for the collection of those reports.

(c) AGGREGATED REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS FROM STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each State that receives a report under subsection (a)(1) or (b)(1) shall submit to the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly an annual report that describes the data collected pursuant to all such reports submitted to the State under subsection (a)(1) or (b)(1), as applicable, during the previous year in such a manner as may be required jointly by the Administrator and the Secretaries.

(B) ANONYMIZED DATA.—The reports submitted under subparagraph (A) shall only include anonymized and aggregated information.

(2) PUBLIC REPORT.—The Administrator and the Secretaries shall jointly make publicly available on an annual basis a report that—

(A) describes—

(i) using information collected from the reports under subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) and paragraph (1)(A), the aggregated total energy use and water use of data centers in the United States, by region, during the calendar year covered by the report;

(ii) regional impacts of data centers on water and electricity rates for consumers and communities;

(iii) the environmental impacts resulting from the operation of data centers, including—

(I) water and energy sources, supply, quality, and reliability impacts on consumers and communities; and

(II) other direct or indirect impacts; and

(iv) recommendations for best practices to limit the impacts described in clauses (ii) and (iii);

(B) includes, based on the reports received by the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly under subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) and paragraph (1)(A) for the calendar year covered by the report, the aggregated projection of energy use and water use by data centers for the 5 years following that calendar year; and

(C) does not include any information that the Administrator and the Secretaries jointly determine is proprietary.

(d) RULEMAKING.—

(1) FEDERAL AUTHORITY.—The Administrator and the Secretaries may jointly pro-

mulgate such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(2) STATE AUTHORITY.—A State may promulgate such regulations in accordance with the laws of the State as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) STATE ENFORCEMENT.—If a State establishes a program for collecting data pursuant to subsection (a)(1) and (b)(1), the State may issue fines and otherwise engage in other enforcement activities to comply with the requirements of this Act and applicable State laws.

(2) FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Administrator and the Secretaries shall jointly fine a data center operator that negligently violates a requirement of subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2) \$20,000 for each day that the data center operator is in violation of that requirement.

(B) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—On the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator and the Secretaries shall jointly adjust the amount described in subparagraph (A) to reflect changes for the 36-month period ending the preceding November 30 in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

SEC. 4. FEES.

The Administrator and the Secretaries shall jointly assess fees on data center operators that submit a report under subsection (a)(2) or (b)(2) of section 3 in an amount necessary to carry out this Act and may, without further appropriation, use the amounts collected to carry out those subsections.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S.J. Res. 147. 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 “Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition on Abusive Acts or Practices”; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

S.J. RES. 147

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition on Abusive Acts or Practices (88 Fed. Reg. 21883 (April 12, 2023))” (90 Fed. Reg. 20084 (May 12, 2025)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 661—RECOGNIZING THE 205TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JUSTICE, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 661

Whereas the people of ancient Greece developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the founding fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek language, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming the representative democracy of the United States;

Whereas Petros Mavromichalis, the former Commander-in-Chief of Greece and a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821, "It is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you.";

Whereas, in an October 21, 1823, letter to Greek scholar Adamantios Koraes discussing the ongoing Greek struggle for independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote that "[n]o people sympathise more feelingly than ours with the sufferings of your countrymen, none offer more sincere and ardent prayers to heaven for their success";

Whereas, on January 19, 1824, in a speech in support of his resolution to send an American envoy to Greece amid its struggle for independence, then-Congressman Daniel Webster recognized "the struggle of an interesting and gallant people . . . contending against fearful odds, for being, and for the common privilege of human nature";

Whereas individual American Philhellenes, including future abolitionists Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe and Jonathan Peckham Miller, and George Jarvis, traveled to Greece to fight alongside and provide aid to the Greek people in their struggle for independence;

Whereas the people of the United States generously sent humanitarian assistance to the people of Greece during their struggle for independence, often through philhellene committees;

Whereas Greece heroically resisted Axis forces at a crucial moment in World War II, forcing Adolf Hitler to change his timeline and delaying the attack on the Soviet Union;

Whereas Winston Churchill said that "if there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know which the outcome of World War II would have been" and "no longer will we say that Greeks fight like heroes, but that heroes fight like Greeks";

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Greeks were killed during World War II;

Whereas Greece consistently allied with the United States in major international conflicts throughout its history as a modern state and has been a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since 1952;

Whereas the United States has demonstrated its support for the trilateral partnership of Greece, Israel, and Cyprus by enacting into law the Eastern Mediterranean Security and Energy Partnership Act of 2019 (title II of division J of Public Law 116-94) and through joint engagement with Greece, Israel, and Cyprus in the "3+1" format;

Whereas this support was bolstered in the United States-Greece Defense and Interparliamentary Partnership Act of 2021 (sub-title B of title XIII of Public Law 117-81), establishing a 3+1 Interparliamentary Group to discuss the expansion of cooperation in areas of common concern;

Whereas the United States maintains close bilateral cooperation with Greece on security, energy, and other shared priorities, including the commitment to security cooperation that led to the conclusion of a Mutual Defense Cooperation Agreement, which was updated in 2019 and 2021, in order to enhance defense ties between the two countries and promote stability in the broader region;

Whereas the ongoing United States-Greece Strategic Dialogue reflects Greece's importance to the United States as a geostrategic partner, especially in the Eastern Mediterranean and Balkans, and as an important NATO ally;

Whereas, on November 13, 2023, the United States and Greece signed a memorandum of understanding to advance energy security and cooperation in the Western Balkans;

Whereas regular high-level engagement between the Governments of the United States and Greece continued through 2024 and into 2025, during which both governments reaffirmed the strategic importance of the United States-Greece relationship and pledged to continue and increase cooperation based on shared values and interests;

Whereas, in the framework of the fifth United States-Greece Strategic Dialogue, on February 9, 2024, Greece became the 35th country to sign onto the Artemis Accords, affirming its commitment to a peaceful, sustainable, and transparent cooperation in space;

Whereas the Government and people of Greece actively participate in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas Greece has shown a strong commitment to meeting NATO defense spending obligations, recognizing the need for a more robust European pillar within NATO;

Whereas Greece remains an integral part of the European Union and a current non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas the Greek-American community has greatly contributed to American society and has helped forge the strong ties between the United States and Greece;

Whereas the Governments and people of Greece and the United States are at the forefront of efforts to advance freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those efforts and similar ideals have forged a close bond between the peoples of Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2026, Greek Independence Day, with the people of Greece and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which those two great countries were founded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends sincere congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 205th anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed;

(3) commends the Greek-American community for its contributions to the United States and its role as a bridge between the two countries;

(4) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 205 years ago;

(5) appreciates the ever-stronger bilateral relationship, based on shared values and interests, including the important energy and security partnership that exists between the United States and Greece, and the important role that Greece plays in bolstering European energy security; and

(6) appreciates Greece as a valued NATO ally and its critical role in ensuring regional stability.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE RATEPAYER PROTECTION PLEDGE ANNOUNCED ON MARCH 4, 2026, REFLECTS SOUND NATIONAL POLICY TO PROTECT RATEPAYERS IN THE UNITED STATES, PROMOTE ELECTRICITY AFFORDABILITY, AND ENSURE THAT ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, INCLUDING HOUSEHOLDS, SMALL BUSINESSES, SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS, AND FARMS, HAVE ACCESS TO RELIABLE AND AFFORDABLE ENERGY AS ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND DATA CENTER INFRASTRUCTURE EXPANDS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. MARSHALL) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. CON. RES. 30

Whereas data centers consumed approximately 183 terawatt-hours of electricity in the United States in 2024, which is more than 4 percent of total national electricity consumption in the United States;

Whereas the Department of Energy projects that the share of total national electricity consumption in the United States that is consumed by data centers could reach up to 12 percent by 2028 as artificial intelligence workloads require continuously operating, high power density computing infrastructure at unprecedented scale;

Whereas, under the traditional utility regulatory model, the costs of building, upgrading, and maintaining the transmission and distribution infrastructure required to service new large industrial loads are socialized across all ratepayers through rate proceedings, meaning that households and small businesses in the United States effectively subsidize the electricity infrastructure of some of the most highly capitalized companies in history;

Whereas, because data centers cluster geographically rather than diffuse evenly across the electric grid, the impact of data centers on local electricity rates is acute and uneven; and

Whereas, on March 4, 2026, Amazon, Google, Meta, Microsoft, OpenAI, Oracle, and xAI signed the Ratepayer Protection Pledge at the White House, committing to negotiate separate rate structures with utilities and State governments wherever those signatories build data centers and to pay those rates for generation and delivery infrastructure whether or not the signatories consume the electricity, establishing a pay-whether-used obligation that, alongside protecting ratepayers from infrastructure cost-shifting, creates an incentive for the signatories to make their backup generation resources available to grid operators during scarcity events, thereby enhancing reliability for all people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

(1) it is the Sense of Congress that—

(A) the Ratepayer Protection Pledge announced on March 4, 2026, reflects sound national policy founded on the principle that the people of the United States should not be required to foot the bill for private data center energy and infrastructure costs;

(B) the artificial intelligence data center boom in the United States should be leveraged to address electricity affordability and

benefit all households and businesses in the United States; and

(C) relevant Federal agencies, including the Department of Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, should support and facilitate the implementation of the commitments made in the Ratepayer Protection Pledge, including by working with private companies to expedite the permitting and interconnection of new energy generation resources; and

(2) Congress encourages additional artificial intelligence companies, hyperscalers, data center operators, and technology firms that have not yet signed the Ratepayer Protection Pledge to voluntarily adopt equivalent commitments without delay.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 31—RECOGNIZING THE DUTY OF CONGRESS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF WORKING WOMEN

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. BLUNT, ROCHESTER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PADILLA, and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 31

Whereas the Congress recognizes its obligation to guarantee equal protection of the law to all workers;

Whereas this obligation requires the Congress to safeguard workers from unequal treatment on the basis of real or perceived sex, gender, or nonconformity to norms or stereotypes thereof;

Whereas working families are working paycheck to paycheck and deserve a quality, affordable life, which can only be made possible by addressing the needs of the approximately 75,000,000 women in the workforce;

Whereas recent executive and administrative actions have caused disproportionate harm to women in the broader rollback of workplace rights, freedoms, and protections;

Whereas women comprise nearly half of the Nation's workforce, and are essential to the economic stability, growth, and prosperity of the United States, and make indispensable contributions across every sector of the economy, serving as leaders in education, health care, public service, caregiving, and other vital industries;

Whereas persistent wage disparities, loopholes in section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (commonly known as the "Equal Pay Act of 1963") (29 U.S.C. 206(d)), occupational segregation, workplace discrimination, and gender-based violence and harassment continue to disproportionately burden working women, particularly women of color;

Whereas recent progress toward pay parity and gender equity has been undermined by deliberate, coordinated opposition, including legislative, administrative, and judicial actions weakening civil rights enforcement, removing workplace protections, limiting access to essential health care, and destabilizing programs that support working families;

Whereas the administration has specifically targeted for elimination such Federal programs which advance gender equity in the Nation and abroad;

Whereas actions of the President have threatened to eliminate the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, which was established by Congress in 1920 and is the only Federal agency tasked with advancing economic opportunity for working women and

which, for more than 100 years, has concretely worked to improve the wages and working conditions for women across the Nation;

Whereas the targeted elimination of equal opportunity obligations under apprenticeship programs of the Department of Labor has undermined women's pathways to high-paid careers in the trades traditionally dominated by men;

Whereas the rescission of the "Enforcement Guidance on Harassment in the Workplace" of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has created intentional confusion and left women vulnerable to harassment in the workplace;

Whereas reductions in staffing, funding, and enforcement capacity at Federal agencies charged with protecting workers' rights and enforcing civil rights laws have weakened oversight of workplace discrimination, harassment, wage theft, and retaliation;

Whereas women are disproportionately represented in public sector employment, and cuts to public programs and services disproportionately threaten women's employment, wages, and retirement security;

Whereas the administration has undertaken reckless mass layoffs which gutted Federal agencies with majority-women workforces, including the Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Education, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of the Treasury, and Department of Housing and Urban Development;

Whereas not only are women of color and immigrant women overrepresented in care work, but the critical caregiving services women provide are often otherwise taken on as unpaid labor by women;

Whereas the lack of Federal actions to create a robust, well-paid care industry harms women's economic opportunity and directly exploits some of the most vulnerable women;

Whereas the administration has unjustly sought to push Federal contractors, grant recipients, and even private employers to abandon efforts to promote gender and racial equity at work;

Whereas the administration has sought to erode workers' ability to form unions and collectively bargain for their rights, who organized as such have won a narrower gender pay gap;

Whereas, consequently—

(1) data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate volatility in women's labor force participation in 2025, with more than 455,000 women exiting the workforce in the United States and the steepest declines among mothers of young children, especially Black mothers;

(2) unemployment among women, especially Black women, has increased under the Administration, with Black women's unemployment greater than 7 percent; and

(3) the wage gap between women and men has increased for 2 consecutive years, highlighting the compounded effects of the policy failures described herein;

Whereas women continue to face barriers to economic advancement, and disproportionate caregiving responsibilities, all of which are exacerbated by the cost of living crisis and rising costs of housing, health care, childcare, food, and education; and

Whereas Congress, the first branch of the United States Government, has a duty to act decisively to advance the rights and freedoms of working women in face of these barriers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes an affirmative duty to ensure women have equal opportunity within the workforce, as a prerequisite for economic security, democratic participation, shared

prosperity, and full participation in public life;

(2) recognizes that the workforce of the Nation is stronger, more innovative, and more competitive when women are able to contribute and lead across all industries;

(3) affirms its commitment to economic prosperity for all, including—

(A) equal pay for equal work;

(B) pay transparency;

(C) workplaces free from discrimination;

(D) workplace safety standards and regulations designed to protect the health of the Nation's workers;

(E) comprehensive and accessible health care, including reproductive health care;

(F) affordable, high-quality childcare and early education;

(G) paid family and medical leave;

(H) paid sick days;

(I) predictable scheduling and fair labor standards; and

(J) access to affordable housing, education, and workforce development opportunities;

(4) affirms its commitment to ensuring that all women, regardless of race, immigration status, language, or occupation, are able to work with dignity, free from violence, harassment, discrimination, retaliation, and abuse;

(5) recognizes the value of all work, especially domestic and part-time work, and recognizes its obligation to ensure that such work is dignified with fair pay, benefits, protections, and working conditions;

(6) condemns actions and policies that weaken civil rights enforcement, undermine workplace protections, reduce access to health care and essential services, or otherwise threaten the economic security of working women;

(7) commits itself to restoring and strengthening Federal agencies that combat discrimination in the workplace, including the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs;

(8) reaffirms its commitment to ensuring all people can live a life with dignity by raising wages, including by raising the Federal minimum wage, and eliminating tipped and subminimum wages;

(9) reaffirms its commitment to expanding access to high-paying jobs across gender lines by strengthening programs that dismantle occupational segregation;

(10) recognizes the right of every worker to join a union, free from interference and intimidation, and bargain collectively for fair wages and working conditions;

(11) calls upon Federal, State, and local governments, employers, labor organizations, and community institutions to work collaboratively to ensure that all working women have the opportunity to thrive and be free from harassment and discrimination; and

(12) declares that addressing the immediate needs of working women is essential to the prosperity of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4779. Mr. WARNOCK (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.

SA 4780. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4732 proposed by Mr. HUSTED to the 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 4781. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4732 proposed by Mr. HUSTED to the 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 4782. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4732 proposed by Mr. HUSTED to the 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 4783. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1383, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4784. Mr. JUSTICE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 858, to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work on the National Mall to honor the extraordinary acts of valor, selfless service, and sacrifice displayed by Medal of Honor recipients.

SA 4785. Mr. THUNE (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 648, honoring the memory, service, and sacrifice of Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, United States Army Reserve.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4779. Mr. WARNOCK (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:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; STATEMENT OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Redistricting Reform Act of 2026”.

(b) **FINDING OF CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.**—Congress finds that it has the authority to establish the terms and conditions States must follow in carrying out congressional redistricting after an apportionment of Members of the House of Representatives because—

(1) the authority granted to Congress under article I, section 4 of the Constitution of the United States gives Congress the power to enact laws governing the time, place, and manner of elections for Members of the House of Representatives;

(2) the authority granted to Congress under section 5 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce section 2 of such amendment, which requires Representatives to be apportioned among the several States according to their number;

(3) the authority granted to Congress under section 5 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution gives Congress the power to enact laws to enforce section 1 of such amendment, including protections against excessive partisan gerrymandering that Federal courts have not enforced because they understand such enforcement to be committed to Congress by the Constitution;

(4) of the authority granted to Congress to enforce article IV, section 4, of the Constitution, and the guarantee of a Republican Form of Government to every State, which Federal courts have not enforced because they understand such enforcement to be committed to Congress by the Constitution; and

(5) requiring States to use uniform redistricting criteria is an appropriate and important exercise of such authority.

(c) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; statement of constitutional authority; table of contents.

TITLE I—REQUIREMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

Sec. 101. Requiring congressional redistricting to be conducted through plan of independent State commission.

Sec. 102. Ban on mid-decade redistricting.

Sec. 103. Criteria for redistricting.

TITLE II—INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS

Sec. 201. Independent redistricting commission.

Sec. 202. Establishment of selection pool of individuals eligible to serve as members of commission.

Sec. 203. Public notice and input.

Sec. 204. Establishment of related entities.

Sec. 205. Report on diversity of memberships of independent redistricting commissions.

TITLE III—ROLE OF COURTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF REDISTRICTING PLANS

Sec. 301. Failure by State to enact plan.

Sec. 302. Special rule for redistricting conducted under order of Federal court.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Payments to States for carrying out redistricting.

Sec. 402. Civil enforcement.

Sec. 403. State apportionment notice defined.

Sec. 404. No effect on elections for State and local office.

Sec. 405. Effective date.

TITLE I—REQUIREMENTS FOR CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

SEC. 101. REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING TO BE CONDUCTED THROUGH PLAN OF INDEPENDENT STATE COMMISSION.

(a) **USE OF PLAN REQUIRED.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and except as provided in subsection (c) and subsection (d), any congressional redistricting conducted by a State shall be conducted in accordance with—

(1) the redistricting plan developed and enacted into law by the independent redistricting commission established in the State, in accordance with title II; or

(2) if a plan developed by such commission is not enacted into law, the redistricting plan developed and enacted into law by a 3-judge court, in accordance with section 301.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 22(c) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for an apportionment of Representatives in Congress”, approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a(c)), is amended by striking “in the manner provided by the law thereof” and inserting: “in the manner provided by the Redistricting Reform Act of 2026”.

(c) **SPECIAL RULE FOR EXISTING COMMISSIONS.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to any State in which, under law in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act, congressional redistricting is carried out in accordance with a plan developed and approved by an independent redistricting commission which is in compliance with each of the following requirements:

(1) **PUBLICLY AVAILABLE APPLICATION PROCESS.**—Membership on the commission is open to citizens of the State through a publicly available application process.

(2) **DISQUALIFICATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE AND POLITICAL APPOINTMENT.**—Indi-

viduals who, for a covered period of time as established by the State, hold or have held public office, individuals who are or have been candidates for elected public office, and individuals who serve or have served as an officer, employee, or paid consultant of a campaign committee of a candidate for public office are disqualified from serving on the commission.

(3) **SCREENING FOR CONFLICTS.**—Individuals who apply to serve on the commission are screened through a process that excludes persons with conflicts of interest from the pool of potential commissioners.

(4) **MULTI-PARTISAN COMPOSITION.**—Membership on the commission represents those who are affiliated with the two political parties whose candidates received the most votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State, as well as those who are unaffiliated with any party or who are affiliated with political parties other than the two political parties whose candidates received the most votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(5) **CRITERIA FOR REDISTRICTING.**—Members of the commission are required to meet certain criteria in the map drawing process, including minimizing the division of communities of interest and a ban on drawing maps to favor a political party.

(6) **PUBLIC INPUT.**—Public hearings are held and comments from the public are accepted before a final map is approved.

(7) **BROAD-BASED SUPPORT FOR APPROVAL OF FINAL PLAN.**—The approval of the final redistricting plan requires a majority vote of the members of the commission, including the support of at least one member of each of the following:

(A) Members who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the most votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(B) Members who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the second most votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(C) Members who are not affiliated with any political party or who are affiliated with political parties other than the political parties described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

(d) **TREATMENT OF STATE OF IOWA.**—Subsection (a) does not apply to the State of Iowa, so long as congressional redistricting in such State is carried out in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, under law which was in effect for the most recent congressional redistricting carried out in the State prior to the date of the enactment of this Act and which remains in effect continuously on and after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 102. BAN ON MID-DECADE REDISTRICTING.

(a) **BAN.**—A State that has been redistricted in accordance with this Act and a State described in section 101(c) or section 101(d) may not be redistricted again until after the next apportionment of Representatives under section 22(a) of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for an apportionment of Representatives in Congress”, approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a), unless a court requires the State to conduct such subsequent redistricting to comply with the Constitution of the United States, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), the Constitution of the State, or the terms or conditions of this Act.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF REMEDIES FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.**—Section 402 applies with respect to a violation of subsection (a) in the

same manner as such section applies with respect to a violation of any other provision of this Act, and the remedies available pursuant to such section may be applied with respect to a violation of subsection (a).

SEC. 103. CRITERIA FOR REDISTRICTING.

(a) **REQUIRING PLANS TO MEET CRITERIA.**—A State may not use a congressional redistricting plan that is not in compliance with this section.

(b) **RANKED CRITERIA.**—Under the redistricting plan of a State, there shall be established single-member congressional districts using the following criteria as set forth in the following order of priority:

(1) Districts shall comply with the United States Constitution, including the requirement that they substantially equalize total population.

(2) Districts shall comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.), including by creating any districts where, if based upon the totality of the circumstances, 2 or more politically cohesive groups protected by such Act are able to elect representatives of choice in coalition with one another, and all applicable Federal laws.

(3)(A) Districts shall be drawn, to the extent that the totality of the circumstances warrant, to ensure the practical ability of a group protected under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) to participate in the political process and to nominate candidates and to elect representatives of choice is not diluted or diminished, regardless of whether or not such protected group constitutes a majority of a district's citizen voting age population.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the assessment of whether a protected group has the practical ability to nominate candidates and to elect representatives of choice shall require the consideration of the following factors:

(i) Whether the group is politically cohesive.

(ii) Whether there is racially polarized voting in the relevant geographic region.

(iii) If there is racially polarized voting in the relevant geographic region, whether the preferred candidates of the group nevertheless receive a sufficient amount of consistent crossover support from other voters such that the group is a functional majority with the ability to both nominate candidates and elect representatives of choice.

(4)(A) Districts shall be drawn to represent communities of interest and neighborhoods to the extent practicable after compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (3). A community of interest is defined as an area for which the record before the entity responsible for developing and adopting the redistricting plan demonstrates the existence of broadly shared interests and representational needs, including shared interests and representational needs rooted in common ethnic, racial, economic, Indian, social, cultural, geographic, or historic identities, or arising from similar socioeconomic conditions. The term communities of interest may, if the record warrants, include political subdivisions such as counties, municipalities, Indian lands, or school districts, but shall not include common relationships with political parties or political candidates.

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), in considering the needs of multiple, overlapping communities of interest, the entity responsible for developing and adopting the redistricting plan shall give greater weight to those communities of interest whose representational needs would most benefit from the community's inclusion in a single congressional district.

(c) **NO FAVORING OR DISFAVORING OF POLITICAL PARTIES.**—

(1) **PROHIBITION.**—A State may not use a redistricting plan to conduct an election that, when considered on a statewide basis, has been drawn with the intent or has the effect of materially favoring or disfavoring any political party.

(2) **DETERMINATION OF EFFECT.**—The determination of whether a redistricting plan has the effect of materially favoring or disfavoring a political party shall be based on an evaluation of the totality of circumstances which, at a minimum, shall involve consideration of each of the following factors:

(A) Computer modeling based on relevant statewide general elections for Federal office held over the 8 years preceding the adoption of the redistricting plan setting forth the probable electoral outcomes for the plan under a range of reasonably foreseeable conditions.

(B) An analysis of whether the redistricting plan is statistically likely to result in partisan advantage or disadvantage on a statewide basis, the degree of any such advantage or disadvantage, and whether such advantage or disadvantage is likely to be present under a range of reasonably foreseeable electoral conditions.

(C) A comparison of the modeled electoral outcomes for the redistricting plan to the modeled electoral outcomes for alternative plans that demonstrably comply with the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (b) in order to determine whether reasonable alternatives exist that would result in materially lower levels of partisan advantage or disadvantage on a statewide basis. For purposes of this subparagraph, alternative plans considered may include both actual plans proposed during the redistricting process and other plans prepared for purposes of comparison.

(D) Any other relevant information, including how broad support for the redistricting plan was among members of the entity responsible for developing and adopting the plan and whether the processes leading to the development and adoption of the plan were transparent and equally open to all members of the entity and to the public.

(3) **REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.**—

(A) **TRIGGER.**—In any civil action brought under section 402 in which a party asserts a claim that a State has enacted a redistricting plan which is in violation of this subsection, a party may file a motion not later than 30 days after the enactment of the plan (or, if later, not later than 30 days after the effective date of this Act) requesting that the court determine whether a presumption of such a violation exists. If such a motion is timely filed, the court shall hold a hearing not later than 15 days after the date the motion is filed to assess whether a presumption of such a violation exists.

(B) **ASSESSMENT.**—To conduct the assessment required under subparagraph (A), the court shall do the following:

(i) Determine the number of congressional districts under the plan that would have been carried by each political party's candidates for the office of President and the office of Senator in the 2 most recent general elections for the office of President and the 2 most recent general elections for the office of Senator (other than special general elections) immediately preceding the enactment of the plan, except that if a State conducts a primary election for the office of Senator which is open to candidates of all political parties, the primary election shall be used instead of the general election and the number of districts carried by a party's candidates for the office of Senator shall be determined on the basis of the combined vote share of all candidates in the election who are affiliated with such party.

(ii) Determine, for each of the 4 elections assessed under clause (i), whether the number of districts that would have been carried by any party's candidate as determined under clause (i) results in partisan advantage or disadvantage in excess of 7 percent or one congressional district, whichever is greater, as determined by standard quantitative measures of partisan fairness that relate a party's share of the statewide vote to that party's share of seats.

(C) **PRESUMPTION OF VIOLATION.**—A plan is presumed to violate paragraph (1) if it exceeds the threshold described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (B) with respect to 2 or more of the 4 elections assessed under such subparagraph.

(D) **STAY OF USE OF PLAN.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, in any action under this paragraph, the following rules shall apply:

(i) Upon filing of a motion under subparagraph (A), a State's use of the plan which is the subject of the motion shall be automatically stayed pending resolution of such motion.

(ii) If after considering the motion, the court rules that the plan is presumed under subparagraph (C) to violate paragraph (1), a State may not use such plan until and unless the court which is carrying out the determination of the effect of the plan under paragraph (2) determines that, notwithstanding the presumptive violation, the plan does not violate paragraph (1).

(E) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER ASSESSMENTS.**—The absence of a presumption of a violation with respect to a redistricting plan as determined under this paragraph shall not affect the determination of the effect of the plan under paragraph (2).

(4) **DETERMINATION OF INTENT.**—A court may rely on all available evidence when determining whether a redistricting plan was drawn with the intent to materially favor or disfavor a political party, including evidence of the partisan effects of a plan, the degree of support the plan received from members of the entity responsible for developing and adopting the plan, and whether the processes leading to development and adoption of the plan were transparent and equally open to all members of the entity and to the public.

(5) **NO VIOLATION BASED ON CERTAIN CRITERIA.**—No redistricting plan shall be found to be in violation of paragraph (1) because of the proper application of the criteria set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b), unless one or more alternative plans could have complied with such paragraphs without having the effect of materially favoring or disfavoring a political party.

(d) **FACTORS PROHIBITED FROM CONSIDERATION.**—In developing the redistricting plan for the State, the State may not take into consideration any of the following factors, except as necessary to comply with the criteria described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b), to achieve partisan fairness and comply with subsection (b), and to enable the redistricting plan to be measured against the external metrics described in section 203(d):

(1) The residence of any Member of the House of Representatives or candidate.

(2) The political party affiliation or voting history of the population of a district.

(e) **ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.**—A State may not rely upon criteria not set forth in this section to justify non-compliance with the requirements of this section.

(f) **APPLICABILITY.**—This section applies to any authority, whether appointed, elected, judicial, or otherwise, responsible for enacting the congressional redistricting plan of a State.

(g) **SEVERABILITY OF CRITERIA.**—If any of the criteria set forth in this section, or the

application of such criteria to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remaining criteria set forth in this section, and the application of such criteria to any person or circumstance, shall not be affected by the holding.

TITLE II—INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS

SEC. 201. INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 204(a) shall establish an independent redistricting commission for the State, which shall consist of 15 members appointed by the agency as follows:

(A) Not later than October 1 of a year ending in the numeral zero, the agency shall, at a public meeting held not earlier than 15 days after notice of the meeting has been given to the public, first appoint 6 members as follows:

(i) The agency shall appoint 2 members on a random basis from the majority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 202(b)(1)(A)).

(ii) The agency shall appoint 2 members on a random basis from the minority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 202(b)(1)(B)).

(iii) The agency shall appoint 2 members on a random basis from the independent category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 202(b)(1)(C)).

(B) Not later than November 15 of a year ending in the numeral zero, the members appointed by the agency under subparagraph (A) shall, at a public meeting held not earlier than 15 days after notice of the meeting has been given to the public, then appoint 9 members as follows:

(i) The members shall appoint 3 members from the majority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 202(b)(1)(A)).

(ii) The members shall appoint 3 members from the minority category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 202(b)(1)(B)).

(iii) The members shall appoint 3 members from the independent category of the approved selection pool (as described in section 202(b)(1)(C)).

(2) RULES FOR APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS APPOINTED BY FIRST MEMBERS.—

(A) AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF AT LEAST 4 MEMBERS.—The appointment of any of the 9 members of the independent redistricting commission who are appointed by the first members of the commission pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), as well as the designation of alternates for such members pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) and the appointment of alternates to fill vacancies pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), shall require the affirmative vote of at least 4 of the members appointed by the nonpartisan agency under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), including at least one member from each of the categories referred to in such subparagraph.

(B) ENSURING DIVERSITY.—In appointing the 9 members pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), as well as in designating alternates pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) and in appointing alternates to fill vacancies pursuant to subparagraph (B) of paragraph (4), the first members of the independent redistricting commission shall ensure that the membership is representative of the demographic groups (including racial, ethnic, economic, and gender) and geographic regions of the State, and provides racial, ethnic, and language minorities protected under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with a meaningful opportunity to participate

in the development of the State's redistricting plan.

(3) DESIGNATION OF ALTERNATES TO SERVE IN CASE OF VACANCIES.—

(A) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY AGENCY.—At the time the agency appoints the members of the independent redistricting commission under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) from each of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the agency shall, on a random basis, designate 2 other individuals from such category to serve as alternate members who may be appointed to fill vacancies in the commission in accordance with paragraph (4).

(B) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY FIRST MEMBERS.—At the time the members appointed by the agency appoint the other members of the independent redistricting commission under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) from each of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the members shall, in accordance with the special rules described in paragraph (2), designate 2 other individuals from such category to serve as alternate members who may be appointed to fill vacancies in the commission in accordance with paragraph (4).

(4) APPOINTMENT OF ALTERNATES TO SERVE IN CASE OF VACANCIES.—

(A) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY AGENCY.—If a vacancy occurs in the commission with respect to a member who was appointed by the nonpartisan agency under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) from one of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the agency shall fill the vacancy by appointing, on a random basis, one of the 2 alternates from such category who was designated under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3). At the time the agency appoints an alternate to fill a vacancy under the previous sentence, the agency shall designate, on a random basis, another individual from the same category to serve as an alternate member, in accordance with subparagraph (A) of paragraph (3).

(B) MEMBERS APPOINTED BY FIRST MEMBERS.—If a vacancy occurs in the commission with respect to a member who was appointed by the first members of the commission under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) from one of the categories referred to in such subparagraph, the first members shall, in accordance with the special rules described in paragraph (2), fill the vacancy by appointing one of the 2 alternates from such category who was designated under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3). At the time the first members appoint an alternate to fill a vacancy under the previous sentence, the first members shall, in accordance with the special rules described in paragraph (2), designate another individual from the same category to serve as an alternate member, in accordance with subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3).

(5) REMOVAL.—A member of the independent redistricting commission may be removed by a majority vote of the remaining members of the commission if it is shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the member is not eligible to serve on the commission under section 202(a).

(b) PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING COMMISSION BUSINESS.—

(1) CHAIR.—Members of an independent redistricting commission established under this section shall select by majority vote one member who was appointed from the independent category of the approved selection pool described in section 202(b)(1)(C) to serve as chair of the commission. The commission may not take any action to develop a redistricting plan for the State under section 203 until the appointment of the commission's chair.

(2) REQUIRING MAJORITY APPROVAL FOR ACTIONS.—The independent redistricting commission of a State may not publish and dis-

seminate any draft or final redistricting plan, or take any other action, without the approval of at least—

(A) a majority of the whole membership of the commission; and

(B) at least one member of the commission appointed from each of the categories of the approved selection pool described in section 202(b)(1).

(3) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the commission shall constitute a quorum.

(c) STAFF; CONTRACTORS.—

(1) STAFF.—Under a public application process in which all application materials are available for public inspection, the independent redistricting commission of a State shall appoint and set the pay of technical experts, legal counsel, consultants, and such other staff as it considers appropriate, subject to State law.

(2) CONTRACTORS.—The independent redistricting commission of a State may enter into such contracts with vendors as it considers appropriate, subject to State law, except that any such contract shall be valid only if approved by the vote of a majority of the members of the commission, including at least one member appointed from each of the categories of the approved selection pool described in section 202(b)(1).

(3) REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY.—

(A) REPORT BY APPLICANTS.—Each individual who applies for a position as an employee of the independent redistricting commission and each vendor who applies for a contract with the commission shall, at the time of applying, file with the commission a report summarizing—

(i) any expenditure for political activity made by such individual or vendor during the 10 most recent calendar years; and

(ii) any income received by such individual or vendor during the 10 most recent calendar years which is attributable to an expenditure for political activity.

(B) ANNUAL REPORTS BY EMPLOYEES AND VENDORS.—Each person who is an employee or vendor of the independent redistricting commission shall, not later than 1 year after the person is appointed as an employee or enters into a contract as a vendor (as the case may be) and annually thereafter for each year during which the person serves as an employee or a vendor, file with the commission a report summarizing the expenditures and income described in subparagraph (A) during the 10 most recent calendar years.

(C) EXPENDITURE FOR POLITICAL ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this paragraph, the term "expenditure for political activity" means a disbursement for any of the following:

(i) An independent expenditure, as defined in section 301(17) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(17)).

(ii) An electioneering communication, as defined in section 304(f)(3) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30104(f)(3)) or any other public communication, as defined in section 301(22) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 30101(22)) that would be an electioneering communication if it were a broadcast, cable, or satellite communication.

(iii) Any dues or other payments to trade associations or organizations described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code that are, or could reasonably be anticipated to be, used or transferred to another association or organization for a use described in paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of section 501(c) of such Code.

(4) GOAL OF IMPARTIALITY.—The commission shall take such steps as it considers appropriate to ensure that any staff appointed under this subsection, and any vendor with whom the commission enters into a contract

under this subsection, will work in an impartial manner, and may require any person who applies for an appointment to a staff position or for a vendor's contract with the commission to provide information on the person's history of political activity beyond the information on the person's expenditures for political activity provided in the reports required under paragraph (3) (including donations to candidates, political committees, and political parties) as a condition of the appointment or the contract.

(5) **DISQUALIFICATION; WAIVER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The independent redistricting commission may not appoint an individual as an employee, and may not enter into a contract with a vendor, if the individual or vendor meets any of the criteria for the disqualification of an individual from serving as a member of the commission which are set forth in section 202(a)(2).

(B) **WAIVER.**—The commission may by unanimous vote of its members waive the application of subparagraph (A) to an individual or a vendor after receiving and reviewing the report filed by the individual or vendor under paragraph (3).

(d) **TERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The independent redistricting commission of a State shall terminate on the earlier of—

(A) June 14 of the next year ending in the numeral zero; or

(B) the day on which the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 204(a) has, in accordance with section 202(b)(1), submitted a selection pool to the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State established under section 204(b).

(2) **PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.**—The State shall ensure that the records of the independent redistricting commission are retained in the appropriate State archive in such manner as may be necessary to enable the State to respond to any civil action brought with respect to congressional redistricting in the State.

SEC. 202. ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECTION POOL OF INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE TO SERVE AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) **CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An individual is eligible to serve as a member of an independent redistricting commission if the individual meets each of the following criteria:

(A) As of the date of appointment, the individual is registered to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State.

(B) During the 3-year period ending on the date of the individual's appointment, the individual has been continuously registered to vote with the same political party, or has not been registered to vote with any political party.

(C) The individual submits to the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 204, at such time and in such form as the agency may require, an application for inclusion in the selection pool under this section, and includes with the application a written statement, with an attestation under penalty of perjury, containing the following information and assurances:

(i) The full current name and any former names of, and the contact information for, the individual, including an electronic mail address, the address of the individual's residence, mailing address, and telephone numbers.

(ii) The individual's race, ethnicity, gender, age, date of birth, and household income for the most recent taxable year.

(iii) The political party with which the individual is affiliated, if any.

(iv) The reason or reasons the individual desires to serve on the independent redistricting commission, the individual's qualifications, and information relevant to the ability of the individual to be fair and impartial, including, but not limited to—

(I) any involvement with, or financial support of, professional, social, political, religious, or community organizations or causes; and

(II) the individual's employment and educational history.

(v) An assurance that the individual shall commit to carrying out the individual's duties under this Act in an honest, independent, and impartial fashion, and to upholding public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process.

(vi) An assurance that, during the covered periods described in paragraph (3), the individual has not taken and will not take any action which would disqualify the individual from serving as a member of the commission under paragraph (2).

(2) **DISQUALIFICATIONS.**—An individual is not eligible to serve as a member of the commission if any of the following applies during any of the covered periods described in paragraph (3):

(A) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual holds public office or is a candidate for election for public office.

(B) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual serves as an officer of a political party or as an officer, employee, or paid consultant of a campaign committee of a candidate for public office or of any political action committee (as determined in accordance with the law of the State).

(C) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual holds a position as a registered lobbyist under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) or an equivalent State or local law.

(D) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual is an employee of an elected public official, a contractor with the government of the State, or a donor to the campaign of any candidate for public office or to any political action committee (other than a donor who, during any of such covered periods, gives an aggregate amount of \$1,000 or less to the campaigns of all candidates for all public offices and to all political action committees).

(E) The individual paid a civil money penalty or criminal fine, or was sentenced to a term of imprisonment, for violating any provision of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101 et seq.).

(F) The individual or (in the case of the covered periods described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (3)) an immediate family member of the individual is an agent of a foreign principal under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.).

(3) **COVERED PERIODS DESCRIBED.**—In this subsection, the term "covered period" means, with respect to the appointment of an individual to the commission, any of the following:

(A) The 10-year period ending on the date of the individual's appointment.

(B) The period beginning on the date of the individual's appointment and ending on August 14 of the next year ending in the numeral one.

(C) The 10-year period beginning on the day after the last day of the period described in subparagraph (B).

(4) **IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term "immediate family member" means, with respect to an individual, a father, stepfather, mother, stepmother, son, stepson, daughter, stepdaughter, brother, stepbrother, sister, stepsister, husband, wife, father-in-law, or mother-in-law.

(b) **DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION OF SELECTION POOL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than June 15 of each year ending in the numeral zero, the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 204(a) shall develop and submit to the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State established under section 204(b) a selection pool of 36 individuals who are eligible to serve as members of the independent redistricting commission of the State under this Act, consisting of individuals in the following categories:

(A) A majority category, consisting of 12 individuals who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the most votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(B) A minority category, consisting of 12 individuals who are affiliated with the political party whose candidate received the second most votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(C) An independent category, consisting of 12 individuals who are not affiliated with either of the political parties described in subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B).

(2) **FACTORS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DEVELOPING POOL.**—In selecting individuals for the selection pool under this subsection, the nonpartisan agency shall—

(A) ensure that the pool is representative of the demographic groups (including racial, ethnic, economic, and gender) and geographic regions of the State, and includes applicants who would allow racial, ethnic, and language minorities protected under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 a meaningful opportunity to participate in the development of the State's redistricting plan; and

(B) take into consideration the analytical skills of the individuals selected in relevant fields (including mapping, data management, law, community outreach, demography, and the geography of the State) and their ability to work on an impartial basis.

(3) **INTERVIEWS OF APPLICANTS.**—To assist the nonpartisan agency in developing the selection pool under this subsection, the nonpartisan agency shall conduct interviews of applicants under oath. If an individual is included in a selection pool developed under this section, all of the interviews of the individual shall be transcribed and the transcriptions made available on the nonpartisan agency's website contemporaneously with release of the report under paragraph (6).

(4) **DETERMINATION OF POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION OF INDIVIDUALS IN SELECTION POOL.**—For purposes of this section, an individual shall be considered to be affiliated with a political party only if the nonpartisan agency is able to verify (to the greatest extent possible) the information the individual provides in the application submitted under subsection (a)(1)(C), including by considering additional information provided by other persons with knowledge of the individual's history of political activity.

(5) **ENCOURAGING RESIDENTS TO APPLY FOR INCLUSION IN POOL.**—The nonpartisan agency shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that residents of the State across various geographic regions and demographic groups are aware of the opportunity to serve

on the independent redistricting commission, including publicizing the role of the panel and using newspapers, broadcast media, and online sources, including ethnic media, to encourage individuals to apply for inclusion in the selection pool developed under this subsection.

(6) **REPORT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECTION POOL.**—At the time the nonpartisan agency submits the selection pool to the Select Committee on Redistricting under paragraph (1), it shall publish and post on the agency's public website a report describing the process by which the pool was developed, and shall include in the report a description of how the individuals in the pool meet the eligibility criteria of subsection (a) and of how the pool reflects the factors the agency is required to take into consideration under paragraph (2).

(7) **PUBLIC COMMENT ON SELECTION POOL.**—During the 14-day period which begins on the date the nonpartisan agency publishes the report under paragraph (6), the agency shall accept comments from the public on the individuals included in the selection pool. The agency shall post all such comments contemporaneously on the nonpartisan agency's website and shall transmit them to the Select Committee on Redistricting immediately upon the expiration of such period.

(8) **ACTION BY SELECT COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not earlier than 15 days and not later than 21 days after receiving the selection pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the Select Committee on Redistricting shall, by majority vote—

(i) approve the pool as submitted by the nonpartisan agency, in which case the pool shall be considered the approved selection pool for purposes of section 201(a)(1); or

(ii) reject the pool, in which case the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit a replacement selection pool in accordance with subsection (c).

(B) **IN ACTION DEEMED REJECTION.**—If the Select Committee on Redistricting fails to approve or reject the pool within the deadline set forth in subparagraph (A), the Select Committee shall be deemed to have rejected the pool for purposes of such subparagraph.

(C) **DEVELOPMENT OF REPLACEMENT SELECTION POOL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Select Committee on Redistricting rejects the selection pool submitted by the nonpartisan agency under subsection (b), not later than 14 days after the rejection, the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit to the Select Committee a replacement selection pool, under the same terms and conditions that applied to the development and submission of the selection pool under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b). The replacement pool submitted under this paragraph may include individuals who were included in the rejected selection pool submitted under subsection (b), so long as at least one of the individuals in the replacement pool was not included in such rejected pool.

(2) **ACTION BY SELECT COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 21 days after receiving the replacement selection pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the Select Committee on Redistricting shall, by majority vote—

(i) approve the pool as submitted by the nonpartisan agency, in which case the pool shall be considered the approved selection pool for purposes of section 201(a)(1); or

(ii) reject the pool, in which case the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit a second replacement selection pool in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) **IN ACTION DEEMED REJECTION.**—If the Select Committee on Redistricting fails to approve or reject the pool within the deadline set forth in subparagraph (A), the Select

Committee shall be deemed to have rejected the pool for purposes of such subparagraph.

(D) **DEVELOPMENT OF SECOND REPLACEMENT SELECTION POOL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Select Committee on Redistricting rejects the replacement selection pool submitted by the nonpartisan agency under subsection (c), not later than 14 days after the rejection, the nonpartisan agency shall develop and submit to the Select Committee a second replacement selection pool, under the same terms and conditions that applied to the development and submission of the selection pool under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b). The second replacement selection pool submitted under this paragraph may include individuals who were included in the rejected selection pool submitted under subsection (b) or the rejected replacement selection pool submitted under subsection (c), so long as at least one of the individuals in the replacement pool was not included in either such rejected pool.

(2) **ACTION BY SELECT COMMITTEE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not earlier than 15 days and not later than 14 days after receiving the second replacement selection pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the Select Committee on Redistricting shall, by majority vote—

(i) approve the pool as submitted by the nonpartisan agency, in which case the pool shall be considered the approved selection pool for purposes of section 201(a)(1); or

(ii) reject the pool.

(B) **IN ACTION DEEMED REJECTION.**—If the Select Committee on Redistricting fails to approve or reject the pool within the deadline set forth in subparagraph (A), the Select Committee shall be deemed to have rejected the pool for purposes of such subparagraph.

(C) **EFFECT OF REJECTION.**—If the Select Committee on Redistricting rejects the second replacement pool from the nonpartisan agency under paragraph (1), the redistricting plan for the State shall be developed and enacted in accordance with title III.

SEC. 203. PUBLIC NOTICE AND INPUT.

(a) **PUBLIC NOTICE AND INPUT.**—

(1) **USE OF OPEN AND TRANSPARENT PROCESS.**—The independent redistricting commission of a State shall hold each of its meetings in public, shall solicit and take into consideration comments from the public, including proposed maps, throughout the process of developing the redistricting plan for the State, and shall carry out its duties in an open and transparent manner which provides for the widest public dissemination reasonably possible of its proposed and final redistricting plans.

(2) **WEBSITE.**—

(A) **FEATURES.**—The commission shall maintain a public internet site which is not affiliated with or maintained by the office of any elected official and which includes the following features:

(i) General information on the commission, its role in the redistricting process, and its members, including contact information.

(ii) An updated schedule of commission hearings and activities, including deadlines for the submission of comments.

(iii) All draft redistricting plans developed by the commission under subsection (b) and the final redistricting plan developed under subsection (c), including the accompanying written evaluation under subsection (d).

(iv) All comments received from the public on the commission's activities, including any proposed maps submitted under paragraph (1).

(v) Live streaming of commission hearings and an archive of previous meetings, including any documents considered at any such meeting, which the commission shall post

not later than 24 hours after the conclusion of the meeting.

(vi) Access in an easily useable format to the demographic and other data used by the commission to develop and analyze the proposed redistricting plans, together with access to any software used to draw maps of proposed districts and to any reports analyzing and evaluating any such maps.

(vii) A method by which members of the public may submit comments and proposed maps directly to the commission.

(viii) All records of the commission, including all communications to or from members, employees, and contractors regarding the work of the commission.

(ix) A list of all contractors receiving payment from the commission, together with the annual disclosures submitted by the contractors under section 201(c)(3).

(x) A list of the names of all individuals who submitted applications to serve on the commission, together with the applications submitted by individuals included in any selection pool, except that the commission may redact from such applications any financial or other personally sensitive information.

(B) **SEARCHABLE FORMAT.**—The commission shall ensure that all information posted and maintained on the site under this paragraph, including information and proposed maps submitted by the public, shall be maintained in an easily searchable format.

(C) **DEADLINE.**—The commission shall ensure that the public internet site under this paragraph is operational (in at least a preliminary format) not later than January 1 of the year ending in the numeral one.

(3) **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.**—The commission shall solicit, accept, and consider comments from the public with respect to its duties, activities, and procedures at any time during the period—

(A) which begins on January 1 of the year ending in the numeral one; and

(B) which ends 7 days before the date of the meeting at which the commission shall vote on approving the final redistricting plan for enactment into law under subsection (c)(2).

(4) **MEETINGS AND HEARINGS IN VARIOUS GEOGRAPHIC LOCATIONS.**—To the greatest extent practicable, the commission shall hold its meetings and hearings in various geographic regions and locations throughout the State.

(5) **MULTIPLE LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL NOTICES.**—The commission shall make each notice which is required to be posted and published under this section available in any language in which the State (or any jurisdiction in the State) is required to provide election materials under section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10503).

(b) **DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLICATION OF PRELIMINARY REDISTRICTING PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Prior to developing and publishing a final redistricting plan under subsection (c), the independent redistricting commission of a State shall develop and publish a preliminary redistricting plan.

(2) **MINIMUM PUBLIC HEARINGS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT PRIOR TO DEVELOPMENT.**—

(A) **3 HEARINGS REQUIRED.**—Prior to developing a preliminary redistricting plan under this subsection, the commission shall hold not fewer than 3 public hearings at which members of the public may provide input and comments regarding the potential contents of redistricting plans for the State and the process by which the commission will develop the preliminary plan under this subsection.

(B) **MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTICE PRIOR TO HEARINGS.**—Not fewer than 14 days prior to the date of each hearing held under this paragraph, the commission shall post notices of the hearing on the website maintained

under subsection (a)(2), and shall provide for the publication of such notices in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State. Each such notice shall specify the date, time, and location of the hearing.

(C) SUBMISSION OF PLANS AND MAPS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.—Any member of the public may submit maps or portions of maps for consideration by the commission. As provided under subsection (a)(2)(A), any such map shall be made publicly available on the commission's website and open to comment.

(3) PUBLICATION OF PRELIMINARY PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The commission shall post the preliminary redistricting plan developed under this subsection, together with a report that includes the commission's responses to any public comments received under subsection (a)(3), on the website maintained under subsection (a)(2), and shall provide for the publication of each such plan in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State.

(B) MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTICE PRIOR TO PUBLICATION.—Not fewer than 14 days prior to the date on which the commission posts and publishes the preliminary plan under this paragraph, the commission shall notify the public through the website maintained under subsection (a)(2), as well as through publication of notice in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State, of the pending publication of the plan.

(4) MINIMUM POST-PUBLICATION PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT.—The commission shall accept and consider comments from the public (including through the website maintained under subsection (a)(2)) with respect to the preliminary redistricting plan published under paragraph (3), including proposed revisions to maps, for not fewer than 30 days after the date on which the plan is published.

(5) POST-PUBLICATION HEARINGS.—

(A) 3 HEARINGS REQUIRED.—After posting and publishing the preliminary redistricting plan under paragraph (3), the commission shall hold not fewer than 3 public hearings in different geographic areas of the State at which members of the public may provide input and comments regarding the preliminary plan.

(B) MINIMUM PERIOD FOR NOTICE PRIOR TO HEARINGS.—Not fewer than 14 days prior to the date of each hearing held under this paragraph, the commission shall post notices of the hearing on the website maintained under subsection (a)(2), and shall provide for the publication of such notices in newspapers of general circulation throughout the State. Each such notice shall specify the date, time, and location of the hearing.

(6) PERMITTING MULTIPLE PRELIMINARY PLANS.—At the option of the commission, after developing and publishing the preliminary redistricting plan under this subsection, the commission may develop and publish subsequent preliminary redistricting plans, so long as the process for the development and publication of each such subsequent plan meets the requirements set forth in this subsection for the development and publication of the first preliminary redistricting plan.

(c) PROCESS FOR ENACTMENT OF FINAL REDISTRICTING PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After taking into consideration comments from the public on any preliminary redistricting plan developed and published under subsection (b), the independent redistricting commission of a State shall develop and publish a final redistricting plan for the State.

(2) MEETING; FINAL VOTE.—Not later than the deadline specified in subsection (e), the commission shall hold a public hearing at which the members of the commission shall vote on approving the final plan for enactment into law.

(3) PUBLICATION OF PLAN AND ACCOMPANYING MATERIALS.—Not fewer than 14 days before the date of the meeting under paragraph (2), the commission shall provide the following information to the public through the website maintained under subsection (a)(2), as well as through newspapers of general circulation throughout the State:

(A) The final redistricting plan, including all relevant maps.

(B) A report by the commission to accompany the plan which provides the background for the plan and the commission's reasons for selecting the plan as the final redistricting plan, including responses to the public comments received on any preliminary redistricting plan developed and published under subsection (b).

(C) Any dissenting or additional views with respect to the plan of individual members of the commission.

(4) ENACTMENT.—Subject to paragraph (5), the final redistricting plan developed and published under this subsection shall be deemed to be enacted into law upon the expiration of the 45-day period which begins on the date on which—

(A) such final plan is approved by a majority of the whole membership of the commission; and

(B) at least one member of the commission appointed from each of the categories of the approved selection pool described in section 202(b)(1) approves such final plan.

(5) REVIEW BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—

(A) REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF PLAN FOR REVIEW.—The final redistricting plan shall not be deemed to be enacted into law unless the State submits the plan to the Department of Justice for an administrative review to determine if the plan is in compliance with the criteria described in subsections (b) and (c) of section 103.

(B) TERMINATION OF REVIEW.—The Department of Justice shall terminate any administrative review under subparagraph (A) if, during the 45-day period which begins on the date the plan is enacted into law, an action is filed in a United States district court alleging that the plan is not in compliance with the criteria described in subsections (b) and (c) of section 103.

(d) WRITTEN EVALUATION OF PLAN AGAINST EXTERNAL METRICS.—The independent redistricting commission shall include with each redistricting plan developed and published under this section a written evaluation that measures each such plan against external metrics which cover the criteria set forth in section 103(a), including the impact of the plan on the ability of communities of color to elect candidates of choice, measures of partisan fairness using multiple accepted methodologies, and the degree to which the plan preserves or divides communities of interest.

(e) TIMING.—The independent redistricting commission of a State may begin its work on the redistricting plan of the State upon receipt of relevant population information from the Bureau of the Census, and shall approve a final redistricting plan for the State in each year ending in the numeral one not later than 8 months after the date on which the State receives the State apportionment notice or October 1, whichever occurs later.

SEC. 204. ESTABLISHMENT OF RELATED ENTITIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OR DESIGNATION OF NONPARTISAN AGENCY OF STATE LEGISLATURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall establish a nonpartisan agency in the legislative branch of the State government to appoint the members of the independent redistricting commission for the State in accordance with section 201.

(2) NONPARTISANSHIP DESCRIBED.—For purposes of this subsection, an agency shall be considered to be nonpartisan if under law the agency—

(A) is required to provide services on a nonpartisan basis;

(B) is required to maintain impartiality; and

(C) is prohibited from advocating for the adoption or rejection of any legislative proposal.

(3) TRAINING OF MEMBERS APPOINTED TO COMMISSION.—Not later than January 15 of a year ending in the numeral one, the nonpartisan agency established or designated under this subsection shall provide the members of the independent redistricting commission with initial training on their obligations as members of the commission, including obligations under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.) and other applicable laws.

(4) REGULATIONS.—The nonpartisan agency established or designated under this subsection shall adopt and publish regulations, after notice and opportunity for comment, establishing the procedures that the agency will follow in fulfilling its duties under this Act, including the procedures to be used in vetting the qualifications and political affiliation of applicants and in creating the selection pools, the randomized process to be used in selecting the initial members of the independent redistricting commission, and the rules that the agency will apply to ensure that the agency carries out its duties under this Act in a maximally transparent, publicly accessible, and impartial manner.

(5) DESIGNATION OF EXISTING AGENCY.—At its option, a State may designate an existing agency in the legislative branch of its government to appoint the members of the independent redistricting commission plan for the State under this Act, so long as the agency meets the requirements for nonpartisanship under this subsection.

(6) TERMINATION OF AGENCY SPECIFICALLY ESTABLISHED FOR REDISTRICTING.—If a State does not designate an existing agency under paragraph (5) but instead establishes a new agency to serve as the nonpartisan agency under this section, the new agency shall terminate upon the enactment into law of the redistricting plan for the State.

(7) PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.—The State shall ensure that the records of the nonpartisan agency are retained in the appropriate State archive in such manner as may be necessary to enable the State to respond to any civil action brought with respect to congressional redistricting in the State.

(8) DEADLINE.—The State shall meet the requirements of this subsection not later than each October 15 of a year ending in the numeral nine.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDISTRICTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall appoint a Select Committee on Redistricting to approve or disapprove a selection pool developed by the independent redistricting commission for the State under section 202.

(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Select Committee on Redistricting for a State under this subsection shall consist of the following members:

(A) One member of the upper house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the greatest number of seats in the upper house.

(B) One member of the upper house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the second greatest number of seats in the upper house.

(C) One member of the lower house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the greatest number of seats in the lower house.

(D) One member of the lower house of the State legislature, who shall be appointed by the leader of the party with the second greatest number of seats in the lower house.

(3) **SPECIAL RULE FOR STATES WITH UNICAMERAL LEGISLATURE.**—In the case of a State with a unicameral legislature, the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State under this subsection shall consist of the following members:

(A) Two members of the State legislature appointed by the chair of the political party of the State whose candidate received the highest percentage of votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(B) Two members of the State legislature appointed by the chair of the political party whose candidate received the second highest percentage of votes in the most recent statewide election for Federal office held in the State.

(4) **DEADLINE.**—The State shall meet the requirements of this subsection not later than each January 15 of a year ending in the numeral zero.

(5) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to prohibit the leader of any political party in a legislature from appointment to the Select Committee on Redistricting.

SEC. 205. REPORT ON DIVERSITY OF MEMBERSHIPS OF INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS.

Not later than May 15 of a year ending in the numeral one, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the extent to which the memberships of independent redistricting commissions for States established under this title with respect to the immediately preceding year ending in the numeral zero meet the diversity requirements as provided for in sections 201(a)(2)(B) and 202(b)(2).

TITLE III—ROLE OF COURTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF REDISTRICTING PLANS

SEC. 301. FAILURE BY STATE TO ENACT PLAN.

(a) **DEADLINE FOR ENACTMENT OF PLAN.**—Each State shall enact a final congressional redistricting plan following transmission of a notice of apportionment to the President by the earliest of—

- (1) the deadline set forth in State law;
- (2) February 15 of the year in which regularly scheduled general elections for Federal office are held in the State; or
- (3) 90 days before the date of the next regularly scheduled primary election for Federal office held in the State.

(b) **DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN BY COURT IN CASE OF MISSED DEADLINE.**—If a State has not enacted a final congressional redistricting plan by the applicable deadline under subsection (a), or it appears likely that a State will fail to enact a final congressional redistricting plan by such deadline—

(1) any citizen of the State may file an action in the United States district court for the applicable venue asking the district court to assume jurisdiction;

(2) the United States district court for the applicable venue, acting through a 3-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code, shall have the exclusive authority to develop and publish the congressional redistricting plan for the State; and

(3) the final congressional redistricting plan developed and published by the court under this section shall be deemed to be enacted on the date on which the court publishes the final congressional redistricting plan, as described in subsection (e).

(c) **APPLICABLE VENUE.**—For purposes of this section, the “applicable venue” with respect to a State is the District of Columbia

or the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located, as selected by the first party to file with the court sufficient evidence that a State has failed to, or is reasonably likely to fail to, enact a final redistricting plan for the State prior to the expiration of the applicable deadline set forth in subsection (a).

(d) **PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.**—

(1) **CRITERIA.**—In developing a redistricting plan for a State under this section, the court shall adhere to the same terms and conditions that applied (or that would have applied, as the case may be) to the development of a plan by the State under section 103.

(2) **ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND RECORDS.**—The court shall have access to any information, data, software, or other records and material that was used (or that would have been used, as the case may be) by the State in carrying out its duties under this title.

(3) **HEARING; PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—In developing a redistricting plan for a State, the court shall—

(A) hold one or more evidentiary hearings at which interested members of the public may appear and be heard and present testimony, including expert testimony, in accordance with the rules of the court; and

(B) consider other submissions and comments by the public, including proposals for redistricting plans to cover the entire State or any portion of the State.

(4) **USE OF SPECIAL MASTER.**—To assist in the development and publication of a redistricting plan for a State under this section, the court may appoint a special master to make recommendations to the court on possible plans for the State.

(e) **PUBLICATION OF PLAN.**—

(1) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF INITIAL PLAN.**—Upon completing the development of one or more initial redistricting plans, the court shall make the plans available to the public at no cost, and shall also make available the underlying data used to develop the plans and a written evaluation of the plans against external metrics (as described in section 203(d)).

(2) **PUBLICATION OF FINAL PLAN.**—At any time after the expiration of the 14-day period which begins on the date the court makes the plans available to the public under paragraph (1), and taking into consideration any submissions and comments by the public which are received during such period, the court shall develop and publish the final redistricting plan for the State.

(f) **USE OF INTERIM PLAN.**—In the event that the court is not able to develop and publish a final redistricting plan for the State with sufficient time for an upcoming election to proceed, the court may develop and publish an interim redistricting plan which shall serve as the redistricting plan for the State until the court develops and publishes a final plan in accordance with this section. Nothing in this subsection may be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority or discretion of the court to develop and publish the final redistricting plan, including the discretion to make any changes the court deems necessary to an interim redistricting plan.

(g) **APPEALS.**—Review on appeal of any final or interim plan adopted by the court in accordance with this section shall be governed by the appellate process in section 402.

(h) **STAY OF STATE PROCEEDINGS.**—The filing of an action under this section shall act as a stay of any proceedings in State court with respect to the State’s congressional redistricting plan unless otherwise ordered by the court.

SEC. 302. SPECIAL RULE FOR REDISTRICTING CONDUCTED UNDER ORDER OF FEDERAL COURT.

If a Federal court requires a State to conduct redistricting subsequent to an apportionment of Representatives in the State in order to comply with the Constitution or to enforce the Voting Rights Act of 1965, section 203 shall apply with respect to the redistricting, except that the court may revise any of the deadlines set forth in such section if the court determines that a revision is appropriate in order to provide for a timely enactment of a new redistricting plan for the State.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATIVE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CARRYING OUT REDISTRICTING.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENTS.**—Subject to subsection (d), not later than 30 days after a State receives a State apportionment notice, the Election Assistance Commission shall, subject to the availability of appropriations provided pursuant to subsection (e), make a payment to the State in an amount equal to the product of—

(1) the number of Representatives to which the State is entitled, as provided under the notice; and

(2) \$150,000.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—A State shall use the payment made under this section to establish and operate the State’s independent redistricting commission, to implement the State redistricting plan, and to otherwise carry out congressional redistricting in the State.

(c) **NO PAYMENT TO STATES WITH SINGLE MEMBER.**—The Election Assistance Commission shall not make a payment under this section to any State which is not entitled to more than one Representative under its State apportionment notice.

(d) **REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF SELECTION POOL AS CONDITION OF PAYMENT.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and paragraph (3), the Election Assistance Commission may not make a payment to a State under this section until the State certifies to the Commission that the nonpartisan agency established or designated by a State under section 204(a) has, in accordance with section 202(b)(1), submitted a selection pool to the Select Committee on Redistricting for the State established under section 204(b).

(2) **EXCEPTION FOR STATES WITH EXISTING COMMISSIONS.**—In the case of a State which, pursuant to section 101(c), is exempt from the requirements of section 101(a), the Commission may not make a payment to the State under this section until the State certifies to the Commission that its redistricting commission meets the requirements of section 101(c).

(3) **EXCEPTION FOR STATE OF IOWA.**—In the case of the State of Iowa, the Commission may not make a payment to the State under this section until the State certifies to the Commission that it will carry out congressional redistricting pursuant to the State’s apportionment notice in accordance with a plan developed by the Iowa Legislative Services Agency with the assistance of a Temporary Redistricting Advisory Commission, as provided under the law described in section 101(d).

(e) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for payments under this section.

SEC. 402. CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **CIVIL ENFORCEMENT.**—

(1) **ACTIONS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—The Attorney General may bring a civil action for such relief as may be appropriate to carry out this Act.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any citizen of a State who is aggrieved by the failure of the State to meet the requirements of the Constitution or Federal law, including this Act, with respect to the State's congressional redistricting, may bring a civil action in the United States district court for the applicable venue for such relief as may be appropriate to remedy the failure.

(3) DELIVERY OF COMPLAINT TO HOUSE AND SENATE.—In any action brought under this section, a copy of the complaint shall be delivered promptly to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate.

(4) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION AND APPLICABLE VENUE.—The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction to hear and determine claims asserting that a congressional redistricting plan violates the requirements of the Constitution or Federal law, including this Act. The applicable venue for such an action shall be the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or for the judicial district in which the capital of the State is located, as selected by the person bringing the action, except that the applicable venue for a civil action that includes a claim that a redistricting plan is in violation of section 103(c) shall be the District of Columbia.

(5) USE OF 3-JUDGE COURT.—If an action under this section raises statewide claims under the Constitution or this Act, the action shall be heard by a 3-judge court convened pursuant to section 2284 of title 28, United States Code.

(6) REVIEW OF FINAL DECISION.—A final decision in an action brought under this section shall be reviewable on appeal by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. There shall be no right of appeal in such proceedings to any other court of appeals. Such appeal shall be taken by the filing of a notice of appeal within 10 days of the entry of the final decision. A final decision by the Court of Appeals may be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States by writ of certiorari.

(b) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—In any action brought under this section, it shall be the duty of the district court, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and the Supreme Court of the United States (if it chooses to hear the action) to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of the action and appeal.

(c) REMEDIES.—

(1) ADOPTION OF REPLACEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the district court in an action under this section finds that the congressional redistricting plan of a State violates, in whole or in part, the requirements of this Act—

(i) the court shall adopt a replacement congressional redistricting plan for the State in accordance with the process set forth in section 301; or

(ii) if circumstances warrant and no delay to an upcoming regularly scheduled election for the House of Representatives in the State would result, the district court, in its discretion, may allow a State to develop and propose a remedial congressional redistricting plan for review by the court to determine whether the plan is in compliance with this Act, except that—

(I) the State may not develop and propose a remedial plan under this clause if the court determines that the congressional redistricting plan of the State was enacted with discriminatory intent in violation of the Constitution or section 103(b); and

(II) nothing in this clause may be construed to permit a State to use such a reme-

dial plan which has not been approved by the court.

(B) PROHIBITING USE OF PLANS IN VIOLATION OF REQUIREMENTS.—No court shall order a State to use a congressional redistricting plan which violates, in whole or in part, the requirements of this Act, or to conduct an election under terms and conditions which violate, in whole or in part, the requirements of this Act.

(C) SPECIAL RULE IN CASE FINAL ADJUDICATION NOT EXPECTED WITHIN 3 MONTHS OF ELECTION.—If final adjudication of an action under this section is not reasonably expected to be completed at least 3 months prior to the next regularly scheduled primary election for the House of Representatives in the State, the district court shall, as the balance of equities warrant—

(i) develop, adopt, and order the use of an interim congressional redistricting plan in accordance with section 301(f) to address any claims under this Act for which a party seeking relief has demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success; and

(ii) order adjustments to the timing of primary elections for the House of Representatives and other related deadlines, as needed, to allow sufficient opportunity for adjudication of the matter and adoption of a remedial or replacement plan for use in the next regularly scheduled general elections for the House of Representatives.

(2) NO STAY PENDING APPEAL.—Notwithstanding the appeal of an order finding that a congressional redistricting plan of a State violates, in whole or in part, the requirements of this Act, no stay shall issue which shall bar the development or adoption of a replacement or remedial plan under this subsection, as may be directed by the district court, pending such appeal. If such a replacement or remedial plan has been adopted, no appellate court may stay or otherwise enjoin the use of such plan during the pendency of an appeal, except upon an order holding, based on the record, that adoption of such plan was an abuse of discretion.

(3) SPECIAL AUTHORITY OF COURT OF APPEALS.—

(A) ORDERING OF NEW REMEDIAL PLAN.—If, upon consideration of an appeal under this title, the Court of Appeals determines that a plan does not comply with the requirements of this Act, it shall direct that the District Court promptly develop a new remedial plan with assistance of a special master for consideration by the Court of Appeals.

(B) FAILURE OF DISTRICT COURT TO TAKE TIMELY ACTION.—If, at any point during the pendency of an action under this section, the District Court fails to take action necessary to permit resolution of the case prior to the next regularly scheduled election for the House of Representatives in the State or fails to grant the relief described in paragraph (1)(C), any party may seek a writ of mandamus from the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction over the motion for a writ of mandamus and shall establish an expedited briefing and hearing schedule for resolution of the motion. If the Court of Appeals determines that a writ should be granted, the Court of Appeals shall take any action necessary, including developing a congressional redistricting plan with assistance of a special master to ensure that a remedial plan is adopted in time for use in the next regularly scheduled election for the House of Representatives in the State.

(4) EFFECT OF ENACTMENT OF REPLACEMENT PLAN.—A State's enactment of a redistricting plan which replaces a plan which is the subject of an action under this section shall not be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority of the court to adjudicate or grant relief with respect to any

claims or issues not addressed by the replacement plan, including claims that the plan which is the subject of the action was enacted, in whole or in part, with discriminatory intent, or claims to consider whether relief should be granted under section 3(c) of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10302(c)) based on the plan which is the subject of the action.

(d) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In a civil action under this section, the court may allow the prevailing party (other than the United States) reasonable attorney fees, including litigation expenses, and costs.

(e) RELATION TO OTHER LAWS.—

(1) RIGHTS AND REMEDIES ADDITIONAL TO OTHER RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—The rights and remedies established by this section are in addition to all other rights and remedies provided by law, and neither the rights and remedies established by this section nor any other provision of this Act shall supersede, restrict, or limit the application of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.).

(2) VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965.—Nothing in this Act authorizes or requires conduct that is prohibited by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (52 U.S.C. 10301 et seq.).

(f) LEGISLATIVE PRIVILEGE.—No person, legislature, or State may claim legislative privilege under either State or Federal law in a civil action brought under this section or in any other legal challenge, under either State or Federal law, to a redistricting plan enacted under this Act.

(g) REMOVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At any time, a civil action brought in a State court which asserts a claim for which the district courts of the United States have exclusive jurisdiction under this title may be removed by any party in the case, including an intervenor, by filing, in the district court for an applicable venue under this section, a notice of removal signed pursuant to Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure containing a short and plain statement of the grounds for removal. Consent of parties shall not be required for removal.

(2) CLAIMS NOT WITHIN THE ORIGINAL OR SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION.—If a civil action removed in accordance with paragraph (1) contains claims not within the original or supplemental jurisdiction of the district court, the district court shall sever all such claims and remand them to the State court from which the action was removed.

SEC. 403. STATE APPORTIONMENT NOTICE DEFINED.

In this Act, the "State apportionment notice" means, with respect to a State, the notice sent to the State from the Clerk of the House of Representatives under section 22(b) of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for an apportionment of Representatives in Congress", approved June 18, 1929 (2 U.S.C. 2a), of the number of Representatives to which the State is entitled.

SEC. 404. NO EFFECT ON ELECTIONS FOR STATE AND LOCAL OFFICE.

Nothing in this Act or in any amendment made by this Act may be construed to affect the manner in which a State carries out elections for State or local office, including the process by which a State establishes the districts used in such elections.

SEC. 405. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to redistricting carried out pursuant to the decennial census conducted during 2030 or any succeeding decennial census.

SA 4780. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

to amendment SA 4732 proposed by Mr. HUSTED to the 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:

On page 7, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(d) ACCEPTANCE OF AFFIDAVIT FOR TRIBAL IDENTIFICATION.—Section 303A(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(i)—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subclause:

“(III) an affidavit developed and made available to the individual by the State in which the individual attests that the individual is a member of a federally recognized Indian Tribe, but does not possess a Tribal identification document with a photograph or an expiration date because the federally recognized Indian Tribe does not issue such identification.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A)(i), by inserting the following before the semicolon: “or an affidavit described in subclause (II) or (III) of paragraph (1)(B)(i)”.

SA 4781. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4732 proposed by Mr. HUSTED to the 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:

On page 7, strike lines 21 through 25 and insert the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to elections for Federal office held on or after such date.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 303A(f) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), is amended by striking “1 day” and inserting “1 year”.

(B) Section 311(b)(4) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as added by subsection (b), is amended by inserting “1 year after” after “303A,”.

SA 4782. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4732 proposed by Mr. HUSTED to the 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:

On page 7, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(d) TRIBAL IDENTIFICATION GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, shall establish a program to provide grants to federally recognized Indian Tribes to develop, enhance, and issue Tribal identification documents that include the name of

the individual, a photograph of the individual, and an expiration date, as determined by the issuing Indian Tribe.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Grants under this subsection shall be administered in accordance with the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.).

(3) APPROPRIATION.—There are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2026, to provide grants under this subsection. Amounts appropriated under the preceding sentence shall remain available until expended.

SA 4783. Mr. WARNOCK 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. —. AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS TO SUPPLEMENT BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

Of the unobligated balances of amounts appropriated for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement under section 100052 of the Act entitled “An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14” (Public Law 119-21; 139 Stat. 387) (commonly known as the “One Big Beautiful Bill Act”), \$2,900,000,000 shall be transferred to the Secretary of Defense and be available to supplement the basic allowance for housing payable to members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Space Force under section 403 of title 37, United States Code.

SA 4784. Mr. JUSTICE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 858, to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work on the National Mall to honor the extraordinary acts of valor, selfless service, and sacrifice displayed by Medal of Honor recipients; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Hershel ‘Woody’ Williams National Medal of Honor Monument Location Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MONUMENT LOCATION.

(a) SITE.—Notwithstanding section 8908(c) of title 40, United States Code, the commemorative work authorized by section 1(a) of Public Law 117-80 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note) shall be located within the Reserve (as defined in section 8902(a) of title 40, United States Code).

(b) APPLICABILITY OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.—Except as provided in subsection (a), chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”), shall apply to the commemorative work.

SA 4785. Mr. THUNE (for Ms. KLOBUCHAR) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 648, honoring the memory, service, and sacrifice of Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, United States Army Reserve; as follows:

In the preamble, strike the second whereas clause and insert the following:

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, 35, of Winter Haven, Florida, Sergeant First Class Noah L. Tietjens, 42, of Bellevue, Nebraska, Sergeant Declan J. Coady, 20, of Des Moines, Iowa, Major Jeffrey R. O'Brien, 45, of Waukegan, Iowa, and Chief Warrant Officer 3 Robert M. Marzan, 54, of Spotsylvania, Virginia;

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have six 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 1 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a briefing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 2026, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2026

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Thursday, March 26; 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; finally, that the cloture motions filed during Tuesday's session ripen at 1:30 p.m.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. 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 CASSIDY, WELCH, WHITEHOUSE, PADILLA, and LEE.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM EARL HILTON

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a good friend Sheriff William Hilton, who was tragically killed Monday. Sheriff Hilton was a sheriff in every positive meaningful sense of the word.

He was steady. He was committed. He was there to answer the call when the community needed him. That kind of service is more than just a job, it was his life's calling, and he lived that calling every day.

He was a devoted husband to his wife Billie, a loving father to Shane and Kristy, and a proud grandfather to Slade.

But behind a man with such heavy responsibility is always a strong family, and, indeed, his family loved him, supported him, and stood by him through long, difficult, often 7-day workweeks. A true servant, a man others leaned on.

As Sheriff Wood his deputy and mentee said, "I talked to him almost every day. If I had any questions, who else [could I ask but him]?"

It tells you what you need to know about Sheriff Hilton. He just had lots of wisdom. He retired in 2008. He could have lived a comfortable life fishing. His community asked him to come back as sheriff, and he served two more terms.

By the time he retired for good in 2020, he had served in law enforcement for 50 years. Again, he could have lived comfortably in retirement, but he came back because of his sense of duty.

We rode together once. There was a police ambush in 2016 in Baton Rouge, and a gunman killed four officers. Sheriff Hilton and I rode down to the ceremony for one of them, a lawman paying tribute to a fellow lawman. I always appreciated that.

And there is something to be said about a lawman's realism. Sheriff Hilton certainly had it. He once told me: When you are fighting crime, it is like mowing the grass. You never stop. You just keep on going.

There wasn't any anger. There wasn't any bitterness, just a realism. And it was the task before him, and it was a task he was going to do.

There is a quote about losing a friend that says: The melody he played upon the lives of those around him will never be played quite the same way again.

So while the melody may not be played quite the same way, it will be

echoed by his family, by his community, and by all of us.

I ask that we take just a moment of silence to honor the life of Sheriff William Earl Hilton.

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

(Moment of silence.)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, someone asked me today: Since Senate Democrats keep moving the goalpost on DHS funding, what kind of frustration is there among Republicans?

I replied: Ask the American people how frustrated they are.

Americans are being hurt for some political gain that some Senate Democrats seem to enjoy.

This is the New Orleans Airport. These are the lines. At one point, it was out of the building and into the parking garage. That is on the second floor. They had to come through the parking garage, through the second floor, and down to the mezzanine level in order to get into this line.

It was a 5-hour wait for people to be able to go through the TSA checkpoint. At that point, people had missed their flights. You came to the airport 3 hours early, and you missed your flight after standing in that line.

Now, I am just asking the folks at the airport who came to visit New Orleans—maybe a destination wedding, something for their family, and then they return to whatever State they are from, having a great time—call up the Senate Democrats who are opposing ending the shutdown.

By the way, the rate of callouts from TSA staff exceeded 40 percent over the weekend. You know, they have bills to pay. I am not quite sure what they are doing. It could be that they are driving for Uber or they are driving for Lyft. They are trying to pay their bills. That is the issue here.

By the way, it is not just TSA agents. It is the FEMA agents, the people who help process the claims to rebuild communities after natural disasters. It is the Coast Guard, the people that rescue you when your boat breaks down, the people who are in the boats protecting our naval ships—protecting our naval ships right now on deployment outside of Iran. It is the people protecting us from cyber attacks—the cyber attacks that are coming right now from Iran.

Now every time an offer is made, Democrats say: Nope. It is not quite there yet.

As someone said, they are now rejecting deals which are better than their first offer.

Now, put this in context. Republicans and Democrats negotiated a funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security months ago. At some point, that deal was broken. They said: No, this is not good enough.

Then, 6 weeks ago, they refused to fund the Department of Homeland Security, at which point folks like TSA agents stopped getting paid and FEMA and Cybersecurity and Coast Guard, et cetera.

So Republicans have leaned forward and offered, for example, body cameras. They said they wanted body cameras. I think they wanted \$20 million. I am told the White House has offered over \$100 million for body cameras.

No, now we want something different.

I will just say that at some point, you have to be willing to make an agreement. At some point, you have to decide that a line this long, inconveniencing that many Americans, and not paying TSA agents, FEMA, Coast Guard, and others, is wrong, and you have to accept a deal.

Now, maybe you don't. Clearly you don't. But at some point, you should consider the pain that you are exacting upon fellow Americans, upon people who are not getting paid for 6 weeks even though they have bills to pay.

I want to compliment right now the people who are able to work, whether it is TSA, FEMA, Coast Guard, or Cybersecurity. Let us just thank them. Let us just thank them for doing what they are able to do to protect us even though they have not been paid for 6 weeks.

I will point out that the Department of Homeland Security covers FEMA. I would like the FEMA agents to be paid. Hurricane season starts in 10 weeks. In my State, in the gulf coast, the Atlantic coast, we know what that means. Planning should be taking place now in case a hurricane hits in 10 weeks. That planning is not taking place because people cannot go to work if their Department is shut down.

So if you start to wonder how frustrated Republicans are, ask these people how frustrated they are, and ask the people who are at the end, right where they would be getting checked in, how frustrated they are.

I ask my Democratic colleagues in the Senate to accept "yes" for an answer. If we have actually come to where you were, and you move back, and we have come forward still yet, and you move back once more, maybe at some point, you must examine your priorities. Is it to serve the American people? Is it to make sure that hard-working public servants are paid? Or is it to gain a political objective? I ask you, please, to put the American people first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I am going to speak about two topics—the SAVE Act and the war in Iraq. I would like to start with the SAVE Act.

We are debating the SAVE Act, the SAVE America Act. In my view, that

will actually undermine our elections and sow distrust in the elections. But I want to present letters and calls I have received from Vermonters, including our town clerks and their experience and their judgment about what this will do.

We are very proud in Vermont that we have a very high voter participation rate and no fraud, and that is a point of pride that is shared among Republicans, among Independents, and among Democrats.

These are the words of a town clerk in Vermont:

I have serious concerns regarding the SAVE Act, specifically the barrier it creates for voters and the unnecessary administrative and infrastructure burden it will place on election officials.

If the SAVE Act is enacted, it will put a disproportionate burden on women, low-income families, and anyone who has changed their name since birth. Requiring the documentation to prove a name change can be difficult. It can be expensive.

Many women do not have just one name change, and they may have several due to multiple marriages or divorces, each requiring additional documentation to create a paper trail. Even if the government were to provide a free ID, the underlying documents needed to obtain that ID are rarely free.

Consider the practical reality. What if a voter loses their documentation in a house fire or a flood?

By the way, we had three floods 3 years in a row on July 14.

They lack the time or resources to replace these documents in time to cast their vote.

By the way, that matters to Vermonters of all political persuasions.

Furthermore, if a voter is struggling to put food on their table and does not have a copy of their birth certificate, they should not be forced to choose between feeding their children and exercising their right to vote.

Would voters be forced to use provisional ballots, and if so, how much more time would my office—

This is the clerk's office—

need to spend processing those after the polls close?

Recently, I had an 85-year-old woman come into my office, deeply distressed. She doesn't have a driver's license, a passport, or any other documents that are required under the SAVE America Act. Yet she has voted in every election her entire life. She is terrified that her right to vote will be stripped away.

In a small community like ours, we know our neighbors. Requiring her to produce a birth certificate she hasn't seen in decades ignores the reality of local governance.

And as an election official, I also have significant concerns regarding the logistical challenges this creates. How are we to verify the authenticity of various out-of-state documents? What system will I be provided—

This is the clerk—

to ensure these documents are legitimate?

Federal databases are not always updated in real time. If the act requires verification against the federal database, any lag in the system would wrongly flag eligible citizens as ineligible.

Managing the nuances of local, primary, and federal elections is already a complex task, even for the most seasoned officials. This act represents yet another unfunded mandate.

Our taxpayers are demanding lower taxes, and how can we implement this massive ad-

ministrative shift without raising taxes or diverting funds for other essential services?

Elections are the heartbeat of our community, and as an election official, my priority is ensuring that every eligible neighbor can cast their vote without undue hardship.

The SAVE America Act threatens to turn a straightforward civic duty into a costly, bureaucratic nightmare for our town and its residents. We must ensure that our laws protect the right to vote for all citizens, regardless of their age, sex, income, or life circumstances, rather than creating an unfunded mandate that our taxpayers cannot afford.

Another former town clerk wrote:

I am thoroughly horrified by the onerous requirements for registering to vote. As a former town clerk, I have always believed that a well-functioning democracy should do everything in its power to encourage people to vote, not throw up roadblocks that effectively block millions of people from doing so.

Though no one wants noncitizens to be allowed to vote in federal elections, multiple studies have demonstrated that this is an extremely rare event.

From a cost-benefit standpoint, the SAVE America Act makes no sense. I believe the risk of harm to millions of current and future voters vastly outweighs the risk of non-citizen voting, which is a relatively minimal issue.

Mr. President, that is what is called Vermont common sense.

If Congress and the public believe that showing a valid ID at the polling place is something that should be implemented across the country, this should be proposed in new legislation that will be delayed until at least 2028 so that everyone is given the opportunity to obtain a federal identification card, which can be used for the purposes of voting.

It is ironic that the Republicans, who have historically been opposed to a national ID card, are now the ones screaming the loudest for documentation.

There is absolutely no reason that the bill should specify that a valid driver's license or a REAL ID card should not qualify as sufficient documentation to establish one's eligibility to vote. I believe this is simply a callous attempt to disenfranchise millions of people of color and those of lower socioeconomic status, as well as women who have chosen to change their names upon marriage.

Another clerk writes:

As a former town clerk who managed many Federal elections over the course of my career, I always felt comfortable with the Vermont registration form that asked a number of questions of people who are required to sign an affidavit as to the accuracy of their residency and citizen status. The penalties for perjury are severe, and there is little to no incentive for a noncitizen to risk their status in the United States by illegally attempting to vote.

Many voter registrations take place through the Department of Motor Vehicles, and the creation of the so-called motor voter system has vastly improved the ability of officials to ensure that voter lists are accurate and up to date. Additionally, the Vermont election management system is an online registration system that requires either a Social Security number that can be cross-checked or a valid Vermont driver's license number. Both of these systems are fully functional in Vermont and offer convenience for residents as well as enhanced accuracy in the maintenance of voter lists in the conduct of elections.

The clerk continues:

I would venture to suggest that the SAVE Act, in its current form, would render those systems obsolete and create a huge problem for town clerks, members of the board of civil authority, and voters by disallowing driver's licenses and REAL ID cards as an acceptable form of identification. Both of these systems would be rendered unusable. Voters in my State, they have called, they have emailed, and they have written to me with their concerns.

Another Vermonter, a Vermonter from Stowe:

I am writing to voice my concern over the protection of my voting rights and the voting rights of millions of other married women.

I recently needed to renew my passport. I, fortunately, have my original birth certificate, but found out I no longer had an original copy of my marriage license. It took me significant time, effort, and money to obtain the original, and then to have the passport expedited in order to get it on time for my trip. We are talking months. I was fortunate that I had my birth certificate and, as I would imagine, that many people do not.

In her view, this bill is outrageous.

One Vermonter in Hinesburg said:

I am hearing rumblings that the Senate will be taking action on the SAVE Act that, unfortunately, passed in the House.

In this person's view, this is a voter suppression bill.

Personally, I have already purchased copies of my birth certificate and my marriage license, even though I have a passport, because I wanted to be damned sure I can vote. But, obviously, there are many people who won't be able to access their needed proof of eligibility. If this bill goes through, they will therefore be denied one of their basic rights as Americans.

"I am pretty sure you are going to vote no on this," she says to me. "I just wanted to let you know that I am against it too."

By the way, she is right. I want this Vermonter to know they are right.

Another voter in Winooski:

Please vote no to the SAVE Act. It's a solution in search of a problem because voting by undocumented people does not happen in any significant degree in this country.

It will disenfranchise millions of voters. It is essentially a poll tax on anyone who has changed their name at any point in their life, which means many women, amongst others, will be unable to vote.

We have watched SCOTUS erode the Voting Rights Act of 1965 by degrees.

The SAVE Act will be a death blow—

in the opinion of this writer—

to the work of so many to enable people to vote, that some even sacrifice their life for. And it is further endangered by the lies about this act.

I am listening to my constituents. We all need to listen to our constituents and our local leaders. We cannot advance a bill that will disenfranchise voters. We cannot block access to the ballot box. We cannot limit voices, nor can we stop, nor should we stop, nor should we impede people from voting. I cannot and will not support the SAVE Act.

IRAN

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I want to speak on the topic of the war in Iran.

As I am standing here, 3,000 soldiers from the 82nd Airborne are on their way to Iran. These are elite paratroopers who are trained to jump into enemy-held territory. They will join 5,000 marines who are being sent from Japan and California.

How did we get here?

On February 28, President Trump launched this war—something he is now calling an “excursion”—with a massive display of U.S. military power and dominance. It was stunning. In the opening days, more than 8,000 targets were struck in Iran. More than 120 Iranian vessels were damaged or destroyed, nearly eliminating Iran’s ability to launch drones and missiles. Iran’s military and civilian leadership was decapitated, and that includes the then-Ayatollah, who was the leader, now replaced by his son. It was an incredible demonstration of military power and execution of military might, just like Midnight Hammer was in June.

Things are different today. We face something completely unpredictable, and we have had no discussion or debate about it. We face what has happened in Iraq and what has happened in Afghanistan, and that is that a country with limited power has asymmetric power. It is confronting us with the limits of what can be accomplished with military power.

Iran has closed the Strait of Hormuz, and to the shock of most Americans, there appears to have been very little, if any, planning on the part of the folks who pushed us into the war about what would happen when the strait was closed. The Iranians really don’t need massive military power to keep the strait closed. A drone strike or a mine that hits a vessel that is going through, whether escorted or not, means that Iran has a vote; They can attack.

It also means international shippers have a vote: Do they want to risk their cargo and their crew when that is an active military combat zone?

They have answered that: No. There are hundreds of oil-carrying cargo vessels on both sides of the strait that won’t proceed through.

The President has to make a major decision. We have to make a major decision. His decision appears to be that he will escalate this war. He will put his faith that there is a military solution to resolving an outcome. That is despite the experience we have had in which we have consistently been shown the limitations of what can be accomplished with our extraordinary military.

By all indications, the President has chosen a path of escalation: the marines I mentioned, the paratroopers I mentioned, the massing of our military assets in the region, the attacks I outlined, and the \$200 billion request that is coming our way. That is an extraordinary request of the American taxpayer. It is \$60 billion more than President Bush requested in his supple-

mental to fund the opening months of the Iraq invasion in 2003.

Escalation at this point—and that is the decision that is upon us—is going to be irresistible. That is in the context of the President’s getting intelligence assessments from our intelligence community, as well as from the Israeli intelligence community, that the hope for the collapse of the Iranian regime will not occur. It is intact. They have lost many of their leaders, and they have replaced all of those leaders whom they have lost.

So do we expect that this paratrooper expedition and this marine expedition can change that? That is a question that this body must debate.

One of the weaknesses of our position right now is that the President did bypass Congress in making his decision to go on this “expedition.” The President also bypassed the American people by not addressing them and outlining with clarity the goals that he seeks to accomplish, the means by which he hopes to accomplish them, and the expectation of the sacrifices that American citizens will have to make in order to achieve his goals.

In a democracy, this is not just something that is done because it is nice to do. In a democracy, having public backing for a war is not optional; it is a strategic necessity for success. There has been no effort to engage the public, and, indeed, public opinion of the wisdom of this shows that barely 40 percent of Americans support this war and that more than 60 percent think our military action in Iran has been excessive.

This reservation that we are seeing on the part of the American people about this war is understandable. There has been no explanation of the goals and the expectation about an outcome. There has been no candor about what this war will cost. And \$200 billion as a supplemental is a downpayment on more to come; \$200 billion is literally a \$1,400 tax on every single American household.

The average American family is also going to pay an extra \$2,000 at the pump with the increase in gas prices. Families in Vermont are going to pay \$1,000 more to heat their homes.

Our small farmers in Vermont and in the Presiding Officer’s State are going to pay about 35 percent more for fertilizer just as planting season begins.

We owe candor to the American people when it comes to what is going to be required for this war.

The other essential obligation we have in making a decision about going to war is to the men and women we will ask to go to war because of our decision or because of our indecision.

When I was first in Congress, I attended the funeral of a young Vermont marine. He died at the age of 21 in the siege of Fallujah. He died on Thanksgiving day. We all honor him as a hero, just like the other Vermonters who fell in post-9/11 wars.

In Vermont, at that point, we had the highest casualty rate on a per-capita

population basis of any State in the Nation.

We are so proud of the commitment of service that our young Vermonters give to our country.

They step up because they believe in us. They believe that, in a democracy, they serve us by volunteering, and they subjected themselves to the authority of the Commander in Chief, a civilian. And they will show up, and they will serve at the call of the Commander in Chief.

We, in Congress, have a role to play, and it is to weigh in on the decisions of where and when we will send young men and women into harm’s way. They do their job; we are not doing our job.

We have had no hearings. We have had no debate. We have had no discussion. It is just happening. We are sleepwalking passively into a war that could be yet another war in the Middle East.

Yes, it is true: The Iranian regime is dangerous. Saddam’s regime was dangerous. The Taliban was dangerous. In the cases of Iraq and Afghanistan, we did escalate, and we stayed. You couldn’t get out because we didn’t make a decision. We were there and justified staying because we were there in the first place.

We are at that moment with what is occurring in Iran. And, yes, it is an evil regime. Yes, we want them not to have a nuclear weapon. But is diplomacy to be abandoned? Is unilateral action to be chosen? Is that to be done where we have literally no debate and no discussion?

It is the wrong decision, and we face very soon a question of whether we will support a \$200 billion expenditure for that war. The President calls it an excursion, but we all know better. We must make a decision, and I have made a decision. I will not support \$200 billion for a military “excursion” in Iran.

The burden of war is borne by those who fight it, the young men and the young women who put themselves in harm’s way because we sent them there. They are the ones who suffer the loss of life, devastation in their families, lifelong injuries, PTSD. But the true burden of war is borne by those who fight, not by those who decide. Is it not our responsibility—our minimal responsibility—to decide? We are not doing that. We are passively backing into a war with no debate, no discussion, no profound appreciation of what we are asking the young men and women of this country to subject themselves to. We owe them more than that.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we are fortunate. We are blessed to inhabit a country where freedom is the norm, where popular sovereignty is the objective, and has been since the dawn of our Republic. We are celebrating this year the 250th anniversary of this country,

which, itself, was founded upon the idea that all human beings are created equal; that we have certain inalienable rights, among these, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The consent of the governed—that is the key part. That is what differentiates a tyrannical government—which is to say most governments that have ever existed—versus a government in which men and women are allowed to be free, in which government exists for the specific purpose of serving the people. That is part of what was recognized in the document whose 250th anniversary we will be celebrating on July 4, that governments are indeed instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

So what does that mean to provide your consent? Well, among many other things, it means the ability to participate in selecting who may operate your government, who will wield the levers of government power.

Government power is something that is easily misunderstood. These things don't necessarily occur to us automatically. To remember what government is, sometimes we are inclined to attribute to government qualities that it does not have and can never have, qualities that government can never have specifically because the government is not a person; the government consists of official power, the power to act in the name of an entire country or other body politic, in order to establish rules carrying the force of generally applicable law, enforceable with the immense power of government.

Ultimately, it is, then, about power, and that is one of the many reasons why, even though we need to respect government and respect the authority of government—especially when it is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people—we should never lose sight of the fact that government is best understood as wielding authority that is dangerous.

In other words, like other things that we rely on, that we need, that are necessary in some cases to sustain life, or in other cases to make life manageable or enjoyable, government is one of those many things that, while a key indispensable part of our lives, it is, at its core, dangerous because it is ultimately about force.

And what differentiates government from other entities or other people—endeavors that can bring about force. Government has the ability to use force to enforce law, to enforce compliance with rules that we call laws because they are enforceable by force, with the degree of official sanction and impunity that goes along with being a government.

And that is why—I believe it was George Washington who pointed out that, like fire, government is nec-

essary, but it has to be carefully contained and constrained, less it take over and destroy those very same things that it is there to serve.

James Madison explained it really well in Federalist No. 51, when he explained that if human beings were angels, we wouldn't need government because if we were angels, we would be naturally benevolent, kind, virtuous, and respectful of the law, respectful of order, respectful of each other. And that is not to say that human beings are not that way; I believe that human beings are fundamentally, generally good. But not all human beings are that way, and no human being is that way all of the time.

So getting back to Madison's point, if all human beings were angels, we wouldn't need a government because we wouldn't harm each other; we wouldn't physically injure each other; we wouldn't try to take other people's possessions, things that don't belong to us; we would live in harmony. That is not the condition that we inhabit because, alas, we ourselves are not angels.

So he said: If men and women were angels, they wouldn't need government. He also said: If we had access to angels to run our government, we wouldn't have a problem with government that would require us to subject government to rules.

And that is where this document comes in, the document that was written 11 years after the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence, remember, in many respects, sort of helped kick off the Revolutionary War. It was sort of already underway a little bit anyway, but it made it really official.

But after the Declaration of Independence was put in place, it took years for us to win that war. By most accounts, 6 or 7 years. I believe it was about 7 years before it was deemed officially won and we defeated the world's last standing superpower at the time.

Now, this was a conflict as if between David and Goliath. Now the original conflict between literally David and Goliath was not a conflict in which the smart money would have been on David. David was a small shepherd boy. David was no match for Goliath. Had the Vegas oddsmakers been in business then, there is no chance that they would have given David good odds at all facing Goliath—this huge individual, armed to the gills, fiercely trained warrior; he was a professional killer. Nobody would have bet on David. Unless they were really, really thrill-seeking, risk-oriented gamblers, they would not have placed bets on David. Now had they done so, I am sure they would have made a fortune because nobody else would have believed that it was possible for David to win, but he did.

So too with the American Revolution. We were David in that battle, and England was Goliath—the world's last-standing military and economic super-

power. We chose to take them on. And despite all odds being against us, we won. Took us about 7 years to get through that, but we won, and we reflexively, instinctively put in place a weak system of national government under the Articles of Confederation, which ultimately failed, in large part because in our reflexive instinct to resist that which we had endured under British colonial rule. We had come to fear large, distant national governments—because, in many respects, that is what the American Revolution was about.

It is not as though our American forbearers sat there one day and said: You know, we are tired of flying the Union Jack, or we are tired of having a Monarch. That didn't really explain what happened nor was it about them being tired of singing "God Save the King" or tired of the pronunciation they had over there.

Actually, I have no idea whether, or to what extent, the pronunciations differed as much then as they do now, depending on which side of the Atlantic you found yourself on.

It really had to do with this: We were subject to a large, distant, omnipresent, brooding, intrusive, heavily taxing, aggressively regulating national government, one that was so far from the people that it was slow to respond to their needs, even their urgent pleas. It became overly aggressive, and it knew no boundaries around its authority. That is really what the American Revolution was about.

During the seasons, the decades—really, the nearly two centuries—in which we were in this pattern of being British Colonies, we went through cycles. There were seasons when the national government of Great Britain would withdraw and let us sort of govern ourselves. It was during those seasons, in particular, when our local self-rule—our Colonial governments—blossomed, and Americans learned the art of local self-government.

Then there would be other seasons, often during or in the aftermath of a large conflict, a large-scale expensive war. The Crown and Parliament needed to raise funds for a war or to pay off war debts, and very often that is when they would send forth their swarms of regulators and tax collectors to the Colonies, and they would start to hold the Colonies with a tighter grip.

And it was after several cycles of this drama—several cycles of this bipolar, passive aggressive pattern—that we faced from the Crown and Parliament that, in 1776, we decided we had had enough.

So back to the early 1780s, we won the war. We instinctively put together a government that would not resemble the system that we lived under previously. And so we reflexively created this quite weak, anemic national government, and that too proved problematic.

Within just a few years, it became apparent that we couldn't survive unless we had a national government that

was capable of functioning as such; and that our national government couldn't function effectively as a national government unless it had a few powers—including the power to coordinate and regulate commerce between the States and with foreign nations, including the power to raise taxes to, among other things, fund war efforts, fund national defense, assemble armies, and so forth.

And so it was against that backdrop that our Founding Fathers came together in that hot summer of 1787 in Philadelphia. They tried the previous year in 1786. They assembled in Annapolis to deal with the same inadequacies of the Articles of Confederation. They tried to convene, but they failed because they failed to achieve a quorum.

And they assembled in the late spring of 1787. It was still, ostensibly, with the mindset of amending the Articles of Confederation. It was not officially their objective to write an entirely new document and ordain an entirely new structure and framework for our government to operate, and yet that is what they came up with.

I happen to believe that those men were special. They were unusually gifted, unusually well educated, both as compared to their day and ours, in every respect. I believe they were wise men raised up by almighty God to that very purpose, because it is my belief that this is a land that God has preordained for liberty, that he did not intend the sons and daughters of the United States of America to live in captivity under the oppressive yoke of any tyrant, foreign or domestic.

And that is why we are so blessed with those uniquely inspired and inspiring and gifted and well-educated individuals who understood liberty. They understood power. They understood its dark side, and they understood the potential for greatness of any society that can live under the rule of law with this system of laws that attempts to treat people equally.

We may not be equal in our capacity, in our possessions, in our stations in life, but we are all treated equally in terms of the fact that we are all equally subject to a just system of laws. That, from the American Republic's very beginning, has been the objective. While we don't always live up to that to the degree that we should, that is the aspiration; and, in that respect, it is something that differentiates us from so many other nations and certainly did at the time.

What they came up with in the end was a system of government that fairly allocated powers between the States and the Federal sovereign. And it acknowledged that it is just as important for the Federal Government to have power, to be exclusive in its domain over the Federal sovereign, as it is for the States to retain all other powers not granted to the Federal sovereign. It is no less bad for the Federal Government to intrude upon the sovereignty of the States than it is for the States to intrude upon and undermine

the sovereignty of the Federal Government.

And that is why the Founding Fathers were inclined to devote so much time, attention, and brain power to this difficult task of assigning to each level of government what its responsibilities would be, and then separately assigning to each branch of the Federal Government—the U.S. Government—which powers could be exercised by and within each branch.

These things were relatively foreign to our English counterparts. They were even relatively new concepts here in some respects. In others, there were patterns that emerged in which you can see a close resemblance between the British system and ours—you know, like a bicameral legislative body, as there was in Parliament; a chief Executive, as there was in England, with a President and a Parliament.

There was some separation of powers, yes, but it wasn't complete. It was nothing like ours was. And then, as now, the dual sovereignty system did not exist in the United Kingdom. It was very rare in the entire world. It was a relatively new creature here.

There were a couple of antecedents. I will mention two of them briefly.

One of them was the Swiss cantons, which had survived for centuries based on an allocation of power. The Swiss Confederacy, as it was known, consisted of a consortium of regional governments called cantons, and they came together for certain national purposes—including, and especially, national defense.

So, too, was a more local, home-grown, familiar example known as the Iroquois Confederacy. The Iroquois Confederacy had existed and lived for centuries with Tribes that came together, maintained their right, their authority to govern themselves locally at a local level as to internal matters. But they came together and were one when it came to external affairs, especially military matters.

It was in the 1740s that one of our Founding Fathers, Benjamin Franklin—many decades before we would become an independent Nation and many decades before we would have a Constitution—Benjamin Franklin attended a conference of sorts in Albany, NY. Other attendees at that conference included a chief from the Onondaga Tribe named Canassatego. Canassatego and Benjamin Franklin became friends, or at least allies, as Canassatego explained to Benjamin Franklin the secrets of the Iroquois Confederacy's longevity, its durability, its ability to defend itself—showing him that if you take one arrow and you want to break it, it is easy to break a wooden arrow. But if you take a bundle of five or six of those thin, wooden arrows and you bow them together, you can't just break them like you can easily break an arrow.

Canassatego explained to Benjamin Franklin that this is the secret of the

Iroquois Confederacy. If we were just one Tribe—his Tribe, the Onondaga Tribe—if just the Onondaga Tribe had to defend itself, it would be much easier for an enemy Tribe to break. But when we are part of the Iroquois Confederacy—as they had been for centuries—we come together as a confederacy and defend ourselves when we are under common attack, when we need to defend ourselves, and that worked.

In many respects, it was really more the Iroquois Confederacy than the Swiss cantons that were an inspiration. After all, this was right here on the American continent. Individuals were able to meet and interact with them far more so than they would have ever had the opportunity to interact with government officials from the Swiss Confederacy. And in many respects, the U.S. Government closely resembles at least that spirit, at least that general concept, embraced by the Iroquois Confederacy.

So they wisely came together, and I believe it is fortunate. I believe it was providential and the product of a lot of divine inspiration and intervention that in that hot, sweltering summer of 1778, in Philadelphia, having convened ostensibly for the purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation to cover a couple of major deficits in the Articles of Confederation—they were just going to amend them.

The concept was: We will get together. We will figure out how to deal with the interstate and foreign commerce problem, and with the ability to raise funds, the ability to raise an army and wage war, when necessary, and a few things like that. And then we were going to move on, but they didn't do that. And I think that was another part of the pattern of divine providence intervening on behalf of American people with these wise men raised up by almighty God unto that very purpose to bring about the result that they did.

Finally, in the midsummer of 1787, they signed that document—that document that has now persisted, that has now endured close to two-and-a-half centuries and helped foster the development of the greatest civilization the world has ever known.

Without each of these ingredients, this combination of local self-rule and national government, each remaining in its lane—this concept that we sometimes refer to as federalism—the American experiment would have failed.

So too—and that, by the way, is what I refer to as the vertical, structural protection in the Constitution. We have a lot of protections. The whole thing is a protection. The whole Constitution is a protection in that its purpose for existence is itself restraining government power. In literally every instance, with one possible exception, that is what the Constitution does: It restrains government power.

So it restrains it on these two axes, the one I just described—the allocation of power between the States and the Federal Government is the one we call

federalism. The horizontal protection is the one that I alluded to briefly earlier—the separation of powers. We have got three separate branches of government. I prefer to refer to them coordinate rather than coequal branches. People use different terms to describe them.

I never call them just equal because they really are not equal. They don't wield equal power. They are not equal in terms of their danger.

Many people mistakenly refer to the judicial branch as the most dangerous branch. I think that is a huge mistake. It is just not true. Now, sure, when mistakes happen over there, they do have consequences. They can be bad, especially because it is the least democratic of the three branches. It is the least accountable to the people—by design, because its job is not to curry favor with the people. It is, rather, to decide cases and controversies. And having been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, the Justices who hold the highest judicial office in this country, on the highest Court of the land, the Supreme Court of the United States—the only Court that is itself established by the Constitution, with the rest of the courts being the creations of Congress, pursuant to our constitutional authority under article III of the Constitution—they are the least accountable to the government because they are there to just decide case and controversies.

The executive branch, run by the President—and, by way, as far as the Constitution is concerned, the President, and to a degree the Vice President, acting together, but primarily the President, is vested with the power of the executive branch.

Insofar as we follow the Constitution correctly, if we were following it to its full capacity, we would continue to recognize today, as the Constitution itself does and has from the beginning, that all executive power is vested in the President of the United States.

Yes, the Vice President is also elected and serves with him. The Vice President serves two principle functions under our Constitution. Function one is to serve as a spare, as a backup, as the person who steps into the role of the President in the event of a death, resignation, impeachment, and removal of the President of the United States.

The second function is to serve as the President of this institution, the U.S. Senate. But beyond that twofold role that I described of the Vice President, the entirety of the executive power is vested in the President of the United States.

This is significant power, to be sure; and yet that power and the power of the Courts is still ancillary to—it is still less than—the power vested in this branch of government, where we work—the executive branch of the U.S. Government, the Congress of the United States.

How do we know it is the most powerful? We know it is the most powerful

because we make the law. The other two branches perform ancillary functions to the lawmaking. We make the law. We decide what the law should be, what the penalty for not obeying the law should be. We prescribe these rules of action in the abstract, and it is then up to the executive branch—meaning the President and those who serve under the President—to execute, implement, and enforce the law; in other words, to carry out what it is that we decide. If you want to give it a corporate model analogy, it is as though we are the board of directors and the President is the CEO.

The other way that we know that it is the most powerful and the most dangerous—beyond the fact that we make the laws that the executive implements and enforces and executes and that the judicial branch interprets where people disagree as to its meaning—again, both ancillary functions. Executing and interpreting are both ancillary to lawmaking. The other reason we know that the lawmaking function—and, therefore, the lawmaking organ—the Congress, the legislative branch, is the most dangerous and the most powerful is because they entrusted that power only to the branch of government that they made most accountable to the people at the most regular intervals.

Presidents stand for election only every 4 years. By contrast, every Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, by constitutional design, stands for election every 2 years, every 24 months. In many respects, this feels like a nanosecond in the legislative timeline. It is very frequent. So every Member of the House is up for reelection every 2 years. In the Senate, one-third of our Members are up for reelection every 2 years. That is why we are never very far from an election cycle that will reorder things, that will send in new personnel, send some back home, bring others back in.

This wasn't just because the Founding Fathers decided in the abstract or for optical reasons that this would be fun to try. They did it because they knew that this was the most dangerous power, the most abusable power within the Federal Government and that it shouldn't be entrusted to those who are detached from the people. You need to make them accountable to the people at very regular intervals, and that is precisely what they did.

So when we look at that government today and what it does, it is, in many respects, far more powerful than the Founding Fathers could have imagined, and that is not just because the United States of America has grown from this sort of outpost of ragtag rebels who rebelled against their mother country to being the world's greatest economic and military and educational superpower, not just in existence today but perhaps that human history has ever recorded.

So they would have been surprised by that, but that is not what I am really referring to here. They would have

been surprised by the extent to which this government, our national government, our Federal Government, based in this city, has become as powerful as it is within this country, separate and apart from the prominence that this country has acquired through economic growth, military prowess, and so forth. In other words, this government performs a lot more functions than the Founding Fathers ever envisioned, ever ordained, or ever authorized it to perform.

If you read through the Constitution—and you can do it in a few minutes, it is around 5,000 words, it doesn't take that long—most of the powers of the Federal Government are those powers enumerated or listed and given to Congress in one part of the Constitution. There are a few others that you can find throughout the document. Most of them can be found in article I, section 8, with 18 separate clauses. And its powers include primarily the power to establish a uniform system of laws governing immigration and naturalization: who can come into the country, who becomes a citizen, and so forth; the power to collect taxes, to raise money, and to spend that money in pursuit of Federal purposes as ordained by the Constitution—those are both deficits in the Articles of Confederation that they filled—the power to regulate trade, or commerce, between the States with foreign nations and with the Indian Tribes; the power to establish a uniform system of weights and measures and the power to set up a system of postal roads; the power to establish a system of what we now call intellectual property laws: trademarks, copyrights, and patents, basically. They used slightly different language then, but the idea was to protect the right of authors and inventors to protect their art, so to speak, whether that was a design or an invention, a poem, a book—whatever it is. These intellectual property rights would be distinctively national and Federal.

And what, might you ask, do these things have in common? Well, they tend to be the sorts of things that need to be done at the national level. Basically, that seemed to be their standard: Let's figure out what has to be done at the national level lest there be chaos, and let's leave everything else to the States and localities.

There are a few others. Bankruptcy laws come to mind and, of course, the power to provide for our national defense: to assemble an Army and a Navy, the power to declare war. Then there is perhaps my favorite power of Congress that often goes unutilized and inert, almost rendered vestigial but shouldn't be: the power to grant letters of marque and reprisal.

I am referring there, of course, to letters of marque. That is spelled M-A-R-Q-U-E. This is basically a hall pass issued by Congress in the name of the United States that allows the person holding it to engage in state-sponsored acts of piracy on the high seas with

utter impunity, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States. If that is not awesome, I don't know what is. Now, it has been a couple hundred years since we have used those with any regularity. And perhaps it is time we do it again. It is a way of involving privateers in our dirty work, in our military work without the U.S. Government itself having to put American sweat, blood, and treasure on the line.

If individuals want to sign up to do so, they may do so with the hope and expectation that they will reap a liberal, rich reward if they succeed in taking things away from our enemies and being able to bring those things back into our country. It is part of how we have won wars, particularly at a time when we didn't have a whole lot of money. We haven't used those in a long time. Perhaps we ought to look at doing those again.

But my point in reciting all of these—and there are a few others, but this is the lion's share, where the bulk of the power is. There is one other I will mention here that is not found in article I, section 8. There is one that is found in article I, section 4, clause 1 that gives Congress the power to establish rules and regulations not governing elections generally, but governing the election of Federal officials, principally U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives. They understood and, in fact, openly provided in article I, section 4, clause 1 that those elections would be conducted not by a Federal election official—we don't want that, the Founding Fathers didn't want that then, we don't want that now, and we should never in the future want that—but that the States will conduct those elections and that the States could come up with basic rules to govern the time, place, and manner of those elections. And in the very same clause, they said: But Congress may alter or add to those basic rules and regulations, specifically concerning—exclusively concerning—the election of U.S. Representatives and U.S. Senators.

Why? Well, because that is a Federal power. Congress is the Federal policy-making body. Congress would necessarily have that power. But my point is this: In all of those 18 clauses of article I, section 8, and then in all the other miscellaneous powers of the Federal Government almost always described in the Constitution as powers of Congress—because, again, it is our job to set the policy. The two other branches perform ancillary—important but ancillary—functions of either executing and implementing the laws we make or interpreting the laws we make.

The Constitution, in giving this power, never once gave the Federal Government power to just legislate generally. They instead gave the U.S. Government the power to do these limited things, to exercise these limited enumerated powers that James Madison described collectively in *Federalist* No. 45 as few and defined, while by con-

trast to those powers reserved to the States as numerous and indefinite.

There is no power in there that says you can make good law generally, do good things for good people. That was not what it was about. State legislatures, except as constrained by their State constitutions or as prohibited by the U.S. Constitution, may have some limitations, but except as those limitations are found either in their State constitution or in the U.S. Constitution.

State governments are free in our system to legislate on whatever they want just because it might be good policy, but not all good policy is constitutional within the Federal system because there are a whole lot of things that are not within our power. Among those things are things that tend to happen in one State at one time that aren't crossing across State lines, that don't trigger any of the issues that I mentioned a few minutes ago—national defense, weights and measures, bankruptcy laws, intellectual property laws, and so forth.

Things like labor, manufacturing, agriculture, mining, health, safety, and welfare historically, except as they touch one of the Federal powers, were the province of States and localities. This was always how it was supposed to be.

Now, we have deviated from that substantially, particularly since the 1930s in the New Deal era and particularly since one date that often goes overlooked in American history: April 12, 1937. It is a date when the Constitution was changed but not by constitutional amendment. Had the change in the Constitution that was wrought that day been implemented, been adopted as a constitutional amendment, it would have been one of the most significant constitutional amendments ever adopted, but they didn't do it that way. It was done by the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court, I believe, exceeded its authority and, by so doing, authorized the U.S. Congress to exceed its authority by interpreting one provision—clause 3 of article I, section 8, the commerce clause—to give Congress the open-ended power to regulate not just what it had theretofore been able to regulate as interstate commerce—meaning, up until that time, the commerce clause had always been understood—historically and according to its text, the text, the original understanding—it had always been understood and accepted as authorizing Congress to do a few things: No. 1, we could regulate things or persons moving in interstate commerce; meaning moving across State lines; meaning, if you had interstate commercial transactions. Let's say if you had a farmer in Virginia growing tobacco and he was selling his raw tobacco to a cigar manufacturer in Maryland, that was an interstate commercial transaction. That is part of why the commerce clause was put in there, because neither the laws of Virginia nor the laws of Maryland

would be competent to address all the issues that could come up in that commercial transaction occurring across two different States.

You had to have at least some government power that was capable of resolving disputes where one State claimed all of the authority to regulate that transaction and the other State did likewise. Just one of many examples of how and why the commerce clause was designed and originally understood: among other things, to authorize Congress to regulate interstate commercial transactions—things and persons moving in commerce across State lines.

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore assumed the Chair.)

It was also understood historically as authorizing Congress to regulate channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce, the conduits and processes and means by which persons and things typically move interstate in a stream of commerce. And by this we mean interstate roadways, waterways, canals. Today we would add airways, airwaves, and so forth. These are channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce. There are a lot of these.

To give you an example of one: our telephone system or the internet. These are networks of wires that themselves are all connected, and those wires stretch across States—across every State. If you pick up a telephone here and you make a phone call in Washington, DC—or if you are in Utah—if you pick up a telephone in Provo, UT, my hometown, and you call someone else in Provo, UT—it hasn't crossed interstate lines—that is still subject to Federal regulation because you have touched a channel or an instrumentality of interstate commerce.

By the same token if you board an aircraft in Salt Lake City, UT, and you fly to southern Utah, land in St. George, UT, that is an interstate flight. You have not crossed State lines. And yet that is properly regulated as a Federal thing because you are traveling in interstate airways.

These are channels and instrumentalities of interstate commerce. So what changed on April 12, 1937? Well, it was that the Supreme Court of the United States interpreted the commerce clause giving Congress the power to regulate not only that, not only channels and instrumentalities and interstate commercial transactions but also anything and everything that when measured in the aggregate, even if it takes place in one State at one time, as long as it substantially affected interstate commerce when measured in the aggregate one could regulate it Federally.

Now, does that sound like legalese? Yes, because it is. Does it sound confusing? Yes, it is probably intended to be so. Let me just put this in perspective.

This radically transformed our government the U.S. Government that was originally established and ordained as

a government of powers that James Madison described in Federalist No. 45 as “few and defined” while describing the powers reserved for the States as “numerous and indefinite.”

It almost flipped the equation.

Because of the supremacy clause where we do act, where we have the authority to act, our law governs, our law trumps the inconsistent State law that might conflict with it.

And so, yes, that matters. And that mattered immensely because all of a sudden we went from being a Federal Government with few and defined powers to a government with numerous and indefinite powers because almost everything—almost every aspect of human existence—in one way or another can sort of be characterized as something that when measured in the aggregate substantially affects interstate commerce.

Let me give you an example of this carried to its logical conclusion where it went: *NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel* was the decision the Supreme Court made on April 12, 1937. It did so in the context of labor regulations.

They said: Yeah, labor, even when we are talking—as we usually are—about somebody who is working in a job in one State at one time not across interstate lines, not in a channel or instrumentality of interstate commerce, not in the District of Columbia, an Indian Reservation, or some other Federal enclave, but just garden variety labor in a particular State.

Because other people work in other States and people sometimes move from one State to another and money is frequently transacted from one State to another, that means Congress can regulate labor—or that is what they concluded at the time.

Within 5 years, this culminated into a really illustrative flashpoint. In a case called *Wickard v. Filburn* the Supreme Court of the United States reviewed a case involving the plight of a wheat farmer named Roscoe Filburn. He was a wheat farmer in Ohio, and he got in trouble with the U.S. Government. He was fined many thousands of dollars.

I don't remember what the exact sum was, but as I recall, it was the present-day equivalent of what would have been many tens or perhaps even hundreds of thousands of dollars for a grave offense against the United States.

What, you might ask, was his grave offense? Did he kill somebody? Did he rob a bank? Did he remove too many mattress tags that you are not supposed to remove?

No, they didn't have those then.

No. This was his offense: He grew too much wheat. He grew more wheat than Congress in its infinite wisdom felt was appropriate. Technically speaking, it wasn't Congress' judgment, and this is part of the problem.

Congress, in 1937, perhaps egged on by *NLRB v. Jones & Laughlin Steel*—Congress passed the Agricultural Adjust-

ment Act of 1937. In the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937, Congress decided to ordain and establish the U.S. Department of Agriculture as the omniscient, omnipresent arbiter of who may grow what crops and in what quantity, because after all we can't have people growing whatever crops they want in whatever quantities or that would be chaos—dogs and cats living together in the streets, Book of Revelation-style chaos.

We could not have that. We have got to have Congress controlling prices. So we delegated out to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to make his own set of laws, thus violating at once both the vertical protection of federalism because all of the sudden we cannibalized a lot of the State power and made it Federal. We had taken it over from them.

And then we simultaneously disrupted the horizontal protection of separation of powers because we are supposed to make the laws—and we kind of still do—but ever since 1937, we have also kind of just been delegating it out to other people. That is what Congress did with the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937.

So they said: Secretary of Agriculture, you may—in fact, you must establish production quotas for a whole host of agricultural products.

Why? Well, because we can't have farmers deciding how much wheat or hay or rice or beef to raise. That would be chaos because then we won't be able to control prices. And if Congress can't control prices, it will be chaos. Dogs and cats living together in the streets, Book of Revelation-style apocalyptic nightmares. That was their warning.

So they handed that power over to the Secretary of Agriculture. And what did he do? Well, he sent out to every farmer—we will start at least with every grain farmer in America—these little cards.

I have one of them framed. My son John gave it to me for Christmas a couple years ago. It is a little card just like the one that Roscoe Filburn the wheat farmer would have received, telling him how much wheat—how many bushels of wheat he could grow based on the number of acres he farmed to grow wheat. And they said: You may not exceed X number of bushels.

So we had just exercised the power that was always historically considered a State and local power—if they exercise that power. It would have been a State power because a wheat farmer typically grows wheat—at least in those days they would have and most farmers still today—they were typically operating in one State at one time. They are not growing wheat while on a conveyor belt or a bus that moves interstate or something. So it would have been subject to State and local power.

No. We made it Federal. Once it was Federal, then we messed up the vertical protection of federalism. We then outsourced the lawmaking to the

executive branch—not to the President directly, but to the Secretary of Agriculture—and we said: OK. You can now make a bunch of other laws, and those laws will decide how much wheat per acre a wheat farmer may grow and then the same thing for a whole host of other agricultural products.

Back to Roscoe Filburn. He got in trouble. He got fined a ton of money, many thousands of dollars, which is lot more than it is now.

But, you know, this farmer Roscoe Filburn, he was no simple-minded human. And Roscoe Filburn had what every American should have; he had a darn good lawyer. So when he got to the Supreme Court of the United States he said: You know what? I shouldn't be in trouble at all for this because, yes—yes—it is true. I grew more wheat than Secretary Wickard—the Secretary of Agriculture at the time—told me I could grow. I did it. But I shouldn't get in trouble for that because the wheat—the amount of wheat that I grew in excess of my Federal grain production quota—my limit—never entered interstate commerce.

And that, after all, was the hook, the Federal hook that allowed the U.S. Government authority over Roscoe Filburn's wheat and the wheat grown by every other farmer in America.

So he said that: The amount of wheat that I grew in excess of my quota never entered interstate commerce. Why? Because it never entered commerce at all because it never even left my farm. I took that wheat, the wheat I grew on top of my grain production quota, and I kept it on my farm to use as food for my family and for my animals and to reserve the balance to use as seed in subsequent growing seasons.

That is a darn good argument. It should have been the end of the matter. It wasn't. The Supreme Court wasn't finished with its verbal legal and mental gymnastics.

They said: Ah, but by not complying strictly with your grain production quota and with growing even a small amount of wheat in excess of your grain production limit as granted to you by the Secretary of Agriculture, that means that you bought less wheat than you would have had to buy on the open market; because had you not retained that for use on your own farm, you would have to have bought it somewhere else. And that, in turn, when replicated by other Roscoe Filburns all over the country would itself have in the aggregate a substantial effect on interstate commerce.

It is really quite disgusting if you think about it. We went from a government of few and defined powers to a government of powers that can be described as numerous and indefinite, all without altering or amending the Constitution, which was made deliberately difficult—to amend the Constitution—because it is a law of laws.

It is not supposed to be something you can just change like changing a

pair of socks. You have got to amend the Constitution, and amending the Constitution was made deliberately difficult. There are two mechanisms by which you can do it. We have only ever used one, and that is the mechanism by which two-thirds of both Chambers of Congress propose a constitutional amendment, and that amendment becomes effective only after it has been ratified by three-fourths of the States.

We didn't use that. And had they tried to amend the Constitution like that, it would have never succeeded. It would have failed miserably because they would have known.

It is kind of a problem because ever since then, we have just accepted this premise that the U.S. Government is really powerful, that it can exercise pretty much whatever power it wants because it is only a mental step or two removed from saying: well, this or that affects interstate commerce.

Once we have all this power vested in this government, it became far too easy and far too tempting—far too alluring for Federal lawmakers, U.S. Senators and U.S. Representatives, to cease to be the lawmakers and instead to make other lawmakers to delegate the lawmaking power, to pass laws that read sort of like this: We hereby declare as Congress of the United States that we shall have fair labor standards in the United States and we hereby delegate to the National Labor Relations Board the power to make and interpret and enforce their own rules carrying the force of generally applicable Federal law to make sure that we have fair labor standards.

We hereby declare that we shall have fair trade practices in the United States and hereby give the FTC the power to make its own laws that govern what fair trade practices are, and they can make the law now.

You do this with Agency after Agency after Agency, and so now the people who were once closely connected or at least only one step removed from those who made even their Federal laws, now they are several steps removed from it. And you have got people making their laws who were neither elected by the people nor accountable to them.

Now, lest you think this is a de minimis problem, let me give you this example. I have got two visual aids in my office in addition to the Agricultural Adjustment Act grain production quota just like the one Roscoe Filburn had.

I keep these two stacks of documents. One is a short stack. It is about that tall. It is usually a few thousands pages long, consists of the laws passed by Congress last year. Some would say that is too big, too many pages. Maybe they are right. Regardless, it is about that big.

The other stack is 13 feet tall. In a typical year, it is about 100,000 pages long, stacked—with each of these documents stacked on top of each other. It is 13 feet tall, 100,000 pages long. That consists of the Federal Register.

The Federal Register is the annual cumulative index of Federal regulations as they are first announced, released for notice and comment, creating the illusion of a democratic process—it is just the illusion, the notice and comment process in what is known as modern administrative law in the United States.

It is a fraud. It is a farce, at least as far as any kind of democratic input goes. They do whatever they want. They don't really care that much. I mean, they try to go through the notice and comment period, receive the comments, and make some nominal changes, perhaps if they see something they haven't thought of before.

But for the most part, they are going to do whatever they want because they don't care. They don't work for the American people. They can't be fired by the American people. They don't ever stand for election. Most of them don't even work for anyone who him or herself can be fired.

It is almost government on autopilot, which is a type of government that can't be removed, which is not just something that has the potential for tyranny, it is the literal definition of tyranny.

In fact, some of the leading political philosophers, some of the political philosophers that have the greatest imprint on the thinking of our Founding Fathers, noted that the consolidation of the power to make law with the power to enforce law—if that power is wielded whenever, if ever it is wielded by the same people, it is not just the case that that can lead to tyranny; it is tyranny. It is what tyranny is. So that is a problem.

These are all areas in which we have strayed in one way or another, and it explains how it is that we started from this simple system that was established from the beginning on popular sovereignty and started also from the premise that we wanted local self-rule, local government to be the norm except, where necessary, to wield Federal power, and where Federal power was appropriate, it should be distributed between these three branches of government—one making the laws, one executing and enforcing them, and one interpreting them. We went from that system to a system in which consolidation of power has become the norm rather than distribution of power, which was the entire objective of the Constitution.

Why, then, am I speaking of this today? Over the 2½ centuries of our country's existence and the soon-to-be 240 years of our operation as a constitutional Republic under the U.S. Constitution of 1787, we have seen these structural protections granted to the American people as part of their freedom, as part of what it means to have popular sovereignty. We have seen them whittled. We have seen them diminished, oftentimes in small increments, other times in giant leaps. But these offenses to the structural Con-

stitution shouldn't be overlooked, they can't be overlooked, and when they are overlooked, it causes other problems. It also makes that much more severe what can happen whenever any other constitutional insult or injury or offense or deviation comes into existence.

Let's take for example—let's suppose that even though most Presidents operating the executive branch of government would pledge while running to faithfully execute the laws of the United States as our Chief Executive Officer—in fact, that is kind of part of the job, part of the oath of office that they take. Insofar as they stray from that and they either exercise power that is not theirs or they refuse to execute power that they are charged with enforcing, that creates its own set of problems.

One of many points in our history that I can point to where that became a problem is during the years January 20, 2021, to January 20, 2025. The President of the United States decided that the borders of the United States and the laws designed to protect the borders of the United States and the laws designed to decide who may enter this country and who may not were sort of optional, and that, after all, it really just needed to be much more about letting people who wanted to be here into our borders and live among us—in many respects, as one of us.

During that 4-year period alone, as stunning as it may seem, 10 to 15 million people entered our country unlawfully with the President of the United States and those serving under him basically—not just basically but genuinely beckoning them on, saying: Come on in. May we get you a cold beverage? Is there anything we can do to make you more comfortable?

Ten to fifteen million—now, this is problematic on so many levels. Congress, over many decades, has enacted laws deciding who may enter and who may not. Congress has, over many decades, decided the terms and conditions by which that may happen, who may enter, and for what period of time, who may work and in what capacity, subject to what restrictions.

These were all just overlooked for the most part as that President—the one serving from 2021 to 2025—just said: Let's just bring them all in.

He paid lip service to a couple of laws that appeared to grant fairly broad authority to allow people in for humanitarian purposes, but he didn't follow those. He did not follow the restrictions that those laws put in place; he just said: Come on in.

Realizing that, you know, it was going to be very difficult to stop him from allowing that to happen—and it was. Ten to fifteen million people entered the United States unlawfully during that time period. That by itself is a type of insult, a type of injury to the constitutional structure in that if you have a President who refuses to enforce

the law and, in fact, facilitates the violation of our law, that is itself a type of injury to the Constitution.

It is a type of injury that is often difficult in many respects for the courts to enforce. In some cases, the courts have the chance to do so, and they don't enforce it. But there are a number of constitutional injuries that are very, very difficult for the courts to enforce, and the problem continues.

This by itself was an injury, but the injury compounded. As you might imagine, people were fleeing countries in numbers that large, that many millions of people, all at once. Some of them were running from something. They were all running from something, and some of those people who were running from something had no doubt led a life of criminal activity in their home countries.

Nearly every one of those people, nearly every one of the 10 to 15 million people—maybe more—paid an exorbitant sum. At the low end, we are talking \$3,000, \$4,000 a head. At the high end, for the higher risk ones—the people who had to travel from farther distances or who had bounties on their heads or warrants out for their arrest on Interpol or whatever—those people were paying many tens of thousands of dollars a head. To whom? Well, not to the U.S. Government—to international drug cartels, which ended up making tens of billions of dollars a year, year after year, during that 4-year reign of terror in which Joe Biden refused to enforce our border.

Meanwhile, if we back up a few years, back up 30 years or so, when Congress passed another law—a law that I am going to reconnect with what happened between 2021 and 2025 in just a moment.

In 1993, Congress enacted a law called the NVRA, the National Voter Registration Act, also known as the motor voter law. It was designed for a purpose—it was meant to make it easier for American citizens to vote. It said this: For any State that agrees to participate in this, they get an amount of Federal funding for cooperating in the Federal program. Nearly every State agreed to participate in it and participates in it to this day.

The program works like this: Under the NVRA, an American citizen in any participating State, which is nearly all of them, can go into a DMV—a department of motor vehicles or whatever you call it in your State—and apply for a driver's license. When they apply for a driver's license, they are free to check a box saying: I would like, while applying for my driver's license, simultaneously to register to vote.

It is kind of a good idea in some ways, I suppose, because when you go to a DMV and you are applying for a driver's license, you typically have to establish who you are. They are going to take your picture. This is going to become an official document. It is sort of like when you register to vote. So why not do both of them at once? It made a lot of sense, I suppose.

But the way it works out is all you have to do is check a box saying: I want to register to vote as I am applying for a driver's license. Then here comes the kicker. All you have to do is sign your name at the bottom saying “I certify that I am a citizen and otherwise allowed to vote,” meaning “I haven't lost my right to vote by virtue of a criminal conviction or something like that or for renouncing my citizenship” or whatever else could end up doing that. There isn't much else that would have that effect. But that is all it requires. There is no proof. There are no details. Nothing.

Well, back in 1993, even though it wasn't that long ago, the world was a little bit of a different place. We didn't have 30 million-plus noncitizens residing in this country then. We do now. And it wasn't commonplace in those days for the noncitizens who were here to need to have and, in fact, to have a driver's license. So many of them didn't apply for them. Many States didn't offer them if you weren't a citizen.

That has changed, too, since 1993. Nearly every State today will give you a driver's license—no problem—if you are not a citizen. In 19 States plus the District of Columbia, you may freely apply for and receive a driver's license even if you are by your own admission an illegal alien. Even if you are a known illegal alien, you may do so.

So what is to stop them from going in to apply for a driver's license and checking the box saying “I want to register to vote too”—especially when all they have to do is sign their name at the bottom? No further questions asked. That is it. It seems risky, right? It seems dangerous.

Well, a couple decades ago, some States started to wrestle with this. Some States started to consider, well, maybe we ought to ask a few questions. Maybe we ought to ask for some type of documentation as to their citizenship.

That issue was raised by the State of Arizona, and in 2013, two decades after the NVRA was passed, the Supreme Court of the United States decided a case called *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona*. In that case, the Supreme Court said: We have looked at the NVRA, and we conclude that the NVRA prohibits Arizona or any other State—when registering voters using an NVRA form at a DMV, we conclude that the NVRA prohibits those States from requesting any proof of citizenship or asking further questions with regard to citizenship because this is a Federal matter and any discretion about the requirements of the NVRA have been preempted by Federal law such that the States have no authority to act in that area.

So since 2013, no State is even allowed to inquire into somebody's citizenship when they do this.

It didn't get that much attention at the time. In fact, this is a case that until fairly recently—I introduced this

bill in the Senate. My partner on this bill in the House of Representatives is Congressman CHIP ROY from Texas. He and I started piecing this puzzle together about 2½ or 3 years ago. When we put it all together, we realized this really is a problem, and it became an especially acute problem during the Biden Presidency when 10 to 15 million illegal aliens came into this country. We realized the extent to which this could be abused—perhaps is already being abused.

But our greater concern has from the beginning been based on what could occur in the future as people realize the extent to which voting in U.S. elections is really easy if you are not a citizen. That is why we wrote, that is why we introduced what was originally called the SAVE Act, which is a very simple approach. The SAVE Act simply said that when you apply to register to vote using an NVRA form or otherwise register to vote, you have to prove you are a citizen if you want to vote in Federal elections.

Now, the States are free to do whatever they want with regard to their elections. State and local elections are the province of State and local governments. And they themselves may decide, consistent with the terms of their own State constitutions, who may vote in what election.

Until a few years ago, I would have considered it an absurd suggestion if anyone even hinted at the possibility that some States might legalize noncitizen voting. Well, some States have at least for purposes of some local elections.

There are three or four States, plus DC, that at least in some local elections openly allow noncitizen voters. Now that means that they are registering noncitizens to vote in those elections.

As Federal authorities have inquired into how it is they go about separating out those voter registration files and making sure that those noncitizen voters registered to vote in those States are precluded from voting in Federal elections, they go mute. They refuse to answer. They won't say anything.

That is chilling. They are registering noncitizens to vote. We asked them: How do you keep them from voting in Federal elections? And they won't answer. That is not the worst of it.

About half of the States, particularly those with Democrat legislatures and Democrat Governors, refuse to answer any questions about whether, to what extent, in what way they are taking any steps to review their voter registration files to make sure that no noncitizens are not found among them. They refuse to answer. They refuse to share data.

We have established, within the Department of Homeland Security, a database, a database known as the SAVE database, hence the term SAVE Act. I will get in a minute to the name change that happened more recently with the SAVE Act.

It is this database called the SAVE database that was established and designed for this very purpose—to help States to review their voter registration files and take their voter registration data. It is one of the great miracles of modern technology. We have this huge country, some 350 million people who are still living here, most of whom are citizens. But we have got more noncitizens living here than ever before.

But through the miracle of modern technology, it is relatively easy to take these huge files, these huge databases of voter registrations in the 50 States and the District of Columbia, run them through the SAVE database. And it will fairly quickly kick out a report, showing these individuals appear not to be citizens of the United States.

To their credit, a lot of States have taken advantage of this. Interestingly enough, it is basically most, nearly all States with Republican legislatures and Governors have done that or at least have started the process of doing that. In the process, they have discovered many thousands of noncitizens who have, in fact, registered to vote—many thousands.

That is just in the States that have decided to clean up their files and decided to run them through the SAVE database. Those are the conscientious ones. What about the nonconscientious ones or the ones that are conscientiously, if they might want to call it that, refusing to comply, refusing to even figure out whether they are violating the law?

Remember, it is a Federal offense—it is a Federal felony offense to vote in a U.S. Federal election. It is, likewise, a Federal felony offense to knowingly facilitate and arrange for someone who is not a citizen, knowing that they are not a citizen, to vote in U.S. Federal elections.

And yet these States are just refusing to comply. It is like don't ask, don't tell. Do not tell me where the noncitizens who are voting in our State might be found because we don't want to remove them.

What other legitimate reason could there be to turn a blind eye to this? Knowing all that we know, about 30 million noncitizens living in the United States, 10 to 15 million who just arrived in the last few years alone—how easy it is in almost every State to walk into any DMV and by signing your name and checking a box, registering to vote, including in Federal elections, with four of those States and the District of Columbia openly allowing noncitizens to vote in some local election, and then refusing to tell us what, if anything, they are doing to prevent those noncitizens from voting in Federal elections.

That is why we introduced the SAVE Act. And then in the last couple of months, at the request of President Trump and Majority Leader THUNE, we changed the SAVE Act to the SAVE America Act. We had the name change.

It is descriptive. It is what we do. We save America by passing this.

And we also added the voter ID provision. This was kind of part of the plan from the beginning. We had originally wanted to introduce it with the voter ID provision of the bill. But we were advised at the time to keep it simple so that we have a simple message about citizenship.

But as time has moved on, we have realized that there is actually great symmetry. And we have come up with this mantra that the SAVE America Act is about making it easy to vote and hard to cheat. It is equally important to accomplish both of those objectives.

Without both of them, you mess things up. If you leave off either of them, you are in trouble. So if you make it easy to vote but also easy to cheat, you are going to have problems. It is going to be chaos.

If you make it hard to vote and hard to cheat, that is going to cause its own set of problems. You don't want to make it hard to vote. You want it to be easy because exercising that constitutionally protected right, that is the fundamental incident, the fundamental blessing. The core element of what it means to be a U.S. citizen should not be difficult to exercise.

And so we wrote a bill that, when passed into law, will make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. If you cheat either one of those, if you give short shrift to either objective, you will have a problem.

Now, how do we do that? Well, we achieve it through two principle means: The SAVE America Act requires voter ID at the time of voting, government-issued photo ID showing that you are who you claim to be and that you are the same person listed under your voter registration file. Very simple.

A whole lot of our States, including, I believe, 22 States represented by at least one, if not two, Democratic Senators, have photo ID laws. So if a whole bunch of Democratic Senators come from States that have voter ID laws, you don't hear them complaining about the voter ID law.

If they don't complain about their own States' voter ID laws, why should they be concerned about ours? Why should their State and local elections be any different than ours when we have the clearest and the strictest penalty against noncitizen voting?

Well, there shouldn't—there isn't a legitimate defense against this. There isn't a legitimate reason to not have a voter ID law in place in the Federal Government, just as so many of the States have.

The second element involves citizenship, citizenship verification. We achieve this citizenship verification in two different ways: One, it is the citizen's responsibility. When a voter shows up to register to vote, he or she must provide some type of proof of citizenship.

Now, ideally, we would like that to be the same type of proof of citizenship that is used in other areas of the Federal Government, most notably, most commonly, the type of proof of U.S. citizenship that every American citizen has for decades and still to this day has to provide when starting a new job, whenever you begin a new job as a new employee.

In fact, everyone in this room, everyone in this building, everyone in the entire Capitol Complex, nearly every—essentially, every employee in the United States of America has had to provide this documentation whenever he or she starts a new job as an employee.

You have to fill out a form called the I-9, where, in addition to stating your name and date of birth and basic information like that, you are also required to provide documentation of your U.S. citizenship. And that is to make sure that those working in the United States, those employed in the United States are either citizens or, if they are not citizens, that they are here on a visa that allows them to work.

Not all visas allow employment; and those visas that allow some employment usually have pretty significant restrictions attached to them, defining the nature and the duration of the work they may carry out here while being paid.

That documentation typically consists of a birth certificate and a government-issued photo ID. Sometimes an original copy of the Social Security card can also suffice to buttress, to supplement the birth certificate. It has got to be an original copy of the birth certificate. Not hard to get. Easier today to get than ever before.

In most States—I believe in every State today, in fact—you can order one of these online if you can't find yours. And for a few dollars, you can order a copy and have it mailed to you within just a few days.

It used to be a little bit harder. You know, in the days before the internet, you would have to write out a letter, put it in the mail, stamp it, wait for it to come back. Maybe they would get it. Maybe they didn't. But it is a lot easier today.

These documents are so common that every American has to provide a set of documents every single time they start a new job. I myself have had to do this a number of times. Since becoming an adult, every single job I have started, I have had to fill out an I-9; and I had to provide that documentation.

I had to do that even here when starting as a U.S. Senator. I had to provide that documentation, and that wasn't the only documentation I had to provide. I also had to provide my election certificate that showed that the people of Utah had, in fact, elected me to the U.S. Senate.

Had I not done so, I couldn't have started this job, just as I couldn't have started any previous job without proving who I was and that I was a U.S. citizen and that I was entitled to be here.

So it requires you to prove your citizenship. The preferred form is the birth certificate, coupled with a government-issued photo ID.

But when we wrote the law, when we wrote this bill, we really wanted to make sure that we didn't make it too hard because, again, we want to make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. If you cheat either one of those, if you pay too little attention to either one of those elements, you are going to mess up the equation.

And so we said: Look, there may be some people who have incomplete documentation. Maybe they have got a government-issued photo ID but no birth certificate. Maybe they have the birth certificate but no government-issued photo ID.

Or maybe some people will be missing something else. Maybe they have had a name change. Maybe they have—you know, a woman who has gotten married and decided to take her husband's last name has her birth certificate. The birth certificate doesn't have her husband's last name on it because, you know, obviously, her parents would have had no idea what her husband's name would be or who she would marry. So it wouldn't be on there.

If she can't find her marriage certificate or some other proof of a name change, we don't want that to become a problem. And, in fact, we don't even want it to even become a problem if a voter registering to vote can't find any of his or her documentation. Most of us have those, and we can find them without too much trouble. And if we can't find them, most of us can order one—order a copy and get what we need.

But even if you can't find one of the necessary documents, or you can't find any of them, or because your house burned down, or because your dog ate them or something else—I don't know—we still wanted to make that easy.

And so we provided text in there that is now found in the legislation now pending before the Senate. It starts on page 12, line 22 of this legislation.

And it says that if you can't find any of the other documents, I mean, any of them or all of them, it is OK. You can fill out an affidavit. It is just like filling out a form. You just have to provide a little bit more information.

And then you allow the State to confirm or refute that information that can establish the critical elements of your citizenship.

So, for example, the affidavit would look something like this. If you are a natural-born citizen of the United States, meaning you were a citizen as of the moment of your birth, by virtue of the circumstances surrounding your birth, then you are a natural-born citizen.

And if you are a natural-born citizen, then your affidavit would look something like this: I, John Smith—or whatever your name is—was born on such and such a date in this or that city. Here were my parents' names.

Maybe you need that; maybe you don't. And I was a citizen as of the moment of my birth.

It is about all you would need if you had the birthplace, the birth date, and especially your parents' names. It would be very easy for the State to document that. Then, once you fill out that affidavit under penalty of perjury—it is a sworn statement. Once you fill that out, the burden shifts to the State, and unless the State concludes that you have been lying—and if you were to lie about it, there would be consequences because you will have signed it under penalty of perjury—then you are good. There is no further responsibility, and there is no cost. If you are lying, then, yes, there would be problems, but I don't think most people are going to do that. Most people have sense enough, by the time they have to sign something under penalty of perjury in the form of an affidavit—providing that level of detail—that it is going to be less likely.

In any event, that is a risk that we take on in this legislation. Why? Well, because we want to make it easy to vote and hard to cheat. We don't want to skimp on either one of those elements.

You can also prove your citizenship with one document if you have got it. That document is a U.S. passport. Not everybody has one of those. A lot of Americans do. It is useful to have, especially—if you are ever going to engage in any international travel, you are going to need one. If you don't ever travel internationally, you probably don't want to go through the hassle and expense of getting one as they cost a couple of hundred dollars; but if you do have one, you can use it.

So here we are. It is very simple legislation requiring that which we already require in other laws. It is requiring people to do what they do all the time. Every day in America, a whole lot of people are starting a new job. In fact, I would dare say that, of the working-aged adults in the workforce today—I don't know what the average is, but I would imagine that the average American employee probably changes jobs, changes employers, at least every—I don't know—5 or 6 years. Maybe it is more than that. This is not an uncommon thing. And every time you do that, you have got to pony up the documentation for the I-9 to prove you are an American citizen or you can't start the job. So we know people are doing this because we know most adults in this country—at least those who are able to work—do, in fact, have jobs. So this is no mystery.

We also know that—I don't know—I think it is, maybe, 160, 170 million people have passports. To get a passport, you have got to provide—obviously, you can't provide a passport to get a passport unless you have already got one that hasn't yet expired. Then it will serve as proof. If you have never had one or if you have one that has expired, you are going to have to come up

with the original documentation: a birth certificate, a government-issued photo ID, a Social Security card, whatever.

But a lot of people go through this—and not just a lot—we are talking hundreds of millions of Americans do this all the time. It is not that difficult. Yet you would never guess this based on the hue and cry we hear from our colleagues across the aisle.

This law has taken on a life and a flavor all its own. This proposed law, this bill, is really, really popular as 90 or 95 percent of all Republican voters support it, and between 70 and 75 percent of Democratic voters support it.

Do you know how hard it is to find any bill or any set of policies that will garner that much support in every racial and age and geographic demographic imaginable? In every party affiliation demographic? It is really uncommon. This thing seems to be growing more popular every single day. In fact, it is controversial only in the halls of this building, the U.S. Capitol. The U.S. Congress is the only place where it is controversial. Only Senate and House Democrats don't like it. The American people overwhelmingly do. Sure, you will find a few people out in the country who don't, but they are vastly outnumbered.

So why would the Democrats here oppose it? Well, let me go through some of the arguments that we hear most frequently against it.

The first argument that we often hear is not necessarily the most common, but it is one that almost always comes up, so I will list it first, which is stunning to me.

The argument goes like this: We can't do this because States are in charge of elections, not the Federal Government. This is a violation of the vertical protection of federalism for the U.S. Government to impose this mandate on the States, which are constitutionally responsible and exclusively responsible for conducting elections.

This is a lie. This is just a baldfaced lie. It is incompatible with any reading of article I, section 4, clause 1. It is, moreover, the height of hypocrisy for people who continue to support a whole litany of laws already enacted by this Congress, pursuant to the very same provision of article I, section 4, clause 1—under the very same provision—yet they don't oppose those.

In fact, the only reason that this law even became necessary—what first got us thinking about it—has to do with this expansive, absurdly incorrect interpretation of the NVRA made by the Supreme Court back in 2013. I say it was absurdly incorrect and it was and it remains that today. It, nonetheless, remains conclusive over the dissent of my former boss Justice Alito, who wrote a masterful dissent explaining why that interpretation was wrong. The majority of the Court persisted with what was an unconscionably bad ruling and not supported by the text.

What irritates me, what astounds me, and what leaves me almost speechless is that not one of our Democratic colleagues—nearly all of whom are raising this trumped up, baseless federalism argument against the SAVE America Act—not one of them has ever breathed a word about the NVRA. Not one of them has ever even hinted at the possibility that we might need to repeal the NVRA. They are not saying that, and I am not arguing that. But taken to its logical conclusion, their own argument leads inexorably to the conclusion that the NVRA itself is unconstitutional, which it is not, but that is where it goes. That is where the hypocrisy starts and does not end.

Shame on them to make a federalism argument here when the plain text of the Constitution says that this is a Federal responsibility and when our existing law that they do not oppose; that they wholeheartedly support; and that some of them were even here and voted for and supported and aggressively advocated to pass—they say nothing about. Yet it is the same law. If this is unconstitutional, that one was way more unconstitutional. Neither one of them is. They know it, and they persist in making these arguments.

Argument No. 2: This argument was made just a little while ago by my friend and colleague the distinguished Senator from Vermont—the last speaker in this Chamber before I started speaking this evening and a good friend of mine. I really do like him, but he is wrong on this. He is not just wrong, but somebody has badly deceived him. He is making the argument that this disenfranchises women. He even read a letter from a constituent, from a woman, in his home State of Vermont who was, understandably, expressing outrage because she believes that she and other women around the State of Vermont and throughout the country are about to be disenfranchised should this bill become law. She will not.

Now, her argument and his argument, in building on her argument raised in her letter and sending alarm bells, should have been something that he as a U.S. Senator would have wanted to correct. After all, we don't want our constituents panicking, especially needlessly, and this one is a needless panic. She wrote to him in a panic, understandably concerned that she and other women across the State of Vermont and throughout the United States of America would be unable to vote because, if after getting married they take their husband's name and their birth certificate doesn't contain their married name—unless you happen to marry somebody with the same last name that you were born with, which very rarely happens—then all of a sudden, you would be unable to vote.

What? This has never been the case. This has never been a problem. It is not a problem when you fill out the I-9 when you start a new job. Yet you use a birth certificate for that. It is not a

problem when you apply for a passport. You use a birth certificate for that. It is also not a problem when you register to vote under the SAVE America Act. We make it very simple and clear: If you have got a marriage certificate, that can suffice for establishing the name change. If you have got a name change that occurred for other reasons having to do with adoption or you just wanted to change your name, you can provide the court order approving the name change and recording it. People do change their names, and sometimes there are interesting stories about this.

Years ago, when I was a young missionary in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of the State of Texas, I met a family who told a story of a family friend who decided, one day, that he wanted to change his name to Squirrel. He went to a local courthouse and appeared before the judge.

The judge said: Do you want to change your name?

Yes, sir.

To what do you want to change your name?

And he said: Squirrel.

The judge said: Squirrel? "Squirrel" what?

And he said: Squirrel—period—meaning that is it. He just wanted to be "Squirrel," sort of like—I don't know—Cher, Bono, Sting. "Squirrel—period."

Well, the court reporter, apparently, recorded that as an answer, so his name is now "Squirrel Period," with the last name spelled P-E-R-I-O-D. That is what it is. So, from now on, unless he has changed his name since then, Squirrel Period has had to establish his identity as Squirrel Period. I hope he has changed his name since then because that doesn't seem like a great last name and rather confusing.

In any event, Squirrel Period, if he were to newly register to vote under this law—and keep in mind, it is only if Squirrel Period decided to move or otherwise had to newly register to vote—this law wouldn't require anything new in terms of his voter registration, meaning, if he is already registered to vote—and there is nothing that requires him to reregister as this law does not—he is not going to have to go in and redo his voter registration. That doesn't change unless or until he moves. Nobody's status quo changes under the citizen provisions of the SAVE America Act unless or until you move.

So, assuming Squirrel Period moved, Squirrel Period would need to, in the first instance, either provide a—if he had a U.S. passport, that would be the easiest way to do it because you can use one document. So he comes forward with his passport. If his passport says "Squirrel Period," then he can register to vote with that. If he doesn't have one of those, then he would get his birth certificate. I have no idea what this individual's name was at the time of his birth. Let's say his name was John Smith. He would provide the birth certificate that says "John

Smith" and then a copy of the court recording, with the court seal, saying that John Smith had changed his name to Squirrel Period.

But even if Squirrel Period couldn't find any of those documents—not his birth certificate, not the court documentation of his name change from John Smith to Squirrel Period—he could still square out an affidavit establishing those essential elements: I was born John Smith in Harlingen, TX, in 1954. My parents were James and Emma Smith, and I changed my name 25 years later in the general district court of Harlingen, TX, from "John Smith" to "Squirrel Period." I am a natural-born citizen.

That would be the end of it.

They hand that over to the State election officials, and it is up to the State election officials to do the rest. Even if he doesn't have a single document to his name at that point, he could still register to vote.

What is wrong with that? There is not a darned thing wrong with that. This is just good government. This is protecting and preserving popular sovereignty—a form of popular sovereignty that we will lose if we continue on this course toward not caring about who votes in our elections.

Yes, we lose a degree of popular sovereignty also when we allow, when we enable, when we facilitate, when we deliberately turn a blind eye to the risk of noncitizens voting in our elections. This is an act of facilitating foreign interference in our own elections. This is a form of democratic suicidality that I don't think we have ever observed in this country.

Why any country would want to attack itself or allow or invite itself to be attacked like this, I do not comprehend. Against such a known risk, it is difficult to understand.

Of course, in addition to these provisions that require the citizen to provide documentation at the time of voter registration, of new voter registration, there are some back-end citizenship verification requirements that don't impose any burden at all on any citizen, that just require the State election officials to routinely go through and review their voter registration files in an effort to weed out those who are not citizens.

Now, they may leave them in there for purposes of voting in State or local elections if their State and local laws and State constitution allow that. That is their business—crazy, in my opinion, but they can do whatever they want on that. But for purposes of ascertaining who may receive a ballot to vote in a Federal election under the provisions of this law, they would be required to work with the people at the Department of Homeland Security who run this SAVE database, cycle their data through that database periodically to identify those who may have registered to vote, and then remove them from eligibility to vote in Federal elections.

Again, that imposes no obligation, no burden on any U.S. citizen other than the government officials involved in that, whose job it is to enforce and apply the law anyway. This doesn't do anything to undermine anyone's right to vote.

So back to the arguments against it. We started with the federalism argument; we refuted that one.

We proceeded then to the argument that this would disenfranchise women—absolutely absurd. There is not a single particle of truth to that.

Argument No. 3, Jim Crow 2.0—that this would somehow disenfranchise racial minorities, Black Americans. Sometimes they articulate it as “rural Americans,” which is weird, as if certain demographics within this country, whether racial minorities, rural Americans, or otherwise, can't be expected to have documents. This is just racist. It is not just unsettling; it is not just disturbing; it is not just insensitive; that is racist. Some refer to it as the “soft bigotry of low expectations.” There is nothing soft about this bigotry; it is just bigoted. And this is coming from the party of Jim Crow, the party that pioneered and designed Jim Crow, the party that designed this system of laws throughout the Southern United States to systematically, hatefully exclude African Americans from public life and much of private life, to segregate them.

This is evil. I can't imagine why a member of the party of Jim Crow would want to resurrect memories of Jim Crow, especially when making accusations of Jim Crow where accusations of Jim Crow have absolutely no place. There is nothing about this that is that way.

So for them to accuse us of supporting Jim Crow policies—were this not the U.S. Senate, where we have the speech-and-debate clause privilege—I mean, those are not only fighting words, those are defamatory. They are false and defamatory words spoken with knowledge of their falsity and reckless disregard as to their truthfulness. Even under the very, very strict standard of *New York Times v. Sullivan*, as against a public figure, that is defamatory language. Yet they do it over and over again.

Do you know what else? To show you how absurd this is, if that is Jim Crow, do you know what else is? Well, the Oscars, the Grammys, the Emmys, the Super Bowl, and the Democratic National Convention, because, you know what, to get into the Democratic National Convention, to participate as a delegate in the Democratic National Convention, guess what you have to do. You have to produce photo ID and documentation that you are entitled to be there and that you are eligible to participate and vote in the Democratic National Convention. So if the SAVE America Act is Jim Crow, then so is the Democratic Party.

But, of course, the Democratic Party is not Jim Crow. Yes, they were into that thing many decades ago. Fortu-

nately, that ended many decades ago. But neither is the SAVE America Act.

On that note, let me talk about how that ended many decades ago. How did it end, this awful regime? For centuries before then, when slavery was a thing, African Americans lived in violent oppression and in a truly evil system that deprived them of the dignity of being human beings in every way imageable.

After the Civil War and the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments were adopted and Reconstruction began, we were supposed to emerge from that. We were making progress toward racial equality in this country until gains made by the Democratic Party in national elections in the 1870s halted Reconstruction, and in many ways, that oppression—the same oppression that kept African Americans in bondage for so long—took on a different form.

Now that slavery was abolished, of course, with the 13th Amendment, the equal protection clause in the 14th Amendment accorded them the rights of full citizenship, no differently than anyone else, and established this principle that the government may not treat you differently based on your race. The 15th Amendment ensured that those formerly in the bondage of slavery would have the right to vote.

Yet, as Reconstruction was halted, a different form of oppression took over and lasted for far too long—for many decades. In fact, kind of the beginning of the end of Jim Crow in many respects started with the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*, but there were still vestiges of Jim Crow alive and well after that.

In many respects, what sounded the death knell—not immediately but really started nailing down the end of Jim Crow—was the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That law is instructive here. When that law was still a bill, a proposal, it was passed by the House of Representatives in March of 1964. At the time it was passed by the House, it had a national approval rating of about 51 percent.

It came over here to the Senate. Many people considered it doomed to failure over here because in the Senate, the supporters of the Civil Rights Act didn't have nearly enough votes to achieve cloture in the Senate.

Cloture is, of course, the mechanism codified in rule XXII of the Senate rules that allows the Senate to bring debate to a close.

They were 32 votes shy of the supermajority required for cloture. To his great credit, the Senate majority leader at the time, Senator Mike Mansfield, a Democrat, decided that he was not going to give up even though he was 32 votes short of cloture, which meant effectively that it couldn't pass, or at least that was conventional wisdom.

He said: Nope. We are going to see about that. We are going to debate it, and we are going to require those who oppose this law to come down here day after day, week after week, for as long

as it takes to state their opposition to it, and we will require them to hold the floor and to continue to state their opposition and see what happens to the popularity of that bill as they do that.

They did that day after day, and this continued for weeks, a total of 60 days, excluding Sundays, when I think they would discontinue, so for 70 calendar days, but they were in session for 60 days.

Eventually, that started to sharpen the senses of the U.S. Senators who were opposing the legislation. They got tired of standing here day after day to defend the indefensible, to defend an oppressive system of Jim Crow laws, and they got especially tired as they realized that law was getting even more popular even as they were trying to defeat it.

Their position became indefensible, but it took weeks of debating it—literally many, many weeks, like 10 weeks of debate—before they got to the point where they decided they had had enough and they were losing. Their arguments were unpersuasive, and in the end, those arguments became impossible for them to overcome.

So as a result of that fact, having their minds sharpened by physical exhaustion and by the sort of political exhaustion that comes from having to defend an indefensible position, they started negotiating amendments—perhaps initially to save face with the American people and eventually in an effort to try to resolve whatever lingering substantive concerns they had. They were able to do that, and they negotiated amendments, and they adopted amendments. Those amendments eventually were sufficient for them to be able to overcome a 32-vote cloture deficit. The law passed, and with that came the end of the oppressive Jim Crow era.

I believe that the time has come again when we need that kind of filibuster. People who are aware of the filibuster, what it means, start to conflate it, view it as the other side of the same coin as cloture. They are kind of the same thing but not really. They are kind of the other side of the same coin but not really.

You see, cloture is a procedural mechanism—one procedural mechanism that can be used to force debate to a close. You have to have a supermajority of Senators in order to stop all Senators from continuing to speak.

But this isn't necessarily a static thing. The fact that in March of 1964, when there was not a sufficient supermajority to force debate to a close with a cloture vote—in fact, they were 32 votes shy of that—these guys had the courage to continue debating week after week after week, meaning those who wanted to pass the law, those who were probably being told by some of their colleagues: You are wasting everyone's time. This can't pass. We are 32 votes shy of cloture.

But thank Heavens that we brought Jim Crow to an end. That hateful, oppressive, evil system of laws was

brought to an end because Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield, a Democrat, was willing to make Senators defend their indefensible positions until they could no longer defend them or, alternatively, until they decided it was time to start to agree, to start to negotiate changes and to make changes, to make the bill acceptable, and they finally did that, and they got it passed into law.

Do you know what? Jim Crow is dead, and it is dead in large part because of Mike Mansfield's courage in forcing Members to debate. Thank heavens he didn't give up and throw up his hands and say: Oh, everybody is telling me we can't do this. Thank Heavens he didn't give up and say: Our Members are tired, and they want to go home, or they want to go to Paris or whatever it is that they want to do when the Senate is in recess. Thank Heavens that they were willing to stand with something knowing that it was the right thing to do, knowing that the American people wanted them to do it until it could get done. And it worked, and we are all the beneficiaries of it.

Who knows how long that tyranny would have ended? Who knows how long that hateful regime of Jim Crow would have lasted had Mike Mansfield not had the courage to do that. Yes, I am a Republican, and he was a Democrat, and my hat goes out to him. Thank Heaven above for Mike Mansfield.

I will not pretend for a moment that the similarities between the SAVE America Act and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 are any greater than they are, but I am also not going to ignore the procedural parallels to them or the procedural dynamics at play in the U.S. Senate that I think warrant our best efforts to try to pass this thing. Unlike March of 1964 when the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed by the House, when it had a 51-percent approval rating with the American people, the SAVE America Act is supported by 80 or 85 percent of all Americans today.

And unlike the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which when it arrived in March of 1964 in the Senate Chamber, it faced a daunting, seemingly insurmountable cloture deficit of 32 votes, we have a cloture deficit of only 10 votes. Unlike the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which was groundbreaking, revolutionary, brave, yes, but also somewhat complex, it plowed a lot of new ground, a lot for people to digest to understand how it might work—this bill, the SAVE America Act, is relatively simple. It is only 28, 29 pages long.

I think one of the reasons for its popularity is that people totally understand the need to do it, and most people can tell you what it does: It makes it easy to vote and hard to cheat. Well, how does it do that? Voter ID and proof of citizenship, it is that simple.

So, yeah, it is hard. Yeah, we face a cloture deficit, but we have overcome

harder obstacles before. We can do hard things. In the U.S. Senate, perhaps we sometimes forget that we can do hard things, but we can. And I assure you, we must. And if I have anything to do with it, we will.

Now, I know that some want to give up, and I know that far too many of my colleagues who want this bill to pass maybe are wondering: How do we do it? I will tell them: Hold on, have faith, have hope, and have the courage to stand up and continue to defend what it is that we know our voters want and what in our hearts we know is right, what we know in our hearts the American people need and deserve. And it is, after all, already against Federal law for noncitizens to vote in U.S. elections, so why not make it official? Why not make it real? Why not make it enforceable?

You see, because this ties to one of the other arguments made regularly against the SAVE America Act, however disingenuously, however shamefully. One of their favorite arguments against the SAVE America Act is we don't need it, we don't need it because noncitizens don't vote. In fact, they don't register to vote because—and here is the kicker—because it is already illegal.

You know how crazy that is? Do you know how absurd that makes you look when you make that argument? That literally is like saying we don't need police to enforce the law because crime is already unlawful. It is like saying we don't need to require liquor store operators to ID their customers to make sure that they don't sell liquor to children because selling liquor to children is already illegal. This makes no sense.

In fact, what they are arguing against the SAVE America Act is arguably even more absurd than those two extremely absurd hypothetical examples I just provided. Why? Because our system of laws, yes, makes it unlawful for noncitizens to vote, but our system of laws, because of the way this has been interpreted and the way it has evolved over the years, it makes it impossible to detect. And when something is impossible to detect, it is impossible to enforce.

Now, it is not impossible to detect in the sense that if you run the voter registration files through the SAVE database, as many States—primarily those run by Republicans—have done, it is pretty easy to figure out who shouldn't be registered and to remove them from the voter database, to remove their voter registration—or at least their voter registration for purposes relevant to Federal elections.

So it is not that hard if you are a State that doesn't want noncitizens to vote because noncitizens voting in Federal elections is unlawful. So that is really what we are talking about here, isn't it? It is about the States that don't care. It is about the States that know they have got noncitizens registering to vote—and we do because every State that has looked into it has

found them. And just from the few States that have started doing it, we know of thousands.

I suspect before long, we will know of thousands just from the small handful of States that have started cleaning out their voter registration files and running their data through the SAVE database. And those are just the States that are conscientious enough to try to make some minimal effort to detect it.

What are we to make then of the States that refuse to answer the most basic questions about who is registered to vote in their State? I would imagine—I am willing to make a guess—that some of those have some of the most rampant problems within their voter registration rolls, some of the most noncitizens.

And so I will not be surprised if, at the end of the day, we discover that tens—perhaps hundreds of thousands of noncitizens are currently registered to vote. That number could sharply spike to many millions or even tens of millions, given the 30 million-plus noncitizens currently residing in this country and the 10 to 15 million noncitizens who entered this country illegally between 2021 and 2025 alone.

And so we will end where we began, talking about our country's birthday, about our 250th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, of these core concepts of popular sovereignty that this is, in fact, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; that this is a government in a country in which we acknowledge and have acknowledged for almost exactly 250 years that governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

This government isn't legitimate without our consent, and it ceases to be legitimate when we allow those who are not citizens, who are not part of our body politic, to exercise decisions. If everyone is family, no one is family. If everything is urgent, nothing is urgent. If everyone is given the benefit of citizenship by allowing them to vote, then citizenship means nothing. That is the core message that I wish our Democrat colleagues would accept, and I am confident they will ultimately accept, as we continue to make this argument because we are not going away.

I am not going away. I will be back on this floor in this Chamber day after day, week after week, month after month, as long as it takes. I am not giving up—not a chance in hell am I giving up on this because this is about the American dream itself. This is about the fact that when you allow noncitizens to vote, you are robbing something from the American people, from each individual American citizen, something which is distinctively, rightfully theirs.

You cannot take that away. You are taking it away when you allow somebody else to cast a vote that will cancel out yours. That is unfair, it is unacceptable, it is un-American, it is illegal. We must not tolerate it, and we will not.

At the end of the day, we can ignore this problem all we want. I am not going to ignore it. Eighty-five percent of the American people aren't ignoring it. If there are a few people in this building who want to ignore it, so be it, but it is not going to be easy. And they will eventually have to acknowledge that they are on the wrong side of history, just as those who stood against the Civil Rights Act of 1964 eventually learned that they were on the wrong side of history.

And make no mistake, you are. You are on the wrong side of history. You will ultimately be proven wrong on this. I hope that they come sooner rather than later for your sake, for mine, and for all those we represent.

I fundamentally believe that America's best days remain yet ahead of her. They remain yet ahead of her because the American people, as Winston Churchill is noted to have said—perhaps apocryphally, perhaps accurately so—that the American people will always “do the right thing” after they have exhausted every other alternative. If Mr. Churchill didn't mean that as a compliment to the American people, I nonetheless take it as such. It is what we do.

As I noted at the beginning of my remarks, we have certain aspirations that we try to live up to that are embodied in our founding documents, in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution. While we have, countless times, done so imperfectly and at countless times we have fallen far short of that to which we have agreed before God and before government, we know when we need to do better. This is one of those times.

Almighty God intended this land to be a land of liberty—a land of liberty—and I hope and pray it always will be as we honor Him, as we honor our founding documents, and perhaps, most importantly, as we honor each other, as we honor our own citizenship and that of our fellow citizens. In order to do that truly, we must pass the SAVE America Act.

I will be back again and again until this is done. I have miles to go—many, many miles in this journey. I have promises to keep and miles to go before I sleep. And it is not time to sleep. That time is in the future when this is done. Until then, I will not rest.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 12 noon tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:37 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 26, 2026, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. STEPHANIE A. BAGLEY
COL. JOSEPH D. BECKER
COL. JOHN D. BISHOP
COL. ROBERT K. BRYANT
COL. JESSE T. CURRY
COL. ETHAN J. DIVEN
COL. BRIAN M. DUCOTE
COL. DONALD A. FAGNAN
COL. TIMOTHY D. GATLIN
COL. JARROD J. GILLAM
COL. REGINALD R. HARPER
COL. RAPHAEL S. HEFLIN
COL. DANIEL J. HERLIHY
COL. RYAN A. HOWELL
COL. RONALD IAMMARTINO, JR.
COL. JOSEPH A. KATZ
COL. JIM D. KEIRSEY
COL. ALEXANDER C. LOVASZ
COL. EDWIN D. MATTHAIDESS III
COL. ROBERT S. MCCHRYSTAL
COL. STEPHEN J. MIKO
COL. ANDREW R. MORGAN
COL. JENNIFER A. MYKINS
COL. PETER A. PATTERSON
COL. MARC E. PELINI
COL. KELLY K. STEELE
COL. LUCAS S. VANANTWERP
COL. PATRICK E. WORKMAN
COL. GUY YELVERTON III

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

EDGARD DANIEL KAGAN, OF VIRGINIA
LISA S. KENNA, OF VERMONT
DEAN THOMPSON, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

NANCY E. ABELLA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PATRICIA AGUILERA, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE R. ALTMAN, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE C. ARNOLD, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN M. BARRETT, OF CALIFORNIA
JOSEPH JUDE BEDESSEM, OF DELAWARE
MELISSA ANNE BISHOP, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT BENTLEY CALHOUN, OF VIRGINIA
LUCY M. CHANG, OF FLORIDA
ELIZABETH E. DETMEISTER, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL L. DICKERSON, OF MARYLAND
OTTO FREDERICK DICKMAN, OF UTAH
DAVID L. DUNCAN, OF UTAH
Y. ROBERT EWING, OF VIRGINIA
VERNELLE T. FITZPATRICK, OF VIRGINIA
CARLA JENNY FLEHARTY, OF FLORIDA
WILLIAM FLENS, OF ILLINOIS
TERRENCE ROBERT FLYNN, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL GARCIA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRIAN M. GIBEL, OF VIRGINIA
TOBIAS H. GLUCKSMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GUSTAV GOGGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
HEIDI N. GOMEZ, OF VIRGINIA
NIKOLAS E. GRANGER, OF WASHINGTON
GWENDOLYN SIEFERT GREEN, OF VIRGINIA
SETH E. GREEN, OF MARYLAND
MEGHAN GREGONIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KAREN L. GUSTAFSON, OF NEW JERSEY
KIMBERLY D. HARRINGTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOSHUA M. HARRIS, OF MARYLAND
STEPHANIE ELIZABETH HOLMES, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES W. HOLTSNIDER, OF IOWA
GEOFFREY LEE JONES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ILA S. JURISSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JON C. KARBBER, OF VIRGINIA
KAREN YOUNG KESHAP, OF VIRGINIA
DEBORAH Y. LARSON, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINE M. LAWSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
VIRAJ M. LEBAILLY, OF WASHINGTON
ANDREW N. LENTZ, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTIAN M. MARCHANT, OF UTAH
JASON P. MEEKS, OF WISCONSIN
ROBERT J. PALLADINO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LAWRENCE JAMES PETRONI, OF NEW YORK
ALAN SENET PURCELL, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT A. RAINES, OF MARYLAND
ROGER CLAUDE RIGAUD, OF FLORIDA
DEBORAH ROBINSON, OF COLORADO
RYAN D. ROWLANDS, OF VIRGINIA
WENDY CROOK RYDE, OF VIRGINIA
CORINA R. SANDERS, OF VIRGINIA
ALISON SHORTER-LAWRENCE, OF VIRGINIA
CHAHRAZED SIOUD, OF TEXAS
VINCENT D. SPERA, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL A. SULLIVAN, OF TENNESSEE
SUSAN MARY TULLER, OF FLORIDA
MARYBETH K. TURNER, OF NEW YORK
JANINE S. YOUNG, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR

PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

ERNEST J. ABISELLAN, OF VIRGINIA
CLAY C. ALLEN, OF IDAHO
ROBERT T. ALTER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LORI JEAN ANTOLINEZ, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL J. ARCH, OF MASSACHUSETTS
SCOTT E. ASHLEY, OF MISSISSIPPI
CHARLES RUDOLF BAIER, OF CALIFORNIA
DOREEN P. BAILEY, OF TEXAS
DANIELA A. BALLARD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LYDIA B. BARRAZA, OF TEXAS
EDWARD B. BESTIC, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT C. BOLZ, OF MARYLAND
THOMAS S. BROWN, OF TENNESSEE
MATTHEW K. BUNT, OF WASHINGTON
ROBIN A. BUSSE, OF VIRGINIA
CATHLEEN E. CAROTHERS, OF KANSAS
MICHAEL ALBERT CHUNG, OF VIRGINIA
ANTHONY WAYNE CLARE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JASON L. CRAIG, OF UTAH
MELINDA L. CROWLEY, OF MARYLAND
DANIELA A. DIPIERRO, OF VIRGINIA
VIRGINIA L. ELLIOTT, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JASON S. EVANS, OF TEXAS
MARY FRANCIS FISK-RIDDER, OF FLORIDA
MATTHEW J. FLANNIGAN, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY M. FLECKNER, OF WISCONSIN
GREGORY A. FLOYD, OF CALIFORNIA
KIMBERLY R. FURNISH, OF TEXAS
STEPHEN J. GEE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SHAWN K. GRAY, OF TEXAS
ERIK J. HOLMGREN, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER D. HOSTER, OF OKLAHOMA
BRANDON A. HUDSPETH, OF TEXAS
JILL E. HUTCHINGS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SAMUEL J. KELLY, OF VIRGINIA
SAMUEL N. KELLY, OF ARIZONA
JASON B. KHILL, OF VIRGINIA
LIV I. KILPATRICK, OF OREGON
CARRIE K. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA
ALICA E. LEJLIC, OF ILLINOIS
ADAM J. LENERT, OF TEXAS
JOHN C. LETVIN, OF VIRGINIA
JESSE S. LEVINSON, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTIAN J. LYNCH, OF NEW YORK
ANDREW T. MACDONALD, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL E. MANGIS, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN J. MARQUETTE, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
GEOFFREY J. MARTINEAU, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES H. MAY, OF TEXAS
SHANNON T. MCDANIEL, OF MISSOURI
CATHERINE E. MCGEARY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JENNIFER L. MCKEWEAN, OF TEXAS
ROBERT R. MEARKLE, OF TENNESSEE
ERIC R. MEHLER, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN P. MERINO, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTINE E. MEYER, OF VIRGINIA
EMMY KANG MICHAEL, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW P. MICHAUD, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES E. MILLTAY, OF FLORIDA
ANTHONY L. MIRANDA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MEGHAN M. MOORE, OF VIRGINIA
BROOKS SUMMERS MOPPERT, OF FLORIDA
JOHN C. MURRAY, OF VIRGINIA
ERIN ANNA NICKERSON, OF FLORIDA
DAWN M. OSTERHOLT, OF VIRGINIA
MICHELLE Y. OUTLAW, OF HAWAII
SARAH B. PADULA, OF MINNESOTA
AMY L. PATEL, OF VIRGINIA
SAMUEL R. PEALE, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN L. PIERCE, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER G. PIXLEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BRIANNA E. POWERS, OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHRISTOPHER P. QUADE, OF VIRGINIA
MARGOT J. RATCLIFFE, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN R. REYNOLDS, OF UTAH
MARY BRETT ROGERS-SPRINGS, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW E. SANDLANDS, OF CALIFORNIA
JEFFREY BRYAN SCEARCE, OF OREGON
MARISA D. SCOTT, OF VIRGINIA
CHARLES R. SELLERS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JASON W. SHEETS, OF VIRGINIA
SHAWN H. SIMPSON, OF TEXAS
SCOTT M. SINDLE, OF VIRGINIA
LORELEI GRACE SNYDER, OF VIRGINIA
VIRGINIA L. STAAB, OF WASHINGTON
RUTH ANNE STEVENS-KLITZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ALISON BYER BLOSSER STORSVE, OF MARYLAND
THOMAS A. TALMADGE, OF FLORIDA
PATRICK ISAMU TANIMURA, OF TEXAS
BENJAMIN A. THOMSON, OF UTAH
HUGUETTE THORNTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GLENN EDWARD TOSTEN, OF MARYLAND
KENDRA M. TOVRYLA, OF VIRGINIA
KENDY T. VANHORN, OF TEXAS
NICOLE E. VARNES, OF ILLINOIS
NAIDA VIDUGIRIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LIAN VON WATOCH, OF CALIFORNIA
CHIMERE RAVENEL WATERSTREET, OF MARYLAND
JOHN D. WILCOCK, OF VIRGINIA
PHILIP D. WILSON, OF TEXAS
ERKA B. ZIELKE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PAUL V. ZIMMER, OF ALASKA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

TUYVAN HUU NGUYEN, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR

GENERAL TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JASON ALAN CARROLL, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
TIFANI CHANEL DYSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA
JOSEPH FRANCIS EINIKIS III, OF ILLINOIS
MIGUEL EDGAR SINENENG GUARDIAN, OF NEVADA
RACHEL MARIE HOLUB, OF ILLINOIS
EVE CONCINA JOSEPH, OF FLORIDA
JEREMY MICHAEL KENNON, OF MISSOURI
KAYLA YUEN-JI MA, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
ALEXANDRA ELIZABETH MORGAN, OF CALIFORNIA
MAIWAND NAWID, OF TEXAS
KRISTOPHER MARK NORDEEN, OF MINNESOTA
ADAM SCOTT ROBERTS, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

ANDRIAN MANFRED SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
RISHI UDESHI, OF CALIFORNIA
RYAN ALAN WERNER, OF TEXAS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

RUSSELL DUNCAN, OF MARYLAND
CONRAD ESTRADA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CRISTOBAL ZEPEDA, OF COLORADO

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

JOHN HURLEY, OF MARYLAND
JEROMY MCKIM, OF WYOMING

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AMY CALDWELL, OF TENNESSEE
ERIN COVERT, OF TEXAS
ENRIQUE MAZON, OF NEVADA
NICOLE PODESTA, OF NEW YORK
MATTHEW SNYDER, OF NEVADA
JOSEPH TAYLOR, OF ILLINOIS
ROBERT TUEBNER, OF FLORIDA

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING NURSE JESSICA PALMER

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my outstanding constituents, Nurse Jessica Palmer, a dedicated registered nurse whose skill, warmth, and dependability enrich our community through her volunteer work at the Free Senior Health Clinic.

Nurse Palmer volunteers her time with remarkable consistency and a joyful spirit, ensuring that every patient she sees feels seen, heard, and understood. A bright and compassionate professional, she brings both expertise and empathy to every encounter, providing care that is thorough, insightful, and deeply reassuring. The volunteer physicians with whom she works value her diligence, professionalism, and commitment to gathering the information necessary to guide the best possible patient care.

For her unwavering dedication, compassionate heart, and meaningful impact on our community, I am proud to recognize Nurse Palmer as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her exceptional commitment, her remarkable skill, and the lasting, positive influence she has on the lives of the patients she serves.

HONORING DAVID J. SALMONSEN

HON. GLENN THOMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a dedicated servant to the agricultural industry, David J. Salmonsen, who is retiring after nearly three decades of dedicated service to the American Farm Bureau Federation and the American farmer and rancher.

David's journey did not begin in the halls of Congress, but on the soil of his family's diversified dairy and crop farm in Manlius, New York. That upbringing instilled in him a fundamental understanding of the challenges facing our producers—an understanding he carried with him through the University at Albany and the Washington College of Law.

For 29 years, David has been a steady hand and a trusted authority for the Farm Bureau. As Senior Director of Government Affairs, he became one of the Nation's preeminent experts on international trade. From the WTO Doha talks to the implementation of the USMCA and Phase One agreements with China and Japan, David was consistently at the table, ensuring that the voice of the American farmer was heard in every corner of the globe.

His expertise was so highly regarded that he served as a cleared advisor for the USDA

and USTR for over two decades, providing critical Counsel on the Agricultural Policy Advisory Committee. Yet, despite his global reach—leading delegations to Geneva, Brussels, and London—David never forgot his roots. He brought a practical, farm-grown perspective to the most complex international negotiations, never losing sight of the producers he represented.

Mr. Speaker, David Salmonsen leaves behind a legacy of expanded markets, fairer trade, and a stronger future for American agriculture. We thank him for his 29 years of tireless advocacy, and we wish him and his family the very best in a well-deserved retirement.

HONORING DANEÉ WILLIAMS

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Women's History Month to honor and recognize Daneé Williams, a remarkable entrepreneur and community leader from Ave Maria, Florida, whose dedication to service and business excellence has left an indelible mark on Collier County. As the owner of two beloved local businesses—Oil Well Craft Beer and The Secret Ingredient—Daneé embodies the spirit of American entrepreneurship. Her commitment to quality and hospitality was recently recognized by Gulfshore Life, with her businesses securing four "Best of the Gulfshore" awards, including being named the best Brewery in Collier County and taking top honors in the Women's Apparel category. Beyond her commercial success, Daneé is a pillar of community engagement. Ten years ago, she founded the Ave Maria Trunk or Treat, an annual tradition that has grown from a local brewery event into a massive town-wide celebration for hundreds of families. During the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, she demonstrated her adaptability and commitment to her neighbors by expanding her business operations to ensure residents continued to have access to essential services and dining.

Daneé's true legacy, however, is her tireless philanthropy and her "community-first" mentality. She consistently utilizes her business platforms to host fundraisers and support a vast array of noble causes, ranging from healthcare and support through the Cancer Alliance Network and the Alzheimer's Support Network to education and youth initiatives with Ave Maria University, The Guadalupe Center, and Our Lady of the Rosary Orphanage. Her advocacy extends to critical community needs, including supporting Path2Freedom in their work with child trafficking survivors, aiding local veterans' organizations, and participating in the Christmas Angel Tree program to help children in need. Daneé, alongside her husband Matt and their children Cole, Peyton, and Reese, has proven that a small business with

a big heart can shape the soul of a town. Her efforts have helped transform Ave Maria's Town Center into a vibrant gathering place where neighbors become friends. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to honor Daneé Williams today for her leadership, generosity, and unwavering dedication to the people of Florida's 26th District.

MS. THERESA BILLINGS

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my outstanding constituents, Ms. Theresa Billings, a dedicated volunteer whose diligence, precision, and tireless commitment strengthen the operations of the Free Senior Health Clinic and ensure that every aspect of its work runs smoothly.

Ms. Billings demonstrates extraordinary effort each and every day, ensuring that all documentation is accurate and timely. Her careful attention to detail, dedication to gathering statistics, and meticulous preparation of reports guarantee that the clinic's outputs are reliable and on point. Always willing to go above and beyond, she consistently does whatever it takes to remain on task and meet deadlines, supporting both staff and patients with quiet efficiency and unwavering dedication.

For her exceptional commitment, tireless work ethic, and meaningful impact on our community, I am proud to recognize Ms. Billings as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her extraordinary service, her steadfast reliability, and the lasting difference she makes every day.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EARLY ACADEMIC OUTREACH PROGRAM

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the University of California Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) for their 50 years of dedication to making education more accessible to first-generation, socio-economically disadvantaged, and English-language learning students. The organization celebrated their anniversary on February 28, 2026 on the campus of the University of California, Davis.

The Early Academic Outreach Program was established in 1976 by the University of California in response to the California State Legislature's recommendation to expand post-secondary opportunities to every student. EAOP is the University of California's largest academic preparedness program. The program

• 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.

partners with middle and high schools to guide students through academic preparation, college admission requirements, and financial aid processes. EAOP focuses on increasing college preparatory course completion, college application submissions, and enrollment rates among underrepresented students.

The Early Academic Outreach Program is celebrated for its decades of dedication to serving our community by expanding access to education. This program ensures college readiness for underrepresented students by serving over 40,000 students at over 250 K–12 public schools throughout the state each year. Seventy-nine percent of EAOP 12th-grade participants are completing college preparatory coursework compared to forty-nine percent of all California public high school seniors. Sixty-seven percent of EAOP 12th-grade participants complete the SAT or ACT, compared to sixty percent of non-participants at the same California public high schools. The Early Academic Outreach Program has supported more than 450,000 students throughout its existence and, as a result, has diversified and strengthened enrollment in both California's higher education institutions, and in the workforce. Today we recognize the EAOP for being one of the University of California's largest and most successful Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnership programs.

Mr. Speaker, we thank the Early Academic Outreach program for their dedicated service to our underrepresented student community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor them here today.

HONORING MARGI STERN

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Margi Stern. I have named Mrs. Stern as the California 4th District's Woman of the Year for Solano County. This honor recognizes women who have made important contributions to California's 4th Congressional District in Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service.

Mrs. Stern was born in Brooklyn, New York. She earned a Bachelor of Science in speech and language pathology from Whittier College, as well as a master's degree in communication disorders from St. Louis University. She is the grandniece of Arthur Garfield Hayes, a lawyer, civil rights champion, and the co-founder of the ACLU. She is also the niece of Robert L. Stern, a well-known authority in California Campaign finance, the President of Center for Governmental Studies in Los Angeles, and a recipient of the Democracy Hero award by Common Cause.

Mrs. Stern has devoted her career to the betterment of her community. She worked as a Speech Language Pathologist for 37 years, 25 of which were in the Early Intervention Program, for the Solano County Office of Education. After retirement, she volunteered to lead support groups for the parents of children with special needs and worked to teach Parent Communication Skills at the Adult School. Throughout her life, Mrs. Stern has advocated

tirelessly for our special needs community. At Vacaville High School, she created the Anya Elizabeth Janoski Special Education Scholarship, to provide funds to seniors interested in pursuing a career in Special Education. She also participated in the creation, fundraising, and promotion of the Play 4 All Park in Vacaville, and volunteers for Together Everyone Always Matters (TEAM) Vacaville, an organization that provides monthly activities for children with special needs.

In addition to being an incredible advocate for our special needs community, Mrs. Stern is also passionate about eradicating injustice and promoting political participation. She is honored for her work uplifting the women in her community. As a member of the Women's Action Network, she promotes women's participation in city council meetings, campaigns, and local political events. She also serves on the Committee to Establish the Solano Commission for Women and Girls.

Through her participation in local government, Mrs. Stern established the Backyard Hens of Vacaville Group, rewrote the Vacaville city policy to allow hens in the city limits, hosted "meet and greets" for local candidates in Solano County government, and strengthened the Northern Solano Democratic Club. Mrs. Stern consistently shows up for her neighborhood, serving as the Chair of Neighborhood Watch and organizing Neighborhood Night Out among other neighborhood functions. She also speaks every year at the Ernest Kimme Charter School Graduation Ceremony and participates in their Ernest Kimme Service Day.

Mrs. Stern was married to her late husband, Ernest Kimme, a teacher, city council member, and community philanthropist who passed away in 2015. Her son, Stefan Janoski, is bronze sculptor, short film director, and a world-famous skateboarder with a signature Nike shoe that has "Vacaville, California," inscribed on the tongue. Her late daughter, Anya Janoski, was a powerful mentor who contributed to Mrs. Stern's understanding of how to make a difference in the world. Anya passed in 2017 at age 32; she was diagnosed with Cornelia de Lange Syndrome which affected her physical size and her developmental growth.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Margi Stern's passion, leadership, and determination have profoundly impacted our Solano County community. It is with great honor and deep appreciation that we recognize her invaluable contributions here today.

CONGRATULATING CHIEF HUGO SEARLE ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ANGIE CRAIG

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Chief Hugo Searle, on his retirement after 34 years with the fire service. Chief Searle is a dedicated public servant and an outstanding leader who has served Minnesotans with courage and commitment.

Originally from Wales, Chief Searle made Minnesota his home and devoted his career to protecting our communities. He served 19 years with the St. Louis Park Fire Department

and 10 years with the Brooklyn Park Fire Department before being appointed Chief of the Eagan Fire Department in 2021.

During his tenure as Chief, he strengthened community relationships, invested deeply in personnel and guided the department through a period of growth and change. His leadership enhanced emergency response capabilities and fostered a culture grounded in professionalism, compassion, and service. Chief Searle has earned the respect of his colleagues from across the state and is widely regarded as a leader within Minnesota's fire service community.

Chief Searle's commitment to excellence extends far beyond the state. In his free time, Chief Searle serves as a high-altitude mountain guide and has summited Mount Everest.

I am deeply inspired by Chief Searle's commitment to public service and exceptional leadership. His career in the fire service will have a lasting impact in Eagan and across the state of Minnesota and I am grateful for all he has done to support our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Chief Searle and in wishing him all the best on his well-earned retirement.

RECOGNIZING MS. LISA WRIGHT

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize one of my constituents, Ms. Lisa Wright for her tireless service to our community. Lisa has been an invaluable volunteer at the Pregnancy & Family Life Center (PFLC) of Citrus County since 2022, contributing over 1,300 hours of service across multiple roles. Every Monday morning, Lisa uses her own truck to drive to the Food Bank in Homosassa, where she picks up and delivers a pallet of food to stock the Center's pantry. She checks donations for freshness, organizes them, and ensures they are stored properly. In 2025, the Center distributed 83,000 pounds of food to clients. Affectionately known as the "workhorse", Lisa's strength, resilience, and work ethic are unmatched. No task is too large—she tackles mountains of donations, food boxes, and diapers with remarkable efficiency. Even after a significant surgery, Lisa quickly returned to volunteer work, demonstrating her deep love and dedication to the Center.

Lisa also plays a key role in client interactions, ensuring that every woman who visits the Center feels seen, valued, and cared for, and that each family receives the food and personal items they need. Together, Judy, Lisa, and Wanda embody the heart of the PFLC mission—compassion, service, and unwavering support for women and families. Their dedication ensures that every client who walks through the door receives not only essential resources, but also dignity, hope, and encouragement for the future.

Together, with two other exceptional volunteers, Judy and Wanda, Lisa embodies the heart of the PFLC mission—compassion, service, and unwavering support for women and families. Their dedication ensures that every client who walks through the door receives not only essential resources but also dignity, hope, and encouragement for the future. For

their enduring dedication, compassionate hearts, and profound impact on their community, I am honored to recognize Ms. Lisa Wright as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her unwavering commitment, selfless leadership, and the profound, lasting impact she has made on our community.

HONORING THE PENCE GALLERY

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Pence Gallery for their 50 years of dedicated service to the arts and commitment to fostering creativity in our Davis community.

The Pence Gallery's story began in 1968 when Joe and Hazel Pence gifted their former dental office and the surrounding property to the City of Davis. A consortium of arts patrons successfully secured the building from the city to use as a gallery, leading to the establishment of a nonprofit arts organization named in the Pences' honor. The Pence Gallery Association was formed in 1975 and incorporated in 1976 by a small group of community leaders, UC Davis professors, and artists. The Pence Gallery has occupied the D Street location in downtown Davis since its inception, and is managed by a volunteer Board of Directors, a Director-Curator, and an Assistant Director. While the Pence Gallery remains on city-owned property, it operates as an independent nonprofit and receives no city funding for building or operational expenses.

The Pence Gallery's commitment to our community is clear from their facility and programming. In 2005, the gallery unveiled its current facility through a capital campaign. The modern building, designed by San Francisco architects Wayne Barcelon and Darlene Jang, features over 4,500 square feet and stands on the original site. The facility includes three distinct gallery spaces including the Andresen Learning Center Gallery, the Dowling Community Gallery, and the Coldwell Banker Main Gallery. Each area is designed to showcase diverse contemporary artworks throughout the year. Approximately 20,000 people visit annually, enjoying exhibits, programs, artist talks and lectures, and events, including the monthly 2nd Friday ArtAbout. Since 2011, the Pence Gallery has been voted the best art gallery in Yolo County.

The Pence Gallery has rightfully been recognized for supporting the development of local and regional artists. The gallery offers several calls for artists each year, including the Emerging Artist Award, Slice: A Juried Exhibit of Regional Art, Exhibit It!, and the Night Market for young people ages 16 to 25. Throughout its history, many regional artists now recognized nationally exhibited at the Pence Gallery early in their careers.

The Pence Gallery's dedication also extends to arts education and community engagement. The gallery evolved into an educational resource for elementary, high school, and university students through its internship program and ArtSmart program. The Pence Gallery brings adults of all abilities artistic stimulation and an opportunity to experiment, discover,

and create under the guidance of talented local and regional artists. Since 2006, the Pence Gallery has hosted the Pence Gallery Garden Tour annually on the first Sunday in May, a Davis-wide self-guided tour of gardens celebrating innovation, beauty, and creativity in the outdoors. The gallery has also contributed to the scholarly documentation of Northern California art and culture through research and catalogue publication.

Mr. Speaker, we thank the Pence Gallery for their 50 years of dedication to the arts and our community. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor them here today as they celebrate this milestone anniversary.

RECOGNIZING FATHERS M.I.A. ON ITS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize Fathers M.I.A. on its 10th Anniversary. Founded in 2016 by Gernald Hawkins, Sr. and Robert L. Jackson, III, Fathers M.I.A.'s mission is to mentor, support, challenge, assist, and advise fathers as they actively engage in rebuilding relationships with their children.

Mr. Hawkins and Mr. Jackson attended a teen sporting event where they realized it was mothers, and not fathers, who would bring their children to sporting practice and major games. It was there that they identified a need to bridge the gap between father and child.

By working to bridge this gap, they are changing the narrative for fathers who are M.I.A.—Missing In Action—to Motivated, Involved, and Active. Their objective is to give fathers and their children a fighting chance and opportunities to positively change their lives, thinking, and values.

This year, Fathers M.I.A. is holding its 10th Annual 'As We Honor You' Scholarship Gala, a celebration of students who have demonstrated remarkable perseverance in their education despite the absence of paternal love and comfort. During this elegant evening, young ladies are paired with local law enforcement and young men dance with their mothers, creating a unique and supportive atmosphere.

Scholarships are awarded to selected participants upon successful completion of the eight-week program, which significantly contributes to their personal growth and mindset. The program encompasses a variety of activities, including essay writing, etiquette classes, online and social media safety sessions, group therapy, and instruction in positive affirmations.

On behalf of Florida's 25th District, I commend and thank Fathers M.I.A. for their work to strengthen our families and community. I wish them much success as they continue to mentor future generations.

RECOGNIZING MS. JUDY AWE

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize one of my constituents, Ms. Judy Awe, for her tireless service to our community. Judy serves as both the current and past President of the Pregnancy & Family Life Center (PFLC) of Citrus County's Board of Directors. Since joining the Center in 2022, she has dedicated over 760 volunteer hours, serving as both Board President and receptionist one day each week. As Board President, Judy has provided exceptional leadership, guiding the governing body in the operation, management, and strategic growth of the Center. Under her stewardship, the PFLC has flourished, expanding its reach and impact across the community. Her steadfast commitment to supporting women and families facing unplanned pregnancies has earned her deep respect and admiration throughout Citrus County.

Judy works closely with the Executive Director to identify priorities that address the growing material and mental health needs of pregnant women. In her weekly role as receptionist, she is the warm, welcoming face of the PFLC. Her kind smile, encouraging words, and problem-solving skills create a comforting environment for every client. In 2025 alone, the Center conducted 2,139 client visits, and eighteen women chose life for their babies thanks to the compassionate support they received.

Together, with two other exceptional volunteers, Lisa and Wanda, Judy embodies the heart of the PFLC mission—compassion, service, and unwavering support for women and families. Their dedication ensures that every client who walks through the door receives not only essential resources but also dignity, hope, and encouragement for the future. For their enduring dedication, compassionate hearts, and profound impact on their community, I am honored to recognize Ms. Judy Awe as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her unwavering commitment, selfless leadership, and the profound, lasting impact she has made on our community.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MURRAY ROOFING COMPANY

HON. NICHOLAS A. LANGWORTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 50th anniversary of Murray Roofing Company, a proud family-owned business based in Western New York, founded on April 4, 1976. For five decades, the company has stood as a pillar of reliability and excellence in the commercial and industrial roofing industry.

Throughout its history, Murray Roofing Company has built a strong reputation for quality workmanship and dependable service, becoming one of Western New York's leading flat rubber roofing contractors. Their commitment

to excellence has earned the trust of clients across the region and contributed to the strength of the local economy.

Under the leadership of Jeff and Pam Murray, the company has remained dedicated to the values of hard work, integrity, and customer satisfaction. Their stewardship has ensured the continued success of this family-owned business and deepened its positive impact within the community it proudly serves. Jeff and Pam are also committed philanthropists, generously giving back to Western New York while remaining actively engaged in civic life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the United States House of Representatives join me in recognizing Murray Roofing Company on this significant milestone and in wishing Jeff and Pam Murray continued success in the years ahead.

HONORING GARY EDWARDS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gary Edwards, the City of Sonoma's 2026 Honorary Alcalde, honoring more than two decades of service and leadership in support of the Sonoma community.

The Honorary Alcalde program, established in 1975, recognizes a Sonoma resident whose long-term volunteer service, leadership, and quiet dedication have made a meaningful difference in the community. The title "Alcalde," the Spanish word for mayor, reflects Sonoma's early civic history and remains a ceremonial honor today.

Mr. Edwards has a background working in cheese marketing, a career path he pursued since he graduated from Analy High School in 1977. He is currently the owner of Sage Marketing LLC, a company he founded in 1991 to connect cheese and dairy producers with resellers and consumers.

Gary Edwards brings out the best in our community with his work in civic positions. He served on the Sonoma Valley Citizens Advisory Commission (SVCAC) and the Planning Commission. From 2014 to 2018, Edwards served on the Sonoma City Council. Also, he served two terms on the Board of the Redwood Empire Food Bank and is newly serving on the Board of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Sonoma Valley.

Mr. Edwards is widely known for his hands-on approach to service, including improving and cleaning up our parks, organizing Sonoma's annual free Thanksgiving Day dinner for more than 20 years, and his efforts to rebuild the City of Paradise after it was destroyed by wildfires in 2017. His service also includes leadership roles with local Rotary clubs, support for youth and education programs, and assisting our community through food insecurity.

Mr. Edwards celebrates this honor alongside his wife, Ruth, his daughter, Madeline, and his son, Sullivan.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edwards' passion, leadership, and determination have profoundly impacted our Sonoma community. It is with great honor and deep appreciation that we recognize his invaluable contributions here today.

RECOGNIZING MS. ELIZABETH OSWALD

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my outstanding constituents, Ms. Elizabeth Oswald, a dedicated volunteer whose expertise, compassion, and tireless service have made a lasting impact on our community through her work at the Free Senior Health Clinic.

Over the past year, Ms. Oswald has brought more than 20 years of patient care experience to support the doctors and staff, ensuring that every patient receives attentive, knowledgeable, and compassionate care. Beyond her work in the clinic, she has been instrumental in expanding our small food bank, skillfully procuring items to meet immediate community needs and ensuring that no family goes without essential resources. Her dedication, insight, and proactive approach have strengthened both our clinic and the broader community it serves.

For her unwavering commitment, compassionate heart, and remarkable impact, I am proud to recognize Ms. Oswald as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her exceptional service, her expertise, and the lasting difference she has made in the lives of the patients and families she supports.

RECOGNIZING MARCH AS NA- TIONAL ATHLETIC TRAINING MONTH

HON. JOHN JOYCE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as National Athletic Training Month and to honor the dedicated athletic trainers who serve our communities.

Athletic trainers play a vital role in keeping athletes and active individuals safe, healthy, and performing at their best. From preventing injuries to providing life-saving care in critical moments, these highly trained professionals are often the first line of defense in sports and physical activity settings.

In Pennsylvania alone, there are approximately 4,345 certified athletic trainers, each making a meaningful impact in schools, clinics, and communities across the Commonwealth. In Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I am proud to represent 146 members of the National Athletic Trainers Association, whose commitment to patient care strengthens our community every day.

During National Athletic Training Month, let us recognize and thank athletic trainers for their expertise, dedication, and service. Their work truly makes a difference.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JOHN R. FORBES

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. John Forbes as he departs service to this body to assume the role of Clerk for the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs. Over the course of his distinguished career spanning more than two decades, John has honorably served in the United States Air Force, the executive branch, and the legislative branch. As we mark the close of this chapter of John's service, I am pleased to honor his dedicated contributions as a professional staff member for the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Defense.

John began his career as an enlisted airman in the Air Force in August 2000, a formative experience that grounded him in the practical realities of the men and women our defense budgets are meant to serve. Over the following decade, John rose through the ranks and earned his commission as an officer, accumulating experience across multiple Air Force installations. He completed his undergraduate degree in Political Science, graduating Summa Cum Laude from Troy University, and later earned a Master of Arts in Management and Leadership from Webster University.

As his career progressed, John was selected as a Strategic Policy Fellow, serving at the Office of Management and Budget's National Security Division and the Defense Innovation Board in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. He commanded the 27th Special Operations Comptroller Squadron at Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, during which time he established the first-ever Air Force Special Operations Command wing innovation cell, garnering Small Business Innovation Research contracts to accelerate the application of emerging technology to the wing's mission. For this and his broader service, he was recognized as both the United States Air Force Comptroller of the Year and the United States Special Operations Command Comptroller of the Year.

John also served as a Politico-Military Planner for the Joint Staff's J-5 Strategy, Plans, and Policy Directorate, where he was the principal strategist and advisor to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for twelve European allies and partners. Among many consequential assignments, he developed and coordinated the Chairman's foreign engagement plan in response to the threat of Russian incursion into Ukraine and Chinese influence in the region.

In March 2022, John transitioned to Capitol Hill, where he served as a professional staff member on the Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Defense, where he oversaw Research, Development, Test and Evaluation for the Army; Shipbuilding and Conversion for the Navy; and the Defense Security Cooperation Agency.

John joined the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense in January 2023, where

he had oversight responsibility of critical defense and intelligence community accounts, including Operation and Maintenance, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the United States Special Operations Command. John was essential in developing the first full-year continuing resolution for Defense in fiscal year 2025, as well as bringing the Subcommittee back to a resemblance of regular order in fiscal year 2026—both among the most challenging appropriations cycles in recent memory.

As John begins a new chapter in the Senate, I would be remiss if I did not reflect on the tremendous contribution he has made to the House Appropriations Committee and to our national security. John brings to every task an exceptional breadth of experience—the perspective of an enlisted airman, a commander, a strategist, a budget officer, and a legislative professional. His depth of knowledge, his professionalism, and his abiding commitment to the men and women of our armed forces have made him an invaluable member of the defense appropriations staff. I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending John Forbes for his extraordinary service to our country, and I wish him every success in his important new role.

HONORING THE CITY OF
ST. HELENA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the City of St. Helena on the sesquicentennial anniversary of its official establishment as a municipality, and to recognize its rich history, community spirit, and enduring role as the heart of the Napa Valley. This celebration honors the generations of residents, civic leaders, and organizations that have shaped the city's unique character, agricultural heritage, vibrant cultural identity, and forward-looking community values.

The City of St. Helena was officially incorporated on March 24, 1876, though its roots trace back to 1854, four years after California attained statehood. The city grew from an agricultural settlement to a lively hub for wine production and hospitality, centered around a strong and vibrant community. Before Euro-American settlement in the 1840s, the area was inhabited by the Wappo and indigenous people. A local Callajomanes triblet village called Annakotanoma or Anakonoma was also located nearby.

St. Helena is renowned as a hospitality destination and was centered around the location on its western edge of the first hot springs resort in California. The wine industry in Napa Valley as we know it today was originally centered around the two major wineries that were established in St. Helena and thrive today—Beringer and Krug—whose founders were instrumental in the incorporation of the City. Like many municipalities in California, what began as a Board of Trustees elected annually evolved to a modern city council with a separately elected mayor and the complement of staffing that enables a small municipality to serve its populace. For 150 years now, city managers, mayors, and councilmembers have

paved the way for volunteerism and community-driven projects through the city that reflect the values of stewardship and collaboration within our local community.

The City of St. Helena is home to a strong public education system with its own St. Helena Unified School District and values education as a cornerstone of community success with a long-standing tradition of supporting lifelong learning through its public library. Our public library was originally established with the help of Andrew Carnegie after he—like many others before and since—visited and were impressed by both the natural beauty of the Napa Valley and the energy found in the local community of St. Helena.

Mr. Speaker, the City of St. Helena has had a profound impact on our community and our community on the city. Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we honor the city's sesquicentennial anniversary here today as they celebrate this milestone.

RECOGNIZING MR. ROBERT
JACOBSEN

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my outstanding constituents, Mr. Robert Jacobsen, a dedicated volunteer whose generosity, ingenuity, and tireless commitment have made a profound impact on our community through his work with the Free Senior Health Clinic.

Robert is consistently among one of the clinic's most valuable volunteers, ensuring that every patient's needs—whether food, clothing, shoes, or medical equipment—are met. Together with his wife, he approaches every challenge with determination and care, leaving no need unmet. Beyond direct assistance to patients, Robert is a fundraiser extraordinaire, tirelessly advocating for the clinic, its patients, and its food bank, securing resources that sustain and strengthen our community.

For his unwavering dedication, compassionate heart, and remarkable impact, I am proud to recognize Mr. Jacobsen as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring his selfless service, extraordinary commitment, and the lasting difference he has made in the lives of countless patients and families.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
COMMANDER BRADLEY LILE

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the admirable career and dedicated service of Commander Bradley Lile of the Kingsville Police Department.

A native Texan, Commander Lile has committed his life to serving and protecting our community. He is a proud veteran of the United States Army and has served in the Army National Guard and the Texas State

Guard. Since joining the Kingsville Police Department in 1997, Commander Lile has demonstrated strong leadership and an unwavering commitment to public service.

Throughout his tenure, Commander Lile has served with distinction in numerous positions, including Patrol Officer, Field Training Officer, Detective, Corporal, Patrol Corporal, Detective Sergeant, Patrol Sergeant, Communications Sergeant, Patrol Division Commander, Interim Police Chief, and his current role as Commander of the Criminal Investigations Division. In addition, he has taken on critical assignments such as Field Training Officer Coordinator, Crime Stoppers Coordinator, and Public Information Officer.

Commander Lile's expertise is also highlighted by his multiple certifications through the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement, including Master Peace Officer, Instructor, SFST Instructor, Court Security Officer, and Sexual Assault and Family Violence certifications. Commander Lile is also a certified Latent Print Examiner and is qualified to testify on fingerprint evidence in the 79th and 105th District Courts.

Through his multitude of experiences, Commander Lile has displayed a strong passion for public service and a clear understanding of what it means to serve and strengthen our community. It is an honor to represent exemplary citizens such as Commander Lile whose dedication, leadership, and integrity have made a lasting impact on those he serves. Our community has been made better because of his service.

Mr. Speaker, our community extends its deepest gratitude to Commander Lile for his courage, integrity, and the personal sacrifices he made in service of our community. He is a source of pride and inspiration for all South Texans, and I am honored to recognize his outstanding contributions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DARIN LAHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 97, and YEA on Roll Call No. 98.

HONORING VORIS BRUMFIELD
REED

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Voris Brumfield Reed. I have named Mrs. Brumfield Reed as the California 4th District's Woman of the Year for Lake County. This honor recognizes women who have made important contributions to California's 4th Congressional District in Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Service.

Mrs. Brumfield Reed was born in San Angelo, Texas. After graduating from Chapel Hill School for Girls in Waltham, Massachusetts,

she went on to earn her Bachelor of Arts from the University of Denver. She completed her post graduate studies at the Arizona State University, Flagstaff and the University of California, Santa Cruz.

Mrs. Brumfield Reed served as a lay pastor at both Middletown Community United Church and Kelseyville United Methodist Church. She worked to establish a weekly meal program and served as the president of Lake County Church Women's United. Mrs. Brumfield Reed also served as a past member of the Lake County Board of Supervisors and a past Trustee of the Middletown Unified School District. Through her position as the Lake County Geothermal Coordinator, she promoted underground utilities in Middletown and Lower Lake, wastewater collection in Middletown and Anderson Springs, and wrote the grants for the creation of the Anderson Springs Water System.

Mrs. Brumfield Reed's community involvement goes beyond her participation in government. She is a co-creator and co-founder of both the Gibson Museum and Cultural Center, and the Anderson Springs Community Service District, as well as the past President of the Anderson Springs Community Alliance and the Lake County Historical Society. She has also been involved in several community organizations including the Ladies of the Lake, Sistas of Lake County, Oro Fino Rebekah Lodge, and Middletown Lioness.

Mrs. Brumfield Reed is married to Stanley H. Reed, and has four children with her late husband, Richard Brumfield: Rick, Randy, Khristan, and Star Brumfield.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Brumfield Reed's passion, leadership, and determination have profoundly impacted our Lake County community. It is with great honor and deep appreciation that we recognize her invaluable contributions here today.

RECOGNIZING FRANCIS "FRANK" ANDROSKI, ROY GRENAWALT, AND HANS DERKATSCH

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary contributions of three remarkable veterans in my district: Francis "Frank" Androski, retired United States Air Force; Roy Grenawalt, retired United States Army; and Hans Derkatsch, retired United States Army. These men have taken the values they learned in military service—discipline, dedication, and a commitment to others—and applied them to serving their community in meaningful ways.

Through their work with Friends Grief Services, they provide programs and resources to people of all ages who have experienced loss and grief. Frank faithfully picks up and delivers mail, ensuring the organization's daily operations run smoothly. Hans brings healing and wellness to the community by teaching beginner yoga classes, helping participants find balance and peace during difficult times. All three gentlemen serve on the Advisory Board, con-

tributing to planning activities and supporting fundraising efforts to expand the reach of Friends Grief Services.

But their greatest accomplishment is the compassion, support, and guidance they provide to those navigating loss. Their dedication embodies the mission of Friends Grief Services, and it is why they are affectionately known as the "Wise Men of Friends" Support Groups. I am grateful for their service—not only to our country, but also to our community. Their example reminds us that leadership, selflessness, and care for others continue long after military service ends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging their unwavering commitment to serving others and supporting the mission of Friends Grief Services. For their extraordinary generosity and dedication, I am proud to recognize Francis Androski, Roy Grenawalt, and Hans Derkatsch as 2026 Heroes Among Us for Florida's 12th Congressional District. They are truly an inspiration, and I am grateful for their efforts.

HONORING COLONEL CHRISTOPHER COOK

HON. MATT VAN EPPS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Colonel Christopher Cook for his exemplary service, steadfast leadership, and enduring commitment to our Nation throughout a distinguished career in the United States Army.

Colonel Cook was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant from The Citadel in May 2000 and earned his Army Aviator designation at Fort Rucker, Alabama, in May 2001. From the outset of his career, he demonstrated exceptional skill, discipline, and a commitment to excellence that would define his decades of service.

From February 2002 to December 2006, Colonel Cook served with C Company, 1st Battalion, 4th Aviation Regiment, 4th Infantry Division at Fort Hood, Texas. During this time, he held numerous key leadership roles, including AH-64D Apache Longbow Scout Platoon Leader, Class III/V Platoon Leader, Assistant Battalion Operations Officer, Battalion Adjutant, and Battalion Rear Detachment Commander. His leadership during this formative period laid a strong foundation for future operational success.

From August 2007 through June 2014, Colonel Cook served with the elite 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne) at Fort Campbell, Kentucky. As a proud Night Stalker, he held positions of increasing responsibility, including Platoon Leader and Operations Officer for B Company, 2nd Battalion; Company Commander for A Company, 2nd Battalion; Battalion Operations Officer; and Battalion Executive Officer. During this time, he deployed globally in support of critical missions as a Fully Mission Qualified MH-47G Chinook Pilot in Command, Air Mission Commander, Army Special Operations Aviation Operations Officer, and Task Force Commander.

Colonel Cook continued his distinguished service from June 2014 to June 2016 as the G-3X, Chief of Sensitive Activities for the United States Army Special Operations Aviation Command at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He later served from July 2016 to May 2018 as the J-31 Air Division Rotary Wing Operations Officer at United States Special Operations Command at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida.

From June 2018 to June 2019, Colonel Cook commanded the 1st Battalion, 228th Aviation Regiment, Joint Task Force—Bravo, in Soto Cano, Honduras. He subsequently commanded the Special Operations Aviation Training Battalion at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, from July 2019 to July 2021. From July 2021 to July 2023, he served as Director of Security Cooperation for the 160th Special Operations Aviation Advisory Directorate. His final assignment was Deputy Commander of the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (Airborne), where he continued to exemplify the highest standards of leadership and service.

Throughout his career, Colonel Cook deployed multiple times in support of Operations Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom, and Freedom's Sentinel. He is a highly accomplished aviator, qualified in the OH-58A/C, AH-64A, AH-64D, CH-47D, CH-47F, MH-47G, and MH-6M aircraft.

Colonel Cook is a graduate of the United States Army Command and General Staff College. He holds a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from The Citadel and a Master of Science in Organizational Communication from Murray State University.

His numerous awards and decorations include the Legion of Merit; Bronze Star Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters; Defense Meritorious Service Medal; Meritorious Service Medal with one Silver and one Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster; Air Medal with "V" Device and Air Medal; Army Achievement Medal; National Defense Service Medal; Afghanistan Campaign Medal with three Bronze Service Stars; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Army Service Ribbon; Overseas Service Ribbon; NATO Medal; Presidential Unit Citation; Army Superior Unit Award; Meritorious Unit Commendation; and Air Force Meritorious Unit Award. He is also authorized to wear the Master Army Aviator Badge, Parachutist Badge, and Combat Action Badge. In addition, he has earned several prestigious foreign awards, including the Chilean, German (Silver), Brazilian, and British Parachutist Badges, and has been recognized by the Army Aviation Association of America with both the Bronze and Silver Orders of Saint Michael.

Beyond his remarkable military accomplishments, Colonel Cook is a devoted husband to his wife, Lisa, and a proud father to their two children, Kaitlyn and Collin.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Chris Cook's career reflects the very best of the United States Army: courage, professionalism, and selfless service. His contributions to our national security and his unwavering dedication to mission and country deserve our highest recognition.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Colonel Chris Cook for his extraordinary service and in wishing him and his family continued success in all their future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING MAZON'S "NO ONE
DESERVES TO GO HUNGRY"
CAMPAIGN

HON. ANGIE CRAIG

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, the list of the Trump administration's reckless attacks on SNAP, our country's largest and most efficient anti-hunger program, is miles long:

Taking food assistance away from 4 million Americans, illegally demanding SNAP participants' personal data, spreading misinformation about SNAP and fraud, failing to uphold their duties to states and program beneficiaries, eliminating 30 percent of USDA staff, haphazardly eliminating and relocating many regional offices and more.

Today, in response to these attacks, MAZON delivered more than 47,000 postcards to USDA. These postcards flooding USDA send a clear message: that no one deserves to go hungry and SNAP must be protected, not cut.

The more than 47,000 handwritten postcards MAZON delivered today also represent the more than 47 million Americans that are facing financial instability and aren't sure where their next meal will come from.

They are an expression of concern and outrage over the state of hunger in America and the need to take positive action to address it—not exacerbate it, as Republicans in Congress and the White House have chosen to do over the past year.

These postcards were sent from people's homes, synagogues, schools, community organizations, and nonprofits; some even hosted postcard writing parties where they invited their loved ones to take part in communal action with them.

It is an important reminder of what can happen when we refuse to lose hope. A reminder that we should continue challenging politicians who say that America can't afford to feed its people.

My hope is that these postcards refocus this administration on the things that matter. I hope that they remind the Secretary of her duty to carry out SNAP in good faith and as it was intended: to provide for the basic nutritional needs of the American people; to provide a hand up at a time when so many need help affording groceries, rent, utilities and childcare.

RECOGNIZING DR. DAVID
HERNDON

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my outstanding constituents, Dr. David Herndon, a skilled Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine whose generosity and expertise benefit our community through the Free Senior Health Clinic.

Dr. Herndon volunteers his time each Friday during his lunch hour, offering care with both remarkable skill and genuine compassion. A brilliant diagnostician and dedicated practitioner, he combines medical expertise, re-

search knowledge, and heartfelt concern to make a meaningful difference in the lives of his patients. His commitment ensures that our seniors receive not only expert care, but also dignity, reassurance, and hope.

For his enduring dedication, compassionate heart, and profound impact on our community, I am proud to recognize Dr. Herndon as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring his unwavering commitment, selfless leadership, and the lasting, positive influence he has had on the lives of countless residents.

HONORING MARISA ALCORTA

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marisa Alcorta. I have named Mrs. Alcorta as the California 4th Congressional District's Woman of the Year for Yolo County. This honor recognizes women who have made important contributions to California's 4th Congressional District in Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Services.

Mrs. Alcorta was born and raised in Austin, Texas. She earned her Bachelor of Science in Plant Sciences, with a focus on Sustainable Agriculture and International Development from Cornell University. Mrs. Alcorta went on to receive her Master of Science in Horticulture and Agronomy. Marisa is also a Fellow of the California Agricultural Leadership Program, a highly selective statewide program that brings together agricultural leaders to deepen their understanding of public policy, leadership, and the challenges and opportunities shaping California agriculture.

Marisa Alcorta has played a leading role in strengthening agricultural education and workforce development in Yolo County. At the Center for Land-Based Learning, she developed and expanded programs that prepare agricultural employees for leadership and management roles on farms and ranches. She designed the AgHiRE workforce development program, which equips experienced Spanish-speaking agricultural employees with the communication and supervisory skills needed to advance in their careers. She also founded California's first registered agricultural apprenticeship program, creating a structured pathway for aspiring farm managers to gain hands-on training and formal recognition of their skills. Through these initiatives, she has helped build stronger career pathways while supporting the long-term succession of farms and agricultural businesses in the region.

Within our community, Marisa actively contributes to broader efforts that support farmers and agricultural communities throughout California. She serves on the Board of Directors of California FarmLink and has previously served as Chair of the Board, helping guide the organization's strategic direction and expansion of programs that support family farmers and improve access to land and capital. She also serves on the Farm Advisory Council for the California Climate and Agriculture Network, contributing agricultural practitioner perspectives to statewide policy conversations on climate resilience and sustainable agriculture.

Today, Mrs. Alcorta and her husband, Paul Underhill, live and farm in Yolo County. They maintain a close connection to the agricultural community as co-owners of an organic farming operation in the Winters area.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Alcorta's passion, leadership, and determination have profoundly impacted our Yolo County community. It is with great honor and deep appreciation that we recognize her invaluable contributions here today.

HONORING LESLIE LEW

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Leslie Lew. I have named Ms. Lew as the California 4th Congressional District's Woman of the Year for Napa County. This honor recognizes women who have made important contributions to California's 4th Congressional District in Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Services.

Ms. Lew was born in Los Angeles. She earned her Bachelor of Science in Landscape Architecture from the University of California, Davis.

Ms. Lew is a Planned Parenthood champion with years of advocacy experience across multiple roles in our community. She has served as Chair of the Planned Parenthood Northern California Action Fund, Vice Chair of the Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California (PPAC), Co-Chair of the PPAC Legislative Workgroup, and Chair of the Planned Parenthood Northern California Audit Committee. Ms. Lew has been a long-time defender of justice and quality of life for everyone in our community.

Ms. Lew also works with political organizations and candidates to advocate for positive outcomes in our community. She is a member of the Napa County Democratic Central Committee and an elected delegate to the California Democratic Party. She has worked tirelessly to knock doors, make calls, and send texts for democratic candidates across the country. Ms. Lew organized Napa's first postcarding group with RiseUpNapa in 2018. She has also hosted and volunteered at numerous fundraisers for various causes and candidates.

Ms. Lew has helped our community with wildfire recovery by creating a shaded fuel break for fire resilience along a key ridgeline between Napa and Sonoma Counties. She is on the steering committee for the Napa County Prescribed Burn Association, and a member of the Good Fire Alliance and the Lake County Ecocultural Fire Crew.

Beyond her incredible work, Ms. Lew is a lifelong naturalist and outdoor adventurer. She lives with her husband, Tom Farella, and her children, Daisy and Gabe Farella.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Lew's passion, leadership, and determination have profoundly impacted our Napa County community. It is with great honor and deep appreciation that we recognize her invaluable contributions here today.

HONORING SHERIFF ROSANA
"ROSIE" CORDERO-STUTZ

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in honor of Women's History Month, I rise today to recognize and honor Rosanna "Rosie" Cordero-Stutz, who made history on January 7, 2025, when she was sworn in as the first female sheriff of Miami-Dade County and Florida's first Hispanic woman Sheriff. Her historic appointment coincided with a significant milestone in the county's public safety history—the transition of the Miami-Dade Police Department back into the Miami-Dade Sheriff's Office for the first time in nearly sixty years.

Sheriff Cordero-Stutz has dedicated more than three decades to law enforcement and public service, building an exemplary career defined by leadership, professionalism, and an unwavering commitment to safety. Since joining the then Department in 1996, she has served her community without interruption, rising through the ranks.

By 2024, she was entrusted with command of Investigative Services, directing divisions responsible for criminal investigations, government affairs, and forensic services, while also serving as acting assistant director overseeing police services for multiple districts and specialized operations.

Beyond her operational leadership, Sheriff Cordero-Stutz has been deeply engaged in professional organizations and community initiatives. She has served on the legislative committee for the Major County Sheriffs of America and has been a member of the Federal Emergency Management Agency Review Council, appointed by President Donald J. Trump. She has also worked closely with organizations dedicated to strengthening local relationships and preventing violence.

Today, as the chief law enforcement officer of Miami-Dade County, Sheriff Cordero-Stutz's priorities remain clear: ensuring the safety and security of residents and visitors while maintaining the highest standards of professionalism, integrity, and respect within the Miami-Dade Sheriff's Office. Her leadership ensures that the county continues to be a place where families feel safe, visitors feel welcome, and businesses can prosper.

Beyond the badge, Sheriff Cordero-Stutz is grounded by her deep commitment to family. Alongside her husband, Kurt—a retired Miami-Dade police officer—and their son, Evan, she exemplifies the strength and sacrifice of a law enforcement family, balancing the heavy mantle of public safety with the grace of a devoted wife and mother.

It is therefore fitting that we recognize Sheriff Rosanna "Rosie" Cordero-Stutz for her groundbreaking achievements, her decades of distinguished service, and her continued dedication to the people of Miami-Dade County. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her remarkable career and her steadfast commitment to protecting and serving her community.

RECOGNIZING DR. CHRIS MATTEY

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of my outstanding constituents, Dr. Chris Matthey, a dedicated physician whose expertise and compassion benefit our community through her volunteer work at the Free Senior Health Clinic.

Dr. Matthey volunteers every Tuesday, providing critical care to our Spanish-speaking population and ensuring they receive accurate, culturally competent primary care. A specialist in senior care, she combines deep medical knowledge with a humanitarian spirit, bringing both expertise and empathy to every patient she serves. Her dedication and thoughtful approach ensure that seniors in our community receive not only excellent medical care, but also dignity, reassurance, and hope.

For her selfless dedication, unwavering compassion, and profound impact on our community, I am proud to recognize Dr. Matthey as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her exceptional commitment, her remarkable skill, and the lasting, positive influence she has had on the lives of countless residents.

HONORING MARICARMEN REYES
LARIOS

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Maricarmen Reyes Larios. I have named Ms. Reyes Larios as the California 4th Congressional District's Woman of the Year for Sonoma County. This honor recognizes women who have made important contributions to California's 4th Congressional District in Arts and Culture, Professional Achievement, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, or Community Services.

Ms. Reyes Larios was born in Sonoma, California, to Mexican immigrant parents, Francisco Reyes Torres and Maria Larios Abrica. She earned her bachelor's degree in Chicano and Latino Studies from Sonoma State University in 2005. Later, Maricarmen completed a Community Health Worker Certificate at City College of San Francisco in 2025.

Ms. Reyes Larios has dedicated her life to suicide prevention following the tragic passing of her nephew in 2021 and currently serves as a mentor and tutor to further assist the youth of our valley. She is a member of the Sonoma County Suicide Prevention Coalition and works as the Outreach and Event Coordinator at Sonoma Valley Community Health Center. She also serves in several community leadership roles, including Board Member for KSVY Sonoma TV, Board Member for RISK Sonoma, and Board Member for the Sonoma Valley Education Foundation. She also chairs Sonoma County Community Organizations Active in Disaster (COAD) and the Springs Municipal Advisory Council, contributes to the Sonoma Valley Catalyst Fund Grants Committee, and is an active member of the Líderes

Campesinas Sonoma Chapter, and the Sonoma County Community Emergency Response Team (CERT).

Within our community, Ms. Reyes Larios is known for her empathy, integrity, and deep commitment to community well-being. She leads with compassion and cultural humility, creating spaces where people feel seen, respected, and supported. Rooted in her heritage and driven by service, she is a collaborative leader who uplifts others, builds strong relationships, and inspires collective action across Sonoma Valley.

Ms. Reyes Larios was selected as the Grand Marshal of the 2022 Sonoma 4th of July Parade by the Sonoma Valley Fire Department. In 2023, she received the Puente y Ganas Award from Los Cien for her leadership and community impact. She was honored with the Louis Petreka Legacy Award in 2026 by the Sonoma County Department of Emergency Management, and in that same year was named Woman of the Year for Assembly District 4 by Assemblymember Cecilia Aguiar-Curry.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Reyes Larios' passion, leadership, and determination have profoundly impacted our Sonoma County community. It is with great honor and deep appreciation that we recognize her invaluable contributions here today.

HONORING THE PETOSKEY HIGH
SCHOOL STEEL DRUM BAND

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Petoskey High School Steel Drum Band on being selected to represent Michigan in the "Salute to Independence 250th-USA Celebration Parade," commemorating America's Semiquincentennial Anniversary. This remarkable and well-deserved accomplishment reflects the band's commitment to excellence, their dedication to one another, and the steadfast support of their community.

For the last 30 years, the Petoskey Steel Drum Band has entertained communities across Northern Michigan and has frequently performed in Chicago and New Orleans. Founded by Petoskey Band Director, Barry Bennett, this 40-piece ensemble goes beyond traditional Caribbean steel drum music by thoughtfully blending this genre with a wide range of contemporary and familiar favorites, from the Zac Brown Band and Jimmy Buffett to classic Christmas carols.

On July 3, 2026, the band will march along a 2.4-mile parade route that passes directly in front of and through the very streets walked by our Founding Fathers 250 years ago. Immediately following the parade, in a true testament to their gratitude and commitment to their hometown, the band will board their motor coaches and begin the journey back to Petoskey so they may perform in their own community's Fourth of July parade the following evening at 6 p.m. In an extraordinary act of leadership and generosity, Duane Willson, Director of Bands for Public Schools of Petoskey, has committed to fully funding the trip. Currently working to raise the \$80,000 needed to make the experience possible, his

effort will ensure that every student has the opportunity to take part in this historic celebration of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring the Petoskey High School Steel Drum Band on being selected to represent Michigan in the "Salute to Independence 250th-USA Celebration Parade." I extend my heartfelt congratulations to the students, their director, the families, and the entire Petoskey community. May they travel safely, perform proudly, and continue to represent Michigan with excellence, integrity, and patriotism.

RECOGNIZING MS. WANDA
ROSIGNOL

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize one of my constituents, Ms. Wanda Rosignol, for her tireless service to our community. Wanda has been an invaluable volunteer at the Pregnancy & Family Life Center (PFLC) of Citrus County since 2022, donating over 1,340 hours in the food pantry, clothing

distribution, and infant/child care program. Wanda is a team-oriented volunteer who finds real purpose in helping women through pregnancy and motherhood. She works alongside Lisa Wright and others to package and deliver food to clients, personally escorting rolling carts of groceries and clothing items to clients' cars. She also oversees the busy donation bin, often filled to overflowing, sorting items and setting aside the best quality donations for clients. In 2025, the Center distributed 9,300 infant and children's clothing items and more than 4,000 personal care items under her care.

Together, with two other exceptional volunteers, Judy and Lisa, Wanda embodies the heart of the PFLC mission—compassion, service, and unwavering support for women and families. Their dedication ensures that every client who walks through the door receives not only essential resources but also dignity, hope, and encouragement for the future.

For their enduring dedication, compassionate hearts, and profound impact on their community, I am honored to recognize Ms. Wanda Rosignol as a 2026 Hero Among Us. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring her unwavering commitment, selfless leadership, and the profound, lasting impact she has made on our community.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 26, 2026 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1589–S1645

Measures Introduced: Thirty bills and eight resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4185–4214, S.J. Res. 143–147, S. Res. 661, and S. Con. Res. 30–31.

Pages S1614–15

Measures Passed:

Hershel ‘Woody’ Williams National Medal of Honor Monument Location Act: Committee on Energy and Natural Resources was discharged from further consideration of S. 858, to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work on the National Mall to honor the extraordinary acts of valor, selfless service, and sacrifice displayed by Medal of Honor recipients, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S1605**

Justice Amendment No. 4784, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1605**

Scarper Ridge Golden Gate National Recreation Area Boundary Adjustment Act: Committee on Energy and Natural Resources was discharged from further consideration of S. 1142, to adjust the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area to include the Scarper Ridge property, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1605**

Independence of Greece 205th Anniversary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 661, recognizing the 205th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

Page S1609

Honoring Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, United States Army Reserve: Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 648, honoring the memory, service, and sacrifice of Master Sergeant Nicole M. Amor, United States Army Reserve, and the resolution was then agreed to, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S1609**

Thune (for Klobuchar) Amendment No. 4785, to amend the preamble. **Pages S1609–10**

Measures Considered:

D332

Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act—Cloture: Senate continued consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 7147, making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026.

Pages S1589–99, S1599–S1604, S1609

A motion was entered to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill, and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on cloture will occur on Friday, March 27, 2026.

Page S1609

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill on March 12, 2026. **Page S1599**

Senate agreed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill on March 12, 2026. **Page S1599**

By 54 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 71), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate upon reconsideration rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill.

Pages S1599–S1600

Clean Electricity Production Credits: By 47 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 70), Senate did not agree to the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 107, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Internal Revenue Service relating to “Beginning of Construction Requirements for Purposes of the Termination of Clean Electricity Production Credits and Clean Electricity Investment Credits for Applicable Wind and Solar Facilities”.

Page S1599

Reproductive Health Services: By 48 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 72), Senate did not agree to the motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 103,

providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to “Reproductive Health Services”. **Page S1609**

House Messages:

Save America Act—Agreement: Senate continued 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: **Page S1589**

Pending:

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill. **Page S1589**

Thune motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with Thune (for Schmitt) Amendment No. 4420 (to the House amendment to the bill), in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1589**

Thune (for Husted) Amendment No. 4732 (to Amendment No. 4420), to require voters to provide photo identification. **Page S1589**

Thune motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration, with instructions, Thune Amendment No. 4772, to change the enactment date. **Page S1589**

Thune Amendment No. 4773 (to (the instructions) Amendment No. 4772), of a perfecting nature. **Page S1589**

Thune Amendment No. 4774 (to Amendment No. 4773), of a perfecting nature. **Page S1589**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the House message to accompany the bill at approximately 12 noon, on Thursday, March 26, 2026; and that the motions to invoke cloture filed during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, March 24, 2026, ripen at 1:30 p.m. **Page S1628**

Message from the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (PM–54) **Page S1611**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 14257 of April 2, 2025, with respect to trade practices that contribute to large and persistent annual United States Goods Trade Deficits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance. (PM–55) **Page S1612**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 14024 of April 15, 2021, with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–56) **Page S1612**

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency that was originally declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–57) **Page S1612**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

29 Army nominations in the rank of general.

Routine lists in the Foreign Service. **Pages S1644–45**

Messages from the House: **Pages S1612–13**

Measures Referred: **Page S1613**

Executive Communications: **Page S1613**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1615–16**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1616–19**

Additional Statements: **Page S1611**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1619–28**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S1628**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—72) **Pages S1599–S1600, S1609**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon and adjourned at 10:37 p.m., until 12 noon on Thursday, March 26, 2026. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S1644.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

OPERATION EPIC FURY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee received a closed briefing on Operation Epic Fury from Daniel L. Zimmerman, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, and Richard D. Tilley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, both of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Major General Sean M. Choquette, USAF, Vice Director for Operations, J–3,

Joint Staff, and Christopher J. Almont, Senior Defense Intelligence Expert, Defense Combating Terrorism Center, Defense Intelligence Agency, all of the Department of Defense.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Social Security, focusing on a discussion on the facts and the path forward, after receiving testimony from Senators Cassidy and Whitehouse; Molly Dahl, Chief of Long-Term Analysis, Congressional Budget Office; Karen P. Glenn, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration; and Barry F. Huston, Specialist in Social Policy, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.

BULK POWER SYSTEM

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the state of the bulk power system, after receiving testimony from Todd Snitchler, Electric Power Supply Association, Travis Fisher, Cato Institute, and Liza Reed, Niskanen Center, all of Washington, D.C.

RUSSIA-UKRAINE WAR

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing and update on the Russia-Ukraine war from Brendan Hanrahan, Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Christopher W. Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs, Eugene Fishel, Deputy Director, Bureau of Intelligence and Research, Europe Office, and additional briefers, all of the Department of State.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Sheria Akins Clarke, to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, who was introduced by Senator Scott (SC), Kathleen S. Lane, to be United States District Judge for the District of Montana, who was introduced by Senator Daines, Evan Rikhye, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and Kara Marie Westercamp, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

PROTECTING AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution concluded a hearing to examine protecting American citizenship, focusing on federalism, sanctuary cities, and the rule of law, after receiving testimony from former Virginia Attorney General Jason Miyares, Torridon Law, Virginia Beach; Sheriff Clarence F. Birkhead, Durham County, Durham, North Carolina; Jessica M. Vaughan, Center for Immigration Studies, and Stephen I. Vladeck, Georgetown Law, both of Washington, D.C.; and Joe Abraham, Glenview, Illinois.

SENIORS AND THE WORKFORCE

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine seniors and the workforce, after receiving testimony from Rachel U. Greszler, Advancing American Freedom, Johnny C. Taylor, Jr., SHRM, Jason J. Fichtner, National Academy of Social Insurance, and Dan Adcock, National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, all of Washington, D.C.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 22 public bills, H.R. 8070–8091; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 80; and H. Res. 1135–1137 were introduced.

Pages H2709–11

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H2711–12

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 2071, to prohibit Federal funds from being made available to international financial institutions for the purposes of financing foreign shrimp farms,

and for other purposes, with amendments (H. Rept. 119–571);

H.R. 4171, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to provide small issuers with a micro-offering exemption free of mandated disclosures or offering filings, but subject to the antifraud provisions of the Federal securities laws, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–572); and

H.R. 7127, to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt off-exchange secondary trading from State regulation where such trading is with respect to securities of an issuer that makes publicly available

certain current information, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–573). **Page H2709**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Moore (WV) to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2679**

Recess: The House recessed at 11 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H2686**

Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following individual on the part of the House to the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture to fill the existing vacancy thereon: Mr. Anh "Joseph" Cao, Metairie, Louisiana. **Page H2687**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative LaLota wherein he resigned from the Committee on Small Business. **Page H2687**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Miller (OH) wherein he resigned from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. **Page H2687**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Downing wherein he resigned from the Committee on Small Business. **Page H2687**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative McCormick wherein he resigned from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. **Pages H2687–88**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 1135, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H2688**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:12 p.m. and reconvened at 1:30 p.m. **Page H2696**

Make the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Act of 2026: The House passed H.R. 5103, to establish a program to Beautify the District of Columbia and establish the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful Commission, by a yea-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 206 noes, Roll No. 101.

Pages H2698–H2704, H2705

Rejected the McClellan motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform by a yea-and-nay vote of 207 yeas to 214 nays, Roll No. 100. **Pages H2704–05**

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. **Page H2698**

H. Res. 1131, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8029), the resolution (H. Res. 1128) and the bills (H.R. 5103) and (H.R. 7084) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 210

noes, Roll No. 99, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 98. **Pages H2688–96, H2696–97**

Presidential Messages: Received a message from the President transmitting a notification stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14257 of April 2, 2025, is to continue in effect beyond April 2, 2026—referred to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–142). **Page H2697**

Read a message from the President transmitting a notification stating that the national emergency with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation declared in Executive Order 14024 of April 15, 2021, which was expanded in scope in subsequent executive orders, is to continue in effect beyond April 15, 2026—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–143).

Pages H2697–98

Read a message from the President transmitting a notification stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, with respect to South Sudan is to continue in effect beyond April 3, 2026—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–144). **Page H2698**

Read a message from the President transmitting a notification stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13694, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities, of April 1, 2015, and subsequent executive orders, is to continue in effect beyond April 1, 2026—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 119–145). **Page H2698**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2696, H2697, H2704–05, and H2705.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Member Day". Testimony was heard from Representatives Van Drew, Costa, Kiggans of Virginia, and Weber of Texas.

U.S. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government held an oversight hearing on the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Testimony was heard from Scott Kupor, Director, U.S. Office of Personnel Management.

QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE MILITARY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Quality of Life in the Military". Testimony was heard from Sergeant Major Michael R. Weimer, U.S. Army, Sergeant Major of the Army, Department of Army; Master Chief Petty Officer John Perryman, U.S. Navy, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, Department of Navy; Sergeant Major Carlos A. Ruiz, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, U.S. Marine Corps; Chief Master Sergeant David R. Wolfe, U.S. Air Force, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Department of the Air Force; and Chief Master Sergeant John F. Bentivenga, Chief Master Sergeant of the Space Force, U.S. Space Force.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on National Security, Department of State, and Related Programs held a hearing entitled "Member Day". Testimony was heard from Representatives Hageman, Jackson of Illinois, and Stansbury.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Member Day". Testimony was heard from Mannion, Van Drew, Hageman, Ramirez, and Stansbury.

NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held an oversight hearing on the National Weather Service. Testimony was heard from Taylor Jordan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Environmental Observation and Prediction, National Weather Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled "Member Day". Testimony was heard from Representatives Hoyle of Oregon, Liccardo, and Moylan.

NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled "National Security Space Programs and Activities". Testimony was heard from the following Department of Defense officials: William B. Adkins, Principal Deputy Director, National Reconnaissance Office; Thomas W. Ainsworth, Performing the Duties of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space Acquisition and Integration, Department of the Air Force; Marc Berkowitz, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense; Brett Markham, Deputy Director, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency; and Lieutenant General Douglas A. Schies, Deputy Chief of Space Operations for Operations (S3/4/7), U.S. Space Force.

CHANGES AT MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES AND THE EFFECTS ON MILITARY READINESS AND BENEFICIARY ACCESS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing entitled "Changes at Military Treatment Facilities and the Effects on Military Readiness and Beneficiary Access". Testimony was heard from Keith Bass, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, Department of Defense; and Darin Via, Director, Defense Health Agency, Department of Defense.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 7386, the "First Responder Network Authority Reauthorization Act"; and H.R. 7022, the "Mystic Alerts Act". H.R. 7386 and H.R. 7022 were ordered reported, as amended.

TOKENIZATION AND THE FUTURE OF SECURITIES: MODERNIZING OUR CAPITAL MARKETS

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Tokenization and the Future of Securities: Modernizing Our Capital Markets". Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SECURING THE FUTURE: ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY FOR THE MODERN AGE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled "Securing the Future: Arms Control and International Security for the Modern Age". Testimony was heard from Thomas G. DiNanno, Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security, Department of State.

**FUNDING LAPSE AND SECURITY GAPS:
ASSESSING THE HARMFUL IMPACTS OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY SHUTDOWN ON AMERICANS**

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Funding Lapse and Security Gaps: Assessing the Harmful Impacts of the DHS Shutdown on Americans”. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Homeland Security officials: Admiral Thomas G. Allan, Vice Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard; Ha Nguyen McNeill, Senior Official Performing the Duties of the Administrator, Transportation Security Administration; Nicholas Andersen, Acting Director, Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency; and Victoria Barton, Associate Administrator, Office of External Affairs, Federal Emergency Management Agency.

**OVERSIGHT OF THE U.S. PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, Intellectual Property, Artificial Intelligence, and the Internet held a hearing entitled “Oversight of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office”. Testimony was heard from John Squires, Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 1555, the “Bureau of Land Management Mineral Spacing Act”; H.R. 5639, the “Co-Location Energy Act”; H.R. 7831, the “License to Drill Act”; H.R. 7872, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide for the payment of bonus payments of certain coal leases issued under that Act; and H.R. 7882, to provide for the leasing of certain deposits of minerals located within the City of Carlsbad, New Mexico. Testimony was heard from Representatives Kennedy of Utah, Hageman, and Stauber; Mitchell Leverette, Eastern States Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

**UNLEASHING AMERICA’S MINERAL
POTENTIAL: THE CRITICAL MINERAL
COMMODITY SUPPLY CHAIN**

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing entitled “Unleashing America’s Mineral Potential: The Critical Mineral Commodity Supply Chain”. Testimony was heard from Simon Jowitt, State Geologist, Bureau of Mines and Geology, Nevada; and public witnesses.

**THE FUTURE OF LOW EARTH ORBIT:
FROM THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE
STATION TO COMMERCIAL PLATFORMS**

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing entitled “The Future of Low Earth Orbit: From the ISS to Commercial Platforms”. Testimony was heard from Joel Montalbano, Acting Associate Administrator for Space Operations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Charlie Precourt, Member, Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel; and a public witness.

**DEFENDING MAIN STREET: COMBATING
CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY’S THREATS
TO AMERICA’S SMALL BUSINESSES**

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Defending Main Street: Combating CCP Threats to America’s Small Businesses”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on H.R. 6654, the “Veterans Affairs Management and Oversight of Software Assets Act”; H.R. 1288, the “Veteran DATA Act”; H.R. 7319, the “VA Bonus and Relocation Incentive Act”; H.R. 7683, the “VA Fiscal Management Modernization Act”; legislation on the Vets CLEAR Act; legislation on the Veterans Affairs Subcontractor Competition and Opportunity Network Act; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to require that certain sterile processing technicians of the Department of Veterans Affairs maintain appropriate professional certifications, and for other purposes; legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish compensation at a supplemental period of unpaid parental leave for employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; legislation to deem certain individuals as parents for purposes of determining entitlement to certain family and medical leave for such employees; legislation to prohibit the downgrading of law enforcement positions in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; and legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Office of Congressional Legislative Affairs in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes. Testimony was heard from Ilse Wiechers, Acting Deputy Assistant Under Secretary for Health for Patient Care Services, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2347, the “Survivor Justice Tax

Prevention Act”; H.R. 5366, the “Federal Disaster Tax Relief Act of 2025”; H.R. 5334, the “Supporting Early-childhood Educators’ Deductions Act of 2025”; H.R. 7971, the “Taxpayer Experience Improvement Act”; and H.R. 7959, the “IRS Whistleblower Program Improvement Act”. H.R. 2347, H.R. 5366, H.R. 5334, H.R. 7971, and H.R. 7959 were ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

RIISING GLOBAL SCAM ECONOMY

Joint Economic Committee: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the rising global scam economy, focusing on modernizing federal approaches to protect Americans from foreign fraudsters, after receiving testimony from Richard Goldberg, Associate Counsel, Fraud Section, Criminal Division, and Gregory Heeb, Deputy Assistant Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Karen P. Seifert, Director, Scam Center Strike Force, Special Counsel for National Security, United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Columbia, all of the Department of Justice; Lois C. Greisman, Associate Director, Division of Marketing Practices, Federal Trade Commission; Seto J. Bagdoyan, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Service, Government Accountability Office; Reva Price, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; and Stewart Baker, Stewart Baker Consulting PLLC, Kate Griffin, The Aspen Institute Financial Security Program, and Kathy Stokes, AARP, all of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2026

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the posture of the United States Space Command and United States Strategic Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2027 and the future years defense program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine Export-Import Bank Reauthorization, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Catherine Dillon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary (Educational and Cultural Affairs), and Yeouk Kim, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador, both of the Department of State, and Ademola Adewale-Sadik, of New York, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years, 10 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine positioning student-athletes for success in school and beyond, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 545, to prohibit certain uses of xylazine, H.R. 2159, to direct the Attorney General of the United States to submit to the Congress a report on Federal criminal offenses, S. 2934, to limit the availability of civil actions affected by United States sanctions, and the nominations of Brian Gootkin, to be United States Marshal for the District of Montana, and James Stuart, to be United States Marshal for the District of Minnesota, 10:15 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee: Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, oversight hearing on the Government Accountability Office—Federal Buildings Fund, 10 a.m., 2358–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Advancing Permanency in Child Welfare: Leveraging Federal Funding for Adoption Programs”, 10:30 a.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled “Member Day”, 3 p.m., 2358–C Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Cyber, Information Technologies, and Innovation, hearing entitled “Information Technology Posture of the Department of Defense”, 3:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7613, the “ALERT Act”, 10:15 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Budget, Full Committee, hearing entitled “The Best Metric to Reverse the Curse: A 3% Deficit-to-GDP Path to Fiscal Sustainability”, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled “U.S. Universities Under Siege: Foreign Espionage, Stolen Innovation, and the National Security Threat”, 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Communications and Technology, hearing entitled “The Telecommunications Act of 1996: 30 Years Later”, 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled “Policies to Protect Our Communities From Illicit Drug Threats”, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Ethics, Adjudicatory Subcommittee, hearing entitled “In the matter of Representative Sheila Cherfilus-McCormick”, 2 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Digital Assets, Financial Technology, and Artificial Intelligence, hearing entitled “Innovation at the Speed of Markets:

How Regulators Keep Pace with Technology”, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance, hearing entitled “Mitigation and Multiple Loss Properties: Factors Influencing the High Cost of Flooding”, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7654, to authorize the consolidation of reports required to be submitted by the Bureau of Global Health Security and Diplomacy of the Department of State, and for other purposes; H.R. 7642, to authorize the recruitment and retention of specialized disaster assistance professionals by the Department of State; H.R. 7641, to provide for a pilot program to require congressional notification of additional information for certain foreign assistance programs; H.R. 7633, to require the United States flag to be displayed on United States foreign assistance; H. Res. 971, condemning the coercive actions of the People’s Republic of China against Japan in response to statements regarding Taiwan and reaffirming the United States commitment to its allies in the Indo-Pacific region; H.R. 1744, to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2028; H.R. 3447, to require the Secretary of Commerce to issue standards with respect to chip security mechanisms for integrated circuit products, and for other purposes; H.R. 7669, to require a report that describes the current restrictions imposed by the Taliban on women and girls in Afghanistan since August 2021; H.R. 7616, to require the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to identify and mitigate relationships that pose a risk to United States foreign policy interests between certain European institutions and certain covered entities of concern, and for other purposes; H.R. 6428, to require the Secretary of State to submit a report on participation in educational and cultural exchange programs; H.R. 7058, to require the Secretary of State to conduct assessments of the risks posed to the United States by foreign adversaries who utilize generative artificial intelligence for malicious activities, and for other purposes; H.R. 7653, to enhance diplomatic engagement on international biotechnology and biosecurity matters; H.R. 6196, to authorize and encourage the United States to pursue a model of locally led development and humanitarian response and expand engagement with local actors and increase its local partner base; H.R. 7632, to designate a Coordinator for hybrid warfare accountability, require the Secretary of State to submit a report identifying Chinese entities materially supporting Russia’s defense industrial base and recommending appropriate sanctions, and for other purposes; H.R. 2504, to require the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to strengthen United States-European nuclear energy cooperation and combat Russian malign influence in the nuclear energy sector in Europe; H.R. 7649, to ensure that persons found responsible for the unauthorized diversion or destruction of United States humanitarian assistance are liable to the United States, and for other purposes; H.R. 7605, to abolish the United States African Development Foundation; H.R. 7630, to prohibit United States recognition of the claims of sovereignty of South Ossetia or Abkhazia

within the Republic of Georgia; H.R. 7675, to require the Secretary of State to establish the Initiative on Foreign Investment Screening, and for other purposes; and H.R. 7674, to require the Secretary of State to submit to Congress a strategy to support a democratic transition in Venezuela, and for other purposes, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Transportation and Maritime Security, hearing entitled “Arctic Security in an Era of Global Competition: Safeguarding U.S. Interests in Frigid Waters”, 2 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 8065, the “Restoring Executive Branch Authorities to Oversee Offices of the United States Attorneys Act of 2026”; H.R. 8037, the “Protect American AI Act of 2026”; H.R. 1468, the “Protect America’s Innovation and Economic Security from CCP Act of 2025”; H.R. 7730, the “Bankruptcy Threshold Adjustment Act of 2026”; H.R. 6194, the “Protecting Americans from Russian Litigation Act of 2025”; H.R. 3420, the “Words Matter Act of 2025”; and H.R. 6453, the “ADA 30 Days to Comply Act”, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries, hearing on H.R. 5694, the “ARTIST Act”; H.R. 6893, the “Chesapeake Bay Watershed Advancement for Training, Education, Restoration, and Science Act”; H.R. 7250, to reauthorize the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000; and H.R. 7889, the “AWRC Act of 2025”, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Federal Lands, hearing on H.R. 6778, the “Parkway Safety and Reinvestment Act”; H.R. 7618, the “American Battlefield Protection Program Amendments Act of 2026”; H.R. 7951, the “Long-Term Good Neighbor Authority Act”; and H.R. 7979, the “Public Lands Access Restoration Act”, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Environment, hearing entitled “Beneath the Waves: The Science and Technology of Deep-Sea Mining”, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 7613, the “Airspace Location and Enhanced Risk Transparency Act of 2026”, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled “Kitchen Table Issues: Lowering Costs for Veteran Families Through the VA Home Loan Program”, 3 p.m., 360 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, markup on H.R. 1004, the “Love Lives on Act of 2025”; H.R. 2164, the “Dayton National Cemetery Expansion Act of 2025”; H.R. 5339, the “Susan E. Lukas 9/11 Servicemember Fairness Act”; H.R. 5723, the “FRAUD in VA Disability Exam Act”; H.R. 6698, the “Board of Veterans Appeals Annual Report Transparency Act of 2025”; H.R. 6943, the “Veterans Burial Allowance and Reimbursement Act of 2026”; and H.R. 7260, the “National Cemetery Administration Annual Report Act of 2026”, 1:15 p.m., 360 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Thursday, March 26

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, March 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the House message to accompany S. 1383, SAVE America Act. Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Thune (for Husted) Amendment No. 4732 (to Amendment No. 4420) to the House message to accompany the bill, at 1:30 p.m.

Following disposition of Thune (for Husted) Amendment No. 4732 (to Amendment No. 4420) to the House message to accompany S. 1383, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 7417, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H. Res. 1128—Expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the Department of Homeland Security. Consideration of H.R. 8029—Pay Our Homeland Defenders Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E270
Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E263, E263, E264, E265, E266,
E267, E268, E269, E270, E271
Calvert, Ken, Calif., E266

Craig, Angie, Minn., E264, E269
Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E263, E270
Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E267
Joyce, John, Pa., E266
LaHood, Darin, Ill., E267
Langworthy, Nicholas A., N.Y., E265

Thompson, Glenn, Pa., E263
Thompson, Mike, Calif., E263, E264, E265, E266, E267,
E267, E269, E269, E270
Van Epps, Matt, Tenn., E268
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E265



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are