



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026

No. 66

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 15, 2026.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY FINE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from You no secrets are hid, humbly we come before You, appealing to Your mercy and dependent on Your grace.

For even in our noblest efforts to serve You, and in our honest desires to do what is best for this country, we discover how easy it is to mistake approbation for affirmation. All too often we find ourselves valuing veneration over virtue.

Regardless of our attempts to disguise our misdeeds, what is hidden is known to You. Everything that is secret from everyone else is revealed to You.

Silence then all voices but Your own, and speak to us Your words of forgiveness. Quell all desires save for the longing to receive Your love, and strengthen us to remain faithful to Your will.

Purge us from all unrighteousness. Cleanse us from the thoughts of our minds and the willfulness of our hearts by the inspiration of Your holy spirit, that we may perfectly love You and worthily magnify Your holy name, in which we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzales), the whole number of the House is 431.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

NO MAN LEFT BEHIND

(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, on Easter Sunday, President

Donald Trump, Secretary of War Pete Hegseth, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Dan Caine completed a successful mission to rescue two American airmen in Iran.

Less than 48 hours earlier, an American fighter jet had been shot down with a shoulder-fired missile as part of Operation Epic Fury.

A rescue was launched immediately, locating one pilot within hours. However, the second crewmember landed much further away, complicating recovery efforts.

Despite this challenge, President Donald Trump emphasized the promise that no man is left behind. He correctly described the mission as "one of the largest, most complex, most harrowing combat rescue searches ever attempted by the military."

As the grateful father of four sons who have served in the Middle East, I especially appreciate President Donald Trump.

In conclusion, God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Trump is reinstituting peace through strength, revealing war criminal Putin lies, insulting and mocking Trump as war criminal Putin facilitates the Chinese Communist Party providing shoulder-launched missiles through the Black Sea Port of the Republic of Georgia, collaborating with the illegitimate regime of the rigged elections in Tbilisi to kill American pilots.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 40, DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(c) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES WITH IRAN

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 40 in the House if called up by the chair of the

□ 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.

H2889

Committee on Foreign Affairs or its designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative MAST of Florida and Representative MEEKS of New York, or their respective designees.

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

There was no objection.

WORSENING AIR POLLUTION

(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 today to speak about the urgent need to address the worsening air pollution problem in this country and in my home area of New York.

Like many Americans, I remember the blanket of orange smoke that covered our skies throughout the summer of 2023 as a result of the horrific Canadian wildfires.

Recently, I had the opportunity to meet with students from Columbia University advocating for the creation of clean air centers and air filtration systems for low-income individuals and those with preexisting conditions like congenital heart disease.

We all have a moral duty to protect the well-being of Americans across this country from all forms of pollution, from the East Coast to the West Coast and in between.

From the floor of the House of Representatives, I urge my colleagues to take action to address the growing severity and protect Americans from dangerous air pollution. Vote “no” on bills that will make it easier for polluters to pollute.

HONORING ST. JOHN EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church of Merrill, Wisconsin, on its 150th anniversary.

First organized by families of German immigrants in a meeting on April 24, 1876, services were held in a public schoolhouse in the town of Jenny, Wisconsin, which later became Merrill.

St. John Evangelical has had two subsequent structures within Merrill and, since 1953, has worshipped within a beautiful stone edifice at 1104 East 3rd Street.

During its first years, it shared a pastor with neighboring churches and finally called on its first pastor, Reverend Paul Luecke, on August 5, 1883.

Today, the members of St. John are proud of their continued provision of a

daycare facility and an educational resource for their community in a parochial school. During several decades of its existence, German was the church's primary language. With the close of World War I, the congregation had transitioned to holding its services primarily in English.

For continuing its work of proclaiming the good news of Jesus Christ through 150 years, it is my great pleasure to honor St. John Evangelical Lutheran Church of Merrill today before the United States House of Representatives.

PLEA TO GERMAN ROYALTY

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

Ms. PEREZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call on the family of the German Prinz zu Salm-Salm about their land holdings in my district.

In Wahkiakum County, Washington, our local hunters and fishermen are being squeezed out of the lands that they have hunted and fished on for generations, but not by wildfire or even by Federal and State regulations this time, but by German royalty who is buying up land and prohibiting public access to places that we have hunted and fished on for generations. It was reported last month that the German royals now control 7.3 percent of Wahkiakum County.

Now, our local economies and way of life are at risk. I have been told by some in my community that frustrations are so high that without resolution there can only be a violent boiling point.

The Pacific Northwest is no stranger to this kind of interference, but at the hands of a management company whose investors are halfway around the world, this shows that something has gone deeply wrong with how we think about and regulate land and local ownership.

This cultural fabric of our community is ours—to live off the land, to invest back into it. Loyalty to place is grounding, a necessary practice in this fractured and polarized world.

I call on the German royal family to engage with my constituents and revise their hunting access regulations.

□ 1010

RECOGNIZING SHANE PLACEK

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an often overlooked segment of our Nation's legal profession: rural lawyers.

Across the First District and in communities throughout our State, rural lawyers represent the very best of the profession: selfless service and meaningful local impact.

Today, I recognize the outstanding career of Shane Placek of Fremont. While Shane practices in a range of areas, he has earned particular respect among his peers for his work in domestic law. Shane's skill and tenacity are deeply appreciated by his clients and respected by judges, and even the counsel on the other side appreciates him. His thorough preparation, professionalism, and record of success demonstrate his unwavering dedication to families navigating difficult times.

A proud son of Fremont, Shane returned to his hometown after earning his J.D. from the University of Minnesota, choosing to serve the very community that shaped him.

It is a privilege to recognize Shane's distinguished career, which reflects the hard work, integrity, and grit that define rural lawyers across our State.

RECOGNIZING ARAB AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply proud to serve not only as an unapologetic Arab-American woman in Congress but to represent one of the largest Arab-American communities in our country.

That is why I am introducing a resolution recognizing April as Arab American Heritage Month. This month, we must recognize the rich history, culture, and achievements of Arab Americans all across our country.

I know it has been an incredibly difficult time for many of our families, especially those with loved ones in Lebanon and Palestine. Even in the midst of pain and uncertainty, let us all continue to show up for each other, speak out against injustices, and care for each other with compassion and solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that this is the time and month to acknowledge Arab-American contributions, inventions, and support building businesses and showing up for communities and neighbors all across the country.

To all the neighbors in southeastern Michigan and beyond, happy Arab American Heritage Month.

RECOGNIZING CHIEF RUSSELL ROARK

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the career of a true patriot. I rise today to recognize and honor a true public servant, Chief Russell Roark, whose life has been defined by dedication, defined by integrity, and defined by exceptional service to the people of Union County and the entire State of South Carolina.

Chief Roark first began his career in public safety in 1962, when he joined the City of Union Fire Department. Just 1 year later, he joined the City of Union Police Department. Through hard work, professionalism, and steady leadership, Chief Roark quickly advanced through the ranks, becoming assistant chief of police in 1975 and then chief of police in 1982.

In 1983, he played a pivotal role in the merger of the City of Union Police and Fire Departments into a single unified agency known as the Union Public Safety Department. He became its first director, and under his leadership, the department earned South Carolina Law Enforcement Accreditation, becoming the first law enforcement agency in Union County to achieve such a distinction.

Chief Roark also made lasting improvements to the community fire service division, emphasizing advanced training and the importance of strong fire prevention efforts.

Thanks to his leadership, the department earned a Class 2 ISO rating, an achievement that enhanced public safety while reducing insurance costs for all the residents and businesses across the county.

In conclusion, Chief Roark is the definition of a true public servant.

HONORING HELEN HUMPHREYS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Helen Humphreys, affectionately known by so many as the Duchess of Edgely, who passed away on March 28, 2026.

A longtime resident of Hulmeville and Edgely, Helen was a woman whose life was defined by compassion, warmth, and an unmatched devotion to others. She built a successful career in the printing industry, loved her summers in Townsends Inlet, and remained a spirited, vibrant person, even shooting better than her age on the golf course at 85 years old.

More than anything, Mr. Speaker, Helen will be remembered for the home and heart she shared so generously with others. Alongside her beloved husband, Jim, she created a place of comfort, laughter, and belonging for family, friends, and neighbors alike.

Helen touched countless lives with her kindness, her humor, and her open-door spirit. She will be deeply missed, and I am proud to honor her memory here today.

WASHINGTON IS BROKEN

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

Mr. MAGAZINER. Mr. Speaker, here is how you know that Washington is

broken. Instead of voting to end the war, end the tariffs, and lower healthcare costs, what are we doing? Yesterday, we debated 14 bills to rename post offices. This is why people think that Congress sucks.

Our Congress, our House, is supposed to be the envy of the world. Instead, our current leadership is doing everything that they can to make us irrelevant.

Why? Money. The oil companies are making money off the Iran war. The drug companies are making money. The President is getting money for his ballroom.

I wish that more people in Washington would figure out how to spend their time on lawmaking instead of moneymaking.

We need to end this corruption. We need to pass a congressional stock trading ban, get dark money out of elections, and make this city work for the people again so that working Americans can afford to pay their bills.

HEALTHY MEALS HELP KIDS LEARN

(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, school breakfasts and lunches are often the most nutritious meal a student eats in a day. That is why so many districts across the country are offering tastier, healthier meals.

With our incredible Democratic Whip KATHERINE CLARK, I visited one such school in Watertown, Massachusetts, as part of my statewide End Hunger Now tour.

We were treated to a tour of the Hosmer Elementary School by two bright second graders and enjoyed a delicious salad for lunch, featuring lettuce grown down the street by the students at Watertown's very own freight farm.

The enthusiasm of the students about their locally grown, nutritious school meals was infectious.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress can help make sure that every single district across the country has first-class school meal programs. We must pass my bill, the Healthy Meals Help Kids Learn Act, to increase funding for school meal programs.

We must also reverse the devastating Trump administration cuts to local and school food programs that improve access to nutritious food.

Together, we can improve nutrition, improve learning outcomes, and end hunger now.

□ 1020

ADMINISTRATION IS BREAKING THE LAW

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

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, this administration is testing us. They are testing the truth, testing the law, but, most importantly, they are testing our resolve in the Epstein case and whether or not they can continue to lie and commit crimes right in front of our faces.

Yesterday, Pam Bondi was ordered to appear in front of the Oversight and Reform Committee and did not come. Todd Blanche said that he would not release any more files because perhaps they believed that Donald Trump's blanket pardon would excuse them and save their bacon.

So let me be clear: You are breaking the law, and I hope you are getting ready to face contempt.

To the survivors out there who have been through decades of injustice in this case: Know that we are fighting, and while the road to justice may be long, we will not stop until we get it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2026.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON: I hereby resign my position on the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, effective April 15, 2026.

I appreciated the honor to serve and look forward to delivering results for the House in other capacities.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

RUDY YAKYM III,
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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. 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. 1176

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

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Kiley of California (to rank immediately after Mr. Ezell).

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Kiley of California (to rank immediately after Mr. Fry).

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE: Mr. Kiley of California (to rank immediately after Ms. Letlow).

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Fuller.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Fuller.

Mr. LANGWORTHY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6387, FIRE IMPROVEMENT AND REFORMING EXCEPTIONAL EVENTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6398, REDUCING AND ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6409, FOREIGN EMISSIONS AND NONATTAINMENT CLARIFICATION FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1156, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TAX POLICIES THAT SUPPORT WORKING FAMILIES

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1174

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. Each such bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such 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 Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 6387) to amend the Clean Air Act to require revisions to regulations governing the review and handling of air quality monitoring data influenced by exceptional events or actions to mitigate wildfire risk.

(b) The bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation.

(c) The bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. 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. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be consid-

ered as ordered on the resolution and preamble 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 Ways and Means or their respective designees.

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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), 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

Mr. LANGWORTHY. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Rules Committee reported on a rule, House Resolution 1174, that provides for consideration of four measures.

The rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 6387, H.R. 6398, and H.R. 6409, each under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designees, and provides for each bill one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H. Res. 1156, expressing support for tax policies that support working families, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means 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.

The rule before us provides an opportunity for Congress to rein in regulatory overreach, to restore common sense for our environmental policies, and to ensure that American communities are not punished for circumstances beyond their control.

For far too long, States, workers, and job creators have been forced to operate under a system that is overly rigid and increasingly bureaucratic and disconnected from reality. Instead of working with States, Federal regulators have imposed one-size-fits-all policies that drive up costs, delay projects, and make it harder for communities to grow and to prosper.

These measures begin to correct that course and put us on a more practical and more predictable path forward.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act. This legislation addresses a simple but important problem. States are currently being penalized for emissions

that they have absolutely no control over. That includes pollution originating from foreign countries like China, as well as natural events such as wildfires beyond our borders. Yet under current policy, those emissions can still count against a State's ability to meet Federal air quality standards.

This is not how this should work, and we have seen the impact firsthand. In my home State of New York, communities across western New York and the southern tier have repeatedly experienced severe air quality impacts from Canadian wildfires.

This has become a reoccurring issue year after year. Smoke from wildfires in Ontario and Quebec have drifted south, triggering air quality alerts across our State. Families have been told to stay indoors. Schools, camps, and outdoor events have been disrupted and canceled. What should be time spent outside during the summer has, instead, meant staying inside because of conditions beyond anyone's control locally.

□ 1030

In parts of New York, we have seen some of the worst air quality readings in the entire country on these days.

This does not affect just families. It affects local economies, as well. Small businesses, outdoor workers, farmers, and manufacturers all feel the impact when air quality restrictions tighten because of pollution they did not create in the first place.

Yet, under the current framework, those same communities can still face consequences—more regulation and more restrictions—for conditions entirely outside of their control. It makes no sense.

The FENCES Act restores the original intent of the Clean Air Act by making clear that foreign emissions, whether manmade or natural, should not be used to penalize States when determining compliance.

It allows States to account for those emissions earlier in the process instead of forcing them into costly delays, stricter requirements, or potential Federal penalties at the very end because the reality is simple, States like New York should not be punished for smoke coming from wildfires in another country like Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act. Across the country, communities are dealing with the growing threat of wildfires. At the same time, States are taking proactive steps to reduce the risk through prescribed burns, forest management, and other mitigation efforts.

However, under current law, those efforts can count against them when it comes to air quality compliance. Now think about that. States are being penalized for trying to prevent catastrophic wildfires. This isn't just backwards. It creates a system that punishes proactive solutions and rewards inaction.

Part of the problem is how the current system treats those emissions. While naturally occurring wildfires can sometimes be considered exceptional events, the very tools used to prevent those wildfires, like prescribed burns, are often treated the same as emissions from a factory. That is a clear gap in the law, and it leads to confusion, inconsistent decisions, and unnecessary delays for States trying to do the right thing.

The result is a system that discourages mitigation even though we know that proactive land management reduces the severity of wildfires and improves long-term air quality. The consequences are real. When States are discouraged from carrying out these efforts, the risk of larger, more destructive wildfires only increases, leading to worse air quality, greater damage, and higher costs for communities.

The FIRE Act fixes this by ensuring that emissions from wildfire mitigation activities are treated appropriately under the Clean Air Act. It brings consistency on how we treat emissions from wildfires and from the efforts used to prevent them, and it provides States with the clarity and predictability that we need to plan and to act.

It also reduces unnecessary regulatory burdens on manufacturers and local communities while still maintaining strong environmental protections for communities. This is about encouraging smart land management, reducing long-term risk, and recognizing that proactive solutions should not be met with Federal penalties.

Mr. Speaker, the rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act. This measure takes aim at a specific and unnecessary layer of Federal bureaucracy that continues to slow down projects across the country.

Right now, when a Federal agency completes an environmental impact statement, the Environmental Protection Agency is required to conduct a separate review and publicly comment on that work, even in cases where the EPA has already been involved in developing it.

That second review often covers the exact same ground. It adds time. It adds cost. It adds uncertainty, without meaningfully improving any outcomes.

We do not have to look far to see how duplication and delay affect real projects. In upstate New York, Micron announced a historic investment to bring advanced semiconductor manufacturing back to the United States, an investment expected to support thousands and thousands of good-paying jobs and strengthen our domestic supply chain.

This is exactly the kind of project we should be encouraging and putting a rocket booster on, but like many large-scale projects, it has to navigate a complex and very time-consuming environmental review process across multiple levels of government. That is the broader issue. It is not about identi-

fying new risks. It is about how layers of review can stack on top of one another, adding delay and uncertainty, even when high standards are already being met.

The consequences are real. When projects like this one are delayed, jobs are delayed, investment is delayed, and our ability to compete globally, especially in critical industries like semiconductors, is put at risk at a time when we are trying to onshore these critical industries and strengthen our domestic supply chain. This is exactly what is wrong with this approach.

The reality is that the agencies responsible for these projects already have the expertise and the legal responsibility to conduct thorough environmental reviews. They prepare detailed environmental impact statements. They consult with experts and are accountable for the decisions that they make. The EPA is often already involved in that process as it develops.

What this bill addresses is the additional, duplicative step that comes after the work has already been completed. Nothing in this legislation prevents coordination or input during the review itself. It simply removes a redundant requirement that adds delay without adding value.

Recent Supreme Court precedent has reinforced this approach, recognizing that the agencies responsible for a project are best positioned to evaluate its environmental impacts that the scope of review should remain focused and practical.

The RED Tape Act reflects that reality. It removes the duplicative requirement. It streamlines the process, and it ensures that projects that meet the standard can move forward without unnecessary delay because right now too often projects are not being stopped, they are just being slowed down by process.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 1156. Mr. Speaker, today is tax day, and families across the country are sitting down to file their returns and take a closer look at what they owe and what they keep. It is a significant day because it is a direct reminder of how the decisions that we make here in Washington show up in people's lives.

Last year, House Republicans passed and the President signed into law H.R. 1, the Working Families Tax Cut Act, one of the largest tax cuts for working and middle-class Americans in history. The law prevented a \$2.6 trillion tax increase on families making less than \$400,000 a year, and it continues to deliver real savings to millions of Americans.

Today, as families file their taxes, they are seeing the impact of these policies firsthand. For a family of four earning under \$73,000, it can mean no Federal income tax at all, and the relief is targeted where it matters the most: no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, tax relief for our senior citizens in their golden years. These are

changes that show up directly in what families owe, what they keep, and how they plan for the year ahead.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the beginning. In 2026 alone, this law is expected to deliver \$191 billion in additional tax relief, putting more money back in the pockets of American families, including roughly \$1,000 more in refunds. Taxpayers are projected to take home an additional \$91 billion in refunds and keep another \$30 billion in their paychecks through reduced withholdings.

The benefits don't stop there. This law locks in lower tax rates; strengthens the standard deduction; expands the child tax credit to \$2,200, and indexes it to inflation; and provides continued relief through policy like no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, and expanded support for childcare, paid leave, and savings. These policies are helping families keep more of what they earn, plan for their future, and build greater financial stability.

This resolution recognizes the impact of H.R. 1 and reaffirms our commitment to making sure working families come first. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as you know, at the end of March, last month, Speaker JOHNSON gavelled out this Chamber and sent Members of Congress home for a 2-week recess. He did so despite the fact that the Department of Homeland Security has been shut down for 60 days and counting, despite the fact that President Trump had made a reckless and unlawful declaration of war without congressional authorization, despite soaring gas prices and the ongoing cost-of-living crisis stretching from New York, the home of my distinguished colleague, to Colorado, despite the heat, the drought, and the wildfire records being shattered in the Western United States. Despite all of that, Speaker JOHNSON made the decision to gavel the House out of session and send everybody home.

□ 1040

Now, we are back. The 2-week recess has concluded. What has the Republican majority decided is the most pressing challenge and issue for this august body to debate?

I will tell you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently, it is a resolution commemorating a bill that Republicans passed last year. That is what we are here to debate.

Republicans control the floor. They could put a bill on the floor to address cost-of-living issues. They could put a bill on the floor to address soaring gas prices. They could put a bill on the floor to address rising healthcare costs. Instead, we are here to debate a commemorative resolution. It is absurd.

I have, over the course of the 7 years that I have had the privilege of serving in the United States House, never seen something quite like this. It doesn't

really take a resolution, Mr. Speaker, for them to extol what they believe to be the benefits of the bill that they passed last year, the tax bill, which we will talk about today.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that this resolution is wholly unnecessary. There are better ways to spend our time.

I heard the gentleman from New York's long description of the many reasons why that particular resolution that I referenced merits this body's passage. What I found interesting is that over the last 12 months that I have come down here to the House floor, I have heard Republicans use the same refrain in describing this bill: the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. It is in the law.

For a year, I have heard nothing but tweets, Truth Social posts, and floor speeches extolling the virtues of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. What is fascinating is that I didn't hear those four words this morning. I suspect I am not going to hear them the rest of today because Republicans spent some time and have come up with a new name—a new name, a rebrand.

This bill that President Trump signed into law, which gave tax cuts to the richest Americans among us, is so unpopular that Republicans decided that they had to change the name.

I hate to break it to you, but I don't think the rebrand, Mr. Speaker, is going to work. I don't think the name is what the American people were frustrated by. What they are frustrated by is a bill that kicked off 15 million Americans from their healthcare, a bill that amounted to the largest cut in SNAP in the history of our country, a bill that added \$5 trillion over the next decade to the Federal debt. That is what they are frustrated about.

They can call this bill, the One Big Beautiful Bill Act—what is the name now? Maybe the gentleman from New York will indulge me. The working families tax cut, that is what they are calling it now. I suspect, in a few months, they will change the name again because it is not going to change the unpopularity of their policies.

I know this isn't the only resolution that we are debating today, as the gentleman from New York mentioned at great length. We are going to consider three bills from the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, which seek to amend the Clean Air Act in an effort to scale back regulations that protect air quality from pollutants and polluting industries.

There is no debate that these policies could have wide-ranging implications that would allow large swathes of the United States to be exempt from various rules under the Clean Air Act.

I don't, to be candid, Mr. Speaker, really follow the argument that my friend from New York is making. As I understand it, what he is saying is that there are wide swathes of the country, including in his home State—by the way, this applies to my home State as

well—where you have pollution that exceeds the standards that have been set by regulators at the national level. That pollution is causing asthma and respiratory diseases in children.

The solution that they propose is to allow communities that are experiencing this kind of pollution to essentially exempt foreign sources of pollution from those standards so that they don't have to do anything about it.

That is their solution. The air quality is not going to get any better. There will be no prophylactic steps taken by those communities. It is just a way for those communities to no longer have to do anything about pollution. It is absurd, and the American people know it.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say—and I imagine we will have a robust debate about the three bills and the resolution that I referenced. Fundamentally, I suppose if I were to conclude with one overriding sentiment, it is that I am simply asking my Republican colleagues to get serious.

There are a lot of challenges facing the country. It is a difficult time for the families that I represent in northern Colorado and in western Colorado. Times are tough. This House, I believe, could rise to the occasion and actually work together to get some things done for the American people, for the constituents that we all serve. This is not that.

Spare us the commemorative resolutions honoring bills that you all have passed. Let's just skip those, and let's get back to doing the business that the American people expect us to do.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Once again, the Democrats are trying to distract from the facts by recycling the same class warfare talking points, even as Americans across the country are sitting down this week to file their taxes and see the reality for themselves. Families are running the numbers. They are looking at what they owe and what they keep. Filing is simpler. For working people, that matters.

Republicans passed this bill without a single Democratic vote. It was signed into law by President Trump, and 91 percent of tax filers now have a simpler tax code. Families pay no Federal income tax on the first \$31,000 that they earn. The standard deduction is locked and loaded and expanded, which means less paperwork, less time spent dealing with the IRS, and more money staying in families' budgets.

According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, the biggest beneficiaries of this relief are workers and families making less than \$50,000 a year. That is why the rhetoric we keep hearing from Democrats doesn't line up with reality, especially for Americans sitting at their kitchen table filing their taxes right now.

This is relief for the server pulling a double, the factory worker on the line trying to work a few extra hours of overtime, the barber running a small shop, and families trying to get ahead.

Unfortunately, while Republicans fought to ensure that hardworking Americans keep more of their paychecks, because it is their money and not Uncle Sam's, Democrats under President Biden chose a different path. They flooded the post-COVID economy with trillions of dollars in new spending. They overheated the economy and drove inflation to 40-year highs. Working families were left to carry that burden that they still have a hangover on today.

□ 1050

Rather than empowering the American people, Democrats prioritized massive giveaways to political allies through Green New Deal-style programs that layer costly, ineffective regulations. Those policies were not paid for in Washington. They were paid for by families at the gas pump and the grocery store.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump and House Republicans have consistently worked to unleash the full potential of the American economy so that every American who works for a living can benefit.

In stark contrast, Democrats in the last administration chose runaway spending, regulatory access, and leaving everyday Americans to pay the price through skyrocketing costs for basic necessities. Their policies hurt working families. Republican policies have helped working families, and that brings us back to the rule before us today.

This legislation before us makes sure that States are not punished for what they cannot control, supports efforts to prevent disasters before they happen, not after, cuts through red tape that delay jobs and investment, and reinforces policies that help working families keep more of what they earn.

That is what is before the House today. We are hearing concerns that this bill somehow weakens air quality protections or harms public health, but that misses what this legislation actually does. At its core, it is about fairness.

Right now, States can be penalized for emissions that they have absolutely no control over. No one in Buffalo, New York, or western New York, or the southern tier has any impact on Canadian policy on how they manage their forests or why their forests catch on fire every summer. Whether it is pollution coming from those foreign countries or background conditions beyond our control, that is not a system that makes sense.

When that happens, entire regions can fall out of compliance through no fault of their own, making it harder to build new facilities, modernize infrastructure, or bring jobs back to communities that need them the most.

That has real consequences not just for economic growth but for the well-being of the people that live there.

This bill fixes that problem. It ensures that States are judged based on what they can actually control while keeping the same underlying health-based air quality standards fully in place.

Let's be clear: Nothing in this legislation changes those standards. The protections remain. What we are addressing is how those standards are applied in the real world so that communities are not unfairly punished and locked out of economic opportunity. That matters because modernizing facilities here at home means cleaner technology, stronger environmental oversight, and fewer emissions being outsourced overseas.

While there are efforts to frame this as a rollback, it is actually about making the system workable, more predictable, and more grounded in reality. That is what this bill does and that is why it is needed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a couple of points. First, again, we have heard ad nauseam about the various ways, in the view of my colleagues, that the bill that they passed last year has benefited the American public. I disagree. My constituents disagree, but we are not debating that bill today. We are debating—for those who might be watching this, I encourage everybody to look it up—H. Res. 1156. It is a two-page resolution. It is not particularly long. This resolution does nothing, achieves nothing, and changes nothing. It is a commemorative resolution honoring a law that they passed last year. It is a waste of time.

What are we doing? Seriously. This is how the Republican majority chooses to spend its time?

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do next week? Are you going to introduce a different commemorative resolution that honors maybe this resolution that passes today? Maybe that is what we should count on, I guess.

If this resolution passes today, Mr. LANGWORTHY and I will debate next week a second resolution that honors this resolution.

Give me a break. There are better ways for the House of Representatives to spend its time. These are serious issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I don't even know if I can dignify a response to the things that I have heard here this morning. Perhaps we will do another showerhead resolution or utilities or something like that. But it is very clear that there is a war in the Middle East, runaway inflation, out-of-control costs, a partial government

shutdown, and a madman in the White House. What are our colleagues across the aisle calling us here today to do? They are calling us here to gut the Clean Air Act. Mr. Speaker, this is why I rise in opposition today to all three of these bills and in the strongest defense of the Clean Air Act, which is the bipartisan legislation that has protected the health of the American people and our planet for more than a half-century.

It was passed in 1970 with bipartisan support from both Republicans and Democrats. It was born out of necessity when smog choked our cities and our communities suffered from unchecked pollution. It has delivered on a promise to the American people that no matter who you are or where you live, you have a fundamental human right to breathe clean air. There is nothing more basic than that right.

It is a promise that has delivered. It has saved millions of lives, prevented countless illnesses, and improved air quality across the country. As we know, it is under a threat not just in this Chamber but by an administration that has rolled back standards, weakened emissions, undermined the authority of the EPA, and gutted our climate commitments.

Now, at a time, especially in the West when we are facing record drought, record heat, and dangerously low snowpack, what are you all doing with your time on the floor? You are trying to further gut the fundamental program that protects our communities and our planet.

That is why I rise today to oppose these bills. This is not permitting reform. This is gutting our right to breathe clean air. The FENCES Act strips the EPA's authority, the FIRE Act manipulates how air pollution is measured, and the RED Tape Act is perhaps the most alarming of all as it would silence communities and allow Federal projects to move forward without consideration to our public health and to the planet.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this: The consequences of these bills are not abstract. They are measurable, and they will be measured in lives, in the well-being of our people, and damages to our planet.

The Clean Air Act exists to protect the fundamental right of every American, every human, to breathe clean air. That is why I oppose these bills unequivocally. For the sake of our children, our communities, and our future, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on these bills today.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats want to lecture us on the environment, but let's take a look at their record.

For 4 years in the last administration, they pushed policies that were more about ideology than results. They drove up costs. They added layers of bureaucracy. They made it harder for

States and communities to actually manage real environmental challenges.

They created a system that punishes States for factors outside of their control. It discourages proactive solutions and slows down projects with duplicative and unnecessary reviews. That is not environmental leadership. It is regulatory overreach.

Now, under President Trump's leadership, we are taking a more practical approach. We are focusing on policies that actually work by supporting States, encouraging prevention, and cutting through red tape that has held back progress for years. The difference is very clear.

Democrats defend a system that is more complicated, more expensive, and less effective. Republicans are focused on making environmental policy more predictable, more efficient, and more grounded in reality.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the legislation in this rule does. It makes clear that States shouldn't be penalized for emissions they can't control, including pollution from foreign countries and wildfire smoke drifting across our borders. It supports proactive wildfire mitigation instead of punishing States for taking steps to prevent catastrophic fires. It removes duplicative Federal review processes that slow down projects without improving environmental outcomes.

It is not partisan. It is common sense. We have heard a lot from the other side that the EPA already has the tools to deal with wildfire emissions and that this bill is unnecessary. If that were true, we would not be here today.

The reality is, the current system doesn't work. It is broken, and while EPA can exclude certain emissions as exceptional events, the process is complicated, time consuming, and, in many cases, unworkable for States.

Mr. Speaker, here is the real problem. Under the current law, emissions from wildfire can only qualify as exceptional events, but emissions from prescribed burns used to prevent those wildfires do not.

□ 1100

Think about that. States are effectively penalized for taking proactive steps to reduce wildfire risk. That is just totally backward.

As a result, many States don't even attempt to use the existing process because it is too burdensome, too uncertain, and too resource intensive. In fact, for years, States and local agencies were unable to successfully use this process for prescribed burns.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't about creating a loophole. It is about fixing a system that is clearly not working. The FIRE Act removes this barrier. It gives States the certainty that they need to carry out responsible wildfire mitigation without risking noncompliance with Federal air quality standards.

That matters because prescribed burns are not the problem. They are

part of the solution. They reduce the intensity of wildfires. They lower long-term emissions, and they help prevent the devastating economic and environmental damage that we see from large-scale fires like we saw in California.

States should not have to choose between meeting air quality standards and preventing wildfires. This bill makes sure that they don't have to.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, I co-chair the Bipartisan Wildfire Caucus. I have worked with my Republican colleagues on a number of wildfire resiliency and forest management bills, proposals, and securing funding. I will not be lectured by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle as they work to defund the Forest Service, literally, about wildfire resiliency and prescribed burns.

There is no question that, at least with respect to the FIRE Act—I understand we are debating multiple bills with respect to the Clean Air Act, but in terms of the FIRE Act, Mr. EVANS' bill, it does nothing. I mean, existing processes within the EPA provide for precisely the type of relief that he is seeking in this bill.

The bill is, again, completely unnecessary. It is also not going anywhere. We, of course, know that to be the case. In any event, I digress.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and thank her for her leadership, I might just say, Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague from New York wax very poetically about the importance of the big or not the Big Beautiful Bill Act—whatever they are calling it now—the working families bill or something like that that they have come up with.

There are 218 Republicans in the House of Representatives, give or take. I presume, given the importance of this commemorative resolution, that there perhaps might be some colleagues who are going to join my colleague from New York to talk on this bill?

Mr. Speaker, might I ask you to pose that question to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LANGWORTHY)? Does he anticipate any colleagues coming to the floor or just him?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAN of Florida). The inquiry of which you describe, it is not a proper parliamentary inquiry, but the gentleman from New York will be able to respond during his time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I hope he does. I suspect the answer is “no.” I suspect that Mr. LANGWORTHY is here alone and that he will be the only Republican who has been tasked with arguing in favor of this really important commemorative resolution that we are all so eager to vote on.

Mr. Speaker, in any event, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to adopt the

Senate amendment to H.R. 7417, the bipartisan compromise bill that the Senate unanimously passed twice now—twice—to fund the law-abiding agencies within DHS.

Mr. Speaker, this is the deal. You know it. I know it. At the end of the day, the compromise legislation that the Senate passed twice was deprived of a vote on this floor by Republicans. Not a single Senator objected to this bill, twice.

The Republican Senate majority leadership authored the motion, but House Republican leadership refuses to take it up. As a result, it is perpetuating the shutdown of DHS by not putting that deal on the floor.

Members who want to end the shutdown ought to join us in defeating the previous question to put this bipartisan compromise on the floor today.

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 (Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. We are grateful to her for her leadership.

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

Madam Speaker, it has been more than 20 days since the United States Senate reached a unanimous agreement to all but end the shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. Yet, Republican House leadership refuses to bring the measure up for a vote on the House floor. It would pass overwhelmingly here, without question. Without question.

The White House has only recently decided to start paying workers throughout TSA, FEMA, Coast Guard, and our cybersecurity agencies after refusing to do so for weeks. They claim they have the authority to do this.

Madam Speaker, if the administration believes that they have the authority to use this money, then every paycheck that a TSA worker was forced to miss was because the White House made an active choice not to pay them.

Imagine. Imagine the turmoil in people's lives due to no paycheck at the end of the week or at the end of 2 weeks. How do you pay your rent? How do you buy groceries? We know the stories of people being evicted, sleeping in their cars, and donating their plasma for money. This is reality.

The White House had the authority to pay them so that they didn't have to go through this. A number of people left their jobs because they were not getting paid. It really defies imagination that people's lives and economic

security was being held up for purely political reasons.

Madam Speaker, I will just add that this money will probably run out at some point, and our job and the job of the Appropriations Committee is to make sure that these agencies are funded through the end of the year. That can be done because there is no disagreement on both sides of the aisle on funding Coast Guard, TSA, FEMA, cybersecurity, and the Secret Service.

The issue is what we do in our cities and our towns nationwide with the terror that ICE—and there will be a lengthy debate on dealing with this. That is going to be a lengthy debate about the reforms and the overhaul, as it should be. In the meantime, everyone should continue to be paid. Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, they made an agreement.

The public wants to know why you can't get together. I will generally say that we can't get unanimous consent on whether or not the sky is blue in this institution.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, we had unanimous consent not once but twice. I think I read that the Speaker of the House had agreed that this is what they would do, but that was turned around. That was upended.

We know, and I have said a moment ago, that rank and file would support it, as well, if we were allowed to receive a vote. The only people who do not want to reopen this government and this Department are House Republican leadership, who continue to block the bill.

The madness must end, and if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the Senate bill that passed unanimously so that we can end the shutdown. Let's get back to work for the American people, and I encourage my Republican colleagues to join us in this effort.

□ 1110

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

Madam Speaker, I heard the words “purely political gain,” and I completely respect the work that the Committee on Appropriations has done this year. Chairman COLE and Ranking Member DELAURO did a beautiful job navigating a process that has led us for fiscal year 2026 to get all but one of our appropriations bills passed with bipartisan support.

They had a bipartisan agreement on how to fund the Department of Homeland Security, but it wasn't until the Democrats on the other side of the aisle figured that they had to answer to their political base that they decided to throw the biggest political temper tantrum in the history of the

country. Here we sit with a Department still shut down, and they still won't agree to fund the entire Department. In fact, nearly every one of the Members, all but a few courageous Democrats, have voted against funding the Department of Homeland Security in its entirety time and time again right here in the House of Representatives. It is a matter of public record.

Let's be honest about who is responsible for the shutdown. Republicans have put forward serious, good-faith efforts to fund the Department of Homeland Security and keep these critical operations running. It is Democrats that chose to walk away time and again, over and over. It is Democrats who chose to play politics with funding for agencies that protect the American people every single day. They did that knowing full well what is at stake: funding for FEMA and disaster response, our Coast Guard operations, and other core Homeland Security functions.

That was all put at risk because Democrats refused to engage. They made the decision to do that. They were willfully aware that certain parts of the Department, like ICE, were already funded through the end of the year. This wasn't about policy. It was all about political theatrics, and it is all that we have had for the last 40, 50 days.

The consequences are real. Since Democrats shut down DHS, we saw violent attacks at Old Dominion University, the Temple Israel synagogue in Michigan, and in Austin, Texas, and we saw a massive cyberattack on the Stryker Corporation. This is no time to be playing politics with the safety of our homeland. Instead of stepping up, Democrats chose to step back, and now they come to the floor trying to shift the blame, hoping the American people will forget who actually walked away from funding the very agencies responsible for protecting them.

The facts are clear: Republicans are working to fund the government and keep Americans safe. Democrats chose to shut it down.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, a lot of political rhetoric again. I think the American people know the facts. They know that the Senate passed a bill twice on a unanimous basis to fund DHS. It is not complicated. The United States Senate passed the bill. Not a single Senator objected. The United States Senate passed the bill again. Not a single Senator objected. TED CRUZ, MIKE LEE, the most conservative Senators in the United States Senate, approved of this bill. They sent it here. It is sitting at the Clerk's desk. If we voted on it today, my guess is 90 percent of the House of Representatives would vote for it. The only reason we are not is because the Speaker of the House, MIKE

JOHNSON, has decided we are not going to vote on it. That is it.

The rest of it, they can try to confuse the American public and describe to them the play-by-play of the last 65 days. Again, it is not complicated. There is a bill sitting at the Clerk's desk to fund DHS that every Republican Senator, every Democratic Senator, and 90 percent of this body support. The only reason we are not voting on it is politics because Republican Speaker of the House MIKE JOHNSON has decided that he won't allow it. That is it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am prepared to close, but I will say that I am doing this very begrudgingly because I was hoping that we might be able to have some colloquies with my colleague from New York with his colleagues on H. Res. 1156. I know how important this commemorative resolution is to the Republican Conference, and I would be loath to deprive my colleague from New York with the opportunity to have a fulsome debate on it.

Is there no Republican in the House of Representatives who is willing to come down to the floor to extol the virtues of the big, beautiful bill—or the working families bill that they have renamed? None, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I think that was the original name on the bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Was that—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Speaker, I wish to clarify something that the Speaker said. That is not the name of the bill. Just to be clear, I encourage anybody who is watching to go online and pull up the bill. It is, I think, about 350 pages. The one phrase that you will not find in the entirety of the bill is "Working Families Tax Cuts," Madam Speaker. It is nowhere.

I checked. I checked yesterday during the Committee on Rules. I checked again before I came to the floor just to be sure, so I don't know where you came up with that name, Madam Speaker. I am not even really sure who has come up with it in the Republican Conference. Somebody, a marketing guru in the Republican Conference I think convinced the Speaker, and I suppose said to him: "Look, this bill is deeply unpopular. President Trump is deeply unpopular, more unpopular than any President in the modern history of our country. We have got to do something different, and I have got an idea. We will just come up with a new name for the bill; a new name, resolution honoring that new name that will convince them. I am sure that will get the American public on our side." Fascinating.

Madam Speaker, week after week, my colleagues on the other side of the

aisle have opted to take up a variety of legislation. The one common thread is that it fails to meet the moment.

Americans sent us here to work on the issues that they care most about, that have the most impact on their everyday lives: the rising affordability crisis, expanding access to affordable healthcare, protecting our environment and public resources; not to gut air pollution standards and pass commemorative resolutions patting themselves on the back. That is not how Congress should be spending its precious time.

The bills before us do nothing to improve the lives of working families in our country. It is why I would encourage my colleagues to oppose the previous question, the rule, and the underlying bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For years, Democrats have told the American people not to believe what they can see with their own eyes. They have defended a system that penalizes States for emissions they don't control, discourages wildfire prevention, and buries job-creating projects under layers of unnecessary bureaucracy.

The legislation under this rule today takes real steps towards fixing those failures—restoring fairness to our air quality standards, supporting proactive wildfire mitigation, cutting red tape that delays jobs and investment, and reaffirming tax relief for working families through H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule before us today.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1175 OFFERED BY MR. NEGUSE OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7147) making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion that the House recede from its amendment and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of the motion.

SEC. 5. The Speaker is directed to sign the enrolled bill no later than one calendar day after adoption, and the Clerk is directed to present the bill to the President immediately upon signature by the Senate President.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ONDER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas) at 1 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 1174; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1174, 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. 6387, FIRE IMPROVEMENT AND REFORMING EXCEPTIONAL EVENTS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6398, REDUCING AND ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6409, FOREIGN EMISSIONS AND NONATTAINMENT CLARIFICATION FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 1156, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TAX POLICIES THAT SUPPORT WORKING FAMILIES

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. 1174) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6387) to amend the Clean Air Act to require revisions to regulations governing the review and handling of air quality monitoring data influenced by exceptional events

or actions to mitigate wildfire risk; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families, 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 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—212

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

Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NAYS—211

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

NOT VOTING—8

Baumgartner	Kean	Scholten
Cole	Letlow	Tiffany
Kaptur	Mace	

□ 1329

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, and Ms. TOKUDA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GRAVES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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 212, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

AYES—214

Aderholt	Gill (TX)	Mills
Alford	Jimenez	Moolenaar
Allen	Goldman (TX)	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
Bean (FL)	Hamadeh (AZ)	Nunn (IA)
Begich	Haridopolos	Obernoite
Bentz	Harrigan	Ogles
Bergman	Harris (MD)	Onder
Bice	Harris (NC)	Owens
Biggs (AZ)	Harshbarger	Palmer
Biggs (SC)	Hern (OK)	Patronis
Bilirakis	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Boebert	Hill (AR)	Pfleger
Bost	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Brecheen	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Bresnahan	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Huizenga	Rose
Burchett	Hunt	Rouzer
Burlison	Hurd (CO)	Roy
Calvert	Issa	Rulli
Cammack	Jack	Rutherford
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Salazar
Carter (GA)	James	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Schmidt
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Cline	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Self
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Shreve
Collins	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Comer	Kennedy (UT)	Smith (MO)
Crane	Kiggins (VA)	Smith (NE)
Crank	Kiley (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Kim	Smucker
Crenshaw	Knott	Spartz
Davidson	Kustoff	Stauber
De La Cruz	LaHood	Stefanik
DesJarlais	LaLota	Steil
Diaz-Balart	Langworthy	Steube
Donalds	Latta	Strong
Downing	Lawler	Stutzman
Dunn (FL)	Lee (FL)	Taylor
Edwards	Letlow	Tenney
Ellzey	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Emmer	Lucas	Tiffany
Estes	Luna	Timmons
Evans (CO)	Luttrell	Turner (OH)
Ezell	Mackenzie	Valadao
Fallon	Malliotakis	Van Drew
Fedorchak	Maloy	Van Duyn
Feenstra	Mann	Van Epps
Fine	Massie	Van Orden
Finstad	Mast	Wagner
Fischbach	McCaul	Walberg
Fitzgerald	McClain	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Webster (FL)
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
Fuller	Miller (WV)	
Garbarino	Miller-Meeks	

NOES—212

Adams	Barragán	Bonamici
Aguilar	Beatty	Boyle (PA)
Amo	Bell	Brown
Ansari	Bera	Brownley
Auchincloss	Beyer	Budzinski
Balint	Bishop	Bynum

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

NOT VOTING—5

Baumgartner	Mace	Westerman
Kean	Scholten	

□ 1336

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.

Stated for:

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted AYE on Roll Call No. 112.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE ON RULES FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 965

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XV, I rise to provide notice of my intent to offer a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 965.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentlewoman sign the petition?

Ms. PRESSLEY. I did, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to offer the motion just noticed.

Does the gentlewoman offer the motion to discharge?

Ms. PRESSLEY. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts calls up a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of House Resolution 965.

The Clerk will report the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a motion to discharge H.R. 1689 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status.

This is a commonsense policy that will save lives and benefit the American public. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort and vote “yes.”

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I support this motion, and I urge my colleagues, including the 218 Members from both sides of the aisle who signed this discharge petition, to vote “yes.”

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to discharge the Committee on Rules from the further consideration of House Resolution 965.

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. 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 219, nays 209, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—219

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

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espallat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal

Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Kiley (CA)
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lawler
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Malliotakis
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
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pelosi
Perez
Peters

Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Pou
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Randall
Raskin
Riley (NY)
Rivas
Ross
Ruiz
Ryan
Salazar
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Tran
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Vindman
Walkinshaw
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NAYS—209

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
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
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foxy
Franklin, Scott
Fry

Fulcher
Fuller
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Goldman (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Hurd (CO)
Issa
Jack
Jackson (TX)
James
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (SD)

Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy (UT)
Kiggans (VA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mackenzie
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDowell
McGuire
Messmer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)

Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Obernolte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
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
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner (OH)
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Epps
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Westerman
Wied
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOT VOTING—3

Kean Mace Scholten

□ 1350

So the motion to discharge was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SCHOLTEN. Mr. Speaker, I missed votes today, due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 111, No on Roll Call No. 112, and YEA on Roll Call No. 113.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUTZMAN). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 965

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 1689) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in section 4 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and minority leader 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. 1689.

SEC. 3. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 1689 no later than one week after passage.

SEC. 4. The amendment in the nature of a substitute referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

“SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF HAITI FOR TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall designate Haiti for temporary protected status until the date that is 3 months after January 20, 2029.”.

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

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

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in unequivocal support of this vote. I am immensely grateful to the Members who supported my discharge petition on both sides of the aisle and the broad, intergenerational and multiracial coalition of justice seekers throughout the country who power this movement, and my indefatigable staff, my A team, who power this work.

I am grateful for labor unions like SEIU, business industry like ABIC, faith leaders like the Conference of Catholic Bishops, civil rights groups like Black Lives Matter Grassroots, IFC, and so many more, who have joined the movement to extend TPS for Haiti.

Now, this issue, Mr. Speaker, is not the most glamorous, and I don't fault anyone at home who perhaps has never heard of this, but for those who know those three letters, TPS, they know it is life-changing.

Temporary protected status is a legal status for 1.3 million immigrants in the United States. The application process is arduous, requiring piles of paperwork, undergoing a background check, spending hundreds of dollars, and coming from one of the few countries on the list, like Haiti or Venezuela.

Technically, the deadline for maintaining Haiti TPS has already passed. That is why this vote is so urgent. That is why I filed the discharge petition, and that is why Democrats, Republicans, and an Independent have come together to take action.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” to extend temporary protected status for Haitians who are living in the United States and building a future that will help all of us.

Haitians like Rebecca in my district, the Massachusetts Seventh, who shared her personal story with me. Rebecca moved to the United States in 2010, not by choice, but out of necessity following the catastrophic earthquake that killed more people than any other earthquake in the history of the Western Hemisphere.

She witnessed the rise in gangs and saw her beautiful country overtaken by

political violence and instability. After surviving multiple kidnapping attempts, out of desperation Rebecca made the same decision that any of us would make in her position. She immigrated to the United States. She quickly enrolled in school to learn English. She obtained a job to support herself and her family.

Now, in 2026, thanks to her legal status under TPS, Rebecca is a certified nursing assistant. She told me that she cares for her patients with great joy, pride, and dedication.

Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that 20 percent of Haitians in the United States, that is one in five, work in healthcare, bridging the critical workforce gaps that define our caregiving crisis.

Rebecca is not our enemy, and she should not have to live with shame nor fear of being deported solely because of where she was born. She told me that she cannot return to Haiti, and she has no other place to go.

Mr. Speaker, Rebecca's letter ended with two words that no person wishes they would ever need to use: Please help.

Today, Congress has the ability to do just that for Rebecca in Massachusetts, for the teacher in Ohio, for the entrepreneur in Florida, and the more than 350,000 Haitian TPS holders whose lives hang in the balance.

Congress can help. Congress can do the right thing. There is nothing stopping us. Congress, right now and right here, can vote to save lives.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. GILLEN).

Ms. GILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative PRESSLEY, for her leadership on this issue and her yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to advance H.R. 1689, the bipartisan bill extending TPS for Haitians.

I thank my colleague, Representative PRESSLEY, the co-chair of the Haiti Caucus, for her leadership on today's discharge petition. I am grateful for her partnership to protect our Haitian neighbors and friends.

Nassau County is home to one of the largest Haitian populations in the country, and we are incredibly proud of that. Haitian Long Islanders are part of the very fabric of our communities. Haitians work in critical sectors like healthcare, education and caregiving, supporting our elderly and working in local hospitals. Many have built private businesses and enriched our faith community.

□ 1400

Before I came to Congress, I made a promise to the Haitian constituents in my district that I would use my voice and work with anyone in any party to help protect this community and their existing legal status here in the United States.

Removing our neighbors would not just be a humanitarian catastrophe, it would hurt our economy, so as soon as I got to Congress, the very first bill that I introduced was a bipartisan bill to extend TPS for Haitians because protecting our friends and neighbors should be a bipartisan concern.

I was so proud and honored to work with my Republican colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER). I am thankful for his leadership on this issue, as well.

The U.S. State Department claims it is too dangerous for American citizens to go to Haiti because of kidnapping, gang violence, and widespread chaos, but yet the administration has said it is safe for Haitians to return there. How can we say that when the State Department has a "Level 4: Do not travel" advisory on its own website?

I have spoken to Haitian families who desperately want to see peace return to their country and would like to return there when it is safe to do so. However, the safety and economic security that they need to rebuild their lives there is nonexistent. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK).

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a special thank you to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for uniting the Caucus and Congress and passing this and getting the signatures.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of all the Haitian Americans in the United States and not just on their behalf, but on behalf of other Americans also who have businesses. I want us to look at this not just from a humanitarian perspective but also the economic damage which will happen to our country if we were, in fact, to expel over 350,000 Haitian Americans on TPS.

Haitian TPS holders contribute nearly \$6 billion annually to the U.S. economy. Haitian TPS holders pay taxes. They pay \$1.5 billion in Federal taxes, supporting Social Security, Medicare, and public health projects. They are active, compliant contributors to our economy.

Ending TPS would remove hundreds of thousands of workers from the labor force and shrink local economies across the country. Deportation is not fiscally responsible. It is economic sabotage.

There is another way. We can push legislation that would allow a transition, maybe for them to have green cards while we educate Americans to replace these jobs. However, rushing for expulsion or rushing to push them out of the country without an economic plan would only hurt our Nation, our businesses, and us.

Let's look at all the contributions that they have given. We have already stated that Haitian people actually possess more than 20 percent of the jobs in healthcare throughout the Nation, but that is not the end of the story.

Let's look at what they actually do when it comes to the economy in engineering and construction. We all agree that there is a huge housing problem right now. Who is building those homes? Those are our TPS people, who are here and who are working adamantly.

Today, I ask for us to consider this bill and to actually not go forward with expelling all the Haitian TPS recipients because it would only do us harm.

In response, what we should do is be united in thinking of an economic plan to not just create job skills training for Americans, which Americans are asking for directly right now. They want to work. They want to be a part of the economy, and we should give them permanent residency.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me add my voice to that of those who have thanked both Representative GILLEN and, of course, Representative PRESSLEY for their leadership and their stewardship in bringing us to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on this day as just one out of many voices proclaiming that we will not stand idly by as 5,400 Haitian TPS holders in New York City and approximately 345,000 others across America who we have come to call our neighbors, friends, and loved ones are forced back to the same gang violence, exploitation, chaos, and instability that they once narrowly escaped with their lives.

As I stand here, I do so in diametric opposition to this administration, which knows full well of our Haitian neighbors' plight yet does not seek to alleviate their pain. Instead, they hope only to become an active participant in it.

That is because in the twisted, dystopian, political sphere that has been created by the Trump administration and its leadership, these are not innocent families and children struggling for freedom and yearning for any semblance of safety, but instead are nothing more than numbers to fuel their ever-cruel, forever-hungry deportation machine.

Since the moment they arrived in America, Haitian TPS holders have dedicated themselves to contributing to this Nation. They have built businesses, built families, and built up their communities. Through their undeniable strength of character and resilient spirit, they have become an inseparable part of our city and country's social fabric. If anyone would like an example of what it truly means to be a good and decent American, let's look towards Haitian Americans and the families up the street.

My colleagues and I have repeatedly urged the administration to extend protections for our most vulnerable neighbors at this most perilous time. Thus far, our call has gone unanswered.

If Donald Trump intends to continue this injustice by covering his ears and pretending we are silent, let this bipartisan discharge petition serve as a blaring beacon that even he cannot ignore.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to make the moral decision to pass this necessary humanitarian legislation, protect our Haitian neighbors from certain devastation, and vote “yes” on this resolution.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FROST).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of extending temporary protective status for Haitian nationals living in the United States.

I am proud to represent Orlando, Florida, where one of the largest populations of Haitians live in the country. They are facing a humanitarian disaster and crisis, and we are facing a clear humanitarian and policy problem.

Haiti remains in the midst of a severe crisis, unlike anything we can find in the entire world. While hundreds of thousands of Haitian nationals live in the United States, Haiti remains in severe crisis and a horrible humanitarian situation. Hundreds of thousands of Haitian nationals in the United States are living and working under temporary protective status, and now that is at risk.

Conditions in Haiti are not safe to return. Armed groups control parts of the country. Access to food, medical care, and basic security remains deeply unstable. Deporting or forcing families to return under these conditions would be dangerous and unjust.

At the same time, Haitian TPS holders are fully integrated into our communities and societies. They are working, raising families, and contributing to our economy and neighborhoods every day.

The question before us is whether we allow this uncertainty and instability to continue or whether we will act. That is where this discharge petition comes in. The normal legislative process has failed to move this important issue forward, but this discharge petition has succeeded in forcing the House to finally consider legislation to extend TPS for more than 350,000 Haitian nationals. It is important we keep that in mind.

If we fail to move this forward, we are talking about expelling 350,000 of our neighbors to a country that is deeply unstable and dangerous.

By signing this petition, my colleagues have already recognized the urgency of the issue. Now it is time to follow through with action. A vote in favor of this measure provides stability for families, communities, and for critical parts of our workforce.

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FROST. A vote in favor of this measure provides stability to families for communities and critical parts of

our workforce. A vote against it sends people into conditions that we know are unsafe.

This work does not end here. We hope that in the future we can do the same thing for Venezuelan nationals. I am proud to be a part of this fight right now following the leadership of Representative AYANNA PRESSLEY.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close. A vote against this resolution is a vote against our country's best interests, plain and simple, but don't just take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. Republicans in the executive branch agree.

If you go to the State Department's website, you will see the Trump administration has designated Haiti as a “Level 4: Do not travel (Code Red)” because of the multilayered humanitarian crises of natural disasters, gang violence, and political instability impacting the island.

That is why TPS is warranted in this moment, and Secretary Rubio knows that. In fact, when he was in the Senate, it was Rubio who authored the very legislation we are voting on today.

□ 1410

It is not just him who agrees. The U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Mike Waltz, has repeatedly discussed the dire conditions of Haiti and its strategic importance to our national security.

Ambassador Waltz, who was recently a Republican in this very body, believes we should be working to stabilize Haiti. He knows that the international effort to restore order in Port-au-Prince would be undermined if we deported hundreds of thousands of Haitians to the island.

This isn't just about foreign policy. Secretary Kennedy of the Department of Health and Human Services said something families across the country already know too well: America is facing a caregiver crisis. If we were to deport Haitians, we would lose even more nurses, aides, and caregivers that we desperately need. Those jobs can't be replaced by AI. The solution is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” to extend TPS because it is the economic thing to do. It is the strategic thing to do. It is the humane thing to do. But most of all, it is the right thing to do.

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

The previous question is ordered.

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

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

Ms. PRESSLEY. 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.

FOREIGN EMISSIONS AND NON-ATTAINMENT CLARIFICATION FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY ACT

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1174, I call up the bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6409

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 “Foreign Emissions and Nonattainment Clarification for Economic Stability Act” or the “FENCES Act”.

SEC. 2. EMISSIONS BEYOND CONTROL.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF EMISSIONS COVERED.—Section 179B of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7509a) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(regardless of whether such emissions result from human activity)” after “but for emissions emanating from outside of the United States” each place it appears; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting “(regardless of whether such emissions result from human activity)” after “but for emissions emanating from outside the United States”.

(b) DESIGNATIONS.—Section 179B of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7509a) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) DESIGNATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an area within a State may not be designated as a nonattainment area with respect to any new or revised primary or secondary national ambient air quality standard for a pollutant if such State establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such area would be in attainment with such national ambient air quality standard for such pollutant but for emissions emanating from outside of the United States (regardless of whether such emissions result from human activity).”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS AND FEES IF EMISSIONS BEYOND CONTROL.—The Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 179B the following new section:

“SEC. 179C. APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS AND FEES IF EMISSIONS BEYOND CONTROL.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, with respect to any nonattainment area that is classified under section 181 as a Severe Area or an Extreme Area for ozone or under section 188 as a Serious Area for particulate matter, no sanction or fee under section 179 or 185 shall apply with respect to a State (or an area or source therein) on the basis of a deficiency described in section 179(a), or the failure to attain a national ambient air quality standard for ozone or particulate matter by the applicable attainment date, if the State demonstrates that the State would have avoided such deficiency, or such standard would have been attained, but for one or more of the following:

“(1) Emissions emanating from outside the nonattainment area.

“(2) Emissions from an exceptional event (as defined in section 319(b)(1)).

“(3) Emissions from mobile sources to the extent the State demonstrates that—

“(A) such emissions are beyond the control of the State to reduce or eliminate; and

“(B) the State is fully implementing such measures as are within the authority of the State to control emissions from the mobile sources.

“(b) NO EFFECT ON UNDERLYING STANDARDS.—The inapplicability of sanctions or fees with respect to a State (or an area or source therein) pursuant to subsection (a) does not affect the obligation of a State, area, source, or other entity under other provisions of this Act to establish and implement measures to attain a national ambient air quality standard for ozone or particulate matter.

“(c) PERIODIC RENEWAL OF DEMONSTRATION.—For subsection (a) to continue to apply with respect to a State (or an area or source therein), the State involved shall renew the demonstration required by subsection (a) at least once every 5 years.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6409.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act, which addresses the need for commonsense reforms on how emissions impact our Nation's ability to support domestic manufacturing and unleash affordable and reliable energy.

For far too long, burdensome regulations have stood in the way, allowing investments to go overseas while Americans are forced to pay higher prices. Many of these costly regulations result from regulatory burdens associated with the Clean Air Act.

The legislation considered today makes targeted and effective reforms that will support American job creators while continuing to protect our environment and the air we breathe.

The legislation produced by my colleague Congressman AUGUST PFLUGER of Texas ensures that States and local communities are not penalized for foreign air emissions emanating from outside our borders. Across the country, States are being unfairly penalized for pollution that originates from foreign nations, including air emissions from natural events, like the Canadian wildfires.

Currently, the Clean Air Act allows States to adjust their plans when foreign emissions prevent them from meeting Federal standards. However, the guidance from the EPA under the previous administration narrowed that relief, limiting it to only human-caused emissions from abroad.

This bill clarifies that all foreign emissions, whether natural or man-made, are excluded from consideration when determining whether a State meets national air quality standards.

Importantly, the bill allows States to account for foreign emissions earlier in the regulatory process, instead of forcing them to wait until the very end and risk costly delays or Federal sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting these bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act.

Access to quality and affordable healthcare is an issue at the top of many Americans' minds right now as they struggle through the ever-worsening Republican affordability crisis. Republicans have demonstrated over the last year that they have no interest in improving healthcare for the American people.

The Republican big, ugly bill cut more than a trillion dollars from Americans' healthcare. Insurance premiums spiked at the beginning of the year for 20 million people because Republicans refused to extend the ACA tax credits. Fifteen million people are predicted to lose their healthcare altogether. Hospitals are closing in record numbers around the country.

There was a media report just yesterday that said 15 hospitals in my State of New Jersey have the potential to close because of the Republican big, ugly bill and the impact on hospitals.

Now, there are reports that Republicans intend to make further cuts and take healthcare away from more people to pay for Trump's reckless war of choice with Iran. In Trump's America, we can't afford healthcare, but apparently, we can spend a billion dollars a day on the war in Iran. In fact, Trump himself said that it is not possible for the Federal Government to pay for Medicaid and Medicare when we are fighting wars.

Republican attacks on Americans' healthcare continue this week here on the House floor by bringing three dirty air bills to the House floor, including this bill, H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act; and also H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act; and, finally, H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act.

These bills are an attack on the public health protections that are a cornerstone of the Clean Air Act. They will ultimately make Americans sicker and increase healthcare costs even more.

The health harms of air pollution are well-documented, being felt by communities across the country. Communities

in areas with unsafe levels of air pollution see more diagnoses of diseases like asthma, COPD, heart disease, and certain types of cancer, all of which require long-term treatment and medication.

Air pollution, Mr. Speaker, is also responsible for over 100,000 premature deaths every year. It is ridiculous to even consider these bills when our constituents are demanding action on healthcare affordability.

Whether it is from reducing transparency, to artificially reducing air pollution reporting by ignoring climate change, to giving corporate polluters free passes on Clean Air Act requirements, these bills are evidence that Republicans are more interested in helping their pollution friends than the well-being of Americans.

The bill that we are talking about now, the FENCES Act, would undercut the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, or NAAQS, which tells us the amount of air pollution that is safe to breathe.

□ 1420

The bill would have us ignore bad air quality in areas that experience any pollution beyond the jurisdiction of a State or city's borders. It removes the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to impose fees or sanctions on States that fail to make progress toward cleaning up the air.

Let me just explain this. If my hometown of Long Branch or my county of Monmouth or my State of New Jersey was getting pollution from outside that particular jurisdiction, it wouldn't count. They wouldn't have to account for that in terms of dealing with air pollution and trying to reduce it. To me, that is patently ridiculous because we know that air pollution travels across cities, across States, and even across countries. Giving States that are not even trying to improve air quality a free pass for pollution without any incentive to fix the problem is not the right way to proceed, and that is what this bill does.

If signed into law, this bill would require EPA to cook the books on air pollution in favor of industry, removing all accountability for States to clean up air pollution and leaving millions of Americans to breathe unhealthy air. The only winners here are corporate polluters who would get to save a few dollars in compliance costs.

Now Republican attempts to undermine the NAAQS aren't new. Every time the EPA strengthens an air quality standard, opponents complain that stronger public health standards will limit economic growth, but that has never been true, Mr. Speaker. Every time, industry has innovated better pollution control measures to meet the new standards.

Republicans also claim that the FENCES Act is part of their permitting reform effort, but this bill would not speed up any permitting. In fact, it

would cause complete permitting gridlock in areas with pollution that exceeds an air quality standard. This is not permitting reform.

House Republicans are trying to use accounting gimmicks to make areas with poor air quality appear much better to benefit corporate polluters at the expense of the health of Americans across the country. Pushing the FENCES Act at a moment when millions of Americans are struggling to afford their utilities, their groceries, and healthcare, in my opinion, is unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to me to hear my Democratic colleagues talk about where Republicans are on healthcare when, in fact, it was Republicans who initiated the \$50 billion Rural Health Transformation Fund that every Democrat voted against.

As a matter of fact, just this year, the State of New Jersey is going to get \$147,250,806 from the Rural Health Transformation Fund. I think that is a pretty good investment in trying to improve healthcare for people all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PFLUGER), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. PFLUGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Foreign Emissions and Nonattainment Clarification for Economic Stability Act, also known as the FENCES Act.

States and communities are being pushed into nonattainment because of pollution that they don’t control and they can’t prevent. As was just mentioned by my colleague from New Jersey who said that we can’t control pollution across borders, that is right. That is why we have to come up with this bill.

Smoke from Canadian wildfires, emissions drifting across our southern border, and other foreign sources can overwhelm local air quality readings even when the States are fully compliant and acting in good faith.

Congress has long recognized this reality. That is why the Clean Air Act allows States to account for foreign emissions when those emissions interfere with attainment, but that balance was disrupted when EPA guidance under the Biden administration sharply narrowed what counts as foreign emissions, limiting relief to certain human-caused sources while excluding events like wildfires. That distinction was arbitrary and unworkable. States cannot regulate another country, and they certainly cannot regulate natural disasters.

The FENCES Act corrects that mistake. In fact, let me change that phrasing. The FENCES Act corrects that overreach by the previous administration. It clarifies that all foreign emis-

sions, whether natural or human caused, must be excluded when the EPA makes nonattainment determinations or reviews new source permits. Just as important, the bill allows States to raise these issues earlier in the process rather than years after the planning and investment have happened when the consequences are most severe.

Those consequences are significant. Nonattainment designations impose substantial regulatory burdens on States, communities, energy producers, and manufacturers. They trigger stricter permitting requirements, delay infrastructure projects, and raise the costs for businesses trying to expand or hire. For energy producers, it means slower approvals for drilling and processing. For manufacturers, it means uncertainty around whether a project will even move forward. For local communities, it means fewer jobs and less investment, even when they have done everything right to comply with the law.

The issue is not theoretical. In my area, the Permian Basin, we saw how even the possibility, the threatening of a nonattainment designation can create uncertainty. That uncertainty affects permitting timelines, capital planning, and long-term investment decisions for both producers and local communities. Companies begin to question whether new jobs will face delays or additional requirements, and local leaders are left planning around an unclear regulatory future. When the stakes are that high, EPA needs to get the analysis right. That is the way the law was written, and this bill gets us back to that intent.

It was said that this bill favors the dirty production in manufacturing and lowers the air quality. No, it actually holds our communities accountable. It holds them accountable, the communities that we care about domestically that should be held accountable, but shouldn’t be penalized for cities in Mexico or wildfires that are happening in Canada or other foreign sources that they don’t control. That is what this bill does.

When the Supreme Court decided on the *Loper Bright* case, that is the *Chevron* deference case, this is the decision they had in mind because the Biden administration overreached so often and so critically.

This bill is a targeted, commonsense measure that does not change air quality standards. In fact, it actually enforces them more accurately within our local communities, and it makes a narrow adjustment to ensure that compliance determinations are fair by excluding foreign emissions from EPA nonattainment designations.

American workers and businesses should not face regulatory penalties for pollution originating outside our borders or for uncontrollable natural events. I urge my colleagues to think about a commonsense solution and to get back to the intent of the law,

which is exactly what the FENCES Act does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes.”

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated this bill in committee, I was reminded of the environmental history of the Adirondack Mountains, which are located just to the north of my district in upstate New York. The Adirondacks are known for their beauty as well as the ecological damage they suffered from acid rain.

That acid rain was caused by polluting power plants in the Midwest, and that pollution didn’t stop in upstate New York. It also harmed people and the environment in eastern Canada. The international pressure brought by the Canadian Government helped motivate the Bush administration and Congress to enact the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, which included a program to control sources of acid rain pollution.

In that case, American industries were the polluters, but it demonstrates how international cooperation in pursuit of our common environmental goals is, indeed, possible.

States and counties burdened by foreign pollution sources should be able to rely upon their Federal Government to address these issues through bilateral discussions with the polluting country. We should be able to have a bipartisan consensus in Congress that we would like our environmental and diplomatic efforts to prioritize these issues in our international relations.

Of course, it should be a national imperative that we collectively demand polluters in Mexico, China, or any other country that may be proven to be contributing to an area’s nonattainment of a Clean Air Act standard, to do something to control their pollution.

I understand that States and counties may be frustrated by pollution sources from outside their jurisdiction, but the lungs of the people living and working in those areas don’t care from whence that pollution originated. It affects their health all the same.

I don’t think the answer can be to simply ignore the problem of Americans breathing unsafe levels of air pollution. States and local air agencies should continue to work with EPA to find ways to better protect people by also allowing for opportunities to prove when emissions originate from outside their borders.

Thankfully, that is already how the Clean Air Act works, making this bill unnecessary. Section 179B of the Clean Air Act currently gives States that opportunity to prove emissions came from an international source and provides regulatory relief when an area would have otherwise achieved the National Ambient Air Quality Standard.

□ 1430

Instead, this bill allows States to completely ignore international pollution in their State implementation plans, and it provides free passes on pollution that comes from outside the area, from exceptional events, and from mobile-source pollution.

The bill blocks EPA's ability to impose sanctions on States that fail to make progress toward reducing air pollution, including States that are not even trying to improve air quality.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that we should be working to better protect our constituents from having to breathe pollution from foreign sources, but pretending that pollution doesn't exist simply cannot be the answer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose this bill.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), a distinguished Member.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge support for the FENCES Act, a commonsense bill that brings fairness and clarity to how we evaluate air quality in the United States.

In California, our communities are already working hard to meet some of the most stringent environmental standards in the country. Yet, too often, they are penalized for factors completely outside of their control, like pollution or wildfire smoke that comes from outside our borders.

The FENCES Act clarifies that emissions coming from other countries, whether caused by human activity or natural events, cannot be used to determine whether a State is meeting Federal air quality standards. The bill also strengthens existing law under the Clean Air Act by allowing States to account for foreign emissions earlier in the process rather than waiting until final stages of their State implementation plans. For California, wherein nonattainment designations can have serious economic consequences, reliability is important.

Right now, businesses across Central Valley and across our State face significant permitting delays and regulatory uncertainty. I hear from small businesses all the time who want to invest and hire in our region, but they are stuck navigating a system that doesn't reflect today's global realities.

In some cases, these challenges actually push investment overseas to countries with much weaker environmental standards, which ultimately undermines the very goal that we are trying to achieve here in the United States. I think we can all agree that we want our communities to be healthy while also providing opportunities for economic investment.

The FENCES Act helps to provide a level playing field by providing regulatory clarity, streamlining the permitting process, and giving States like California a fair shot at compliance, while still maintaining our commitment to clean air.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which strikes the balance between reasonable environmental standards and allowing industry to invest in America to help build our economy and create jobs.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LANDSMAN), a member of our committee.

Mr. LANDSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, America is in the middle of a healthcare crisis. More and more Americans can't afford their healthcare. They just can't pay for it. Hospitals are cutting back services. Many of them are closing their doors.

Then, Trump and congressional Republicans made things much worse when they spent trillions of dollars on tax cuts that mostly benefited the wealthy. To pay for it, they kicked about 15 million Americans off of their health insurance, a cut of approximately \$1 trillion to healthcare for tax cuts for the wealthy.

Then, they refused to give 24 million Americans a break on buying healthcare, and now this. This week, congressional Republicans are bringing three bills to the floor that will make it harder for people to breathe.

One of those bills, the so-called FENCES Act, directs the EPA to use accounting gimmicks that will allow industries to pollute our air without consequences. It is an air pollution bill.

This bill will make Americans sicker while Trump and congressional Republicans have cut healthcare for millions of Americans. Congress should be focused entirely on expanding healthcare and protecting our air and water. Fortunately, the Senate won't take these bills up, and they are not going anywhere.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to talk about Republican positions on healthcare. I will remind them again that, in particular, the State of Ohio received \$202,030,262 from the Rural Health Transformation Fund that every Democrat voted against. I remind my colleagues that the Republicans have made a major investment in healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Alabama for yielding, and I appreciate his hard work going into the Rural Transformation Healthcare Fund that was in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. The gentleman originated the idea, and we certainly appreciate his hard work on that.

Today, I rise to support H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act; H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act; and H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act.

These three bills are an essential part of the committee's broader efforts on permitting reform and aligned with

the White House permitting priorities, which include modernizing the Clean Air Act.

A lot has changed since 1990, the last time that the Clean Air Act got a substantial overhaul. Some parts of the law have become outdated, contributing to the regulatory gridlock that is stifling American growth and innovation.

A lot has changed since 1990, the last time the Clean Air Act got a substantial overhaul, and some parts of the law have become outdated, contributing also to more gridlock.

These bills are foundational to our permitting reform efforts because they illustrate ways that we protect public health and the environment while removing outdated provisions that are slowing energy production and manufacturing, ultimately preventing job creation.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has held multiple hearings this Congress on the process for establishing and implementing national air quality standards and improving the preconstruction permitting program without sacrificing environmental protections. Some of the most expensive and significant barriers in the permitting process are the result of the law's outdated provisions.

What is worse, these burdensome requirements fail to address the most significant sources of pollution and create disincentives for companies to invest in cost-efficient and effective technology that would actually improve air quality.

In the U.S., it takes 80 percent longer to permit projects than elsewhere in the world. America's outdated permitting system costs manufacturers in the U.S. approximately \$7.9 billion each year. While a reasonable level of permitting is, of course, needed, without commonsense reforms, our Nation risks falling behind our adversaries, like China.

Notably, over 70 percent of projects require Clean Air Act permits, which have the most burdensome approval process of any permitting requirement. Notably, over 70 percent of projects require these permits, and these three bills remove regulatory uncertainty and bureaucratic hoops that impact what and where job creators build new businesses, but they do not change the underlying environmental protections in the law.

The FENCES Act introduced by Congressman PFLUGER ensures that States and local communities are not penalized for foreign air emissions emanating from outside of the U.S. The FENCES Act clarifies that all foreign emissions, whether natural or man-made, are not considered when determining whether a State meets national air quality standards.

The FENCES Act protects manufacturers and communities from unnecessary compliance burdens caused by events beyond their control, such as pollution from China, foreign wildfires,

or dust storms, while upholding environmental standards under the Clean Air Act.

The RED Tape Act, introduced by Congressman JOYCE, eliminates a duplicative environmental review for projects already subject to NEPA environmental review. The duplicative process leads to additional delays and costs in the NEPA process.

The FIRE Act, introduced by Congressman GABE EVANS and co-led by Congressman ADAM GRAY, updates the Clean Air Act to address the biggest threat in air pollution that this country faces today: wildfires. Bipartisan legislation ensures that States are not punished for prescribed burns or emissions that they cannot control.

Prescribed burns are the most effective tool to decrease the severity of wildfires and public health problems associated with wildfire smoke. Despite the widespread acceptance of benefits of prescribed burns, they are underutilized across the U.S. due to perverse regulatory burdens under current air quality laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act; H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act; and H.R. 6387, the FIRE Act. These bills provide commonsense solutions and long-needed updates to the Clean Air Act.

□ 1440

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MENEFFEE).

Mr. MENEFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PALLONE for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of the FENCES Act.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about protecting public health and the environment and without sacrificing environmental protection in this country, but I want to point out that it is this administration currently in office that has eviscerated the EPA. Time after time, we have seen these bills filed that are intended to weaken our environmental protection.

Let me be clear about what the FENCES Act actually does. It weakens the Clean Air Act. It removes the EPA's ability to hold States accountable when they fail to reduce air pollution, and it gives polluters a free pass in communities that can least afford it. I represent Houston, Texas. In my district, environmental justice is not a talking point; it is a reality that people wake up to each and every day.

We have communities that have some of the highest concentrations of industrial pollution in the entire country: communities with more than five polluting facilities in a 2-mile radius, cancer clusters, high rates of lung disease and heart disease, lower life expectancies, children and seniors breathing in some of the most contaminated air in America.

These communities don't need us here in Washington making it worse. I

know firsthand what happens when you take the pressure off of State environmental regulators.

Before I came to Congress, I served as the chief legal officer for Harris County, the largest county in Texas. I watched the State's environmental regulators look the other way when pollution ran rampant in underserved communities.

They sat on cancer clusters. They let polluting facilities concentrate in neighborhoods that had no political power to fight back, and they handed passes to industry while residents got sick. I had to sue them to get them to act, but that is not how our government should work.

The Federal Government has to hold these folks accountable when they put industry over people and put our communities' health at risk, but this bill would add yet another obstacle to holding those in power accountable.

Here is what the FENCES Act actually does. Under current law, States already get credit when pollution blows in from other countries or from out of State. They are not penalized for pollution that they cannot control. That protection exists today.

This bill doesn't fix a gap. It tears open a new one. It expands that exemption so broadly that States can point to foreign pollution as a reason to stop making progress on air quality altogether.

It removes the EPA's ability to hold them accountable. It is a built-in excuse to look the other way. State regulators and polluters both know exactly how to exploit it, and they will.

That is why I tried to change this bill by submitting an amendment. It said one simple thing: that before this law takes effect, the Secretary of Health and Human Services must certify that the impacts will not harm children and the elderly. That is it. Prove that this is safe for our kids and our seniors before it takes effect.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked it. They would not allow that vote. They couldn't say yes to that because this bill was never about clean air. It is about giving corporate polluters cover while the people in our districts pay with their health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Utah). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MENEFFEE. Over 100 million Americans already live in counties with unhealthy air quality. Air pollution contributes to more than 100,000 premature deaths in this country each and every year. The people in our communities are not abstractions. They are already on the wrong side of these numbers.

This body lets pollution run rampant as our communities see poison in the wind that blows and wonder "Where did all the blue skies go?"

We should be standing up to make sure that every single person in our

communities has clean land, clean air, and clean water, regardless of their ZIP Code or socioeconomic status.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the FENCES Act.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman bringing up the situation that people in rural America find themselves in. What we tried to do with the One Big Beautiful Bill Act with the Rural Health Transformation Fund was meet a lot of those needs. The State of Texas got more money than any other State, \$281,319,361, to try to improve healthcare opportunities for people who live in disadvantaged areas. What we are also trying to do is improve those conditions, to give people an opportunity to have a better job, to have better options in food, and have better healthcare options, as well. That is a big part of what we are trying to do with the modernization of the Clean Air Act and these bills that we bring before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CISCOMANI).

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PALMER for yielding me time to speak in support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act.

This commonsense legislation ensures that American communities and manufacturers are not penalized for pollution that they cannot control. Emissions from foreign countries, wildfires, and dust storms should not determine whether our States meet Federal air quality standards.

The FENCES Act restores the original intent of the Clean Air Act by clarifying that foreign emissions, whether natural or man-made, are excluded from compliance determinations and permitting decisions. It also allows States to account for these emissions earlier in the regulatory process, providing certainty and preventing costly delays.

For border communities like those that I represent in southern Arizona, this is about fairness. Our districts should not face economic penalties for pollution originating beyond our own borders.

The FENCES Act strengthens regulatory certainty, supports American jobs, and upholds our Nation's environmental standards. It is also widely supported by the business community and will ensure we are creating an environment in which industry can thrive.

I strongly believe that when we manufacture here in America, we do it better and cleaner than anywhere else in the world, and this legislation is essential in supporting American innovation and excellence across a wide variety of sectors, from mining to chips manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. DEXTER).

Ms. DEXTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong and vehement opposition to these bills, specifically the FENCES Act, that gut the Clean Air Act's core public health protections.

Before the Clean Air Act was passed in 1970, pollution choked American cities. It blanketed entire communities in a toxic haze so thick that residents were reported to believe they were under chemical attack.

In Los Angeles, people had smog-burned eyes and seared lungs. In my hometown of Portland, an industrial hub, smokestacks filled the skies with black plumes. Children walked to school clutching handkerchiefs over their faces. Drivers crashed on the highway because they couldn't see more than a few feet ahead. Families were scared. They were sick, and they were desperate for change.

That is the reality my Republican colleagues are now trying to drag us back to. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards are one of the most important tools we have to protect health. They set limits on dangerous pollution and ensure communities know when the air they breathe is unsafe. These bills would undermine those standards, allowing States to sidestep them and leave the public in the dark about real health risks.

As a lung doctor, I know exactly what that means. It means more asthma attacks, more heart attacks, more strokes, more cancer diagnoses, and more children in the ER.

We have seen this play out time and time again, and today, I cannot help but wonder when are we going to learn our lesson.

In places like Cancer Alley, families wake up every day knowing the air they breathe is making them sick. Communities are living with higher rates of cancer, respiratory illness, and premature death—real people, real families bearing the cost of decisions made right here.

It is not just one place. Across the country, in communities living near the major sources of pollution, we see the same pattern. When standards are weakened and accountability disappears, people pay with their health.

This is not what the people of Oregon sent me here to do. They sent me here to fight for healthy communities, for clean air, for safe water, and a better future for our children.

I will not sit silently while this body rolls back lifesaving protections that have put polluters on watch. I urge my colleagues to reject these bills. Our children are watching. History is watching, and the air we breathe is on the line.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act.

Washington has ignored a simple fact that every Arizonan knows firsthand.

Eighty percent of the air pollution in Maricopa County, Arizona's largest county, with a population of approximately 5.5 million people, is caused by natural phenomena or international transport.

Wildfire smoke from California, Canada, and Mexico, dust storms across the desert, and emissions drifting in from China and Mexico are all outside our control. Yet Arizona was penalized with stricter Federal mandates, threatening jobs and growth in one of the fastest growing regions in America.

That makes no sense because Arizona—and Maricopa County specifically—is home to economic and technological development that will better the lives of Arizonans and Americans nationwide.

□ 1450

From semiconductor manufacturing to aerospace and national defense facilities, Arizona is building the industries that keep America competitive.

These employers depend on fair, predictable permitting, not rules that punish us for pollution blowing in from another country.

Arizona's leaders have invested in real outreach and compliance tools that have cut controllable emissions by 50 percent since 2000, but no State should be forced to impose more regulations on families and small businesses for pollution that they did not cause nor can they remedy. That is exactly where the FENCES Act is necessary.

The FENCES Act restores the original intent of the Clean Air Act by making clear that all foreign emissions, natural or man-made, are excluded when EPA conducts air quality reviews.

Democrats would continue to penalize States like Arizona for these uncontrollable sources. Democrats want to continue to impose costly delays, Federal sanctions, and unnecessary burdens on manufacturers, communities, and States.

Earlier this year, President Trump and EPA Administrator Lee Zeldin recognized the impact of these onerous rules and stopped their negative effects in Maricopa County, but no State should have to rely on the unpredictability and capriciousness of any administration.

Congress must act so that no future EPA can arbitrarily punish Arizona or any State for emissions beyond our borders.

The FENCES Act is grounded in sound science and common sense. It protects jobs, supports investment, and ensures environmental rules focus on what States can actually control.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the FENCES Act. Let's pass it today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MIN).

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 6409, the

FENCES Act, which would gut the Clean Air Act.

For over 60 years, the Clean Air Act has stood as our Nation's landmark air pollution law, serving as our most effective tool to try to keep the air that our children and families breathe safe and to hold polluters accountable.

Despite this achievement, we still have more than 100,000 people prematurely dying in the United States every year because of air pollution. That is simply unacceptable.

We should be building on the progress of the Clean Air Act, not gutting it. We should be decarbonizing transportation, regulating carbon emissions, acknowledging that climate change is happening and that the science is real, and trying to improve air quality and reduce the climate trends that we are seeing that are so alarming. Instead, we are debating another bill that would give yet another free pass to corporations and billionaires at the expense of working families.

I understand my colleagues across the aisle are debating right now, and will introduce later today, a bill to rename the big, ugly bill to something maybe more palatable to the masses. They are doing that because the big, ugly bill is so unpopular right now that they are trying to run away from it as fast as possible.

I have a news flash for y'all. It is not the name that is the problem. It is the substance of the bill that helps, again, the Epstein elites that y'all are protecting so hard. It does so at the expense of the working class—in this case, with the FENCES Act gutting the Clean Air Act and polluting our air and water.

The bill before us today is yet another attack on the Clean Air Act that we cannot afford. The FENCES Act would pave the way for States to avoid their responsibility to improve air quality and protect public health by claiming air pollution in their State as a foreign source.

This bill is completely unnecessary because, under current law, States are not penalized for pollution they can't control, such as from foreign sources or other States. This is a solution in search of a problem.

It is important to remember that air pollution doesn't vanish when we don't see it. It moves across national borders and has deadly impacts on Americans here at home.

As a reminder, not too long ago, in the 1960s and 1970s, Los Angeles, just up the 405 from where I live in Orange County, was one of the most polluted cities in the world, with smog so pervasive that people reported burning eyes and extremely low visibility.

Because of landmark laws like the Clean Air Act and efforts by State and local governments, air pollution in Los Angeles has been significantly reduced, driving down chronic health impacts and having notable and statistically proven quality-of-life improvements for millions of Californians in southern California.

For these reasons, at the appropriate time, I plan to 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 ensure that this bill does not go into effect until the EPA and Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee certify that the act will not increase health harms or the costs associated with treating those harms.

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 gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I don't think we want to follow the California model for America's economic future, with their high energy prices, the highest poverty rate in the country, and destructive economic policies driving businesses out of the State.

I think with Republicans' policies, it is very clear that we have the best interests of the people at heart.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6409, the FENCES Act. I thank my good friend from Alabama for holding this debate.

You may not think of my home State of Idaho as a border State when you start thinking about border States, but Idaho is a border State. We share an international border with Canada in the northern panhandle of the State of Idaho.

There is a lot of timber on both sides of that borderline. Especially in a dry year like this—and this is going to be a dry year for us—it is not uncommon to have wildfire break out on one side or the other. It has happened many times before. Unfortunately, it will probably happen again, where, on the Canadian side, a wildfire breaks out.

Oftentimes, that smoke, those pollutants, blow right over the border, and there is absolutely nothing that the State of Idaho can do with that. Sometimes, we share some firefighting resources, but the bottom line is that it didn't break out in our forest.

It is true that the Clean Air Act has a provision to address that. What is not being brought up, at least consistently, is that there is also a conflict with that through the EPA. The EPA guidance, largely enforced with the previous administration, conflicts with the Clean Air Act provision allowing States to adjust their emission plans. Every time one of those fires breaks out, we become at risk of falling out of our emissions standards.

Mr. Speaker, this is really a pretty simple bill. All it does is ensure a fair

and consistent ability for these air quality designations to be put in place.

I stand in strong support of that. That is just one example. There are many other examples that some of my colleagues have brought up already.

It is not fair for States to be penalized for something that is out of their control. This simply takes steps in order to put fair and consistent air quality designations in place. That is it.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 6409, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

The FENCES Act, Mr. Speaker, is a bad faith attempt by Republicans to use accounting gimmicks to make areas with bad air quality appear safe at the expense of our communities.

I hear from my Republican colleagues all the time that the Federal Government should be more transparent, but the literal and figurative smog that would be created by the FENCES Act will only make Americans sicker.

The FENCES Act goes an extra step to waive sanctions and fees for States, not just for international pollution but also pollution from mobile sources, exceptional events, and even from a different district within the same State.

In other words, the FENCES Act removes all incentives for States to work toward NAAQS attainment. This is a bad deal for the American people.

Every year, over 100,000 Americans die prematurely as a result of air pollution. Doctors and scientists widely consider foreign particulate matter to be one of the most toxic air pollutants, as it can cause asthma, COPD, heart disease, and certain types of cancer.

We can't just ignore air pollution and the very real health consequences that result from it to make permitting for industry easier. We shouldn't ignore the broader political landscape in which we are considering this bill, either.

Earlier this year, the EPA announced that it will no longer consider the benefits of protecting public health when developing new rules for fine particulate matter and ozone pollution. Instead, the EPA will only consider the compliance costs for industry.

This decision is entirely antithetical to the EPA's core mission to protect public health and the environment. The American people are asking us to lower healthcare costs, and our responsibility should be to them, not to the industry.

□ 1500

However, our Republican colleagues seem to only answer to their corporate polluter friends who are asking for regulatory rollbacks to save a few dollars. The DEFENSE Act is a gift to industry that would come at the expense of the American people.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the

DEFENSE Act, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that no one wants polluted air and polluted water. We have made tremendous advances in pollution control. As a matter of fact, I worked for two international engineering companies, one of which was in environmental systems. We built the pollution control equipment that has made our air demonstrably cleaner. We built flue gas scrubbers. We built electrostatic precipitators and baghouses.

The technology has improved dramatically since I left my work in the field of engineering. Since 1980, we have reduced pollution from the six criteria gases monitored by the EPA by 78 percent. That is despite the fact that the economy has grown over 240 percent. That is \$2.9 trillion to an economy of \$30.6 trillion adjusted for inflation.

Vehicles miles driven are up 113 percent, and the population is up over 50 percent, yet we have seen remarkable improvements in air quality.

What we are trying to do with this long overdue effort to modernize the Clean Air Act is to not only continue to keep our air clean and our water clean, but to improve economic opportunity to people, particularly people who are disadvantaged such as I was growing up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to support this commonsense legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

Mr. MIN. 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:

Mr. Min of CA moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6409 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

Mr. Min moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6409 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. LIMITATION.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not take effect until the date on which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, publishes a certification that implementation of this Act, and the amendments

made by this Act, will not increase, including for vulnerable populations such as seniors, children, and minority and low-income communities, any of the following:

- (1) Asthma attacks.
- (2) Hospitalization and emergency room visits for those with respiratory disease or cardiovascular disease.
- (3) The risk of preterm birth, babies born with low birth weight, or impaired fetal growth.
- (4) The risk of heart attacks, stroke, or premature death.
- (5) Reproductive, developmental, or other serious harms to human health.
- (6) The costs of healthcare treatment for respiratory disease, cardiovascular disease, or any other serious disease or condition.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REDUCING AND ELIMINATING DUPLICATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS ACT

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1174, I call up the bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 6398

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 "Reducing and Eliminating Duplicative Environmental Regulations Act" or the "RED Tape Act".

SEC. 2. POLICY REVIEW.

Section 309 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)—
 - (A) by striking "and comment in writing" and inserting ", and comment in writing,";
 - (B) by striking "Administrator," and inserting "Administrator";
 - (C) by striking "(1)"; and
 - (D) by striking ", (2) newly authorized Federal projects for construction and any major Federal agency action (other than a project for construction) to which section 102(2)(C) of Public Law 91-190 applies, and (3) proposed regulations published by any department or agency of the Federal Government"; and
- (2) in subsection (b), by striking ", action, or regulation".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Com-

mittee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6398.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act, which would address burdensome regulations in the Clean Air Act and provide the permitting reform needed to support American innovation.

The legislation, which was introduced by my friend Congressman JOHN JOYCE of Pennsylvania eliminates the duplicative requirement in the Clean Air Act that requires the EPA to assess and provide feedback on environmental impact statements other agencies prepare under NEPA.

The primary agency preparing an environmental impact statement already possesses the expertise and resources necessary to evaluate the impacts of a project on our environment, and the EPA is often already involved in the NEPA review process as a cooperating agency. Requiring them to provide a secondary review under section 309 is unnecessary, duplicative, and inefficient, leading to more delays and higher costs for American job creators.

This legislation is an important step to streamline permitting, and it removes burdensome inefficiencies in the current NEPA process. This bill is an essential component in the committee's permitting reform efforts.

The Clean Air Act is long overdue for an update to eliminate outdated provisions that are holding back American manufacturing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the RED Tape Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6398, the so-called RED Tape Act. This bill deletes a section of the Clean Air Act that requires the EPA to review major Federal projects under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. As a result, major Federal projects and regulations will be exempt from any scrutiny of their impacts on air quality and public health from EPA experts.

The bill would also make the permitting process less transparent by removing the requirements that EPA comments be made available to the public

and, therefore, communities would be kept in the dark.

Ignoring the consequences of major actions won't make them go away, but that is exactly what the RED Tape Act would do. For the communities who live near these major projects, turning a blind eye to problems won't protect their families from potentially toxic exposures.

Worse yet, the RED Tape Act is billed as permitting reform when in reality it is a bill to let polluters run amok out of sight from the public and without proper safety and common-sense guardrails.

Republican hypocrisy knows no bounds. They court the make America healthy again community, but then they move a bill forward that will take away the public's ability to simply know the potential toxic risks of large Federal projects. They then tout the importance of permitting reform but bring false permitting solutions to the floor instead of real proposals to make cleaner and cheaper energy sources more readily available to combat rising costs for Americans.

This hypocrisy is just one of the many problems we have to confront as the House is set to vote on these blatant attempts to gut the Clean Air Act, one of the most successful environmental and public health laws ever enacted by Congress. House Republicans are working overtime to further the Trump administration's efforts to silence the scientific, medical, and public health experts at EPA from being able to alert other agencies about how their projects might cause harm to the health of our constituents and our neighbors. That is the type of critical assessment that EPA's expertise alone could offer and would be missing as a result of this bill.

Contrary to the rhetoric of my Republican colleagues, they haven't offered any proof that these reviews were slowing or stopping projects. In fact, the EPA reviews thousands of environmental impact statements each year, with most other agencies taking their recommendations.

Unfortunately, by removing the EPA from the overall process, we are losing out on the expertise of the scientists tasked with protecting public health and the environment. However, to the Republican majority, if you can turn a blind eye to the consequences, they will disappear. Well, they don't disappear just because you turn a blind eye, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1510

That is not how toxic pollution works for countless communities in your district and mine. They deserve to know how large Federal projects might impact their water, air, and soil, and they deserve to have the best and brightest EPA scientists analyze these projects and make comments for the public to scrutinize and to hold the government accountable. Any attempts to remove this simple level of government accountability is an attempt to

silence basic civic participation and transparency, nothing more.

I don't have a problem with making government more efficient, but this bill is simply removing the voice of an important agency whose viewpoint Republicans happen to dislike. This ongoing attack on the EPA, on science and transparency cannot stand, so I urge my colleagues to stand with me in opposition to this misguided bill.

One of the most important things that we have in Congress and that I try to achieve, and I think Democrats all try to achieve, is the right to know. If people know what is going on, then they can voice their opinion. They can go out and speak. They can protest. They can do what they have to do to protect their communities.

However, by eliminating the right to know, we are making it impossible for people to actually express their opinion, which is a fundamental right, in my opinion, under our Constitution.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Dr. JOYCE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding. I rise today in support of my legislation, the RED Tape Act.

The RED Tape Act removes an unnecessary and duplicative environmental review that the EPA currently conducts under the Clean Air Act.

As it stands, the relevant department or agency prepares an environmental impact statement as part of the permitting of a new Federal project, a process in which the EPA is often already involved. After completion of that review, EPA is then asked to go back and provide additional comments on those same findings; hence, the redundant and duplicative nature of the process.

This secondary review of an already-completed environmental impact statement only serves to slow down the critical projects, especially projects in the energy industry.

This bill is about getting projects permitted and getting projects completed, projects that will help us compete with our adversaries in industries like AI and advanced manufacturing.

This bill is not, as has been alleged, an attempt to undermine environmental review. The environmental impact statement must still be completed by the primary agency. This is a process that agencies already have the necessary expertise and capacity to carry out efficiently. In many cases, EPA will still have the opportunity to comment during the initial process as a co-operating agency.

As the name implies, the RED Tape Act simply removes bureaucratic, redundant red tape. Projects will still need to comply with all applicable environmental laws. This is in no way

giving a pass to polluters. It is ensuring that economic growth is not stifled by overly burdensome Federal regulations.

Understand what this legislation will do. This is a commonsense bill that leaves basic environmental protections in place while eliminating artificial barriers. I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage on the floor later this week.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), the ranking member of our Environment Subcommittee.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding. It is worth reiterating just how effective the Clean Air Act has been at protecting our public health.

In the past 50-plus years, the Clean Air Act has proven time and time again that environmental protections and economic growth can, indeed, go hand in hand.

Between 1970 and 2022, major air pollutants dropped by 78 percent, while the U.S. gross domestic product nearly quadrupled. However, despite this progress, there is still much more work to do to ensure that all Americans can breathe healthy air.

More than 156 million Americans are living in places with unhealthy levels of ozone or particle pollution, and that air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in the United States each and every year. I find it disheartening that the majority continues to advance bills that would make the Clean Air Act less effective at protecting people from dangerous pollution.

The RED Tape Act is the latest Republican effort to claim that the rules are too burdensome on industry. This bill amends section 309 of the Clean Air Act to eliminate the requirement for EPA to review and provide written comments on major Federal construction projects and actions in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

This could allow major Federal projects and actions to be approved without proper consideration of their impacts on air quality and public health.

The bill also removes the ability for the public to be informed of potential public health concerns stemming from these projects.

I really do not think Americans are opposed to the Federal Government considering the potential health, economic, and environmental impacts of major decisions before they are made. Yet, this bill would limit that consideration while making it harder for the public to understand the consequences of major projects.

I know some Members will claim this review is duplicative of NEPA, but many of these same Members are also pushing parallel efforts to gut NEPA, claiming that NEPA isn't necessary because our underlying environmental laws will sufficiently protect public health and the environment.

You can have it both ways. You cannot end both parts of a supposedly duplicative process unless the goal of this effort is to severely limit environmental reviews of projects entirely. That is not about cutting red tape. That is about ending decades-old public health protections so that industry doesn't need to worry about how pollution mitigation might cut into their profits.

The bottom line is that the EPA is our Nation's foremost expert at assessing projects' impacts on air quality and is responsible for protecting the air that we breathe and the water that we drink. I cannot support efforts to undermine EPA's expertise and eliminate the agency's efforts to carry out reasonable environmental reviews, and so I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act. Under current law, as we have heard here today, the EPA is required to review and comment on the environmental impacts of Federal projects from other Federal agencies.

Perhaps this would make sense if the EPA wasn't already involved in the initial environmental review and development of the environmental impact statement for Federal projects. What we have here is another, as we said, duplicative and inefficient government process that for decades has delayed development, slowed economic growth, and only hurt American families and businesses in making it more unaffordable for the American people.

Furthermore, in the 30 years since Congress enacted section 309 of the Clean Air Act, agencies have developed their own expertise in preparing environmental impact statements. That is why the Supreme Court ruled that EPA's separate review and comment on broader environmental impacts of proposed Federal actions are no longer appropriate.

I come from the construction industry. I understand how unpredictable timelines and Federal red tape can increase costs and negatively impact job creators. Let me be clear: The RED Tape Act in no way undercuts the environmental review of Federal projects. In no way does it remove EPA's expertise from the process.

It simply streamlines the Federal review process by eliminating duplicative requirements. It seems that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are just fundamentally opposed to efficiency and a sense of urgency.

This legislation is a commonsense solution that benefits job creators and the communities we represent. It makes life more affordable for the American people, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 6398.

□ 1520

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MENEFEE).

Mr. MENEFEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called RED Tape Act.

This bill clearly harms our communities. Right now, when the Federal Government approves a major construction project, like a highway or a Federal facility, the EPA has the legal authority to review it and to flag public health concerns. It can say that this project will harm air quality in this community. It can put that on the record, and regulators can act on it.

This bill eliminates that EPA review entirely. The one agency whose job it is to protect human health and air quality gets cut out of the process—no EPA air quality check, no independent public health voice at the table, major Federal projects approved with zero input from the people whose mission it is to protect the air we breathe.

That is not cutting red tape. That is cutting public health protection.

This bill hits different for my district back in Houston. I remember walking through a neighborhood in my district that for years had been fighting a cancer cluster as a result of environmental contamination. The woman who lived there told me: "In that house, two grandparents passed away. In that house, it was a child. In that house, it was a mother." She said it matter-of-factly, the way people do when grief becomes routine.

I later walked that same neighborhood with the EPA Administrator under President Biden. I showed him what I had seen. EPA under that leadership showed up. They did the work, and they provided a line of protection for the community that they never had before.

The Trump administration and my Republican colleagues are now rolling all of that back. They have already fired thousands of EPA employees, roughly one in four people in the agency. They shut down the Office of Environmental Justice. They took down the EPA's environmental justice mapping tool that communities and local governments were beginning to rely on. One in three EPA staffers who were there on Inauguration Day will be gone by the time this is all over. That is not reform. That is demolition.

Today, the air quality in Houston is unhealthy for sensitive groups. The experts routinely tell us to reduce our time spent outside. It just happened this morning. Houston already ranks among the worst cities in the entire country for toxic air pollutants: ethylene oxide, benzene, and fine particulate matter from petrochemical plants and heavy traffic.

Black and Brown communities in Houston are more than twice as likely as White residents to live in neighborhoods that fail on multiple pollution metrics.

Those are the communities that this bill will hurt. Those are the commu-

nities that need EPA review of major Federal projects, not less of that, but more.

People across this country are dying and having horrible health outcomes because of hyperconcentration of pollution in their communities. This body's response is to present a bill that removes the one Federal agency charged with protecting public health and the environment from the room entirely.

Before I came to Congress, I stood up to the Trump administration in court when they tried to roll back environmental protections, and I plan to do the exact same thing in the Halls of Congress, as well. We owe it to our communities to make sure they have access to clean air, clean land, and clean water, regardless of where in this country they live.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6398, the RED Tape Act.

In my home State of Idaho, we have more than 34 million acres of federally controlled land. I just want to put that in perspective for a minute. My good friend on the other side of the aisle is from the great State of New Jersey. You can put more than six New Jerseys just within the Federal land mass in the State of Idaho. That is how big it is.

Why is that pertinent here? It is pertinent because, with that much land mass, you have a seemingly endless flow of processes going on from departments or agencies for approvals for one thing or another: energy impact statements, the NEPA process. Everything ongoing all the time takes years each time.

We had a recent situation with a wind farm project in my home State. Regardless of what you think about wind farms, this was just an actual occurrence. There was a long process of approval where an EIS, an environmental impact statement, was required, and the EPA was a part of that statement every step of the way, running in parallel as part of that EIS. As soon as that was completed by mandate, the EPA had to go back and publicly comment on the process it just went through itself.

That is just one example, Mr. Speaker, of the duplicative situation that we have. This is really problematic when you have a lot of these projects going on. In my home State, that is a prime example.

All the RED Tape Act does is eliminates that duplicative mandate. There is still the process. We are still going through all the areas of concern. It just eliminates the duplication of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would just add, as I close, that this is potentially even more important now than ever before, to make this easier to deal with, because our energy needs as a country

are taking a hockey stick in the demand curve. It is only going one way.

So much of the energy needs have to go through these processes. A lot of it is coming right out of my home State. We see this as a real problem. Again, I rise in support of H.R. 6398, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. RIVAS).

Ms. RIVAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding to me and for his continued leadership on the Energy and Commerce Committee, especially on environmental justice.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Republicans' RED Tape Act because it guts the Clean Air Act and strips the EPA's ability to inform the public of potential health concerns that they will face because of Federal projects.

The Clean Air Act makes sure that the EPA considers the health and environmental impacts of communities before a project begins. It has helped communities like mine in the San Fernando Valley of Los Angeles breathe cleaner air.

My district has some of the highest asthma rates in the country because of generations of poor land-use decisions. These decisions have placed freeways, landfills, and warehouses next to homes, schools, and parks.

I know that my community is not alone. Over 100 million Americans live in counties with unhealthy levels of pollution. In particular, children, the elderly, low-income communities, and communities of color are disproportionately at risk for serious health conditions.

Air pollution is already associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in our country every year. Trump and Republicans will make this problem worse by ignoring the needs of environmental justice communities across the country. Trump and Republicans are prioritizing the profits of their billionaire and corporate interest friends over the health of our communities.

The RED Tape Act allows polluters to contaminate the air that we breathe without regard for the lives or livelihoods of communities that would be impacted the most.

There is a reason that all Democrats on the Energy and Commerce Committee voted against the RED Tape Act, and that is because it is a harmful bill for everyone, except for Donald Trump and Republicans' billionaire friends.

This bill will increase levels of air pollution and send more people to the hospital at a time when Republicans have already gutted working families' healthcare. This bill does not make life safer or more affordable for working families in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the RED Tape Act and to stand up for environmental justice communities.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. GRIJALVA).

□ 1530

Mrs. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the RED Tape Act is a blatant sacrifice of human health for corporate profits. It will allow major Federal projects to move forward without any consideration for impact on air quality or public health. This is a clear attempt to hide the truth about the health impacts of pollution.

I will make this crystal clear: Our constituents do not want to increase the risks of their children developing asthma or cancer so that billionaires can fast-track polluting projects. This notion is obscene. As a parent, I can tell you, we will not stand for putting polluters over our children's right to breathe in clean air. Not now, not ever.

For this reason, 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. My amendment would ensure that section 309 reviews still occur for major Federal projects or actions that may increase public exposure to mercury, lead compounds, asbestos, or any other hazardous air pollutants.

Air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in the United States each year. These are not just numbers. They are people taken from families far too soon. There must be no sidestepping protections for human health.

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, and I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the RED Tape Act would exempt major Federal projects and regulations from any scrutiny of their impacts on air quality and public health from EPA experts.

The bill would also make the permitting process less transparent by removing the requirement that EPA comments be made available to the public.

Now, clean, safe air is a fundamental human right, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. The Clean Air Act exists to protect that right. Air pollution is associated with over 100,000 premature deaths in the United States every year, and particulate matter is among the most dangerous forms of air pollution. Air pollution presents serious health risks to our communities every day.

Over 100 million Americans live in counties with unhealthy levels of air

pollution with children, the elderly, low-income communities, and communities of color being disproportionately at risk.

You won't hear my colleagues focus on the transparency part of the RED Tape Act, but I will talk about that a little bit today as we conclude.

Under the Clean Air Act, EPA's analysis and comments on major Federal projects and potential impacts must be made public. This transparency is a key feature to hold the government accountable and is the reason why most agencies take EPA's suggestions.

If a major Federal project could expose the public to asbestos, lead, or PFAS under this bill, EPA would not be required to look at that project and provide scientific and public health-focused feedback and suggestions for making it safer.

Equally as important, EPA's comments and suggestions on those risks and exposure would not be made available to the public. That only serves to shield Republican corporate polluters from any scrutiny and would do nothing to ensure Americans' health is protected.

What I said before when we were talking about the FENCES Act, I will say it now on the RED Tape Act. The right to know is one of the most important things that we need to protect around here because then the public can look and see what the dangers are of pollution coming from a particular project and then they can act accordingly.

A healthy America includes healthy air, water, and soil. The EPA is integral to achieving that goal.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to protect transparency and the public health and vote "no" on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I will point out is in 2025, the Supreme Court decision in *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County, Colorado*, ruled that upstream-downstream impacts of Federal action fall outside the scope of the environmental impact statement under NEPA. In light of this decision, the EPA's separate review and comment on broader environmental impacts of proposed Federal action are no longer appropriate.

It is really insulting to the American people to have my colleagues make outrageous statements in regard to what our intent is with this. We have the means to make sure that our air is clean. We are working on that. We do not want, in any form or fashion, to compromise the quality of life that we have here in this country.

It really is stunning to hear fellow Americans want to deny economic justice to whole communities throughout the country. I pointed out several times what each one of their States was receiving in funding from the Rural Health Transformation Fund, a

historic effort to improve healthcare in rural areas where so many disadvantaged people live, that every one of my Democratic colleagues voted against.

We want to give people economic opportunity, not deny them. We want to dramatically improve the healthcare of people who have been denied the opportunity to have a good-paying job with good benefits. As one who grew up with few opportunities, I understand how important it is to have a job that allows people to live in better housing, to have access to better food, better healthcare, and to have something left over to save to meet future needs and eventually retirement.

My colleagues who oppose this bill literally oppose the economic opportunities that could lift millions of disadvantaged Americans into a much brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we recognize that we have a host of Federal regulations that need to be reviewed, to be modernized, not to compromise anyone's healthcare, not to compromise environmental quality, but to improve these to make them work better for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this excellent legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

Mrs. GRIJALVA. 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:

Mrs. Grijalva of Arizona moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6398 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. GRIJALVA is as follows:

Mrs. Grijalva moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6398, as Reported to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. POLICY REVIEW.

Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7609(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) The Administrator shall review, and comment in writing, on the environmental impact of—

"(A) any matter relating to duties and responsibilities granted pursuant to this Act or other provisions of the authority of the Administrator contained in any legislation proposed by any Federal department or agency; and

"(B) any matter relating to duties and responsibilities granted pursuant to this Act or other provisions of the authority of the Administrator contained in—

"(i) any newly authorized Federal project for construction or any major Federal agency action (other than a project for construction) to which section 102(2)(C) of National

Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies that the Administrator determines may result in an increase in the release of, or public exposure to, mercury, a lead compound, asbestos, or any other hazardous air pollutant; or

“(ii) any proposed regulation published by any department or agency of the Federal Government that the Administrator determines may result in such an increase.

“(2) Any such written comment shall be made public at the conclusion of any such review.”.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1540

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR TAX POLICIES THAT SUPPORT WORKING FAMILIES

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to House Resolution 1147, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1156

Whereas, on July 4, 2025, the President signed Public Law 119-21, commonly known as the “Working Families Tax Cuts”;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts prevented a \$2,600,000,000 tax hike on taxpayers making less than \$400,000 per year;

Whereas, for the 2025 tax year, the Working Families Tax Cuts helped deliver an estimated \$222,000,000,000 in tax refunds, putting money directly back into Americans’ wallets;

Whereas, for the 2026 tax year, the Working Families Tax Cuts are anticipated to deliver an average tax cut of \$3,750, helping make America affordable again;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts ensure that families of four making under \$73,000 will generally face zero Federal income tax liability;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts will result in a 15 percent tax cut for Americans whose income is in the bottom 40 percent, with the largest percentage reduction going to the bottom 20 percent;

Whereas the share of total income taxes paid by Americans whose income is in the top 1 percent will increase to nearly 40 percent as a result of the Working Families Tax Cuts, while the share paid by Americans in the remaining 99 percent will decrease to 60 percent;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts enacted “no tax on tips”, which will provide

millions of tipped workers with \$32,000,000,000 of tax relief;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts enacted “no tax on overtime”, which will provide hard-working Americans with a \$90,000,000,000 tax cut on their overtime pay;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts provide a new deduction for interest on auto loans for new American-made vehicles, lowering costs and helping more Americans get behind the wheel;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts honor a lifetime of hard work by American seniors by providing them with a deduction of up to \$6,000 per year;

Whereas, to date, nearly 45 percent of tax returns filed this tax season have claimed at least one of these four new tax cuts;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts help jump-start the American dream for millions of youth by making a down payment of over \$15,000,000,000 in tax-advantaged investment accounts for American children;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts permanently increase the standard deduction, delivering \$205,000,000,000 in new tax relief to the 90 percent of earners who claim it;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts permanently expand the child tax credit, increasing the maximum credit amount to \$2,200 per child and ensuring that the credit will not lose value due to inflation;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts expands the accessibility of the \$17,280 adoption tax credit so that all families who adopt, regardless of income, can benefit;

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts expands educational freedom and choice for working families by ensuring 529 accounts can now cover costs associated with trade schools or K-12 educational expenses; and

Whereas the Working Families Tax Cuts expands access to health savings accounts for more than 10 million Americans to help control health care costs and promotes preventive care by allowing patients to pair these accounts with innovative direct primary care and easier access to telehealth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its support for tax policies that support working families and let them keep more of their hard-earned money; and

(2) recognizes the significant tax relief provided by the Working Families Tax Cuts for hardworking Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1156 and the working families

tax cuts, which have led to this year’s historic tax refund season.

Today, April 15, is tax day. The IRS typically receives around 24 percent of tax returns in April. What millions of Americans are finding out today is that their tax refund is significantly larger than it has been in the past, thanks to the working families tax cuts.

Refunds this tax season have increased by 11 percent, with the average refund over \$3,400. Much of that relief is thanks to the policies championed by President Trump. Over 6 million Americans have claimed no tax on tips, 25 million Americans have claimed no tax on overtime, and 30 million taxpayers claimed the Social Security deduction. Over 1 million Americans claimed the no tax on auto loan interest.

Who are the folks claiming these deductions? It is working-class Americans. It is not millionaires. It is not billionaires. Overall, nearly half of all tax filers this season claimed at least one of those key provisions.

Under this tax relief, tipped workers get, on average, a \$1,300 tax cut. Hourly workers get, on average, a \$1,400 tax cut from no tax on overtime. A \$12,000 deduction for a married couple on Social Security means a more secure retirement.

When Republicans enacted the working families tax cuts, we made America’s workers, families, farmers, and small businesses our top priority.

An inconvenient fact that the Democrats don’t talk about is that the share of income taxes paid by the top 1 percent actually went up from 37 percent to 40 percent. The very rich are paying a higher share of taxes today than they were before passage of this bill. Why? It is because the other 99 percent of Americans saw the share of their taxes go down, from 63 percent to 60 percent.

Don’t take my word for it. Listen to the stories of everyday Americans, like Raymond Huff from Colorado, who testified before the Ways and Means Committee that the working families tax cuts will help him grow his small business and hire more workers; Nancy Overman from Nevada, who testified that she will be able to afford basic necessities without draining her retirement savings, thanks to the no tax on Social Security; Sharon Simmons, a DoorDash driver—who showed up at the White House yesterday, in fact—originally from my home State of Missouri, who testified to how no tax on tips will help her better afford her husband’s medical treatments and travel to Missouri to see her family more often; or the waitress in my district who told me that she got a \$10,000 tax refund, thanks to the no tax on tips, the expanded child tax credit, and other provisions. She told me, Mr. Speaker, that because of that provision, she will be able to pay for her rent for an entire year and a lot of food for her family.

That makes a huge impact on everyday Americans. Families have more

money in their pockets today, thanks to a boosted and permanent child tax credit of \$2,200. When you add in the permanent increase and the standard deduction, up to \$31,500, a family of four earning \$73,000 had zero Federal tax liability this year.

When they controlled Washington, Democrats spent \$10 trillion, and they created a cost-of-living crisis where inflation went up almost 21 percent.

Under Republican tax relief, we expanded 529 accounts to cover K–12 education expenses and trade schools. We expanded health savings accounts so that another 10 million Americans can better manage healthcare costs. For those who are looking to adopt, they have more access to the adoption tax credit, with \$5,000 of that cost being refundable.

Under Trump Accounts, newborn U.S. citizens in America get a \$1,000 investment to start building a more secure financial future. It does not matter if they live on a city block or on a county road. They qualify.

Due to the working families tax cuts, Americans have more money to buy school supplies and put food on their tables. Family farmers and small businesses have more certainty and resources to invest, to grow, and to hire. These are the results of Republican tax relief that puts America's working families first.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I understand why my Republican colleagues are trying to rename this bill the working families tax act because, while this bill may be big—to the tune of \$4.2 trillion that it adds to our national debt—it is certainly not beautiful and certainly not for working families.

In fact, on this tax day, this tells the real story. This is nothing more than a betrayal of the American people. Families were promised relief. Instead, they have been left to foot the bill.

No matter how my Republican friends try to spin it, Americans are hurting. Costs are up across the board. At the pump, gas prices surged over 21 percent in just 1 month, the largest increase in nearly 60 years.

At the grocery store, families are paying more for the basics. Healthcare costs are rising, and this bill guts nearly \$1 trillion from our healthcare system, putting hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, and clinics at risk, and threatening the coverage for millions of Americans. When those cuts are finally realized, families will lose their healthcare, and communities will lose their hospitals, their clinics, and their skilled nursing facilities.

What did working families get in return? Yes, as the chairman pointed out, some taxpayers got larger refunds this year. As a matter of fact, the numbers are that, notwithstanding the fact that the President and the Republicans

promised the Americans that they would get a \$1,000 additional tax return, it is \$346 more than last year. They were promised bigger refunds. Instead, those refunds fell 65 percent short of what was advertised, and they failed to cover the high costs that most families are facing.

To put it in simple terms, given that this is my friend Mr. KELLY's bill, a prominent auto dealer in Pennsylvania, taxpayers were promised an Escalade, but they instead got a go-kart. The gas for that go-kart is going to be a heck of a lot more expensive this year than it was last year. That is not relief. That is a broken promise anyway you cut it.

Let's be clear about who this bill actually helps. It is not workers. It is the ultrawealthy, the corporations, the venture capitalists, all the people who didn't need a tax cut in this environment. Millionaires are getting tax cuts tens of thousands of dollars larger than what working families receive. Meanwhile, families making under \$50,000 have been left with the scraps.

Democrats have a different vision. We believe in using the tax code to actually help the middle- and working-class families of our great country.

□ 1550

We want to provide tax relief for home buyers, for renters, and affordable housing developers so families can finally afford a place to live.

We want to expand the child tax credit and the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit so parents can afford to raise a family. We did that in the last Congress with our child tax credit measure, which cut childhood poverty in half. Our Republican friends allowed that to expire.

We want to support family caregivers who sacrifice so much for their loved ones, and we want to restore the enhanced Affordable Care Act premium tax credits to lower healthcare costs for working families.

We want to allow union workers to deduct their dues, and we want to lower energy bills and strengthen our grid by investing in clean energy, which is affordable energy.

That is what it looks like to put working families first, not rebranding, not gimmicks—real relief.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tax.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, now, for the first time, families across the country are seeing the working families tax cuts show up where it matters: in their paychecks and in refunds.

When this law was written, the goal was straightforward—to reward work, support families, and prevent a massive tax increase from taking place.

Today, the data shows it is doing just that. Across America, more than 53 million filers claimed at least one of the new deductions. Over 25 million taxpayers claimed the overtime deduction. More than 6 million Americans claimed the deduction on tipped income. More than 30 million seniors paid no taxes on their Social Security benefits. More than 1 million Americans claimed the no tax on car loan interest deduction.

That is real relief tied directly to how Americans earn a living, and you can see it in the results. The average tax refund is now over \$3,400. That is an 11 percent increase from last year. Families are getting to keep more of their own hard-earned money.

More than 34 million families have claimed the enhanced, doubled, and permanent child tax credit. Five million Trump accounts have been opened. Think about what that means for the next generation. The working families tax cuts provides families and children a foundation to save, invest, and pursue their version of the American Dream.

Now, let's talk about Main Street. Before serving in Congress, I spent my career in the private sector as a car dealership owner. I know what it is like to try and manage your business and meet payroll while making sure Washington gets its share, as well.

My district is home to one of the highest concentrations of small manufacturers. These manufacturers are aiding President Trump in his goal of employing American workers, producing right here at home, and buying American.

Revitalizing the industrial might of the United States cannot happen without the working families tax cuts restoring immediate expensing for equipment and research and development.

The working families tax cuts also made the 20 percent small business deduction permanent, providing certainty and stability for the mom-and-pop shops who form the backbone of our communities.

In total, more than 12 million small business owners will see an average of \$7,000 in tax relief.

There were times when our family business would have enough money to make payroll, but not enough money to pay ourselves. That is the reality so many businesses face. Small business owners go through that more than anybody else realizes. These are the real dollars that can be reinvested into workers, equipment, or expansion.

From employers to employees, from children to seniors, this law is reaching across the entire country and the entire economy.

People who do not ask for special treatment but only ask for fairness, this law reflects that expectation. It aligns the tax code with how Americans actually earn a living. It prevented a tax increase. It guarantees stability and certainty, and it gave

families and businesses the opportunity to keep more of their own money.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that in my friend Mr. KELLY's district, 27,000 of his constituents will face nutrition cuts, 24,000 will lose their health insurance, and 795 jobs will be lost due to canceling clean energy tax credits that were in that big, ugly H.R. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, the big, ugly bill or, as it has been renamed, the Working Families Tax Cuts Act, is not working for families in my district. In fact, on this tax day, I cannot believe that my Republican colleagues are on the floor today celebrating a bill that is exploding the deficit by \$4.2 trillion, deepening income inequality, stripping healthcare from working families, and taking food off the tables of needy children.

Mr. Speaker, every day I hear from my constituents around Alabama's Seventh Congressional District. They are talking about the fact that nothing seems affordable anymore. What do I say to the single mother in my district who is losing Medicaid coverage for her child because of this bill? What do I say to the elderly neighbor who no longer qualifies for SNAP or to the rural communities I represent who will lose their only hospital because of this bill?

I am deeply saddened because Republicans could have chosen another path. Instead of slashing \$1 trillion from Medicaid, instead of slashing \$500 billion from Medicare, they could have worked with Democrats to renew the fully refundable child tax credit that cut child poverty in half and expanded economic prosperity for communities across the Nation when Democrats were in the majority.

If my Republican colleagues wanted to help working families, they could stand up to President Trump and stop his reckless trade war that has created an affordability crisis.

Mr. Speaker, on this tax day, the American people are seeing exactly what happens when Republicans are in charge. We are seeing tariff wars. We are seeing real wars in the Middle East, tax giveaways for the wealthy, exploding deficits, and an attack on our essential healthcare programs like Medicare and Medicaid.

On this tax day, my constituents say enough is enough. This tax bill has been a devastation to the people that I represent, and on this tax day, I stand before you to say that working families tax cuts is a cut for working families and not a cut to the wealthy.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA).

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today is tax day. Taxpayers across Iowa are seeing real relief through bigger refunds and higher take-home pay delivered by the historic working families tax cuts bill.

Let me be clear. This is real money back in the pockets of hardworking families, small business owners, and farmers.

We have heard the numbers today, and they are historic—the largest refund season in our Nation's history, with Iowans seeing an average tax cut of over \$3,000.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you the rest of the story. I am hearing from family farmers who now have the certainty that their operation will stay in their family for generations to come because this bill includes my provision to permanently double the death tax exemption.

I am hearing from hardworking parents excited to have access to family medical leave, have double child tax credit, and a \$1,000 downpayment for children through Trump's tax accounts.

□ 1600

I am hearing from manufacturers and agricultural producers who are finally seeing a path forward with affordable access to credit, immediate expensing, and a permanent small-business deduction, giving them the certainty they need to invest, grow, and create new jobs in our communities.

I am hearing from waitresses, delivery drivers, tradesmen, and millions of Americans who will finally keep more of what they earned because we delivered no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, and no tax on Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, this is what an economic revival looks like. Through the leadership of President Donald Trump and congressional Republicans, we are restoring opportunity, rewarding work, and strengthening the backbone of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will point out that my friend from Iowa is facing a situation in his district where 12,000 of his constituents will face nutrition cuts. Mr. Speaker, 24,000 will lose health insurance, and 494 jobs will be lost due to canceling clean energy tax credits. All of this is because of H.R. 1.

I find it hard to believe that farmers are jumping for joy. Because of this legislation, tariffs, and an unauthorized war in the Middle East, fertilizer prices for farmers are going through the roof. Fuel prices for farmers are going through the roof, and farmers who are trying to ship their products to other ports are being absolutely devastated because the Strait of Hormuz has been closed. This bill also added \$4.2 trillion to the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

CHU), a great and distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, on this tax day, working families are not feeling the relief they were promised. They are struggling to pay rent, to get the healthcare they need, and to fill up the car with gas.

Here is why. Last year, Republicans passed their big, ugly bill, the single largest transfer of wealth from the poorest Americans to the richest in history. This reverse Robin Hood fails to make life more affordable for working families.

Because this legislation has become so resented by the American people, Republicans chose to put forward this meaningless resolution that is an empty rebranding exercise.

Here is what they are trying to hide. Under their big, ugly bill, the top 0.1 percent of earners, who make about \$11 million a year, receive an average tax cut of \$244,000 each. Compare that to what 40 million of the lowest income households receive, just \$10 a year, not even enough for a meal.

This resolution even dares to say that their big, ugly law helped to control healthcare costs. In reality, this bill kicks 15 million people off their health insurance, off their Medicaid, and off their Affordable Care Act insurance. This is the largest takeaway of healthcare in history.

When Republicans say this is about helping working families, we must ask: Which families? The data clearly shows that this law greatly benefits those least in need while offering only minimal, symbolic relief to those who are struggling the most.

On tax day, Republicans are spending time patting themselves on the back for one of the most regressive and hurtful tax bills in modern history, completely ignoring the real crises facing millions of Americans.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, lies, lies. Sometimes you have just got to deal with common sense.

Who gets overtime? When we cut the tax on overtime, the CEO of the pharmaceutical company who makes \$12 million a year, does he get overtime? As a matter of fact, most white-collar people don't get overtime. Overtime is for the workingman. When we cut taxes on overtime, it is obviously designed to benefit the workingman.

Who gets tips? The workingman and the workingwoman, that is who is getting tips. When we cut taxes on tips, of course, we are aiming at the average guy.

We have a special cut for seniors. Our seniors—wealthy people, not normally—if you look at the special tax cut for seniors, we didn't include the super-wealthy seniors. We were aiming at the average guy.

Wherever you look on your tax return, I beg America to look at how much they paid in taxes a year ago and

how much they paid in taxes this year. Again and again, the workingman is going to find out that we have delivered a workingman's and working-woman's tax cut.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and a strong voice for working people and struggling families.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I will tell you, I have never celebrated tax day until today because I have the distinguished opportunity to comment on the one big, ugly billionaire's bill. It is the gift that keeps on giving because I get to talk about how much this tax bill fails to deliver on its promises.

Most glaringly, Republicans have promised that the average tax refund would increase by over \$1,000. Not so much. In fact, refunds are 65 percent less than promised. Refunds are nowhere near enough to cover the additional costs that Americans are facing because of other failed Republican policies.

Even considering the crumbs from the American table that Republicans have tossed to working families, this pales in comparison to the increased costs of healthcare, food, utilities, gasoline, and almost every product.

Then, on top of all of this, Americans are facing the \$1.2 trillion cuts in Medicaid. They see their hospitals in urban areas and rural areas closing because of it. Food assistance has been cut by \$187 billion.

As we mark tax day this year, one thing is really clear: Republicans have oversold their legislative accomplishment and riddled it with gimmicks for working-class Americans while brandishing massive giveaways to millionaires and billionaires.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans gave millionaires a tax cut that is 390 times the size of what they gave to workers and families making less than \$50,000.

What about the no tax on tips and no tax on overtime, they say? Number one, it is a temporary benefit that is going to expire as soon as you reelect them. Secondly, it is a gimmick because it is not a total exemption. It phases out, and there are much smaller redemptions in tax liability than people are expecting.

Let's be clear. The people who benefited most from the Republican tax bill do not get tips. The one big, beautiful bill for billionaires made the benefits for billionaires permanent and made no tax on tips temporary.

Republicans are so well known to be good at messaging, but this time, they can't message their way out of reality. American families are feeling the pain every single day.

□ 1610

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, tax day is usually a very painful reminder of how much of one's hard-earned money goes out the door. Today would have been no different from the past if Democrats had gotten their way and if Republicans had failed to pass the Working Families Tax Cuts Act.

Take my district, for example, where a typical family of four's taxes would have increased by 26 percent, costing them more than \$1,300 a year. For most families, \$1,300 is not chump change. It is rent, a home improvement project, or even about 7 weeks' worth of groceries. However, today is different. The more thoughtful approach Republicans took prevailed.

This year, Americans are seeing bigger paychecks, larger refunds, and more opportunities for them and their families to build long-term financial security.

Now, the same family of four with two kids earning up to \$73,000 a year who would have seen a 26 percent increase will have no Federal income tax liability and will have their child tax credit permanently increased to \$2,200 per child. The relief does not stop there, with the average tax refund being nearly \$3,500 and an additional \$6,000 standard deduction for America's seniors.

We also strengthened America's agriculture industry by permanently doubling death tax relief and allowing producers to fully deduct new equipment costs, helping family operations innovate and continue for generations to come.

This is what real tax relief looks like, and it is exactly what Republicans will continue fighting for here in Washington.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the gentleman from Nebraska that 9,000 of his constituents will face nutrition cuts because of this bill. Mr. Speaker, 19,000 will lose their health insurance, and 3,098 jobs will be lost due to the cancellation of the clean energy tax credits. His constituents will share in the money that has been added to the national debt, \$4.2 trillion added to the national debt by this bill so billionaires, multimillionaires, and corporations can get huge tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), who is the former leader of the Nevada legislature and a leader and strong voice for the workers of our country and his district, especially the culinary and the hospitality workers.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leader for yielding me time.

Republicans first called this the big, beautiful bill. Now they are calling it tax cuts for working families. Let's be clear, there is nothing beautiful about promising relief and failing to deliver it. That is the betrayal.

They told tipped workers that help was coming, but they refused to make it permanent and left the subminimum

wage stuck at \$2.13 an hour. They said they were fighting for overtime pay, but millions of workers who rely on overtime still see no relief.

In Nevada, this bill does something even worse. It harms our gaming economy. Instead of protecting workers and supporting one of our State's key industries, they changed the wagering loss deduction, creating uncertainty and penalizing the legitimate gaming industry.

That is not helping working people. That is hurting Nevada.

So let's call this what it is. This is not permanent where it should be, it is not fair where it must be, and it does not deliver what was promised.

Now, I didn't just come here to point out the problem. I came with solutions. My TIP Improvement Act makes tax relief for tipped workers permanent and fair. My No Tax on Overtime for All Workers Act ensures every worker who earns overtime qualifies, not just a select few. My FULL HOUSE Act fixes the gaming deduction once and for all, protecting Nevada jobs and businesses.

Instead of voting on a self-glorifying resolution, let's bring forward real solutions, bills that actually deliver for working families and fix what this bill gets wrong.

Let's fix what is broken. Let's deliver what is promised, and let's turn around this betrayal of a bill that is hurting the American family, not making it successful.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that for years, Members in this body have tried to implement no tax on tips. Never before did it ever become law until we passed it within the Big Beautiful Bill Act. It delivered for a lot of tipped employees. In fact, 6 million tipped employees used it this tax filing season.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be fun if we actually did these sorts of discussions and debates sort of like we do term papers where you actually have to give the footnote of where the numbers come from. That is because I hear numbers from my brothers and sisters on the left, and I say: Where did that come from?

So the first number I am going to give you today, Mr. Speaker, from the Joint Economic Committee, tomorrow is the first day that you actually work for yourself, meaning the first 3½ months you have been working to pay taxes, whether it be your property taxes, State income taxes, or Federal taxes, Mr. Speaker. This is for the middle income of our brothers and sisters.

Welcome to Tax Freedom Day, which technically might be actually tomorrow.

The rest of the numbers I will give you, Mr. Speaker—if you want to go on to the Senate Finance Committee's website, you will actually find the facts and the numbers. I would love

someone who is actually a researcher and likes to look at them, look and then compare them to what the Democrats say and what we say.

For Arizona, we were one of the epicenters of inflation. Our brothers and sisters in our State, after the Biden years of inflation, their wages are just now starting to catch up. Our brothers and sisters were poorer.

One of the things we did in the tax bill last summer is we actually found a way to use the tax system to raise wages, whether it be because of paying less taxes or some of the economic growth.

So let's actually walk through some of the numbers. For a couple, there is a \$6,800 real wage increase. You can find that on the Senate's website, Mr. Speaker, \$7,400 to \$10,600 real take-home pay increase for the average Arizona family. Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is a State that was crushed. I think when the Biden inflation years were over, we came in number two in the country.

Our brothers and sisters in that hard-working middle class are still poorer today because we are just now starting to catch up.

I am actually taking a look at small business. I have 514,000 small businesses that now have the 20 percent deduction locked in. Mr. Speaker, tell me that isn't stability, when you start to walk through things like the \$6,000 bonus deduction for seniors in that middle realm of income.

These things are remarkably important to growth, stability, and actually having to deal with the fact that inflation is the biggest tax in the last 40 years, those years of the Biden inflation. Inflation is a tax.

In many ways what we did here in tax reform, we are just trying to make things a little more even for those working brothers and sisters.

I have 822,000 families in Arizona who got an increase in the child deduction of \$2,200. I thought that was something the left actually liked.

When you start to walk through our work, Mr. Speaker, to try to make life better for my brothers and sisters in Arizona, that is why this was so important.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to the gentleman from Arizona that 10,000 of his constituents will face nutrition cuts and 26,000 will lose their healthcare. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, \$4.2 trillion will be added to the national debt in part because of his vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Brooklyn, New York, (Mr. JEFFRIES), who is the distinguished Democratic leader of the United States House of Representatives.

□ 1620

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from the great

State of California, Representative MIKE THOMPSON, for yielding and for his leadership.

We are here on the House floor debating this resolution that Republicans have introduced on tax day to celebrate themselves. This is an extraordinary thing. I have seen a lot during my time here in the United States Congress for more than 10 years. I have never seen a resolution introduced by Members of Congress, let alone a party, the Republican Party, to celebrate themselves for a bill that has damaged the American people.

However, if you are around this town long enough, I guess you see it all.

I am confused with H. Res. 1156 because the first clause says: Whereas, on July 4, 2025, the President signed Public Law 119-21, commonly known as the "Working Families Tax Cuts." It is commonly known to whom?

Let's be clear with the American people: Republicans have made up that name. Why? It is because the bill, the actual name of the bill in Public Law 119-21 is the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. It is deeply unpopular with the American people, who know it has been a disaster.

Now, I have respect for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He recently just called it the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. I am not sure he is allowed to do that because Donald Trump has made clear: Walk away from that name that he gave to the bill himself. Why? It is because the American people understand it has been a disaster.

The American people know that this resolution is not worth the paper that it is written on. It does nothing. It doesn't have the force of law and does nothing to keep the promises that Donald Trump made to the American people that on day one of his Presidency, he was going to lower costs.

However, here in America, Mr. Speaker, costs haven't gone down, costs have gone up because of decisions that Donald Trump and Republicans have made to hurt the American people.

The Trump tariffs have cost everyday Americans thousands of dollars in additional expense per year. That is an affirmative decision to hurt the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have refused to extend the Affordable Care Act tax credits. As a result of that very decision, more than 20 million Americans are experiencing dramatically increased health insurance premiums, in some cases costs having increased by over \$1,000 per month. That is an affirmative decision that Republicans have made to increase costs.

Now, there is a reckless war of choice that has been raging in the Middle East. More than a dozen brave American heroes have already lost their lives. Hundreds have been seriously injured. Billions of taxpayer dollars are being spent per day to drop bombs in the Middle East, and yet Republicans

are unwilling to spend a dime to make life more affordable for the American people.

In fact, this reckless war of choice, this Trump Republican war over in the Middle East has skyrocketed gas prices. All across America, more than \$4 a gallon, largest increase in gas prices on a monthly basis in more than 60 years. Republicans have done that to the American people.

In the face of such policy failure and the one big, ugly bill being such a disaster, we have this resolution in front of us, not worth the paper that it is written on. It doesn't even reference the name of the bill that was passed. Why is that? Because Republicans are trying to hide what has been done to the American people.

Let me just briefly talk about five different things that are in the one big, ugly bill that have caused real harm. One, the one big, ugly bill contained the largest cut to Medicaid in American history, almost a trillion dollar cut to Medicaid. As a result of that, almost 14 million Americans are at risk of losing their health insurance because of the bill that Republicans are celebrating on the floor here today.

As a result of that Medicaid cut, the largest in history, hospitals, nursing homes, and community-based health centers are at a risk of closing all across the country, including in rural America, as a result of the legislation that Republicans are celebrating here on the floor today, though they are running away from the name of the bill because it is such a disaster.

The second problem with the legislation that Republicans are celebrating on the floor today is in that one big, ugly bill, they cut \$186 billion, Mr. Speaker, Republicans cut \$186 billion in nutritional assistance, the largest cut to SNAP in American history, literally ripping food from the mouths of hungry children, seniors, and veterans in this one big, ugly bill. Now my Republican colleagues have the nerve to come on the floor today with this resolution and celebrate that?

The third problem with the bill, amongst many, is that after cutting Medicaid, ripping healthcare away from the American people, stealing food from the mouths of hungry children, seniors, and veterans, \$75 billion in taxpayer money was set aside in a slush fund so that ICE can brutalize and in some cases kill American citizens. There is a \$75 billion slush fund for ICE in this one big, ugly bill that Republicans are on the floor celebrating today, with active harm being done to the American people, including resulting in the deaths, the cold-blooded killing of two American citizens, Renee Nicole Good and Alex Pretti.

The fourth problem with this bill on tax day is who the beneficiaries of this legislation include. Every economist who has studied this legislation knows that it overwhelmingly and disproportionately benefits the wealthy, the well-off, and the well-connected. In

fact, the American people know it, which is why this resolution doesn't even make mention of the official name of the bill, because Republicans are running away from it.

The bottom line is, Medicaid was cut. Nutritional assistance was cut. ICE was given this slush fund of \$75 billion; and billionaire donors to the Republican Party were given massive tax breaks that they did not need and do not deserve in an environment where working families, everyday Americans, middle-class Americans, working-class Americans are struggling to make ends meet, can't thrive, and can barely survive.

Yet, what was done in this one big, ugly bill that Republicans are celebrating on the floor today? Massive tax breaks to Republican billionaire donors, not making life more affordable to the American people, because the American people know that life has become more expensive, not less under Donald Trump's Presidency and failed Republican policies.

The fifth problem, amongst many, is that for years Republicans have portrayed themselves, Mr. Speaker, as the party of fiscal responsibility. This is one of the most fiscally irresponsible bills being celebrated on the floor today by Republicans ever to pass the United States Congress, going all the way back to 1789.

It is legislation that increased the debt by more than \$4 trillion to give ICE a \$75 billion slush fund to cut Medicaid, to rip food from the mouths of children, and to subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless. This is nothing to celebrate here on the floor today.

I am thankful to MIKE THOMPSON, my colleague, and distinguished members of the Ways and Means Committee for communicating to the American people the truth. We will be opposing this resolution, a resolution not worth the paper that it is written on, something that doesn't even have the force of law, because as Democrats we are committed to actually solving problems for the American people, for making life more affordable for the American people, for ending this reckless war of choice in the Middle East that has skyrocketed gas prices, to fix our broken healthcare system, reverse these Medicaid cuts that are part of this one big, ugly bill. Extend the Affordable Care Act tax credits and actually commit to doing things, legislating—not pontificating—legislating in ways that make life better for the American people.

□ 1630

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, because of the passage of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, also known as the working families tax cuts, the folks in Brooklyn, New York, will actually face an average tax cut of \$3,341. That is the area that the minority leader represents. I am happy that Republicans could deliver tax relief for the folks in Brooklyn, even though their Representative could not do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to hear some of the falsehoods that Democrats are saying about this bill and some of the contradictions they are making.

I just heard the Democrat leader say that Republicans are running from this bill, but then, in the next sentence, he said we are on the floor celebrating the bill. Which is it? Are we celebrating the bill, or are we running from it?

You hear a lot of talk about the name of the bill. Naming is a funny thing here. I get it. The American people don't care what it is named. They want to know what it does for them.

What I have to tell you is that my constituents, my taxpayers, those who have filed taxes in my district, think it is a beautiful bill, and they know it is a Working Families Tax Cut Act because they have experienced it. They have more money back in their pockets after filing their taxes this year. Families are averaging \$3,500 in tax cuts. Refunds are up nearly 11 percent.

One of the other things we heard from the Democrats today was talking about specific provisions in the bill. No tax on tips, they have railed against that. Yet, we had a Democrat Member just come to the floor and say he wants to make that permanent. So which is it: do you like it, or don't you like it? In fact, we could have made it permanent had we had any Democrat support when we passed this bill in the first place. Instead, every Democrat voted against no tax on tips, which is very important to people in the hospitality industry in my district and other industries, as well.

Every Democrat speaking today voted against this bill, which prevented what would have been the largest tax increase for working families all across my district and all across the State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Every Democrat voted against no tax on overtime, which 20 million Americans have taken advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, in the few seconds I have left, I want to address one additional thing we have heard from the Democrat side, that this is regressive. Untrue. Look at the facts.

We already, of all developed nations around the world, have the most progressive taxation system, which means the wealthy pay more than they do in other countries, and it becomes even more progressive after this bill is passed. This year, the wealthy are paying a higher percentage of total taxes than they were in the previous year due to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill for the American people. People in my district know that. I don't understand

what the Democrats are saying, but certainly, people believe this is a great bill for them.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out for the gentleman from Pennsylvania that 15,000 people in his district will face nutrition cuts because of this bill, 18,000 will lose their healthcare, and his constituents are going to be on the hook for part of that \$4.2 trillion that this bill added to the national debt.

I thank him for reminding us that this bill is regressive. I don't think anybody on our side has mentioned that, so I thank him very much for the reminder that this is, in fact, a regressive bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a second to talk a little bit about the horrific cuts to healthcare that are in this big, beautiful, big, ugly, H.R. 1, whatever you want to call it. This bill cut \$1 trillion from the Medicaid budget. You can't take a trillion dollars out of healthcare without seeing that ripple across, in a negative way, every community across our country, every congressional district across our great country.

Hospitals will close. Clinics will close. Skilled nursing facilities will close. The ones that are able to stay open are going to have to make big cuts. They are going to have to lay people off. They are going to have to forgo everything from remodeling and improvements in equipment to seismic retrofits.

All of this is truncating people's access to quality healthcare in their district. It is going to be for everybody, not just people who are on Medicaid. If you have all the money in the world, or if you have the best insurance policy in the world, if you become ill or injured and go to the hospital to get help, to get your life saved, and that hospital is still open or that clinic is still open, it means they made drastic cuts to keep it open. You better hope that the person you need to save your life isn't the person they fired to keep the doors open.

Rural America, districts such as mine, is really going to be hurt. We were told that we did a \$50 billion rural slush fund to help those areas, but they cut \$136 billion from rural healthcare funding. I may be from a rural area, but they taught math good enough that I know that \$50 billion doesn't make up for a \$136 billion loss.

Yes, every Democrat voted against it. How could they not? This devastates healthcare in all of our districts and all of your districts. I want to remind you that it also adds \$4.2 trillion to the national debt. Future generations will be saddled with this debt, saddled with a debt that right now I think is \$37 trillion, saddled with a debt that was grown by \$4.2 trillion just to be able to

give a tax cut to the richest people and corporations across this country, people who did not need a tax cut in this fiscal environment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MALLIOTAKIS).

Ms. MALLIOTAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today, millions of Americans across the country are benefiting from the working families tax cuts that President Trump and Republicans have passed.

The reality is that when you speak to people in my district—teachers, firefighters, police officers, homeowners, small business owners, senior citizens, parents—they are seeing tremendous savings. They are either paying less in Federal taxes or are receiving a substantial refund, starting with the \$40,000 SALT deduction, which was quadrupled. That is benefiting homeowners.

The leader, a fellow Representative from New York City, should know the reason we needed the State and local tax deduction was because our mayor and our Governor kept hammering us to death.

□ 1640

We are providing the relief that they so desperately need. Eighty-eight percent of seniors across the country, 52 million seniors will benefit from the provision of Social Security tax being refunded to them. The standard deduction nearly tripled from where it was in 2016. The \$2,200 child tax credit has been extended. The no tax on tips provisions will bring in \$1,300 in relief for an average waitress in our district.

Permanently lowering those tax rates was a significant win not for the wealthy but for, perhaps a first time in a long time, the middle class, the working class, and the senior citizen that relies on Social Security.

Let me also remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we have seen tax revenue increase. Since President Trump first enacted those tax cuts in 2017, we have seen tax revenue go up, despite there being these tax cuts. It went up from \$3.3 trillion to \$5.6 trillion in fiscal year 2026 and even further after this bill was enacted.

The GDP at the same period grew from \$18 trillion to \$31 trillion because these were tax cuts that helped our economy grow, expand, and create jobs.

While the Democrats all voted “no,” they all wanted to see your taxes increase 22 percent, today, on average, Americans are seeing 11 percent in savings, and it is because of President Donald Trump and this Republican Congress that did what we said we are going to do. A lot of politicians talk about cutting taxes. We actually did.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will point out that in the gentlewoman's district in New

York 30,000 of her constituents will face nutrition cuts. Mr. Speaker, 40,000 will lose their healthcare. Mr. Speaker, 123 jobs will be lost due to canceling clean energy tax cuts, and, again, \$4.2 trillion will be added to the national debt because of that vote.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues say this Republican tax law has winners and losers, and they are right. The winners are millionaires taking home over \$90,000 a year in tax breaks. That must be nice. However, for everyone else, working families, seniors, the so-called nongilded class, this bill is a loss. Any meager tax relief they might see is wiped out by the reality of this economy: \$4.2 trillion added to our national debt, \$1,700 a year in tariff tax hitting every American household, rising grocery prices that families feel every single week, skyrocketing healthcare premiums, hundreds of billions spent on a cruel immigration crackdown, and another endless war in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: This isn't a tax cut for working families. It is a windfall for the wealthy paid for by everyone else.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that 86,800 individuals in the district of the ranking member of the Tax Subcommittee, who was speaking before me, because of passage of this bill, those 86,800 families in California will not have \$1,000 child tax credit, they will have a \$2,200 tax credit. Those are the people that are benefiting in this bill that he voted against.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. TENNEY).

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues on tax day to celebrate a generational victory for American workers, families, and small businesses.

The working families tax cut signed into law last July Fourth was a game-changing event for Americans and especially people in my district in upstate New York, the highest tax State in the Nation, even higher than Mr. THOMPSON's district now as the Democrats in these two States continue to compete to raise our taxes.

This tax season, though, is really good news. I have heard from countless constituents and their families about the money they have saved already from President Trump's tax cuts. We doubled the standard deduction, increased the child tax credit to \$2,200 per child. These are now permanent.

What does this mean in practice? A family of three welcoming a new baby into their lives can expect a tax refund of over \$4,000, plus a \$1,000 Trump Account deposit to jump start that child's financial future.

That is real money for food, diapers, clothes, and a future nest egg for that

child. That is government working for families, not against them.

For nearly 90 percent of Americans who claim the standard deduction, this law delivers over \$205 billion in new tax relief on top of what we already did in the Trump tax cuts in 2017.

I spent many years of my life managing and operating our family's small business. I know firsthand what it is like to struggle to make payroll and the stress that small business owners face every single day, especially in States like New York. This is why making the section 199A Qualified Business Deduction now permanent is a certainty for millions of Main Street businesses, small businesses, including sole proprietors, independent contractors, and tradesmen. It means these entrepreneurs can invest in their workers, plan for their future, and compete in a more dynamic marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I thank President Trump, Speaker JOHNSON, and our great Chairman SMITH for spearheading this effort to build on the successes of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and deliver the most significant tax relief for American workers and families in a generation. This has been a godsend for people in New York against the Democrats who are continuing to raise our taxes in the State of New York. I thank them for the relief.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will point out that in that New York congressional district we just heard about, 19,000 of her constituents will face nutrition cuts. Mr. Speaker, 27,000 will lose health insurance. Mr. Speaker, 4,263 jobs will be lost due to the canceling of the clean energy tax credits, and her constituents will share in that liability—\$4.2 trillion added to our national debt.

I will just circle back to the child tax credit issue that the chairman, my friend, referenced. I think it is important to point out that in 2021 in the Democrats' American Rescue Plan, we provided greater child tax credit benefits to folks across the country than was pointed out in this bill: \$3,000 for kids aged 6 to 17 and \$3,600 for children under the age of 6. It was fully refundable.

I think it is also important to point out that the beauty of writing tax law, and that is what we do in the Ways and Means Committee, the most significant committee in the United States Congress established by the Constitution of the United States of America, it is that important, the beauty of our responsibility for writing tax law is that we can actually target communities, populations that need it the most. We can do a child tax credit without having to do a huge windfall for the richest people in the country, and that is what we should be doing.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the most important point about

the child tax credit in the working families tax bill is that it is, in fact, permanent. It will not be reduced. It will not expire. That is something that didn't happen when the Democrats were in charge a few years ago on the child tax credit. They made it temporary.

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we all remember that famous iconic final scene in the movie "Thelma and Louise," two women in a red convertible, pedal down, driving straight off the edge of a cliff.

For working Americans, that is exactly what many saw coming, a \$4 trillion tax hike that would have put families in the passenger seat while the left drove full speed toward the edge. No brakes, no plan, and no way out of impending disaster.

□ 1650

Mr. Speaker, this tax day, House Republicans refuse to let that be the ending.

With the Working Families Tax Cut Act, we turned the wheel. We changed the direction, and we put working people back in control of their own hard-earned money.

No tax on tips, no tax on overtime, a new deduction for Social Security benefits, a new deduction for auto loan interest on American-made vehicles, a new higher standard deduction, a stronger tax credit, all of these mean the same thing, Mr. Speaker: More take-home pay, more breathing room, and more opportunities for the families who make this country work and the families who pay the bills.

The Working Families Tax Cut Act is real relief for real people: parents juggling rising costs, workers picking up extra shifts, and seniors who spent a lifetime paying in and deserve to keep a little bit more of what they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, instead of driving off of the cliff, Republicans have written a happy ending, one where hardworking American taxpayers keep more of what they earn and drive forward with confidence and certainty.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, talk about driving off of the cliff. That Florida district where my friend represents is going to drive off of the cliff.

Mr. Speaker, 22,000 people in his district will face nutrition cuts, 91,000 people will lose their health coverage, and 486 jobs are going to be lost due to canceling clean energy credits.

If that is not a steep enough cliff to drive off of, try this one: \$4.2 trillion added to our national debt. Those constituents in Florida have some responsibility for that debt, just like the rest of our constituents do.

As far as the tax credit for the children that my friend talked about, it is permanent. It is permanent for rich kids. Poor kids won't get the whole credit because it isn't fully refundable.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FONG).

Mr. FONG. Mr. Speaker, for Californians who are losing more and more of their paychecks to taxes, taxes that too often fund Gavin Newsom's endless boondoggles, real relief isn't just welcome. It is overdue.

Thanks to President Trump, Chairman SMITH, and House Republicans, that relief is here. On July 4, 2025, we delivered the largest working families tax cut in American history. The result is no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, the child tax credit boosted to \$2,200 per child and made permanent, taxes on Social Security slashed, and a \$1,000 Trump tax account for every newborn American.

It also means expanding opportunity through the Federal education tax credit scholarship program so that parents can choose the best education for their child.

There is relief for farmers, small businesses, and manufacturers.

There is now more investment happening in California. We are already seeing the results.

Thanks to this historic legislation, average tax refunds are nearing \$4,000 this year, over 15 percent higher than 2024. That is real money that families can use for gas, groceries, or invest in their child's future.

At the end of the day, it is simple: You earned your money. You deserve to keep it.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day, this debate comes down to a simple question: Who is this resolution really for? It is not for the families in my district and not for the workingmen and -women who are paying more at the pump, more at the grocery store, and more for healthcare. It is not for the workers who were promised relief and got far less than what was advertised. It is not for the folks across all of our districts who are going to pay \$1,700 more in tariff taxes this year.

It is for those at the very top, and it adds \$4.2 trillion to our national debt. That is \$4.2 trillion to our national debt.

Democrats believe that the tax code should work for working people, not just the wealthy or the well-connected. This resolution fails that test.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the working families tax cuts were written for the working families of this country by the working families of this country.

After I became chairman, the first hearing that the Ways and Means Committee held was not here in Wash-

ington. It was at a lumberyard in Petersburg, West Virginia, "The State of the American Economy: Appalachia."

We then traveled across the country, listening to workers and job creators and families in Yukon, Oklahoma; in Peachtree City, Georgia; and in Erie, Pennsylvania. We heard directly from waiters and waitresses, factory workers, retirees, welders, and small business owners about how tax relief would benefit them.

Under this bill, a family of four who makes less than \$73,000 a year will have zero in Federal tax liability. This is tax relief for Americans who need it the most.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 1174, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. 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.

HONORING J. MASON DAVIS

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

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life, legacy, and service of J. Mason Davis, an attorney from Alabama, a towering figure in Alabama's legal community, and a steadfast advocate for justice, equality, and human dignity.

Mr. Davis passed away on April 4, 2026, at the age of 90, a profound loss for Alabama and for all who believe in the power of law to advance fairness and opportunity.

Mr. Davis pursued his education with distinction and determination, graduating from Talladega College and later earning his law degree from Howard University School of Law.

Mr. Davis then returned to Alabama. He entered a legal landscape defined by segregation and entrenched inequality. Rather than accept those conditions, he challenged them. He became one of the first Black attorneys to practice in Birmingham's courts, and he used his skill, courage, and conviction to represent individuals and communities who had long been denied a voice.

Beyond the courtroom, Mr. Davis was a mentor, a teacher, and a bridge-builder. He served in leadership roles at one

of Alabama's most respected law firms and helped open doors of opportunity for young attorneys to follow in his footsteps. His contributions were numerous.

Alabama is a better place because J. Mason Davis lived, worked, and served there. The legal profession is better because he insisted that it live up to its highest ideals. Our Nation is better because he never stopped believing in the possibility of a more just and inclusive society.

To his family, friends, colleagues, and all he shaped by his wisdom and generosity, we extend our deepest condolences. May they find comfort in knowing that his legacy endures in the laws that he changed, in the lives that he touched, and in the generation he led.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life and legacy of J. Mason Davis, an Alabama icon and a national treasure.

I rise today to honor the extraordinary life, legacy, and service of Attorney J. Mason Davis, a towering figure in Alabama's legal community and a steadfast advocate for justice, equality, and human dignity. Mr. Davis passed away on April 4, 2026, at the age of 90, a profound loss for Alabama and for all who believe in the power of the law to advance fairness and opportunity.

J. Mason Davis was born in Birmingham, Alabama in 1932, at a time when the promise of equal justice under law was far from reality. Yet, from a young age, he believed deeply in that promise. He pursued education with determination, graduating from Talladega College and later earning his law degree from Howard University School of Law in Washington D.C.

When J. Mason Davis returned to Alabama, he entered a legal landscape defined by segregation and entrenched inequality. Rather than accept those conditions, he challenged them. He became one of the first Black attorneys to practice in Birmingham's courts, and he used his skill, courage, and conviction to represent individuals and communities who had long been denied a voice.

Throughout the Civil Rights Movement, he worked on cases that helped dismantle discrimination and expand opportunities for African Americans in the state.

He never sought the spotlight. He sought justice. And he pursued it with a quiet strength that earned him the respect of colleagues, judges, and community leaders spanning several generations.

Beyond the courtroom, J. Mason Davis was a mentor, a teacher, and a bridge-builder. He served in leadership roles at one of Alabama's most respected law firms, helping open doors of opportunity for young attorneys to follow in his footsteps. He chaired numerous organizations, including the Birmingham Regional Chamber of Commerce, the United Way of Central Alabama, and the Talladega College Board of Trustees, and served as a member of many legal and corporate boards throughout the state.

His contributions were recognized widely. In 2013, he received the NAACP Lifetime Achievement Award for Human and Civil Rights, and in 2016, J. Mason Davis was officially inducted into the Birmingham Business Hall of Fame.

Perhaps his greatest legacy is the example he set—an example of integrity, perseverance, and unwavering dedication to the ideals of equality and justice.

Alabama is a better place because J. Mason Davis lived, worked, and served there. The legal profession is better because he insisted that it live up to its highest ideals. And our nation is better because he never stopped believing in the possibility of a more just and inclusive society.

To his family, friends, colleagues, and all who were shaped by his wisdom and generosity, we extend our deepest condolences. May they find comfort in knowing that his legacy endures—in the laws he helped change, in the lives he touched, and in the generations of leaders he inspired.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life and legacy of J. Mason Davis, not only for what he accomplished, but for what he made possible.

May his legacy continue to guide Alabama and our Nation for years to come.

JACKIE ROBINSON DAY

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor an American giant and second lieutenant, the Honorable Jackie Robinson.

On this Jackie Robinson Day, we remember that when he stepped onto Ebbets Field on April 15, 1947, he broke not only the color barrier, he broke racial segregation in the hierarchy of sports.

He forced this Nation to confront its conscience. His courage, discipline, and unshakeable dignity changed baseball forever. More importantly, it changed America for the better.

That is why it is disgusting when the Pentagon, under our current leadership, removed mention of Jackie Robinson's military service. Mr. Speaker, you cannot honor American history by erasing the very people who made it: Mr. O'Malley, the owner and Jackie Robinson, the player.

Jackie Robinson's legacy is not a DEI to be thrown away. It is patriotism. It is service to the country, and it is sacrifice. It is the truth.

Mr. Jackie Robinson was court-martialed for refusing to sit in the back of a segregated bus. You cannot understand American history, Mr. Speaker, without understanding the whole truth.

Jackie Robinson proved: Diversity is not a weakness in this country but is one of our greatest strengths.

Equity dismantles barriers allowing excellence to rise.

Inclusion expands opportunity, so we as a country become stronger.

Mr. Speaker, as we tell the full story of America, not a sanitized story, not an edited story, but the full story, we give the next generation the courage to keep pushing forward, to keep breaking barriers, and to speak the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not merely to remember a man, but to summon a truth—one

that this Nation has long struggled to face, and longer still to accept. We gather in the shadow and the light of Jackie Robinson, a man who did not simply step onto a baseball field, but stepped into the raging storm of America's conscience.

On April 15th, 1947, when he walked onto Ebbets Field, he carried more than a glove and a bat. He carried the weight of a people who had been told, for generations, to wait—to be patient—to accept less. And yet, he did not wait. He did not bow. He did not break. In his silence, there was thunder. In his restraint, there was revolution.

Jackie Robinson did not just change baseball. He exposed the lie at the heart of this country—that freedom could be partial, that dignity could be selective, that citizenship could be rationed. And in doing so, he forced America to see itself, perhaps for the first time, as it truly was.

And so it is a grave and troubling thing—though not, I must confess, a surprising one—that there are those even now who would dare to diminish his legacy. To erase his service. To tidy up history into something more palatable, more convenient, more false. There is nothing new in this impulse. America has always had talent for forgetting the very people who made it possible.

But you cannot honor this country by amputating its memory. You cannot claim patriotism while discarding truth. Jackie Robinson's life was not an accessory to history—it was a reckoning with it.

He proved something that this Nation has resisted understanding: that what we call diversity is not a threat, but a revelation; that what we call equity is not charity, but justice; that what we call inclusion is not concession, but the expansion of the American promise itself.

For the story of America, if it is to mean anything at all, must be told in full. Not the softened story, not the convenient story, but the whole, difficult, luminous truth.

Because only in that truth can we find the courage to continue—to insist that the barriers before us are not permanent, that the limits imposed upon us are not final.

Today, we honor Jackie Robinson not only as a ballplayer, but as a witness—as a man who testified, with his life, to the possibility of a more honest Nation. A more just one.

And if we are worthy of that testimony, we will remember this: that America is not measured by how well it protects the powerful, but by how fiercely it defends the dignity of all who step forward—against the odds, against the noise, against history itself—to claim their place at the plate.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes

p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 16, 2026, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-3273. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Bank's Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2025, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635g(a); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 8(a) (as amended by Public Law 93-646, Sec. 10); (88 Stat. 2336); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-3274. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Protecting Our Communications Networks by Promoting Transparency Regarding Foreign Adversary Control [GN Docket No.: 25-166] (RIN: 3060-AM37) received April 9, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3275. A letter from the General Counsel, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the Conference's FY 2025 No Fear Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3276. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's FY 2025 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3277. A letter from the General Counsel Performing the Duties of the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the Service's No FEAR Act Report for FY 2025, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3278. A letter from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's FY 2025 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3279. A letter from the Chief of Staff, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's FY 2025 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3280. A letter from the Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2025 No FEAR Act Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3281. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2025 No FEAR Report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, Sec. 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

EC-3282. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; 2025 Management Area 1A Possession Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 230316-0077; RTID 0648-XF104] received April 9, 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-3283. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Southeast Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of America, and South Atlantic; 2025 Commercial Closure for Gag in the South Atlantic [Docket No.: 140819686-5999-02; RTID 0648-XF241] received April 9, 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-3284. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Big Skates in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID 0648-XE689] received April 9, 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-3285. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota Transfer From New Jersey to North Carolina [Docket No.: 241203-0308; RTID 0648-XF222] received April 9, 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-3286. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer From North Carolina to Massachusetts [Docket No.: 241203-0308; RTID 0648-XF218] received April 9, 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-3287. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 250312-0036; RTID 0648-XF144] received April 9, 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-3288. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 250312-0036; RTID 0648-XF144] received April 9, 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-3289. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Greater Atlantic Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic

ting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fishery; 2025 Commercial Atlantic Mackerel Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 240405-0100; RTID 0648-XF181] received April 9, 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-3290. A letter from the Branch Chief, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — GARFO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer From North Carolina to New York [Docket No.: 241203-0308; RTID 0648-XF177] received April 9, 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-3291. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2026 Gulf of Alaska Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID: 0648-XF494] received April 9, 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-3292. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2026 Gulf of Alaska Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID: 0648-XF395] received April 9, 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-3293. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Alaska Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 250312-0037; RTID: 0648-XF003] received April 9, 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-3294. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — Greater Atlantic Region, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2026 Atlantic Herring Fishery Specifications [Docket No.: 251208-0181; RTID: 0648-XF413] received April 9, 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-3295. A letter from the Fisheries Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — HMS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Longline Category Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 220919-0193; RTID 0648-XF427] received April 9, 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-3296. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — HMS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic

Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Angling Category Retention Limit Adjustment [Docket No.: 220919-0193] (RTID: 0648-XE977) received April 9, 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-3297. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — HMS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; Closure of the Angling Category Southern Area Trophy Fishery for 2026 [Docket No.: 220919-0193; RTID: 0648-XF429] received April 9, 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-3298. A letter from the Fishery Management Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries — SERO, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — 2025-2026 Recreational Closure for Gulf Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02; RTID 0648-XF064] received April 9, 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-3299. A letter from the Branch Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishing the Gordie Howe International Bridge as a Port of Entry in Detroit, MI [CBP Dec. 25-17; Docket No.: USCBP-2026-0133] (RIN: 1651-AB64) received January 28, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. LANGWORTHY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1174. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6387) to amend the Clean Air Act to require revisions to regulations governing the review and handling of air quality monitoring data influenced by exceptional events or actions to mitigate wildfire risk; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families (Rept. 119-609). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1175. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8035) to amend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 to extend the authorities of title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 through October 20, 2027, and for other purposes (Rept. 119-610). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 7688. A bill to modernize and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5877. A bill to strengthen the authority of the United States Secret Service to investigate various crimes related to digital asset transactions and to counter transnational cyber criminal activity, including unlicensed money transmitting businesses, structured transactions, and fraud against financial institutions, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-612, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WESTERMAN: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 5587. A bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to waive the requirement for a Federal drilling permit for certain activities, to exempt certain activities from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2289. A bill to provide that an eligible facilities request under section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 is not subject to requirements to prepare certain environmental or historical preservation reviews, with amendments (Rept. 119-614, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 7386. A bill to amend the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 to reauthorize the First Responder Network Authority, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 7022. A bill to provide for the transmission of emergency alerts by satellite, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2289 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5877 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HUIZENGA (for himself and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 8283. A bill to prevent foreign adversaries from threatening the national security of the United States by extracting key technical features of closed-source, American-owned artificial intelligence models, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 8284. A bill to enhance the administration of export control licenses under the Export Control Reform Act of 2018, and other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. MCCORMICK):

H.R. 8285. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to require a competi-

tive market review of applications for a license to export, reexport, or transfer in-country certain technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIL (for himself and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 8286. A bill to amend the Federal securities laws with respect to the materiality of disclosure requirements, to establish the Public Company Advisory Committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 8287. A bill to require the Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research to submit a comprehensive report on the impact and effectiveness of United States semiconductor export controls on the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AMO (for himself and Mr. SHREVE):

H.R. 8288. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to provide assistance for compliance with that Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

H.R. 8289. A bill to amend the Export Control Reform Act of 2018 to ensure expeditious processing of license applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 8290. A bill to require the use of the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any quota increase at the International Monetary Fund for member countries that employ certain exchange rate practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 8291. A bill to establish a community disaster assistance fund for housing and community development and to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide, from the fund, assistance through a community development block grant disaster recovery program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. 8292. A bill to authorize a pilot program under section 258 of the National Housing Act to establish an automated process for providing additional credit rating information for mortgagors and prospective mortgagors under certain mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BEAN of Florida:

H.R. 8293. A bill to abolish the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation; 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. BEYER (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELUZIO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAI, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 8294. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a surtax on high income individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BICE (for herself, Ms. LETLOW, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 8295. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize abuse with respect to assisted reproductive technology; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEAVER (for himself, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 8296. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide for the consideration of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 8297. A bill to restore and protect the Second Amendment rights of residents and United States citizens who visit the District of Columbia by modernizing the District's firearm laws, eliminating prior restraints on acquisition and possession, establishing concealed constitutional carry, prohibiting feature-based firearm bans, and facilitating lawful purchases through Federally licensed dealers in neighboring States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. SCANLON):

H.R. 8298. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to exclude in-kind support and maintenance from income for the purposes of the Supplemental Security Income program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 8299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a program to populate downloadable tax forms with taxpayer return information; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BIGGS of Arizona, Ms. BOEBERT, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FINE, and Mrs. LUNA):

H.R. 8300. A bill to prohibit the use of taxpayer funds for settlements of workplace misconduct claims involving Members of Congress or senior staff of the House of Representatives or the Senate, require personal financial accountability, ensure transparency of past settlements while protecting victims, and mandate referral of criminal allegations to the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. JACOBS):

H.R. 8301. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to conduct a comprehensive review of whether to designate the Rapid Support Forces of Sudan as a specially designated global terrorist organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIM (for herself, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 8302. A bill to amend the definition of aggravated felony in the Immigration and Nationality Act to include certain serious drunk driving offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania (for herself, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LIEU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. TOKUDA):

H.R. 8303. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to revitalize

schoolyards; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mrs. MCBATH (for herself and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 8304. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a grant program for States to improve or establish a credential repository, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. MCDONALD RIVET:

H.R. 8305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the earned income tax credit for parents of young children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 8306. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence to implement a process for establishing a rolling annual standard for the sale of certain integrated circuits to certain countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. OBERNOLTE (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 8307. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to review and establish guidance and best practices for responding to electric vehicle fires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. VASQUEZ, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. GRAY, Mr. CISCOMANI, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia):

H.R. 8308. A bill to establish requirements for the termination of authorizations, the completion and coordination of reviews for authorizations, and judicial review of actions relating to authorizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. RASKIN (for himself and Mr. MIN):

H.R. 8309. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit Presidents and Vice Presidents from receiving damages payments from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 8310. A bill to establish protections for health care providers who raise concerns about the quality of health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, 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 Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 8311. A bill to expand the scope of the Do Not Call rules under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act to include all telephone subscribers, to expand the private right of action for calls in violation of those rules, and to modify the definition of the term "automatic telephone dialing system"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 8312. A bill to establish fraud prevention and program integrity functions and data sharing authorities within the Depart-

ment of Treasury and a permanent governmentwide Inspector General for Fraud, Accountability, and Recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mr. JACK):

H.R. 8313. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the Trump accounts contribution pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 8314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish that employers may offer employees a choice among tax-favored employer contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. BRESNAHAN, and Ms. FRIEDMAN):

H.R. 8315. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the assistance available for recipients of assistance under chapter 53 of such title for acquisition of real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 8316. A bill to impose a one-time tax on the amount in excess of \$10,000,000 of the net worth of certain individuals and trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. HINSON, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. FIGURES, and Ms. SEWELL):

H.R. 8317. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to evaluate, develop, and expand the use of technology-enabled collaborative learning and capacity building models to improve maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGWORTHY:

H. Res. 1176. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ANSARI (for herself, Ms. MCBRIDE, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MIN, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. PETERSEN, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Res. 1177. A resolution impeaching Peter B. Hegseth, Secretary of Defense of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MENG, Ms. CHU, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H. Res. 1178. A resolution commemorating the 5-year remembrance of the April 15, 2021, mass shooting at a FedEx Ground facility in Indianapolis, Indiana, and denouncing all forms of anti-Asian hate, including the resurgence of xenophobic and anti-immigrant rhetoric; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JAYAPAL (for herself, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, Mr. AMO, and Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE):

H. Res. 1179. A resolution condemning attacks on civilians in Sudan and calling for an end to external support to the warring parties and for efforts to promote a negotiated settlement of the war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1180. A resolution recognizing the enduring cultural and historical significance of emancipation in the Nation's capital on the anniversary of President Abraham Lincoln's signing of the District of Columbia Compensated Emancipation Act, which established the "first freed" on April 16, 1862, and celebrating passage of the District of Columbia statehood bill in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SIMON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. CARSON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mrs. FLETCHER):

H. Res. 1181. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of April as "National Arab American Heritage Month" (NAAHM) and celebrating the heritage and culture of Arab Americans in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Mr. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 8283.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 8284.

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

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 8285.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. STEIL:

H.R. 8286.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the US Constitution: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 8287.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AMO:

H.R. 8288.

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

Article I

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 8289.

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

Article I, section 8

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 8290.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 8291.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18).

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 8292.

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

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18).

By Mr. BEAN of Florida:

H.R. 8293.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

[The Congress shall have Power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8294.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. BICE:

H.R. 8295.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 8296.

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

Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution, Commerce Clause

By Mr. CRENSHAW:

H.R. 8297.

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

Clause 17 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 8298.

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

This legislation is introduced pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 8299.

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, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 8300.

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

Title I, Section 8

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.R. 8301.

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

Article I Section 8

By Mrs. KIM:

H.R. 8302.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8303.

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

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mrs. MCBATH:

H.R. 8304.

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

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

By Ms. McDONALD RIVET:

H.R. 8305.

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

U.S. Constitution, Article 1, section 8.

By Mr. MOOLENAAR:

H.R. 8306.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8, Article I and Clause 18 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.R. 8307.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 8308.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 8309.

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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SCANLON:

H.R. 8310.

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

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 8311.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 8312.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 8313.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the US Constitution

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 8314.

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

Article I Section 8

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 8315.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 8316.

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

Congress has the constitutional authority to enact this legislation pursuant Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, which states: "The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:
H.R. 8317.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. MASSIE, Ms. HAGEMAN, Ms. MACE, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 210: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 392: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 425: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 486: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
H.R. 507: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 516: Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 566: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 631: Mr. FULLER.
H.R. 645: Mr. MANN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FULLER.
H.R. 685: Mr. HERN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 868: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 925: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 942: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1014: Mr. LAWLER.
H.R. 1085: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 1132: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1267: Mr. EVANS of Colorado.
H.R. 1340: Mr. WHITESIDES.
H.R. 1363: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York and Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 1394: Mr. FULCHER.
H.R. 1421: Mr. COLLINS.
H.R. 1464: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 1510: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1521: Mr. MCGUIRE and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1572: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1627: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 1628: Mr. YAKYM, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1631: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 1672: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1735: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 1783: Mr. BERA.
H.R. 1810: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.
H.R. 1896: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1902: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 1957: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 1971: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 1993: Mr. MFUME.
H.R. 2004: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. FRY.
H.R. 2036: Mr. POCAN and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2103: Mrs. HAYES and Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 2120: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 2124: Mr. FULLER.
H.R. 2222: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 2289: Mr. DUNN of Florida, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. HARSHBARGER.
H.R. 2315: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 2357: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 2411: Ms. HOYLE of Oregon.
H.R. 2485: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2531: Mrs. GRIJALVA, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 2555: Ms. FOXX, Mr. BURCHETT, and Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 2559: Mr. SHERMAN and Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY.
H.R. 2585: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 2589: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2598: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 2756: Mr. WHITESIDES.
H.R. 2777: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2784: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 2881: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 2978: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.

H.R. 3028: Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
H.R. 3059: Mr. BOST.
H.R. 3104: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3105: Mr. KUSTOFF.
H.R. 3164: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3276: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3350: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 3452: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.
H.R. 3514: Mr. ALFORD.
H.R. 3526: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H.R. 3624: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 3639: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 3747: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 3784: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 3954: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. FRY.
H.R. 3999: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 4011: Ms. GOODLANDER and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 4114: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 4382: Mr. BRECHEEN, Ms. McDONALD RIVET, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. WHITESIDES, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. CISNEROS.
H.R. 4398: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 4642: Mr. VAN EPPS and Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 4710: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.
H.R. 4733: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 4763: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.
H.R. 4782: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4797: Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 4966: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 5106: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 5206: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 5269: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
H.R. 5309: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Ms. GOODLANDER.
H.R. 5415: Mr. FINE and Mr. FRY.
H.R. 5434: Mr. OLSZEWSKI.
H.R. 5437: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 5470: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 5492: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, and Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 5509: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCGUIRE, Mr. YAKYM, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. PEREZ, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia, Mr. LIEU, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 5544: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 5588: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 5589: Mr. LATIMER and Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 5641: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 5642: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 5643: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 5688: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 5800: Mr. BRECHEEN.
H.R. 5874: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 5965: Ms. SALINAS and Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 5993: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 6126: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 6128: Mr. GIMENEZ.
H.R. 6137: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 6152: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 6160: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 6164: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 6231: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia.
H.R. 6238: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6364: Mr. RILEY of New York.
H.R. 6391: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 6397: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 6423: Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 6466: Mr. STRONG.
H.R. 6509: Mrs. HOUCHIN.
H.R. 6534: Mr. FINE.
H.R. 6601: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 6607: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6677: Ms. BUDZINSKI.
H.R. 6731: Ms. BROWN and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 6735: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 6832: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 6835: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 6976: Mr. VASQUEZ and Ms. GOODLANDER.

H.R. 6998: Mr. CRANK.
H.R. 7137: Mr. BEAN of Florida.
H.R. 7146: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 7154: Ms. MORRISON.
H.R. 7208: Mr. DUNN of Florida.
H.R. 7268: Ms. SCHOLTEN.
H.R. 7296: Mr. FULLER.
H.R. 7298: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 7354: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 7359: Mr. FULLER.
H.R. 7365: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 7371: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 7390: Mr. VAN EPPS.
H.R. 7409: Ms. VAN DUYN.
H.R. 7437: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. MRVAN.
H.R. 7449: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 7531: Mr. MFUME.
H.R. 7565: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 7678: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 7687: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 7710: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 7747: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 7779: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS and Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ.
H.R. 7781: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 7809: Mrs. SYKES.
H.R. 7858: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 7874: Mr. SELF.
H.R. 7903: Mrs. RAMIREZ.
H.R. 7936: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 7938: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 7945: Mrs. BICE.
H.R. 7957: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 7973: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 7974: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 7986: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 8019: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 8025: Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 8041: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 8056: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 8070: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 8077: Mr. SCHMIDT.
H.R. 8092: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 8103: Mrs. RAMIREZ and Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 8119: Ms. NORTON and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 8137: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 8163: Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 8170: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 8199: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 8205: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SALAZAR, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 8209: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 8213: Mr. MCGUIRE and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 8216: Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 8242: Mr. GOLDEN of Maine.
H.R. 8253: Ms. SALAZAR and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 8256: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 8270: Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 8275: Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DELUZIO, and Ms. TLAIB.
H.J. Res. 122: Ms. ELFRETH.
H.J. Res. 135: Mr. LEVIN.
H.J. Res. 144: Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. MAGAZINER, Mr. CROW, and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.J. Res. 155: Mr. LATIMER and Mr. NORCROSS.
H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H. Res. 50: Mr. PFLUGER and Mr. GOLDMAN of Texas.
H. Res. 120: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H. Res. 776: Mr. SELF.
H. Res. 1093: Ms. GOODLANDER.
H. Res. 1148: Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H. Res. 1156: Mrs. HOUCHIN, Mrs. KIM, and Mr. FINSTAD.
H. Res. 1164: Mr. CLOUD and Mr. GOSAR.
H. Res. 1167: Ms. NORTON.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 15, 2026

No. 66

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 14, 2026)

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Loving and ever-present God, You have been our help in ages past; You are our hope for the years to come.

Lord, forgive us when we fail to make an adequate response to the flagrant disrespect of Your sovereignty. Forgive us for our reluctance to speak in defense of Your majesty. Remind us that there are certain lines we should never cross.

Lord, we trust You to direct our steps with Your providential power. Guide our lawmakers. Where there is perplexity, provide clarity. Where there is weakness, provide strength. Where there is fear, provide courage.

We pray in the Name of the only One who can save us. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with

Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Iowa.

TRIBUTE TO ATHENA PORTER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am here to honor a fellow Iowan, a person that I know very well—not necessarily because I talk to them often. So I want to celebrate an Iowan's advocacy to prevent cancer.

Athena Porter, from Leon, IA, is a proud graduate of my university, the University of Northern Iowa, and she also served on my staff for a considerable amount of time. She has now been working for a long time in the rural health clinic there in Leon, IA. She is also a community leader.

In 2023, she was diagnosed with cervical cancer. Unlike most cancers, cervical cancer can be prevented by taking an HPV vaccine. Through proactive preventive care, Athena found out in her twenties that she was HPV positive, making her at risk for cervical cancer. In partnership with her doctors, Athena routinely checked on the status of the virus in her body. After giving birth to her second child, Athena found out news you never want to hear: that she had cervical cancer. Thanks to early detection, Athena was able to get care to eliminate the cancer.

Today, as a result of her bout with cancer, Athena is an advocate for vaccine use, early screening, and proper treatment—all because she appreciates being a cervical cancer survivor.

So I want to thank Athena for publicly sharing her story. Also, let her experience be an encouragement for others to get early care—and get early care as often as you can.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

WORKING FAMILIES TAX CUT ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I don't know a lot of people who look forward to April 15. No. I suspect tax day doesn't rank high on Americans' favorite days of the year, but I would wager that a lot more Americans were pleasantly surprised this year when they went to file their taxes because thanks to Republicans' Working Families Tax Cut bill, a lot more Americans kept a lot more of their hard-earned money this year.

That is right. Hard-working Americans saw lower tax bills. Tax refunds increased by more than 10 percent compared to last year, and the average refund is more than \$3,400 this year thanks to Republicans' tax cuts.

As the American people have now seen firsthand, the Working Families Tax Cuts provided significant tax relief. First of all, it locked in the lower rates permanently. In 2017, Republicans lowered rates—tax rates—across the board, and as of last year, these new lower rates are now permanent which means that hard-working Americans won't have to worry about a higher tax bill in the years to come.

We also nearly doubled the standard deduction in 2017. The Working Families Tax Cuts raised it even further and made that permanent too.

And then there is the child tax credit which Republicans doubled in 2017. The

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1747

Working Families Tax Cuts raised it again to \$2,200. And Republicans didn't just raise the child tax credit, we linked it to inflation so it doesn't lose its value over time. That, too, is a permanent feature of the Tax Code thanks to Republicans' landmark bill.

The Working Families Tax Cuts also introduced a number of new tax relief provisions into the Tax Code. This tax season, more than 30 million seniors claimed a new \$6,000 bonus deduction for older Americans.

Over a million people bought a new American-made car and were able to deduct an average \$1,800 in auto loan interest on that new vehicle. More than 25 million American workers were able to deduct overtime pay from their taxes and realize thousands of dollars in tax savings. And over 6 million workers deducted income from tips this tax year.

With all that, a lot more Americans were looking at a bigger refund when they finished their tax returns, and they are thinking about the best use of that additional money in their pocket: Saving for their first home, investing in their kids' education, taking a family vacation, using their money how they see fit rather than sending it to Uncle Sam.

As its name implies, the Working Families Tax Cuts focuses on working families. But this bill also did a lot to support America's small businesses as well as family farms and ranches.

Thanks to Republicans' landmark bill, 12 million small businesses saw an average tax reduction of \$7,000. This bill made the 199A small business deduction permanent, which has been a significant boost for small businesses and for family farms and ranches.

One agriculture co-op in my State of South Dakota estimates its impact at over \$100 million since it was created by Republicans in 2017.

Millions of small businesses, farms, and ranches were able to use this provision and reduce their tax bill this year freeing up money to invest in their operations and employees, create jobs, and increase innovation.

That is not all. The working families tax cuts made 100-percent bonus depreciation permanent too, which allows businesses and farmers and ranchers to deduct the full cost of a new piece of equipment the year they start using it.

Permanent research and development expensing is already paying dividends for businesses in my State.

A lot of farmers, ranchers, and small business owners breathed a sigh of relief when they heard that this bill raised the death tax threshold and spared them—spared them—from a potentially devastating tax bill, not to mention from the costly estate planning expenses that come with it.

Since Republicans passed this landmark bill last summer, we have heard Democrats' typical refrain that this bill was just tax cuts for billionaires. That is laughable. It really is.

The largest proportional benefits from this bill went to Americans earn-

ing less than \$50,000 a year. The increased standard deduction from this bill is something that was claimed by more than a 100 million Americans this year to reduce and simplify their taxes. More than 34 million American families claimed the child tax credit this year, which the working families tax cuts permanently increased and linked to the cost-of-living.

And nearly half of filers—half of filers—claimed one of the new tax cuts—no tax on tips and overtime, auto loan interest, or the senior deduction.

Millions of middle-income Americans saw a lower tax bill this year, and that is no fluke. The working families tax cuts puts these hard-working Americans first. It lets them keep more of their hard-earned money to spend, invest, and save how they see fit. It helps hard-working people get one step closer to the American dream.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday an Ipsos poll found that fewer than one in four Americans think Trump's war in Iran has been worthwhile. And who can blame them? Every metric indicates that Donald Trump's handling of Operation Epic Fury has been an epic failure.

Donald Trump promised this war would be won in a matter of days or weeks. It is now day 47. And let's take stock of the 47 days into this historic blunder. Thirteen U.S. servicemembers have been killed. Thousands of civilians have been killed and injured across the region. The Strait of Hormuz is not only closed, it has become an Iranian cash cow. And Iran's control of the strait is greater today than before when Trump started the war.

Iran's nuclear ambitions have only grown, and the Iranian regime is even more radical than before the war. Americans, meanwhile, are shelling out more than \$4 for a gallon of gas, on average.

Now Donald Trump says that gas prices "could be the same" or "a little higher" by November. Those are his words. Trump says gas prices "could be the same" or "a little higher" by November. Unbelievable.

Trump's No. 1 promise entering the White House was to bring inflation

down, and now he is admitting his own war could drive gas prices up for much of the rest of the year. When Donald Trump admits his own war will drive gas prices up through November, you know there is trouble coming down the road for American motorists.

Donald Trump is learning the hard way that ending a war is a lot harder than beginning one. He would rather pick a fight with the Pope online than reckon with what is truly on the line right now: the lives of American servicemembers and the livelihood of American working families.

And throughout all this miasma, all this mess, this horrible war, where are the Senate Republicans? Months into this war, still no hearings, no testimony, no clarity on how it will end. Don't the Republicans, when we are in war, don't they know their responsibility? I don't care if they are the same party. Don't they know they have a responsibility to get the facts out and let the American people know what is going on here? Because Trump isn't giving people any idea, but he still keeps changing his mind and his goals in the war, none of which he has achieved.

So where are Senate Republicans? The American people have a right to ask. Enough is enough. Trump may not understand how damaging his war has been to the American people. Republicans may be hiding from having hearings or asking questions, but Senate Democrats who know how damaging the war has been are asking a whole lot of questions.

That is why we will force a vote on another War Powers Resolution. This is the fourth since the war began. I thank Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH for her work on this week's resolution. I thank Senators KAINE and BOOKER and other Members of our caucus for their continuing leadership on this crucial issue.

Republicans have voted against this resolution three times now. But as the war drags on for 47 days with no end in sight, they should join us on this resolution and end the war once and for all—and all the troubles it is bringing to Americans once and for all. It is 47 days already, where are you?

If the Republicans vote no again, we will continue to force votes on these resolutions every week until either this war ends or the Republicans get the courage to stand up to Donald Trump.

WORKING FAMILIES TAX CUT ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on tax day, not a single American would say that tax day is their favorite date on the calendar. Republicans, however, seem to think today will mark an inflection point in their political fortunes. Evidently, they haven't been paying much attention.

When Republicans passed the One Big Beautiful Bill, they promised Americans that their tax refunds would grow

by a thousand dollars, on average. Well, the results are in, and the massive tax relief Republicans promised has turned out to be a dud.

Refunds, on average, have changed only by a third, about \$350, and Americans need every penny they can get, but a couple of hundred dollars doesn't go very far on a tax break when the average American family will pay an extra \$2,000 on tariff taxes and \$740 this year to fill up their tank.

That is right. Donald Trump's war in Iran alone has wiped out any tax refund Americans will see this year.

Let me say that again: Donald Trump's war in Iran alone has wiped out any extra tax refund Americans will see this year, and that is not including all the increases they are paying because of tariffs and higher electric bills and what they are doing to healthcare.

No wonder only one in four Americans believe the One Big Beautiful Bill is helpful, only one in four. That means there are some Republicans who don't like it. Seven in ten Americans, meanwhile, say they are still paying too much in taxes. Seven in ten Americans say they are paying too much in taxes while the ultra-wealthy aren't paying their fair share.

And they are right. Trump's One Big Beautiful Bill has been a dud for working families, but millionaires got a \$300,000 tax cut. Big corporations got a tax cut of \$65 billion. Republicans want to call their bill a working- and middle-class tax cut, but truth be told, it should be called a massive giveaway to the ultra-ultra-wealthy. The lion's share of the benefits go to those at the very top, while inflation and Trump's war has eviscerated any shred of benefit felt by the rest of Americans.

That is not tax relief. That is not tax relief. That is a brazen betrayal of working Americans. If Republicans think that rebranding their toxic bill will make Americans forget the economic pit that Trump and the Republicans pushed them into, they will be sorely mistaken.

FEDERAL RESERVE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the Fed, this morning, once again, Donald Trump escalated his attacks on the independence of the Federal Reserve.

In an interview on Fox Business, the President renewed his threats against Reserve Chair Jerome Powell, saying that if Powell doesn't leave, he will fire him. There are no legitimate grounds for the President to remove the Chair of the Federal Reserve for simply doing his job.

Trump's threats against the Fed does nothing but rattle markets, undermine confidence, inject more chaos into the financial system, and then raise rates. Doesn't Trump understand something rudimentary? When there is uncertainty about the Fed's path, rates go up. Trump, are you hearing that?

The more you screw around with the Fed, the higher rates will be, and you want lower rates.

He doesn't know what to do. He doesn't know what he is talking about. He doesn't understand the economy, the Fed, or interest rates.

To every American who is struggling with high prices, if you want mortgage rates to come down or if you are worried about the economy getting worse, the President's attacks on the Fed should alarm you. And meddling with the Fed will certainly drive up interest rates because the markets hate uncertainty.

We know what is going on. Donald Trump—typical—is angry that his own policies have driven up prices and killed jobs. But instead of owning up to his mistakes, he continues to look for a scapegoat, someone else to blame.

That is all he does. He screws things up and then blames somebody else.

Doesn't he realize that is not going to solve the problem?

That is not going to solve the problem. Blame Donald Trump. That is not going to do it. It may make you feel better for a minute or two, but it sure doesn't solve the problem. And it doesn't solve the American people's firm, strong disagreement with what you are doing.

Trump wants to fire Powell because he won't lower interest rates, but Trump's Treasury Secretary said yesterday that the Fed shouldn't lower interest rates because of the chaos of the Iran war.

What is going on in this administration? Trump says one thing. His Treasury Secretary says another.

Senate Republicans have an obligation to push back when Donald Trump threatens the independence of the Federal Reserve. And so long as these bogus investigations and intimidation tactics continue, the nomination of Kevin Warsh should not—should not—move forward.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES WITHIN OR AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—Motion to Discharge

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, fiscal years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a), and in accordance with section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 123, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Iran, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or a specific authorization for use of military force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 123, a joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

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

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

The Majority whip.

TAX DAY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today is April 15. Americans all across the country know that it is tax day in America.

We just heard the minority leader come to the floor, and it sounds like he is almost despondent that this year the American people are able to get higher tax refunds than in the past.

Because of what we have been able to do and pass, people are keeping more of their hard-earned money. For people that are filing their taxes for the first time under this new tax law, the Working Families Tax Cuts, they are seeing that they are keeping more. And this is what we promised: to put more money in people's pockets.

I hear about it at home in Wyoming. I was home, traveling in the State, and recently spoke to a group of veterans. They were meeting with their families in Dubois, WY. We had a "welcome home" for our veterans.

I was also in Sundance, WY; Gillette, WY; Laramie, WY. I visited with students. I was in Lusk, WY, as well as Newcastle. I sat down with farmers, ranchers, and small business owners. Across the board, we talked about new opportunities that they are experiencing as a result of the law, since Republicans cut taxes dramatically, and how that appears to them in their daily lives and what it means to them and their families.

And those families in Wyoming aren't alone. Americans all across the country are seeing smaller tax bills and larger tax refunds.

So the Internal Revenue Service has released data today on the tax refunds. The average refund this year is over \$3,400 per family. Now that is nearly \$250 per month in people's pockets. That is much higher than it was last year. These are the refunds that people are getting.

And yet, when I hear the Senator from New York, he referred to the amount of money that people are getting back in their refunds, and I think he said the word "dud." Maybe to him that is a dud. Maybe to him, in New York City, that is a dud.

For working families in Wyoming, \$250 a month means a lot of money in their pockets. When they go to the gas station, the grocery store, when they

plan what they want to do over the summer—all of those things—this is real money in the pockets of Wyoming families and American families. And the best we can hear from the minority leader is, it is a dud.

That is not what I am hearing around my home State. It is probably not what you are hearing in your home State of Oklahoma. People understand that money in their pockets matters to them, and it matters to their families, even if the Democrats don't believe that or the minority leader doesn't see it the way we see it.

But in so many ways, he doesn't—because we think it is important for people to keep more of their hard-earned money, and it is a direct result of the bill that we passed, the Working Families Tax Cut law.

So what have the Democrats said to do about that? Well, they tried to do the opposite last year. They wanted to pass a \$4 trillion tax increase on the American people—not \$4,000, not \$4 million, not \$4 billion—\$4 trillion of increased taxes. That is where they were headed.

They weren't just heading that way. They voted for that. They voted for the largest tax increase in American history.

And Senator SCHUMER, today, talked about a poll. And what did he say? He said Americans think they are paying too much in taxes right now. Can you imagine what they would have been saying if they were paying what they are paying now plus 4 trillion additional dollars in taxes?

Why in the world would, then, the minority leader come to the floor and put together a group and lead the charge to raise taxes by \$4 trillion, if he comes to the floor and talks about the fact that Americans think they are paying too much in taxes?

I think we are paying too much in taxes. I want to cut more taxes. That is what the people of Wyoming want. That is what Americans want. That is certainly what Republicans want.

So it was just interesting to hear the minority leader talk about these refund checks that are putting more money in people's pockets and saying: Well, it is a dud.

It is not a dud for the people of Wyoming. They are encouraged by what we are doing, and they want us to do even more. And we need to do more.

The Democrats talk about a \$4 trillion tax increase. That is raising taxes on families, on workers, on small businesses, all across the board. Well, Republicans permanently lowered taxes, and we did it for hard-working families and small businesses.

You know, in doing so, we made it easier for all Americans—whether they are working, whether retired—to keep more money in their pockets. More than 53 million Americans have benefited from at least one of the new Republican tax cuts. That is a lot of people.

So if you are a senior and receive a Social Security check, you are bene-

fitting for the first time from our “no taxes on Social Security” pledge. This is a new \$6,000 deduction for seniors.

Mr. President, 30 million seniors have already benefited, and everybody doesn't even have their taxes in yet. The deadline is tonight at midnight.

Well, if you are a mother or a father with children, you are benefiting from the expanded child tax credits. That is \$2,200 per child, per year.

Millions of parents have enrolled their children in Trump Accounts. That is a big deal. For parents with newborn children, the savings accounts get \$1,000 deposited into them straight from the U.S. Treasury. It happens immediately when your child is born. And I am happy to report that there are groups of individuals around the country who are matching those contributions in the Trump Accounts and adding more in individual States or to young people born in different locations—all of this in an effort to get these young people off on a good start.

In Wyoming and across the country, more than 6 million Americans are benefitting from the “no tax on tips” provision in the Working Families Tax Cut law. These are our waiters, our barbers, our bartenders, the tour guides. They have claimed an average deduction of over \$7,000 on the no tax on tips.

More than 25 million Americans have benefited from no tax on overtime. They are the firefighters, the police officers, the nurses, the linemen, the coal miners in Wyoming and in your home State. They have claimed an average deduction of over \$3,000 on overtime.

So hard-working Americans are being rewarded—rewarded for working more—working more. Think about that. That is not what the Democrats are proposing. What we did was put incentives in for people working more, to keep more of what they earn.

Democrats are looking to take more for the government. We are looking to find ways to let people keep what they earn.

So the extra money goes right into their bank accounts, not to the bureaucrats in Washington or the Democrats that want to take that money to spend it. That is why they wanted to raise taxes by \$4 trillion. They wanted to tax more so they could spend more. It is all wrong.

The Working Families Tax Cut law protects 2 million family-owned farms and ranches in my State and in the Presiding Officer's from the dreaded death tax. The small business owners in our communities talk about that when I walk Main Street, and I saw it in Newcastle, WY, 2 weeks ago. Instead of being forced to sell their land or their small businesses to pay taxes to Washington so Democrats can spend more, families in Wyoming are now able to plan for their futures for generations to come.

The Working Families Tax Cut law also allows businesses to immediately deduct up to \$2.5 million in new equip-

ment. That means more jobs, more growth, more people in the workplace. It means more opportunities for farmers, for ranchers, and for Main Street America.

Because of lower taxes and more opportunities, workers across our Nation are seeing bigger paychecks—another thing that the Senate minority leader referred to as a “dud” earlier today. Real wages are up this year. This is significant progress.

The only people who seem to be upset about lower taxes, bigger refunds, and higher wages are the elected Democrats in this body, who voted for a \$4 trillion tax increase, and the minority leader, who led the charge. Democrats want to raise taxes on the American people. They believe that the money you earn isn't yours. They want it so they can spend it. Democrats believe that the money you earn belongs to the government. That is why the Democrat Party is known as the party of high taxes.

It is not just here in the U.S. Senate; it is in the States and the big cities that are run by Democrats across the country.

This year, in the State of Virginia, a Democrat Governor was elected and sworn into office. So Democrats in Virginia now control the house, the senate, and the Governor's mansion—a big flip in Virginia. Since they took over in January, Democrats have introduced 50—50—new tax increases. That is the Democrat mindset: Raise taxes. Get power. Raise taxes.

Democrats want to raise taxes on barbershops, on nail salons, on dry cleaners, and gymnasiums. They are proposing new taxes on firearms and on ammunition in Virginia. That is what has happened now that Virginia has elected Democrats.

Democrats like to use the word “affordability.” Apparently, the Democrats' idea of affordability is higher taxes paid by working families so they can spend more money on liberal social programs. That is where we are in America today.

Republicans know the best way to make America affordable is with good jobs, growing paychecks, lower taxes, and that is exactly what we are seeing here today, on April 15, as people file their taxes and see the larger refunds this year—refunds of over \$3,400, over \$250 a month.

The American people know the money belongs to them, not to Washington. They have earned it. They should keep more of it. Republicans trust people at home to know best what they want to do with that money—what they want to spend, what they want to save, what they want to invest.

So this tax day, I come to the floor to say the American people have more money in their pockets because Republicans—all of us—have passed the Working Families Tax Cut law. Republicans are going to continue to fight for an America where families get to keep

more of what they earn and make the decisions about how to spend it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The President pro tempore.

IOWA

Mr. GRASSLEY. I have two items I would like to discuss. During the Easter break when the Senate was not in session, I was holding in Iowa Q&A's in 25 of our 99 counties. My annual practice allows me to hear directly from the grassroots. At my meetings, Iowans set the agenda. No issue is off limits.

I had a chance to hear from the Rural Health Transformation Fund—how it is working out for our hospitals and helping our communities. For example, in Pella, IA, they are using the Federal dollars to invest in a PET scan machine and an oncology nurse.

Then I also had the working families tax cuts coming up and how that is making a difference in rural America.

I also heard from farm families and rural bankers about the high costs of impacting farmers' bottom line.

To relieve some pressure on this farming situation in the Midwest and, of course, my State of Iowa, I am calling on President Trump to use his emergency powers to suspend the countervailing duties on phosphate fertilizers. I also appreciate the President's recent tweet in regard to his concern about high fertilizer costs for farmers, so I am suggesting one way to him of how he could fix that.

I have long been beating the drum on another issue affecting our family farmers, and that is for the nationwide, year-round E15. There has never been a more important time to infuse markets with \$14 billion to boost the farm economy. That \$14 billion is not my figure. It comes from the economists for the Iowa corn growers.

Finally, at these 25 county Q&A's I held, Iowans told me they are sick and tired of government shutdowns. As a cosponsor of the Prevent Government Shutdowns Act, I hope that we will consider that it costs money to shut the government down, and it costs money to reopen government. We ought to applaud Senator LANKFORD on his legislation for a continuing resolution that he has been trying to push Congress to adopt for maybe the last 5 or 6 years. There is no better time to use an example of the need for Senator LANKFORD's legislation than the fact that we had a 43-day, all-government shutdown last year, and this year we have already, for the Department of Homeland Security, had a 45- or 46-day shutdown so far. Senator LANKFORD has the best idea that that will never happen again in our government—any shutdown.

Congress' failure to fund the government shouldn't be penalizing the hard-working men and women of this country.

At my 99 county meetings, I promise to bring Iowans' views back to the policymaking tables, and I intend to roll

up my sleeves and keep working on behalf of Iowans.

FISA SECTION 702 REAUTHORIZATION

Now, on another subject—and more critical because of timing—deals with FISA Section 702 reauthorization. In 5 short days, Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—FISA for short—is set to expire.

Section 702 is an essential national security tool. That law is responsible for over 60 percent of the intelligence in the President's daily brief. Section 702 enables our intelligence and law enforcement community to thwart attacks before they occur. It is, as I see it, a preventative national defense-national security issue.

Section 702 has saved countless lives in the United States and even abroad. It gives our military a strategic edge, allows us to hunt down foreign terrorists and rescue hostages, and helps us defend critical infrastructure from cyber attacks.

More recently, Section 702 has enabled more than 90 percent of CIA-driven synthetic drug disruptions abroad and prevented a mass casualty terrorist attack at a Taylor Swift concert overseas.

So there is no doubt that this is a powerful, critical tool to protect Americans. But there is also no doubt that powerful tools like this require strong oversight and accountability.

I have put a lot of attention into the fact of congressional oversight as it applies to Section 702. I have and will continue to demand transparency. I will faithfully make sure that we execute in Congress its duty to encourage oversight, but we must balance our oversight responsibilities with our responsibility to protect our country and our countrymen. I refuse to incapacitate our intelligence community at a time of conflict and when threats to our national security and prosperity continue to multiply.

Two years ago, the Reforming Intelligence and Securing America Act—RISAA for short—added critical and successful reform to section 702 in response to some abuse and overreach. I have been monitoring the implementation of these reforms for 2 years, and so I want to discuss with you some of my concerns.

One important RISAA reform was a provision that grants access to select Members of Congress to attend and conduct oversight of "any proceeding of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court." This ensures that these hearings, which necessarily occur in secret because of national security, are subject to congressional oversight in a secure way. That was intended in our legislation.

But at the end of the Biden administration, the Justice Department imposed a set of unlawful restrictions on congressional access to these proceedings. Among other things, the rules DOJ imposed allowed the Justice Department to kick Members out of the courtroom at will, also prohibiting

them from even taking notes and even prohibiting them from requesting information or sharing what they learned with their colleagues. And from my standpoint of emphasis upon oversight and following the law, this was an untenable position and situation and, of course, contrary to the compromise that was worked out during the last reauthorizations 2 years ago.

I have been fighting to fix this issue for months. I even wrote a letter to Attorney General Bondi with my Democratic colleague Senator DURBIN, demanding change. We both recognize that transparency and congressional oversight is not a Republican or Democrat responsibility or issue, but it is rather a separation of powers issue—something that you learn in eighth grade civics or high school government classes—that we call checks and balances. Around here, we don't use that term. We use the term of "oversight." In other words, Congress passes laws that appropriates money, and we have a responsibility after we do that to make sure that the executive branch faithfully executes these laws.

So today, I am happy to say that this issue has now been resolved, and an important transparency and accountability tool has been returned to the Congress. So I am really grateful to the Trump administration and the Department of Justice for revising and repairing the misguided and noncompliant procedures that were written in the previous administration. This new Department of Justice policy restores the intent of RISAA and the constitutional separation of powers to its proper boundaries with Congress as a coequal branch.

Additionally, because of my oversight, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court is working to create overflow space to ensure that all eligible Members and their staff will be able to attend proceedings and thus exercise their oversight authority.

I have no reason to understand how the Department of Justice under Biden thought they could get away with violating this responsibility that the compromise gave us to exercise our oversight responsibility. But that is the way it worked out, and now we have that corrected.

So now that DOJ has made this right, the reforms from the last reauthorization are in full effect. In the last public audit, the FBI achieved a 99-percent compliance rate with the U.S. persons queries, which have also decreased sharply overall in recent years.

The reforms that we imposed in RISAA are working. If it expires, so do its civil liberties protections and many of the oversight mechanisms.

The Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board recently reported that section 702 targeting and querying compliance remains at nearly 100 percent throughout the intelligence community. FISA, including section 702, remains subject to intense Agency, judicial, and congressional oversight and

scrutiny. So if section 702 expires, so do its civil liberties protections.

I have spent my career in the Senate holding the government accountable. I will never stop asking questions or abandon my oversight duties. That doesn't mean that we should blind ourselves and gamble with the safety of our communities. So with these oversight reforms fulfilling the intent of the previous reauthorization, I will support this year's reauthorization. Let's reauthorize 702 before it expires.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). The Senator from New Jersey.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, it has been 2 weeks since we last voted on a War Powers Resolution to responsibly end Trump's unauthorized, unconstitutional, reckless war with Iran. In just those 2 weeks, the war has continued to spiral out of control, and Americans are paying the price.

Here is where we are since we last voted and why we are calling up another War Powers Resolution for a vote, why we are forcing that debate onto this floor. Americans are facing soaring costs, and this war is making those costs explode and get worse. Prices are rising because of the decisions made by President Trump without congressional approval. Gas and essentials are surging as global energy markets react to the blockade, the destruction of energy infrastructure, and the unbelievable, immense uncertainty in the market. Inflation jumped sharply, driven overwhelming by energy costs tied to the conflict. Analysts say we spent \$25 billion during the month of March on the war, and this month, it is expected to be similar.

Now, remember, the President launched this war without congressional consent. He has basically said that any President is entitled to commit tens of billions of dollars, to commit American lives—13 we have lost, hundreds of Americans injured—as he began this war without authorization, without transparency.

Observers note that this is a war the administration initiated not only without approval but with shifting reasons for the provocation of our going to war itself.

This President has said everything: We are going to stop this regime. We want regime change and then we don't. He has said that we are going to save civilians from being murdered by this regime, and now, he says that is not the priority.

He says: Oh, we are getting in for the nuclear crisis. Even though I had obliterated it just months ago, it is now a crisis again.

His shifting reasons and provocations are bad enough, but now the outcomes he says he seeks are outcomes that have shifted themselves. He has failed to tell the American people why we are in this. He has no endgame.

Just today, the administration deployed 10,000 more U.S. troops into

harm's way into this region. Naval forces have expanded to now enforce a maritime blockade that takes the efforts of tens of thousands of American military professionals, and officials are preparing for potential additional strikes and ground operations.

So where does that leave us? Well, No. 1, if the war ended today—which it won't. It seems to be expanding. But if it ended today, the oil shock, the economic crisis would go for months and months longer—again, Americans paying the price. We still have our American troops in greater harm's way. We have an Iranian regime who—even though their near-term combat capabilities have been significantly degraded—now are flexing more power in that region and influence by choking the Strait of Hormuz, which we have not been able to stop.

The situation is worse. The regime is more extreme. The fissile material to make a nuclear weapon is still there in that theater. This President has made the situation worse, at the cost of tens of billions of dollars, American lives, and hundreds of troops injured.

The thing that makes this all worse is the enabling that Congress is doing of this war, their failure to ask for accountability, this failure to have even one open hearing on the biggest military engagement since the war in Afghanistan, not one open hearing where Congress has asked for accountability, for transparency, for facts and information.

On top of that, this body was designed just for that purpose—to provide a check and a balance, to provide oversight—and what we have done is nothing of any substance to play that critical role.

Our Founders warned us what an out-of-control Executive could do if not checked by Congress, and we are not doing it. The price we are paying—every American is feeling it. That is why this war is overwhelmingly unpopular with the American people of all political backgrounds, because they know. Not only are they feeling the pain of it economically, not only are they seeing the pain of it when American troops are killed in battle and the families live with that loss, not only knowing the pain of the hundreds injured, but they are also seeing with their own eyes how the situation is getting worse and not better.

We are bringing this War Powers Resolution back to the floor today because Congress cannot look away. Congress must do their job. Congress must stand with the American people, ask the tough questions that we deserve answers to, hold this President to account, really do our job of asking the hard yet urgent questions.

We need transparency. We need accountability. We need the Senate to do its job. So today, I again lead, with a handful of my colleagues, to bring these War Powers Resolutions, to demand a debate, to demand that this body show some account for its inac-

tion on a war, for allowing an Executive to spend tens of billions of dollars, throw the world and our Nation into economic shock, not achieve any of its stated goals with the nation of Iran, and make more of that region more dangerous and unstable by the day.

We must do our job. We must defend the Constitution, which spells out the checks and balances that should be happening but are not. But we will continue this fight. We will continue to force debate on this floor. We will continue to call on my colleagues across the aisle not to just let Donald Trump do whatever he wants but to hold him to account, to hold public hearings, to ask the difficult questions, to demand accountability.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

WORKING FAMILIES TAX CUTS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, well, today is tax day. It is not a day that conservatives usually celebrate, but this year it is a little bit different. And that is thanks to the working families tax cuts, the Big Beautiful Bill, that are allowing individuals to keep a lot more of their hard-earned money.

And as we have this discussion on tax day, it is imperative that we remember government doesn't create jobs, it creates the environment for jobs growth.

Government is not the one that is generating income. All of that comes from hard-working taxpayers. They send their hard-earned tax dollars here to Washington, DC. And today is a day we should be mindful of the imperative that we should be good stewards of the taxpayer dollar.

Now, one of the things that we heard so much about during the Biden administration was, every time you turned around, taxes were going up; inflation was going up because taxes were going up; and government spending was going up.

Well, things have changed. Things have changed. And as I said, because of the tax cuts in the Big Beautiful Bill, what we know is, citizens are seeing more money stay in their pocketbook without having to send it to DC.

What we also know is, tax refunds this year are up 24 percent, just over \$3,500—\$3,500—for most refunds. A big reason why is that almost half of the filers are claiming new tax breaks that were created in the working families tax cuts, Big Beautiful Bill.

So think about that. Half of the filers are benefiting from the bill that every single one of our Democrat colleagues voted no on that bill.

Now, Americans who claim these added deductions are seeing refunds that are \$775 higher than they were last year, and as we think about that, that is more money in your pocketbook for groceries, for gas, for car payments, for education expenses, for clothing, for things that your family wants to do with your hard-earned money.

Now, earlier today, we heard from our IRS head, and what we heard from

Mr. Bisignano is that they are really executing the mission that was put before them to drive efficiency, to process these claims, to answer questions, and to make certain that people know they can set those withholdings lower, and when they have got a deduction coming, they know how to claim that deduction, and that they get those refunds faster.

We should keep in mind that all of this is happening because of President Trump and because Republicans, indeed, have put the American people first.

They have put these hard-working taxpayers first. That is what people want to see, put them at the first of the queue. They deserve it.

Now, if we had not passed the working families tax cuts, Big Beautiful Bill, last spring and summer, we would have had a \$4 trillion tax hike. Think what that would be doing to you right now if your taxes had gone up, if those escalation rates had kicked in, things had gone up. And what we do know is that while our colleagues across the aisle, the Democrats, wanted to see Americans pay more in taxes, that what that equates to is, there would be fewer jobs; there would be lower wages; and I think one of the big ones, especially when you talk about a State like mine, Tennessee, where small business is your largest employer, then there would be less opportunity.

But because we passed that bill last summer, there is more opportunity. And our small business employers, people that are there on Main Street, are prospering, and businesses are growing.

Now, I do want to highlight some of these provisions that our Democratic colleagues chose to vote against. What we put in the working families tax cuts, the Big Beautiful Bill, that is yielding these deductions that about half of the tax filers are taking is this—this is one that I have worked on for years—and it is the bonus deduction for every senior. And for 88 percent of our Social Security recipients, it has eliminated all the income tax they have on that Social Security.

Now, I actually printed out that page from the 1040 form, and I think it is so important to see. Section 5 has that enhanced deduction for seniors. So it is, for every senior, a \$6,000 deduction. If you and your spouse are both over 65, that is a \$12,000 deduction, but it is part 5, when you get to the point that you are filling out this form, and all the instructions are right there. That is a really big deal. And what we know is that because of this provision, seniors are saving \$670.

Now, think about that. If you are a senior and you are using that deduction and you are represented by Democrats, they voted against that. They voted against allowing you to have a \$6,000 bonus deduction. And what we know is that 30 million seniors have already used that—30 million seniors. According to Mr. Bisignano, it is the most used of all the deductions. It is money in your pocket.

Now, there are millions of workers who are seeing lower taxes on tips and overtime. With the new tips deductions, senior filers are seeing a savings of \$1,370. Some have gone as high as \$5,500. These are savings that are leaving money in your pocket.

But, again, every single Democrat in this Chamber, every single one voted against that. So if you are a worker who uses and receives tips, they voted against that. If you are a senior who works with tip income, they voted against your senior deduction, and they voted against your deduction with tips.

Now, we also know that children that are born can do Trump Accounts. They are eligible for that \$1,000 seed account. These accounts will grow all through that child's life. This is a way they can have money for education or for a first home or keeping that account and letting it grow until they are ready for retirement.

But if you have a baby that was born this year, a child or a grandchild, every Democrat voted against—their having that nest egg.

So how wonderful it would be if these children came out of college debt-free. How wonderful would it be if they had that money for a downpayment. And think about overtime work. We have so many Americans that work overtime. Again, they are benefiting, but the Democrats voted against no tax on overtime.

And they also voted against the enhanced child tax credit, which benefits more than 40 million American families. So if you have children that are under 18 and you are taking that enhanced child tax credit, you are looking at that, and you see when you get to that bottom line and you look at your total deductions, your total credits, Democrats voted against that.

You know, it is so interesting, they think they should have the right of first refusal on your money. They think they know better what to do with your money than you do. They say: Send more of it to DC, and we will put it where we want it. But what we know is that the American people want to keep their money and keep it in their pocket.

Now, we also have a deduction for interest that is paid on "Made in America" vehicles. That is an important thing. So if you bought a car this past year, that interest on that car payment, you are going to be able to deduct every penny.

The Democrats also voted against the permanent extension of the lifetime gift tax exemption. Now, in Tennessee, this was very important to us for family farms. We raised that to \$15 million per individual for a couple that has a family farm or maybe a small business manufacturing company. That is \$30 million. So they will be able to pass that company and its assets on to their children and grandchildren so that they can continue to run this business.

But, bear in mind, every Democrat in this Chamber voted no. They voted against your being able to take what you have worked hard for, to build, to build that company, to carry on the legacy of that farm.

They voted against your being able to do that. They voted against an increase to the standard deduction. That is used by 90 percent of all filers. So as you fill out your tax form, remember, the Democrats said you don't deserve it, they do. They want your money. They don't want you to keep your money so they voted against raising the standard deduction.

They voted against the permanent extension of the 2017 tax cuts for businesses, which fueled investment across America.

You know what, they really have been the "no" caucus when it comes to cutting taxes. They have been the "no" caucus when it comes to allowing you to live your version of the American dream.

What they want, they want that control; they want that power. They want to be able to say: Give it to us. Let us decide what to do with your money. And, oh, by the way, they want more of it. They want you to have less.

They want more so they can waste it in the name of programs that by and large many have outlived their usefulness for the American people.

So this is tax day. We should be grateful for President Trump's leadership. Without him, there would be no Working Families Tax Cut; there wouldn't have been that Big Beautiful Bill. So instead of celebrating historic refunds, Americans, if the Democrats had been in charge, if they had their way, would be struggling to pay another \$4 trillion in taxes. Think about that one.

I am so pleased that we were able to get these taxes passed, signed, sealed, delivered, and signed into law, and that on this tax day, tens of millions of Americans are celebrating increased deductions, increased tax credits, and more money in their pockets because of larger refunds.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today as a U.S. Senator, of course, but also as a former soldier who served in uniform the last time a President rashly sent our men and women into an unjustified war in the Middle East.

I spent nearly a year in Walter Reed Army Medical Center recovering from injuries I earned in Iraq. Every morning, as I struggled to sit up straight, every time I was rolled into yet another surgery, I made sure to read the poster I had next to my hospital bed. It was a framed copy of the Soldier's Creed, the words that those lucky enough to wear the Army uniform live by.

That same framed copy now hangs by my desk here in DC. As I glanced at it

this morning, I realized there is perhaps no greater proof that Donald Trump never deigned to serve a day in his life than the mockery he makes of the Soldier's Creed's commitments every single day he has been in office.

The creed may be associated with the Army, but the sentiments hold true for all of those who wear the uniform of this great Nation. Its 13 lines tell us to be disciplined, physically and mentally tough, trained, proficient, and to look out for those who look out for us, to look out for one another.

Donald Trump is supposed to be our servicemembers' Commander in Chief. The very, very least we should expect of him is to epitomize the standards that we ask our troops to swear by, to live by. The very, very least we should expect of the Commander in Chief is to be as competent, disciplined, and professional as the men and women whose very lives hinge on his capacity to lead, on that competence and professionalism we expect to see in the White House.

The creed makes clear that our troops will never quit, that they will never leave a fallen comrade behind. Yet "Cadet Bone Spurs" is someone who will always quit. And every hour he orders our servicemembers to remain in unnecessary, growing danger, he is proving that Donald Trump does not give a damn about leaving a comrade or so, so many comrades behind. Every moment that Donald Trump leaves our heroes mired in the muck of this illegal war of choice with Iran, he is showing that he cares more about saving face than leading our troops.

So I come to the floor today with a simple question. Our military men and women go out there every day and do their jobs, no matter the risks—all on Donald Trump's orders. So I ask you, Mr. President: Why the hell can't you do your job too? Why can't you live up to the same level of proficiency as our troops?

Look, I am proud of every mission I completed in Iraq, but I would never ever wish another endless, needless, unjustified war like the one I served in on anybody else. I wouldn't wish it on the heroes who are packing up their rucks right now, knowing they may never touch American soil again. I wouldn't wish it on their families, who are being forced to spend their days anxiously awaiting news from half a world away. And I wouldn't wish it on the American people, who want their President to focus on bringing the costs down here at home, not starting new, expensive, taxpayer-funded wars continents away.

But Trump either doesn't understand or he simply doesn't care about that. From the moment this conflict began, the President has tried to shroud his incompetence behind the valor of our servicemembers. When asked to justify his illegal actions, Donald Trump has tried to hide his cowardice behind our heroes' courage. He has tried to act as if questioning why we are at war is the same as questioning the skill and bravery of our troops themselves. It isn't.

And I am here to call bullshit on the President of the United States because I know that our military will always do the best job possible. When given a mission, our servicemembers will say: Yes, I will serve. They don't say: Why me. They don't ask: Will I be safe? No. They dust off their boots, they show up, and they do what is asked of them to the best of their ability every single time, time after time, tour after tour, no matter the risk, no matter the sacrifice. They will always, always execute their orders to the maximum capability of their professionalism, and they are proud to do it.

That isn't the problem. The problem here is that the person who is supposed to be leading them spends more time talking about his Marie Antoinette ballroom than he does sitting in the Situation Room, trying to get us out of this war.

The problem is the guy who claims to be making America great again looks at the word "America" and only sees the letters "M" and "E" in the middle of it.

The problem is that the Commander in Chief not only has no idea what the end state is like for his war of choice but probably doesn't know what the term "end state" means at all.

The problem is that even in the last 2 weeks, the man who is in charge of our Nation's nuclear codes has himself gone increasingly nuclear. He is not believing literal war with Iran is enough. He has now gone on to proverbial war with the Vatican, choosing to pick fights with the Pope, of all people—the Pope.

Rather than trying to engage in any semblance of real diplomacy to end the conflict in the Middle East, he has threatened to annihilate an entire civilization, terrifying people overseas and here at home, who are understandably worried about retaliatory strikes.

Now, after 1 half-assed day of so-called negotiations with Iran, he has whipsawed to the next risky frontier in the region—a dangerous, complex, partial military blockade of the Strait of Hormuz, launching it at our Nation's expense with no justification, no explanation, or any real plan as to what comes next. His only plan seems to rely on the valor, willingness to sacrifice, and professionalism of our military men and women. But let me tell you, that is not enough. They need a true commander.

But Trump is Trump, and he is actively, unabashedly telling us how to ignore what we are all seeing with our own eyes. He is trying to declare "mission accomplished," despite his obvious failures at every single turn. He is declaring "We did it. We're winning" after all signs point to the opposite. We are still at war. Americans are still at risk. Civilians across the region are still dying for no reason that anyone can truly articulate.

In reality, the only thing that Donald Trump has accomplished over the last 6 weeks is more chaos. Because of

his choices, a new, young Ayatollah is in charge who seems even more radical than his father was. Thirteen American heroes have been killed and hundreds more wounded. More Gold Star parents are grieving their children.

More American families are struggling to avoid the spiking gas prices. They are unsure if they can pay even more every time they go to the gas station, but they have to because they need to get to work; they have to take their kids to school; they have to take their aging parents to the doctor. The farmers of Illinois, the farmers of this great Nation have seen, at a time when we should be planting, their input costs skyrocket because of Donald Trump's war of choice.

Look, war is always tragic, but when it is preventable, when it is unjustified, it is not just tragic, it is a travesty. Trump wouldn't let himself be dragged by the bone spurs to serve in Vietnam, so how dare he—how dare he—drag our Nation into a war of his choice today? But this draft dodger—this five-time draft dodger—is too infatuated with maximum pressure to make a serious effort at even minimum diplomacy.

Once again, the Trump foreign policy doctrine has proven reckless, senseless, and dangerous—a doctrine in which fact and fiction are one and the same, one in which our Commander in Chief seems to come to military decisions by virtue of temper tantrums and announces them via tweet in the middle of the night and one in which avarice outweighs advice every single time.

Look, unlike Trump, I actually know what it is like to leave your blood soaking into the desert sand a half a world away. I know what it is like—I know what it is like—and what is at stake for the troops this administration is sending into harm's way. We must safeguard their valor and their professionalism by doing our jobs.

I can tell you this: It is a whole lot easier to cover your eyes and order other Americans to sacrifice their children and sacrifice themselves if you don't have to do any of the sacrificing yourself. It is easier to send other people's children to fight in a war if you know your own children are cozy in a penthouse suite somewhere. It is easier to ignore the everyday realities of war from inside the hallowed halls of the White House where you have McDonald's being DoorDashed to the Oval Office. But it is nearly impossible—it is near impossible—if you have been actually outside the wire yourself.

So I have come to the floor today to keep true a promise I first made over two decades ago. I ran for Congress not because I wanted to be in Congress, not because I wanted to be a Congresswoman or a Senator. I ran for Congress to honor the men and women who carried me out of that bloody war zone.

I made a promise that when the drums of war started beating again, I would be in a position to make sure that our elected officials fully consider the true cost of war—not just in terms

of money but in human lives and in the sacrifices of the men and women who wear the colors of this great Nation. That was the vow I made to the troops I deployed with and to all of those who have served since I hung up my uniform.

I am here today under this great Capitol Dome to keep that most sacred oath because right now, thousands of our troops are ready to do their jobs even if it means laying down their lives. And it is tragic, it is disgusting to me that even as they prepare to do their jobs, our President and some Members of this Chamber seem so eager to neglect their own.

So as those drums of war echo louder than they have ever in years, I am here to remind Donald Trump that he does not have the authority to unilaterally force us into war. He may never have read the Constitution, but I have.

So let me direct his attention to article I, which makes clear that only Congress—only Congress—has the power to declare war. We are the ones tasked with deciding when and how Americans are sent into combat. We are the ones charged with that most solemn duty. Yet Trump is acting as if article I simply doesn't exist, as if obeying the Constitution is optional, as if our founding document is just a yellowing, crumbling piece of paper that he can crumble up and toss into the garbage can at will.

This should not, must not be a partisan issue. No matter if you are struggling to pay rent or if your name is plastered in fake gold on a building on Fifth Avenue, no one can ignore the Constitution, especially if you have sworn an oath to defend it. No matter if you are a Mar-a-Lago worker who is pulling down double shifts or if you are the President of the United States, no one is above the law.

Look, I believe fully that there are certain solemn and urgent times when our military must be called upon to defend us. There are certain moments when the threat in question is significant and imminent, instances when military force is the most effective tool at hand, and when using it is necessary to protect America and her interests.

The thing is, from what little information the Trump administration has shared publicly that he hasn't immediately contradicted—and sometimes in the same sentence—this was not one of those times. If the administration thinks that I am wrong and there was an imminent, reasonable, actual threat to America, then guess what. The floor is theirs.

Come to the Senate. We are just 20 minutes from the White House. It is not hard to find. It is even faster in your motorcade, Mr. President. It is not hard to find us. We are the building with the big dome on top. We are only a 20-minute walk.

Trump knows where the Capitol Building is. It is the spot he told the insurrectionists to march toward on January 6.

So, if his team actually believes that the war is justified, then they need to come to Congress and do their jobs: Explain their case and give the American people a say through their elected representatives, the Members who sit at every one of these desks in this Chamber.

They need to respect the American people enough to finally tell them why they are being forced to bear the costs of this conflict, both in dollars and cents and daughters and sons.

They need to respect our service-members enough to prove why war with Iran is worth having more children grow up without their moms or dads. They need to make it clear that they have thought this through and well enough that they can actually articulate what an end state with this war of choice in Iran would even look like.

When their case has been made and when the debate here in Congress is completed, then the Members of this Chamber must vote. It is our duty. Yes, it is our burden. It is the least we can do for those who are willing to sacrifice everything to safeguard this democracy.

But if the Trump administration refuses to do that—if they refuse to adhere to the Constitution—well then, it begs the question: What are you hiding? What are you hiding, Mr. President? We already know you are incompetent. What else are you hiding?

Look, we have now been at this war of choice—of Trump's choice—for a month and a half. Thousands are dead or are grieving, wounded, and suffering. Only someone as inept and unfit, someone as callous and cruel as Trump would see this as winning. Only a draft-dodging coward would think that this is the right way to engage in a war. Only a man so unqualified to be Commander in Chief would be proud to keep on risking our heroes' lives without even having a concept of a plan for how to get them back home without risking more graves at Arlington.

We can't let this chaos continue unchecked. As our troops continue to sacrifice whatever is asked of them, we Senators—we Senators—need to do the absolute minimum required of us. That is why, this week, I am calling up my War Powers Resolution, demanding that the Trump administration finally end this illegal war, and calling for some actual public oversight and accountability on behalf of the American people. It will come to the floor for a vote shortly.

So, to my Republican colleagues, you have a choice—a simple one, really. You can vote with me to end this conflict and show that you actually care about putting America first, like you claim; or you can vote to put Trump's ego first, proving that, when push comes to shove, you care more about protecting Trump's thin skin than the Constitution that you swore to defend.

At this point, it is pretty clear. Donald J. Trump will always be more in-

terested in looking out for his own self-interest rather than truly serving America's interest.

So my question is, if any of my Republican colleagues are actually brave enough to stand up and tell Donald J. Trump—the five-time draft-dodging coward—“enough.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise in support of my colleague's War Powers Resolution.

I am proud to be a cosponsor with Senator DUCKWORTH, and I am very humbled to be here in the Chamber and listen to her—to listen to her recount her own experience as to her own vow as a Member of this body and to take the very painful lesson that she absorbed when her future was completely altered by her wartime service and put it to a positive use in trying to protect others like her.

Senator DUCKWORTH proves a point that gets proven over and over and over again: that our military serves with distinction and bravery and that they serve with professionalism and excellence. But so often, the issue for them is the quality of the civilian decisions about whether they go to war or not. So often in my lifetime—in Vietnam and Iraq and now in Iran—that brave service was compromised—really, betrayed—by poor civilian decision making and for improper political reasons, rather than a careful assessment of what was in America's best interests.

I have been asking the question since this war began: Have we learned nothing from 25 years of war—unproductive war—in the Middle East?

It is pretty apparent to me, in having asked that question over and over again, that this administration has not.

This administration has not factored in the 14,000-plus deaths in wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have not factored in the more than 65,000 American troops and contractors who were injured. They have not factored in the hundreds of thousands of civilian deaths. They have not factored in the fact that the U.S. military engagements did not produce a safer region. They have not factored in the \$8 trillion spent during those 25 years. They have acted as if that history is now wiped away, and we can engage in a war in the Middle East without reflecting upon these lessons that are written in blood and in the precious resources of our Nation.

So I am not going to ask the question again today, “Have we learned nothing from 25 years of war?” because I think the answer to that, sadly, is plain.

So let me ask a different question: What have we learned in 45 days of war in Iran? What have we learned?

I would argue that we have learned at least three things: War is costly. An unwise war is deeply unpopular. Those who would make diplomacy impossible

make war inevitable. I think those are the lessons that the last 45 days have taught us.

First, war is costly.

As my colleague laid out, 13 members of our armed services—one who lived in Spotsylvania County, VA, who had purchased a home, who was within a few months of retirement and was wanting to retire to that home with his family—have died. Spouses and kids and parents and friends and brothers and sisters are mourning the losses from this unwise and illegal war.

Hundreds of our troops have been injured, and stories come out about the depth of those injuries and the lack of planning that left them exposed to the attacks that caused them to be injured. While I wish it were otherwise, it is likely that there will be more such stories.

There is also the cost in dollars. We are spending, by some estimates, between \$1 billion and \$2 billion a day. We are expecting to see the President, sometime soon, send over a new request for a dramatic increase in funding to fund this Iran war.

But let me talk about costs in a different way, just the cost to everyday Americans' pocketbooks.

Today is tax day. Today is tax day. President Trump is the "taxer in chief." Last year, he imposed chaotic tariffs on the world's economy, right before tax day, and those tariffs cost American families a couple of thousand dollars each. With this one-man tariff war that President Trump started without having congressional authority—that was, ultimately, in significant part, struck down as illegal by the Supreme Court in February of this year—last year, right before tax day, President Trump stood up and showed by his actions that he was the "taxer in chief."

This year, on tax day, we are seeing Americans pay more for food, pay more for energy, and pay more for building supplies because of the actions of this President—in particular, just the price of gas at the gas pump in Virginia and nationally. The price of gas has gone up \$1 a gallon since February 27, just because of President Trump's unilateral decision to take us to war.

Virginians buy 8 million gallons of gas a day. So that is \$8 million Virginians are having to shell out of their pockets—that they weren't having to shell out—because Donald Trump started this war.

This is happening in Illinois. It is happening in Connecticut. It is happening in Nebraska. It is happening in every State, and it is happening all over the world. We are reading about economies that are shutting down 1 day a week. We are reading about street protests in allied nations over the cost of petroleum, all driven by this one man's deciding to take us to war.

So the first lesson from the last 45 days: War is costly.

The second lesson is, an unwise war is deeply unpopular. This war is deeply unpopular with the American public.

Most of us took the last 2 weeks of recess to travel around our States. I represent Virginia, which I believe is one of the most pro-military States in the country. I spent significant time in the Hampton Roads area, which is the center of American naval power, where we build ships and subs, and it has the biggest Navy base in the world.

I spent a lot of time with Virginians over the last 2 weeks. This war is unpopular. Virginians are deployed, and they don't know why, and they don't know when they will come home.

The USS *Ford* carrier, today, passes the record for the longest deployment of a carrier in American modern history. They were supposed to be home with their families before Christmas, and they are still deployed away from their families, with significant maintenance issues reducing the quality of life on that ship.

This war is unpopular. But, of course, it is unpopular. If you go to war without a clear rationale—and the President has floated five or six of them. If you go to war without a clear plan, without apparently anticipating what everyone would have anticipated with the closure of the Strait of Hormuz, if you go to war without allies, if you go to war without Congress, the war will be unpopular. With no plan, no rationale, no allies, and no congressional debate, the war will be unpopular.

This was so easy to predict at the beginning. For some reason, the President thought the magic of his own personality could turn a war of choice into something that would be embraced by the American public. The American public is too smart for that.

So an unwise war is deeply unpopular. That is a lesson of the last 45 days.

Then, the last lesson, I believe, is a profound one that we have to acknowledge, and that is this: Those who make diplomacy impossible make war inevitable.

The President, the Vice President, and his U.N. Representative—even within the last 2 hours, in a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—said the war was necessary to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. There is no intelligence that said that Iran was near getting a nuclear weapon. If what President Trump wanted was to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, then he committed one of the most egregious blunders in the history of the United States, in his first term, when he tore up a diplomatic deal that did precisely that.

The United States and our European allies and adversaries—China and Russia—engaged in a 20-month negotiation with Iran that led to an agreement. On the first page of the agreement—page 1—Iran reaffirms that it will never seek to purchase or develop any nuclear weapons. We had the agreement with Iran for no nuclear weapons. We

had mechanisms of inspection. We had limitations on centrifuges and limitations on the enrichment of plutonium or uranium.

We had a diplomatic deal, and the President tore it up. The deal was working according to our allies. The deal was working according to President Trump's first Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, who urged him to stay in it.

The deal was working, according to the International Atomic Energy Agency that was investigating and inspecting Iranian facilities, but President Trump took a deal that guaranteed no nuclear weapons ever, and he tore it up. The United States doesn't walk away from diplomatic deals; other nations do that. But the President established a dangerous precedent. And many of us said to him at the time: If you tear up a diplomatic deal, you are paving the path to war. It might be soon or it might not be soon, but you are paving a path to war.

If you make diplomacy impossible, you make war inevitable, and that is exactly what Donald Trump has done. Those troops who have died, they have died because Trump tore up a diplomatic deal. The costs that are being experienced by American consumers, we are suffering those costs because Donald Trump tore up a diplomatic deal. The injuries to civilians, to schoolchildren, the injuries to American troops, those are occurring because Donald Trump tore up a diplomatic deal.

We still have a seal that is available right here on the walls of the Senate that has the eagle representing the United States and in each claw it is holding the arrows of war or the laurel branches of peace, and the seal of the United States always has the eagle looking to the laurel branches. We are supposed to prefer diplomacy first.

But Donald Trump has decided that a Department of Defense now needs to be a Department of War, and rules of engagement to protect civilians now can be dismissed and called stupid and things that we don't need to follow.

I hope this body still believes that America should prefer diplomacy first. I hope this body still believes in the United States being a values-based nation, not a bully nation. That is what this vote is about, and that is why I am so proud to join my colleague to support it, and I will continue to be on the floor with my colleagues every week until we stop an illegal and unwise war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am here on the floor to add my support to the resolution being brought before us by Senator DUCKWORTH. This is the third week in a row that we are having an opportunity on the Senate floor to have a short debate and a vote on the most significant military engagement

in the Middle East in many of our Senate careers.

We are now a month and a half into this bungled, mismanaged war, and we have yet to have a single hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the Senate Armed Services Committee on this war, on this military operation.

In the absence of these privileged motions that we are bringing—thankful to Senator DUCKWORTH for bringing one this week—we would have no debate, no vote on the floor on the authorization of war, maybe the most sacred charge we are given as U.S. Senators.

We should not normalize that. We should not fail to note how extraordinary it is that our Senate Republican leadership has declined to do any oversight of a war that is costing billions of dollars every week, that has already led to the loss of over a dozen American lives, that has erupted a regional war throughout the Middle East and is literally melting down economies all over the world, especially in the developing world—not a single hearing—not a single hearing—in the U.S. Senate. Secretary Rubio, Secretary Hegseth have not come to the Senate to explain what their plan is, what their strategy is, what their endgame is.

And I think we know the answer. They simply can't explain what is happening. They can't articulate a strategy. They are not ready to answer questions from Democrats or from Republicans who, I think, increasingly are starting to scratch their heads about how on earth this is in the U.S. national security interest.

Very quickly, because I know we have a number of other colleagues who want to speak, let me just talk about what has happened since we last had an opportunity to vote.

First, the impact on the U.S. economy is getting more acute. There are more and more Americans who are unable to make their lives work because we have seen a 30-percent increase in gas prices since this war began. Farmers have seen a 35-percent increase in fertilizer, a 50-percent increase in diesel costs.

That increase in agricultural costs is going to almost immediately spill over into big increases at the grocery store. And so amidst high inflation, you are now going to see costs just become prohibitive for a lot of American families—a 30-percent higher gasoline cost simply because of this war of choice.

And agricultural economy, which was already in crisis—60 percent of farmers had already said that they were in a worse financial shape this year, prior to the war, than when President Trump came into office—now that gets even worse.

What is the impact on our national security? Well, the President has said that there are a bunch of different meandering explanations and objectives for this war. He said that we want to destroy their missile program. Well,

what have we found out in the last 2 weeks? We have found out that we have come nowhere close to destroying their missile program. In fact, they still likely have the majority of their missiles. And during the cease-fire, Iran has used that time to rehabilitate and rescue many of the missiles and the launchers that were buried in rubble. China stands ready, as soon as the bombing fully ceases, to help them immediately rebuild their missile program. There is no way this campaign is going to eliminate their missile program.

Just the same, we were told that part of the objective of this war was to eliminate their nuclear program. And yet, a month and a half later, they still have all of their enriched uranium. We have not destroyed Iran's knowledge of how to produce nuclear weapons out of existence because neither are possible through a bombing campaign alone.

Sometimes regime change is an objective; sometimes it isn't. The President said: Well, we were gone last week. In fact, we have already achieved regime change. Well, technically, there is a new Ayatollah, but there is absolutely no evidence that this new Ayatollah, that this new crowd of elite leadership—mainly coming out of the hard-line IRGC—is any less provocative, any less dangerous, any less adversarial to U.S. interests. In fact, the opposite is probably true. A doddering 90-year-old Ayatollah was replaced by a group of leaders that are likely much more fanatical and probably much more effective in their aims to try to attack U.S. interests there and around the world.

Of course, one of our objectives is a new objective, the objective to reopen the Strait of Hormuz. The Strait was open before this war began; it is now closed. It is unclear whether President Trump knew that they would close the strait and just threw up his hands, didn't care about the impact on the U.S. economy or whether he didn't know—which would be egregious in and of itself—and was shocked to find out that Iran would close the strait.

We are now a month and a half into this war. The strait is still closed. The President is trying to reopen the Strait by blockading it, which is a very strange strategy, one that, in day two of this new plan, does not seem to be succeeding.

Finally, what is the impact on the world? And I just want to touch on this very shortly. A new war is erupting in the Middle East; Hezbollah was empowered by the attacks; and there is a prospect of a massive new ground invasion of Lebanon from Israel. Already, hundreds have died in that conflict. Last weekend, you likely saw images of just vicious bombings of what looked to be civilian infrastructure happening inside Lebanon. But a new war in the Middle East between Israel and Lebanon, in which thousands will likely die, in which millions will be displaced, that is horrible for U.S. interests, for

our allies' interests. The region is exploding in violence.

But even more cataclysmic in its scope is what is happening to developing nations. Developing nations' economies are literally melting down right now because a 30-percent increase in fuel costs for a short period of time is something that wouldn't tank the entirety of the American economy, even though it does great damage to individual families. But in nations where a short-term fuel shortage or a 30-percent immediate spike is something that a government or a very poor population cannot manage has caused a lot of these countries' economies to simply melt down. These governments are now closing their public operations. Universities in some developing nations are permanently closed because they can't afford to keep the lights on.

There is a rolling disaster happening throughout the world because of these energy price increases that have been designed, manufactured, by Donald Trump. So it is not just that the Middle East is exploding; it is not just that we aren't meeting any of our objectives in Iran; it is not just that American consumers are being harmed—there are billions—billions—of poor people all around the world whose lives are more miserable, whose lives are slipping into greater chaos because of this war.

So we will be down on this floor week after week, every single week, to force at least a short debate, to force a vote. And my hope is that at some point our Republican colleagues, besides one, choose to join us.

It is OK for you to support President Trump, generally and politically, and admit that this war was a massive mistake. We did that when there were Democratic Presidents in office. President Obama helped participate in a war in the Middle East, helping the Saudis be involved in a conflict in Yemen. Many of us thought that was a mistake. We came to the floor and opposed President Obama. We actually filed resolutions making it harder for President Obama to fuel that war.

So I hope, at some point, our Republican colleagues decide they can choose to just say what is clear and obvious—this war was a mistake; it should end as quickly as possible—and not believe that this is somehow incommensurate with their broader political support for the President.

You can, as a U.S. Senator, occasionally stand up to the leader of your party if it is a matter of right and wrong. I believe this is a matter of right and wrong. Maybe it won't be in today's vote, but hopefully in one of the votes we will continue to have, we can have some bipartisan agreement that this war needs to end.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MR. REED. Mr. President, first, I want to salute Senator DUCKWORTH for bringing this critical issue to the floor so that the American people can hear

what our views are on this war but also reflect their views. I also want to salute her for her heroic service in the U.S. Army.

Thank you, Senator.

I rise today to discuss the war in Iran. Forty-six days ago, President Trump unilaterally launched this war. He declined to make his case before the American people. He refused to consult Congress. He failed to present evidence of an imminent threat, and he ignored his advisers, who warned him about the peril of such an operation.

President Trump believed he alone had the judgment to engage our Nation in a major conflict, and he alone had the ability to secure a quick, complete victory.

After more than 6 weeks of war, what has the President accomplished? Thirteen American servicemembers have tragically lost their lives. More than 300 have been wounded. Thousands of civilians across the Middle East have been killed and injured, and hundreds of thousands displaced. The United States has lost dozens of aircraft, sustained significant damage to our bases, and burned through an alarming amount of our missile inventory and other munitions.

Global oil prices have surged more than 45 percent, and the cost of gasoline and household goods in our communities have risen significantly. American families are bearing the cost of a war they wanted nothing to do with and have gained nothing from.

In sum, the President took a difficult status quo and somehow managed to make it far worse.

On February 27, the Strait of Hormuz was open to maritime traffic. American farmers could count on fertilizer shipments. Our high-tech chip makers, in whom we have invested billions of dollars, could count on helium deliveries.

Today, the Strait of Hormuz is closed. Incredibly, it is now President Trump who is blockading the strait, rather than Iranians. This is a bizarre and incoherent strategy. A blockade will push prices even higher, with ripple effects on food, fuel, and consumer goods across this country—indeed across the world.

Additionally, Iran has demonstrated that it responds to military pressure with defiance, not concession. This blockade is unlikely to change Iran's negotiating position, and I worry it will do nothing more than place our servicemembers in greater danger.

Only under President Trump's chaotic tenure would a month and a half of fighting result in the United States being in a weaker strategic position than before the war began. Here are the facts. Iran still retains its nuclear program. Its ballistic missile capabilities and drone arsenal, although diminished, still pose a threat. Moreover, the regime has learned it can effectively control the Strait of Hormuz when it chooses. President Trump has badly damaged America's standing with our

allies, emboldened our adversaries, and lost any moral authority he had on the international stage. The American people, including many of his own supporters, strongly disapprove of this war.

At this stage, we must ask: What comes next?

The President has shown he will not listen to military and regional experts and is uninterested in earning the support of the American people.

While that is a decision he can make, if he is unconstrained by anything other than his "own morality," then Congress has a duty to constrain him through the powers we hold as the constitutional check and balance on the President.

Congress controls the purse. Congress declares war and ratifies treaties. Congress represents—and answers to—the American people. It is long past time for Republicans to stop avoiding their constitutional duties and start reining in the President's ability to unilaterally wage war. At a bare minimum, it is long past time they hold public hearings with Cabinet officials to provide accountability for the American people.

Now, I am relieved that the cease-fire appears to be holding for the moment. The administration should use this time wisely and immediately return to negotiating a diplomatic agreement. That means engaging in serious, structured conversation with Iran to address nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, their proxy activity, but also the sanctions that are in place and the security guarantees that the Iranians will demand.

It also means taking a realistic approach to opening the Strait of Hormuz. The Iranians have a complex, layered network of sea mines, fast attack boats, air and sea drones, missiles, and hidden launch sites in the cliffs around the strait that provide them with many effective options to threaten ships in the passage. Even if the United States cleared the strait of mines and began escorting commercial ships with our own Navy vessels, militarily suppressing and defeating Iran's ambush network is not a sustainable long-term option. A diplomatic arrangement is the only real answer. And I must say that to achieve this diplomatic arrangement, the President needs and should announce a group of experts—not real estate developers and golfing buddies—to go over there. This is not going to be settled by the friends of the President cutting a deal.

It took us almost 2 years and complicated discussions about nuclear policy, nuclear objectives, et cetera, to get the JCPOA. It is going to take us a while to settle this issue, too, and we can't settle it with a casual group negotiating on a weekend.

The President said he was shocked that Iran closed the strait and bombarded gulf nations in response to his attack. That is rather astounding because everyone with a modest knowl-

edge of the Iranian regime was not particularly shocked. Indeed, the course of this war was entirely predictable. Generations of American military and political experts have examined the Iran problem and repeatedly reached the same conclusion: War with Iran would not achieve our goal.

Indeed, President Trump was given the same warning by his advisers. According to press reports, Gen. Dan Caine the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs warned the President of becoming entangled in a prolonged conflict and expressed concerns about U.S. casualties and the difficulty caused by a lack of allies. General Caine also raised the possibility that Iran would block the Strait of Hormuz, stating it was long believed Iran would deploy mines, drones, and missiles to close the world's most vital shipping lane.

A separate intelligence official reportedly emphasized, in his words:

It wasn't just predictable. It was predicted. He was told in advance.

The President ignored the advice and decades of historical lessons and attacked anyway.

At this juncture, the administration has realized that the Iranians are not going to capitulate and that the difficult work of diplomacy cannot be wrapped up in a mere 21 hours of negotiation. Facing this reality, the President has several options.

First, the President could simply declare victory, as he has done so often, and leave the region without a deal. But what would he leave behind? A battered Iran with more antagonistic and radical leaders who may have concluded the only way to avoid future attacks is to acquire a nuclear weapon. With hundreds of pounds of enriched uranium on hand, that possibility is very real—and could be accelerated with Russian, Chinese, or North Korean assistance.

Second, the President could launch new military strikes to try to force the regime to surrender. However, this would inevitably result in renewed attacks against our forces in the region and a prolonged closure of the strait. And as I mentioned earlier, the regime has already demonstrated that its threshold for pain is high and its regard for its people is low. An extended military campaign would not change the Iranians' negotiating demands.

Now I would propose a third route. The President can resurrect serious negotiations with Iran across the full range of issues dividing our two nations. The agenda must be broad enough for both sides to claim benefit. That is the only way you get to a deal, and we hope "The Art of the Deal" is present in this situation.

The United States must address nuclear weapons, ballistic missiles, and malign proxy activity, and Iran will seek guarantees against further military operations, sanctions relief, and other assurances.

President Trump was foolish, in my view—and reflecting Senator KAINE—to

tear up the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action he inherited from President Obama, but with diplomacy, his administration may be able to regain some of the important pieces that he previously abandoned.

But there is an additional obstacle to peace that must be addressed: Prime Minister Netanyahu. Prime Minister Netanyahu has spent the better part of 30 years gathering support for what he believed to be an inevitable confrontation with Iran. His personal and political fortunes are entirely aligned with the continuation of this war. As he faces an election and a criminal trial, he is using the war as personal and political armor. Unless Trump is willing to force Netanyahu to stand down, Israel will continue operations regardless of what America does.

Mr. President, this war was ill-conceived, I oppose it, and if it is still ongoing after 60 days, I will vote against an authorization of military force to continue it. I am proud to be here today in support of Senator DUCKWORTH's proposal. From day one, Trump lacked any clear objectives and realistic views of the consequences, but peace can be accomplished. The path forward requires honesty from President Trump about what military force can and cannot achieve, the discipline to negotiate seriously, and the courage to lead our allies rather than alienate them.

Unfortunately, this President, I believe, cannot be trusted to chart this path. He has shown an intractable instinct for destruction first and diplomacy last. He will never secure a peaceful conclusion to this conflict as long as Congress allows President Trump to wage war whenever and however he sees fit. Yes, we have to stand up and be true to the oath we all took: to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this War Powers Resolution. I urge them to choose the path of peace before the costs of President Trump's war become irreversible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I rise today because I had conversations with a woman in New Jersey recently that I just can't get out of my head. I was in Atlantic City talking with a woman there about how she felt things were going in our country and for her and her family. What she said really stuck with me, seared into my mind. She said that with everything going on right now—this war and rising costs—she felt like she was “drowning.” That was the word she used—“drowning.”

That is the impact this war is having on the American people. And when someone is drowning, you don't just stand by and wait; you don't hesitate; you don't wait for somebody else to act; you act with urgency, swiftly and decisively.

That is what we are trying to do here right now. We are acting by bringing up another War Powers Resolution to bring an end to this war and give the American people the relief they need.

I know the Trump administration and Republicans here in Congress think that this war is going just fine. Depending on what day it is, Trump either is saying the war is over or threatening to escalate it. That is the problem. We are engaged in a war without a clear mission, without taking negotiations to end the war seriously, and without the consultation or buy-in of the American people.

It is a war this administration seems to think can go on almost indefinitely. They don't care about the consequences; they are simply posting their way through it on social media.

What we have seen from Republicans here in Congress isn't any better. A month and a half into this war, and we have not had a single hearing—a month and a half in.

By the way, we haven't had a hearing at all about what happened in Venezuela either.

Every one of our offices gets a flood of calls every day from people tired of this war, people who can't afford this war, who can't afford to pay for the decisions that this President made, and the Republicans in Congress have stood by and watched like bystanders.

Donald Trump, this administration, this Republican Congress—they have all just stood by and watched as the American people feel like they are drowning. If anything, they are making that feeling of extreme anxiety worse. That anxiety is driving our urgency to act.

There were a number of reasons why the woman I talked to was feeling that stress and anxiety, and one of them was gas prices. Gas prices were below \$3 a gallon in February. In New Jersey, the average price is a little more than \$4 a gallon right now, but it is so much higher in some of the biggest population centers. You go around the country, and you can find gas for \$5, even \$6 a gallon right now. If you are a working parent and you have to put gas in the tank every single week to get the kids to school and yourself to work, you are paying significantly more at the pump.

Ending this war is an urgent matter. It is not just gas for our cars that is driving this urgency. Look at the price of diesel. The average price of diesel—what a lot of trucks that transport goods run on—was \$3.72 in February. It is more than \$5.80 in New Jersey right now according to AAA. That means everything you buy, from meat and eggs to coffee and clothes, is getting more expensive because the cost of shipping it costs more than \$2 more per gallon than before.

If you are a working family looking at your bills and wondering how you are going to make ends meet, ending this war is an urgent matter.

Another concern I have heard from so many is the unhinged way that this

President has been acting during this war. Threatening to destroy a civilization—that is not American; that is not what we do; that is not who we are.

I am proud to represent tens of thousands of servicemembers in New Jersey, hundreds of thousands of veterans, people who are obeying the law, people who are abiding by the principles of our country. But this Commander in Chief is threatening to change that.

When the American people see a President threatening what would be war crimes in America's name, it sends a shock through our consciousness; it sends a clear signal that ending this war is an urgent matter. That is why we are doing what we are doing right now—because the American people can't wait for this President to act like a responsible Commander in Chief. They can't wait for this Republican Congress to wake up. They need relief, they need it now, and they deserve it now.

I can't go back to that woman in Atlantic City and tell her that she should wait, that we can address her concerns later.

I urge my colleagues to think about the people back home who need help now and the power we have with this vote to deliver it for them. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution by Senator DUCKWORTH—someone who knows better than any of us the toll that war takes and the urgency needed to stand up for our neighbors.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for his powerful words, and I, too, rise in support of this War Powers Resolution put forward by our colleague Senator DUCKWORTH, who knows a thing or two about the costs of war.

This is a resolution to halt President Trump's unjustified, illegal war against Iran—a war that the overwhelming majority of American people want to see end; a war that this Congress never authorized and where we have never had a hearing from a Trump administration decisionmaker about the war; a war that was started by President Trump and Prime Minister Netanyahu that has made us less—not more—safe; and a war that has made us much worse off, not better off.

We have lost 13 American servicemembers. Hundreds more have been wounded. Thousands of civilians, innocent civilians, have been killed throughout the region.

And the sacrifice of our servicemembers deserves more respect than the President casually remarking that “[s]adly, there will likely be more. . . . That's the way it is.” That is what President Trump said.

Well, that is not the way it is, and it is not the way it should be, and it is not the way an American President should talk about our troops. We must not and cannot normalize President Trump's reckless actions that have brought us to this point.

The costs of this war are mounting. We just saw it today: The President intends to send thousands more troops to the Middle East—6,000 as part of a naval deployment and thousands more to come later.

This war has already cost us, in addition to lives, \$52 billion—\$52 billion—and another billion dollars every day from the American taxpayers. On top of that, on top of what taxpayers will be shelling out, we are seeing Americans struggle with rising prices: gas prices, oil prices. Of course, when you have rising gas and oil prices, it drives up prices on everything else, like fertilizers that our farmers need as we go into the season of growing. And all this coming from the President who promised that he would focus on lowering prices and ending wars. He promised the American people he would be “a peacemaker,” and he is a warmonger. He lied, and because of his lies, people are dying.

Now the President wants to put even more lives at risk to open the Strait of Hormuz. We should all remind our fellow Americans that the Strait of Hormuz was open before the President started this war. It was open before the President started this war, and now the President's main goal is to reopen the Strait of Hormuz.

The President also said the other day that we achieved regime change. He just didn't tell the American people that when he knocked off some of the top Iranian leaders—the ayatollahs—they were replaced by an even more militant and even more radical regime. That is the President's definition of “regime change.”

Now, the President likes to claim periodically that we won. In fact, more than 3 weeks ago, the President of the United States said “We won,” the United States won. He said that a few days ago. The President said “We won.”

My question for my Republican colleagues is, If we won, what the hell are we still doing there? If we won, why are we still there? Why are we still putting American lives at risk? Why are we spending a billion dollars of taxpayer money a day if we won?

Well, we didn't win. And it is impossible to measure how you win because the President never set forth clear rationales for this war because there wasn't really one to be had. And certainly they have advanced no endgame, like what does it mean for him to win the war that he already said that he won.

So we know from the President's own words that there is no clear endgame here, and it is clear every day that this war is not in the interests of the American people.

Now, we have seen from President Trump not strength or leadership. What we have seen is recklessness. Now we in the Senate should apply some brakes and accountability. We have seen a President threatening massive war crimes in the name of the Amer-

ican people, threatening to end a civilization.

Colleagues, this is a time for sober and serious American leadership, and Donald Trump is not a serious leader.

In addition to threatening to end a civilization, he has attacked the Pope because the Pope seeks peace. He has posted an image of himself as Jesus Christ. This is the man in the White House who is running this war. He is putting American lives at risk and endangering people throughout the world, and he is simply not fit to be Commander in Chief.

So all of this without the consent of the American people. That is where Congress is supposed to come in.

So when the Presiding Officer is looking at a President of the United States who is so unhinged, how is it that we can only find one Republican Senator, Senator RAND PAUL—how is it that we can only find one to stand up for the Constitution and against this President who clearly is not following the will of the American people, a President who took us into an illegal war that is making us less safe and worse off? That is our job. That is our job, and this Senate keeps ducking its responsibility.

This resolution put forward by Senator DUCKWORTH is another opportunity for our Republican colleagues to show that they are going to exercise their responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States. We will keep offering War Powers Resolutions so the American people know that we are working every day to end this war which they want to see come to a close. Maybe we can begin that process today.

I thank Senator DUCKWORTH for offering this resolution and really urge my colleagues to search their souls and talk to their constituents and vote yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: Senator SCHIFF for up to 10 minutes, Senator RISCH for up to 5 minutes, Senator DUCKWORTH for up to 3 minutes, and Senator SCHUMER for up to 2 minutes.

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to stand with the American people, who are demanding that we bring an end to President Trump's war in Iran.

It has been over a month since President Trump made the decision to take us to war, and I would like to take a moment to reflect on what this illegal war has achieved and what it has cost.

President Trump's war has delivered higher costs for Americans at the pump, and it has jacked up the cost of fertilizer and fuel for Wisconsin farmers. As Americans struggle to afford basic necessities, the Trump adminis-

tration has spent tens of billions of dollars on a war that Americans did not ask for. We have lost 13 servicemembers, with hundreds of others injured. Thousands of civilians have been killed, including dozens of schoolgirls by an errant U.S. missile. President Trump has eased sanctions on Russia and shown Iran how to profit from blocking the Strait of Hormuz. The same oppressive regime remains in place, Iran still controls its enriched uranium, and the United States is no closer to a guarantee that Iran will not pursue a nuclear weapon.

In short, President Trump's war of choice has accomplished next to nothing at a tremendous cost to the American people, and still Donald Trump has been unable or unwilling to offer a coherent reason for why we are at war.

The American people are looking to Congress to do something. The people's branch is supposed to be a check on this President. We need to stand up on behalf of our constituents, who do not like this war and who want it to end. Americans know the cost of this war. They are the ones who are paying for it.

My Republican colleagues have a choice: Do your job, stand up to this President, and send a clear message to Americans by ending this war today, or live with the consequences as more civilians are killed, more servicemembers are put in harm's way, and more American families struggle to make ends meet. The choice is yours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, we are now in the second month of Trump's Iran war, and we have already, tragically, lost 13 servicemembers, including one—CW3 Robert Marzan—from my home State of California.

We are now in the second month of Trump's Iran war, and more than 200 servicemembers have been injured, some very seriously.

We are now in the second month of Trump's Iran war, and we have already had two American pilots shot down over Iran, necessitating a rescue under extremely dangerous conditions—a heroic rescue, a daring rescue, and one that was only possible because we have the most capable Special Forces in the world but a rescue mission that we must all acknowledge put an incredible number of our servicemembers at grave risk and could have easily gone wrong.

We are now in the second month of Trump's Iran war, and we have squandered tens of billions of dollars that could have been used to build hospitals and affordable housing, to build childcare centers and senior centers, at a time when the President says we can't afford daycare or Medicare or Medicaid.

We are now in the second month of Trump's Iran war, and Americans are paying astronomical prices at the gas pump, at the grocery store, on their utility bills and medical bills, but the

President's actions and inaction are only making life more unaffordable for our citizens.

We are now in the second month of Trump's Iran war, and the President has offered no proposal to even authorize the use of force in Iran, nor have Republicans demanded one. We have not had a single open hearing on the war, nor have Republicans called for one. The case for the war in Iran has never been made, will never be made, and my colleagues will not put the matter to a vote for fear they will lose that vote or be held accountable for it.

How long can this go on? And the short, terrible answer is: for a very long time. It is beginning to have all of the telltale signs of a quagmire.

For this war had no clear purpose. It had no well-defined goal. It had no strategic plan. Its rationale has shifted endlessly with the wind and the whims of the President. It has vacillated between being about regime change and then not about regime change, about missiles and then not about missiles, about oil and then not about oil, about Iran's nuclear threat and then not about its nuclear threat since the President had said the Iran nuclear program had been obliterated a year earlier.

Ironically, the administration's nuclear endgame now sounds a lot like the JCPOA, the much-maligned agreement that Trump tore up and now seems reconciled to embrace—the JCPOA or something like it.

Iran had blockaded the Strait of Hormuz sending oil prices skyrocketing, and now the Vice President says: Two can play at that game. So we are in the blockade business too.

How does that help the American family that can't afford to fill up the car, the trucker put out of work, or the farmer with no fertilizer?

The simple truth is that this administration has no idea how or when this war will end. It is hard to end a war when you are not clear on why you began it.

We can only be certain of one thing: at some point the President will claim victory. But what kind of victory will it be? One in which Iran for the first time can demand tolls from ships passing through Hormuz? One in which the regime has survived—and empowered and embittered—is even worse with more crackdowns on the Iranian people, even less tolerant of dissent, or worse still, with a fervent desire to break out and build a bomb? One in which we suffer persistent and higher gas prices because of long-term damage that has been done to gulf oil and gas infrastructure? One in which Russia is richer and will be richer for the foreseeable future from the higher oil prices it can charge so that it can better fund its war with Ukraine?

Is this the victory that Trump will declare? One for which we have paid dearly in blood and treasure? One for which we will have cut healthcare by \$200 billion more for defense to replen-

ish the stocks of the weapons that he has used?

Does that sound like victory? Does that feel like victory?

In 1984 at the height of the Cold War, Ronald Reagan said this, he said:

History teaches that wars begin when governments believe the price of aggression is cheap.

Sadly, the lessons of that history have come to pass, and they have come to pass in the form of a President who now too often sees aggression as cheap as he has launched not one, but two wars against Iran, as he has launched unilateral strikes in South America and Africa, as he has overseen a war on vessels in the Caribbean and the Eastern Pacific, as he has blockaded Cuba and threatens to "take it" along with Greenland.

To Donald Trump, war has become easy. It has become a kind of default. And as a result, he has become the President he promised he would never be. Far from his promise to end wars, he is now the President determined to start them—and lots of them.

The Founding Fathers warned us of a man like this, a President grown too fond of war, seduced by the quick success of the apprehension of Maduro and Venezuela and of the access to another country's oil, that such an operation begat, he was induced to make war against Iran.

But Iran is not Venezuela, and the son of the Ayatollah is no Delcy Rodriguez, not another pliant regime figure to be easily manipulated.

In the same speech, Reagan also said this:

To keep the peace, we and our allies must be strong enough to convince any potential aggressor that war can bring no benefit, only disaster.

This is peace through strength, his most famous mantra in foreign policy.

Well, what is the strength of our alliances now? The President has turned our back on the security pacts that Reagan championed, like NATO. He has failed to consult with our allies before embarking on this war of choice and claimed we didn't need allies, and then complained when our allies did not come to our assistance in reopening a strait that previously had been opened, but now was closed.

The President has undermined our credibility with friend and foe alike as he threatens to end a civilization or to commit war crimes or as he has ordered military strikes while talks were ongoing or as "two more weeks" becomes—well, becomes a kind of punch line.

And what have we taught Iran the ostensible aggressor in Ronald Reagan's formulation? Have we taught Iran that war can bring no benefit, or is Iran now convinced it can bring the world economy to its knees and impose its will by imposing fees on passage through the Strait of Hormuz? Does it believe that while the U.S. military can pound its navy and missile sites, it can still strike U.S. targets and our partners in

the region with rockets and drones? Does it believe it has an asymmetric advantage over the United States because drones and missiles are cheap and interceptors are expensive?

Ronald Reagan will be right, that we have convinced the aggressor that war can bring no advantage, only disaster if, in fact, it is we who are the aggressors.

This war should never have begun, and it is long past time for the U.S. Congress to put an end to it.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to oppose the resolution we are going to vote on here in just a little bit. I think this is the—I don't know how many times I have been here on this—but this is the same old, same old again.

The resolution isn't very long. It is a few pages long, and really, the operative language is very short.

It says:

Congress hereby directs the President to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against Iran.

That is all it says. It says: President Trump, put your tail between your legs and run. That is what this resolution says.

Now, let me tell you where we are. First of all, I want to talk to Iran. Iran: Nobody is coming to help you, not the Russians, not the Chinese, not the North Koreans, not Venezuela, not Cuba. Nobody is coming to help you, Iran, except for the 47 people over here.

The 47 people on this side of the room are trying to direct the President of the United States who is defending the United States—they are trying to direct him to remove the Armed Forces that we have—our brave, young men and women who are engaged in these hostilities—they are trying to remove them from these hostilities. These 47 people. Nobody else in the world.

So to them I say: The President of the United States has not only the right to do this—I know you claim he doesn't—but he has the right to do this. Not only does he have the right to do this, he has the duty to do this. He took an oath to defend the people of the United States of America.

How did we get here? Forty-seven years ago, Iran started this conflict. We did not. We did not start a war with Iran. We don't want a war with Iran. But we have to defend ourselves. Forty-seven years ago, they took over our embassy in Tehran and held all of our United States, American people who were employed in that embassy for 444 days.

Finally, Ronald Reagan was elected President. We got them out. But since that time, Iran has killed thousands—not hundreds—thousands of Americans wherever they can find them. They do it with all kinds of methods including IEDs, which are deadly.

Fortunately, President Trump in Trump 1 took out General Soleimani

who was the godfather of that operation, and that has ratcheted back. But they are still killing them with IEDs.

The President of the United States is defending the United States of America. You can pass all the resolutions you want. This President is going to defend this country.

Now, I know you say it is illegal. If, indeed, it is illegal as you claim it is, you are in the wrong room. You ought to be in the room across the street in the U.S. Supreme Court, because if it is illegal, you should sue him and you should stop it. You are not doing it because you know you are going to lose that case.

The President of the United States under article II of the Constitution gives the President the authority. He is doing it. This is not going to be a forever war. Indeed, if anything, it is ending what seems like has been a forever conflict with Iran.

Mr. President, you are doing the right thing. You have done a great job thus far. This is going to end fairly quickly. Keep up the good work.

My friends on this side of the aisle, vote to oppose this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I just listened to my colleague on the other side of the aisle who raised concerns about my War Powers Resolution, and I am disappointed—but not in any way surprised—that they continue to carry the President's water on this war.

I would welcome the chairman of Senate Committee on Foreign Relations scheduling oversight hearings for Secretary Rubio. I mean, as a former member of the committee, the Secretary should be used to testifying before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

He should schedule them because we and the American people are owed actual answers on this administration's conduct, planning, and diplomacy during this war of their own making.

And right now, American servicemembers are already in harm's way 6,000 miles east. These troops are ready to do their jobs no matter the risk or the sacrifice required of them, just as our brave American troops have always done time after time and tour after tour.

So to me, it is tragic that even as they continue to do their duties, our President and Members of Congress from the Republican side of the aisle seem so ready to neglect their own duties.

I want a democratic Iran. I want to see its people free from the iron grip of its brutal authoritarian regime, and I am not about to shed a tear for the previous Ayatollah's death. But that does not mean we should not be gravely concerned by the consequences of Trump's actions in his war of choice.

Look, I know there are solemn and urgent times when our military must be called upon to defend us. To deter-

mine when that is, there are four questions we should be asking. No. 1, is the threat significant? No. 2, is the threat imminent? No. 3, is the military the most effective tool for the goal at hand and that there are no other tools that can do the job? And No. 4, would the military be counterproductive to its most solemn mission of protecting America?

With this unconstitutional, unjustified, and unwanted regime-change war in the Middle East, Trump has traded deterrence for instability and chaos and made all of us less safe in the process. It is time for us to rein him in.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I want to thank my colleagues—my colleague from Illinois, who has done such a good job and knows all about what our veterans go through in the horrors of war; my colleague TIM KAINE, who has been so involved in this issue of War Powers Resolutions for decades—or a decade—and so many others of us who are introducing resolutions on this issue.

Now, Republicans have voted against this resolution three times now. But as the war drags on for 47 days, with no end in sight, they should join us today on this resolution to end this war once and for all.

With gas costs costing over \$4 a gallon, with inflation climbing, with mortgage rates going up, the American people literally cannot afford for Republicans to forego another opportunity to work with Democrats to end Trump's disastrous war, at long last.

Congress cannot simply sit on the sidelines while our brave servicemembers are risking their lives on the frontlines. The stakes are too high, and the risks are too great for Republicans to stay silent.

I urge my Republican colleagues to listen to the majority of Americans who are calling for an end to Trump's wanton war of choice. We still don't know the goals. We still don't know the costs. We still don't know the length of time.

There are so many unanswered questions on the most important issue that this Senate can face, which is whether to go to war, and then total silence from the other side—not a single hearing, not a single discussion on this.

Well, I am going to tell my Republican colleagues: They are not going to be able to escape continuing to vote on this. Until our Republican colleagues join us, we will continue forcing a vote on our War Powers Resolution, week after week after week.

This is an American issue, not a partisan one. This is one of the worst forays America has ever made, with so much damage that is going to be lasting.

And so I urge my colleagues to do what they know is the right thing and join us in voting for Senator DUCKWORTH's resolution.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

Mrs. BRITT. 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.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE).

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

NAYS—52

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

NOT VOTING—1

Justice

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

FARMING

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I am back again talking about something that is very, very important to everybody in the United States of America. There should be alarms going off about what is happening. I know we have a lot of bad things happening all over the world. We are in conflicts. We are in situations where we are trying to control our own destiny when we are not getting a lot of help from a lot of people that we should be counting on.

But let's talk about the United States of America for a second. Let's talk about our farmers. Our farmers are in trouble. We better wake up and smell the roses because what is happening in this country should be a crime. We have lost, just in the last few years, 150,000 farms and over 25,000 farmers—150,000. And we take pride in what we do in this country. We do everything as first class as we possibly

can and we are running people out of business right and left and it is getting worse.

Nobody is listening. Nobody is out there pounding on all of our doors saying, "We need help," other than the ones right now that are in desperate and dire need.

Again, we have a lot of problems. But you think we have problems. We start and continue to lose these farmers that we have in this country, and we continue to eat the trash that is sent in from these foreign countries, we are going to have many, many more problems.

It is a big deal because there is not one State in this country that doesn't deal in farming in some capacity—not one State. We are all involved in it. We all have skin in the game.

Agriculture is the backbone of who we are and what we are. And if we are going to continue to be the place that everybody wants to move to, to be a part of, and not a Third World country like a lot of these places that we are allowing to ship food in from, we better wake up.

You know, for some reason, the past administration either didn't understand the importance of agriculture or our farmers or, to put it bluntly, they really didn't even give a damn about it, to be honest with you. Instead, they were focused on outsourcing our food, our lumber, our fish. Anything to do with farming or agriculture, we, for some reason, were turning over everything to people outside our country. And the people that are the cream of the crop, that are true Americans in this country, are our people in agriculture.

You would think that we would have learned a thing or two back during COVID. I can remember standing up here back in the early part of COVID, back in—what was it—2020 and talking about how in the world have we allowed this country to outsource everything that we do medically? Because when we looked up and COVID was rampant, we were looking around for masks, we were looking around for drugs, looking around for things that save people lives. And guess what. We don't make any of that stuff anymore. We outsourced it all. Now we are doing the same thing to farmers.

You know, it is very dangerous to be reliant on countries like China, Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, Brazil, all these people that are either socialists or communist countries. We can't continue to do this. We can't do it.

We built this country on hard work and effort and not by handouts and not by cheap things that we buy to keep this country going, such as what is coming from China or some of these Third World countries.

One thing that we need to be doing to help our farmers is we need to be tariffing the heck out of these countries that are sending in food that is taking over our grocery stores and our restaurants that they say is great food,

it is reliable, it is best in the world, when it is nothing but trash. That is all it is, is total trash. For some reason, because we think that the price is a little bit better, we are getting involved in that—in terms of our grocery stores and our restaurants—and we are serving things that we shouldn't be serving and it is causing a lot more problems.

You know, we have got the best food safety programs and standards in this country by far. We have got to know where it was raised. We have to know what has been sprayed on the food or where the fish was caught. All the things that go along with food safety go along with farming.

You know, over the past decades—past few decades, the beef-packing industry has shrunk to the point that there are only a few plants processing the majority of our Nation's cattle today, and that is beyond stupid—really, it is. Think of what we have done. We have outsourced most of our food processing, especially when it comes to beef, to these gigantic processing companies that, by the way, are owned—two of them—by foreign entities.

President Trump did an Executive order to try to get to the bottom of what these foreign-owned meatpacking companies were doing because their prices were going so high. They were price-fixing. And what do you think is going to happen when you run into a situation where you allow people to control the market?

Think about it. These foreign entities are controlling America's meat supply at the expense of American farmers and their families—people that work hard, like all of us in this country—not to mention that the consolidation of these few processors has threatened Americans' food supply.

You know, in 1980, these foreign processors controlled about 36 percent of the beef market. Think about that. In 1980, they controlled 36 percent of the beef market. Now, today, these processing plants—two of which are foreign-owned—control 85 percent of the U.S. beef-processing market, and we are asking for huge problems.

I am not a mathematician, but I know that those numbers mean that our American-owned small meat processors have been pushed out of business, and that is what they have done. That is how they do it. They try to control everything, so they put in these four meatpacking processing plants across this country, they control it all, and the little guys are gone.

And this country was built on small businesses, small farms—everything that produced good product for U.S. citizens. That is how we were raised. That is how we were brought up.

We need to open up competition and find ways to support American meat-processing plants. We have got to do it. We have to do it. I mean, that is the job of our Agriculture Department. They have started working on that, started trying to open up more to see

what we can do. But we cannot continue to allow four meatpacking processing plants to control everything that we do when it comes to beef.

You know, when I was growing up, it was common to see "Made in America" labels on everything at the store. "Made in America." We were all proud of it. Now, it is rare. Most of the labels we see are "Made in China" or "Made in India." I want to challenge everybody: When you go in the store and you think that this product is made in America, all you have to do is look at the box or the can or whatever. You will be very, very surprised where that product is made. Very surprised. And most of the time, it is not going to be made in the good old U.S.A., and it is hurting our American farmers. It is hurting us bad.

They can put a name on it, they can put a label on it, but that doesn't mean a hill of beans. Unless it says "Made in America," we are selling our country out, we are selling our farmers out—people that have built this country.

In addition to growing our own food and producing our own medicine, we need to be using our own cotton. I want you to think about this: Our cotton farmers are broke. They have had three bad years, and it is getting worse and worse every year.

Now, this is planting season. They are putting all the cotton in the ground. They are putting fertilizer. They have got all these people out there working these tractors and machines worth hundreds of thousands of dollars that they use to plant this cotton. And if you look at it at the end of the day, the cost of putting this cotton in the ground is far and above the amount of money that they will receive when they sell this cotton.

Used to, that didn't happen. Used to, we were not challenged as much. But what have we done? We have allowed foreign countries to do everything they possibly can to outgrow and do things at a rate faster than us, and then we are allowing all this cotton to come in from other countries. Brazil is one.

And, again, if we continue to allow Brazil—without tariffing these people and let them know: Hey, if you are going to send your cotton in here, we are going to have a tough time, and we are going to lose our farmers so we are going to start tariffing your cotton and put a pricetag on it when it comes to this country.

We do not owe Brazil one thing. Our farmers don't owe them anything. We owe our farmers in this country. You know, in my State of Alabama, we are one of the top cotton producers in the country, and we bring in more than \$400 million of revenue every year to the State of Alabama. You know, our stores are filled with shirts, jeans, towels, bedding, but the problem is that you look on that tag, most of them are made overseas—everything with cotton. I mean, we don't really use cotton in this country anymore unless it comes from overseas.

American cotton farmers produce the highest quality of cotton in the world. I mean, but they are undercut by all this foreign junk that we are bringing in. So there is a lot of work that goes into cotton production, and one thing about our cotton farmers, they work 365 days a year. They make the best product they possibly can, but, unfortunately, we are held to a standard that a lot of people and a lot of things that go on—whether it is textile mills or people that are involved in the cotton business use the foreign cotton, and we don't use near as much in our country.

So my point here is that Senator CINDY HYDE-SMITH of Mississippi and I, we are introducing a bill called the Buying American Cotton Act. Now, here is the reason we are doing this: We have to save our cotton farmers. If we don't do it in the next few years, it will be over. They will all be gone. And every American in this country, when you buy something with cotton in it, that cotton is going to come from a foreign entity.

We have to do something to help them, and there is a way to do it without costing a lot of money. There is a way to do it in this building. All we have to do is pass the Buying American Cotton Act to incentivize folks to buy American cotton and bolster our American cotton producers instead of arguing about bailouts when our cotton farmers go under and they need help. Of course, we always, as the Federal Government, try to help them out, but you can't help them out enough where they can really survive in a long period of time.

So what we want to do is get away from the subsidy part and give them an opportunity through the Buying American Cotton Act to give tax credits when people buy American cotton. That is all we want to do. When people buy American cotton, they get a tax credit for it.

If you buy Brazilian cotton, you don't get a tax credit. We have to do something to help our farmers—especially these cotton farmers. When farm income improves, everything else improves. The safety-net programs go down, not to mention the additional economic activity that a strong rural economy will contribute to when you get this tax base done with farmers making a profit. Again, they haven't made any profit going on 4 or 5 years.

Instead of spending money—that is the reason we did this bill. Instead of spending money, we wanted to make sure that these farmers don't need a subsidy at the end of the year. If we give tax credits to entities that buy American cotton, we will not have to pay subsidies anymore. This is an end-all solution to helping the cotton farmers across this country.

Cotton is not just for T-shirts and stuff either. Cotton is for medical supplies, you know, military, critical materials that we use across this country. Cotton plays a key part in national security.

A nation that cannot supply its own basic materials is a nation that has surrendered its independence. And so that is why I am up here today. We are getting ready to celebrate our 250th anniversary, and our farmers have been a huge part of that. For 250 years, we grew our own food; we cut our own timber; we caught our own fish. We did everything we possibly could. But what have we done? Corporations have run out the private sector in this country—the small businesses in this country. They moved it to corporations out of this country, and they have put us in harm's way. They have really put us in harm's way.

So the Buying American Cotton Act puts our farmers in a situation where we do not have to, as a government entity, bail them out every year when they are losing money because they won't lose money, because if we buy their cotton in this country—we are the biggest buyers of cotton all over the world, the United States of America, so let's help our cotton farmers.

And one other thing I want to say about this: I have talked about this several times on the floor. It is getting pretty serious, and it is something that, again, we look at it and say: Oh, it is not going to continue to happen.

Just recently, we estimated that China has bought and owned, as of today, 300,000 acres of American farmland. I want you to think about that—300,000 acres that the Chinese own. Who is our biggest adversary? China. And we are allowing them to buy American farmland in this country, and a lot of it is by our military bases. Now, I wonder why that happens? And I don't think we are stupid, but we are crazy if we continue to let this happen.

It is an urgent and national crisis, and we have got to make sure that we keep an eye on this. And we understand there are some States that are going and telling China now that they cannot buy farmland because they run it through different entities. And that is one thing that we need to make sure that at the end of the day, that we keep an eye on this.

But I want to come up here today and let people know, our farmers are in the fourth quarter, OK? And if we don't have a good year this year, we are going to have a serious—serious—problem with our farmers going out of business. And when farmers go out of business, they are big contributors to our country when it comes to tax base, buying things, producing things, and making our country much stronger.

So I plead with people: Please start understanding what is going on here because if we don't put our foot down and we wait too long and our farmers are gone and they have sold their land, we have got a big problem ahead of us.

And, again, I think it is a huge national security threat when you are having to buy everything out of the country. Again, go back to one thing: Did we learn anything from COVID? Evidently, we didn't. And next time we

look up and you are going to have to buy everything coming from another country—especially when it comes from ag—we have got huge problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Democratic whip.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak to two or three topics. One of them is the current procedural situation in the Senate and, for that matter, the House.

It has been more than 60 days since the White House and congressional Republicans allowed funding to lapse for the Department of Homeland Security and for the government to partially shut down. This has turned out to be the longest government shutdown in American history.

Day after day and week after week, Senate Democrats came to the floor and proposed funding all of the Department of Homeland Security except two specific Agencies—ICE and the CBP agents. Do you remember that, Mr. President?

In one instance, my colleague from Oregon Senator MERKLEY sought unanimous consent to pass legislation to pay all TSA employees. Unfortunately, the Republican majority objected.

In another instance, my colleague from Connecticut Mr. MURPHY sought to pass legislation to pay members of our Coast Guard. Republicans objected to that too.

In all, Republicans blocked bills to fund TSA, FEMA, and the Coast Guard a total of 14 times. Why would they block the funding of these critical Agencies? Because the White House and my Republican colleagues refuse to sit down and talk about the future of ICE and whether the rules that apply to law enforcement all across the United States will apply to ICE.

It is an Agency that we have seen in realtime terrorizing communities like Chicago and Minneapolis across this country with increasingly violent and militarized enforcement operations. You can't miss the ICE agents. They wear masks. The only law enforcement Agency in the United States that I know of—Federal, State, or local—where their officers wear masks. Many of them, historically, didn't even have a name tag to identify who they are. They are a paramilitary force created by President Trump and Stephen Miller to harass people who may be here illegally when it comes to immigration.

All of this occurred when the chaos at our airports grew and essential workers went unpaid. Instead of agreeing to reforms, the White House took Executive action to skirt accountability.

What has happened to ICE? After the killings in Minneapolis and the violence in Chicago and other cities, ICE virtually disappeared. When the director of the Department of Homeland Security was forced to resign, we had a new director come on board—the Senator from Oklahoma. What has happened to him? They have gone radio silent.

The only evidence that the ICE agents are still around and working was when they were dispatched to airports. And for some reason—it may be part of the current charm offensive for ICE—they were told they don't have to wear a mask if they are in an airport. This makes no sense at all if you buy their explanation that the ICE agents are so vulnerable.

What happened when they were in the airport? It is reported that they arrested and detained over 800 people.

Remember what ICE was supposed to do? It was supposed to make us safe—safe in our homes and neighborhoods, safe across the United States. The President said over and over again: ICE is going to go after the worst of the worst. Rapists, murderers, terrorists, the criminally insane—we are going to go find them.

So what has happened in the months that ICE has been on this crusade? One out of seven people that they have detained or removed from the United States actually had a serious criminal record. It made no difference; the Stephen Miller plan is to put fear in the hearts of all the immigrants to the United States, and that is what they set out to do. It is not a question of safety in the neighborhoods; it is a question of whether or not we are going to tolerate immigration in America.

I think there ought to be some basics in a bipartisan agreement when it comes to immigration. Let me tell you what I think those basics are. We should never knowingly allow a dangerous person to come into this country. Second, if there is a person in this country that is seeking legal status and they do something serious, like commission of a crime or they are dangerous, they are gone—gone. Third, we cannot absorb at any one time all the people in the world who want to come to the United States. We need to have an orderly system. I think those three elements are the starting point of a bipartisan conversation.

When it comes to the future of immigration, I was involved several years ago with the Gang of 8—four Democratic Senators, four Republican Senators—among them, John McCain and CHUCK SCHUMER. We sat down for months and wrote up a bill: comprehensive immigration reform. It was supported by business and labor and

the agriculture groups, and by and large, it was bipartisan from start to finish. More money was put into border security than ever in the history of the United States.

That bill passed the U.S. Senate with a bipartisan vote. That should have been the beginning of a conversation that leads us away from where we are today, but what happened? It was sent to the Republican-controlled House of Representatives and, for a variety of political reasons, went nowhere.

It is time for us to return and visit that issue again for a comprehensive immigration reform plan. We have to tell Stephen Miller to cool it.

As far as I am concerned, to turn ICE loose on more and more communities is just to make people fearful and not solve the problem we face. We have to work together to solve it with a comprehensive plan, and we should be started on that immediately.

IRAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will also tell you that when it comes to the future involvement of the United States, we have a serious question in the Middle East. I cannot tell you what the objective of the President is when it comes to the war in Iran. If you take a look at what happened today—we had a rollcall vote on my colleague Senator DUCKWORTH's motion that would have given Congress the authority to declare war, as the Constitution states in article I, section 8. It was defeated on a partisan vote once again. We have tried this two or three other times.

This is an effort to make sure that we have a conversation about the war in Iran. Do you know how many public hearings we have had in Congress about the invasion of Iran? None. Not one. We are virtually in a war that has gone on now for 70 days or so, and we have not debated it.

What is the purpose of our invasion of Iran? The President has given six, seven, eight different explanations, depending on the time of day. One day, it is to close the Strait of Hormuz; the next day, it is to open the Strait of Hormuz. One day, it is to get regime change in Iran; the next day, it is to reject the regime that is governing in Iran. The next day, we are going to eliminate missiles. And it goes on and on. You can't keep up with it.

The problem, of course, is that there is an impact on families all across the world but especially in the United States when it comes to the cost of living. When you ask American families "How are you doing?" they say "Not so well, thank you."

When we take a look at the cost of raising a family these days, we see the cost of groceries hitting an alltime high; we see our utility bills going up—in Illinois, they have gone up 15 percent this year over last year; we see the cost of gasoline going through the roof. It is over \$4 a gallon in Illinois and in some parts of Chicago, over \$5 a

gallon. That is a real hardship on working families.

Why are we in this mess with gasoline? Because of the invasion of Iran and the disruption of the flow of oil through the Strait of Hormuz into Europe and beyond. That is the reality of the President's invasion.

Did anyone in the White House or the Department of Defense sit down and measure the impact of what it would mean if we invaded Iran on the global economy? This morning, I heard on the radio someone predicting the possibility of a global recession.

Was that part of your calculation, Mr. President?

We don't know because we can't understand what the President's motives are on a day-to-day basis when it comes to the future of Iran.

Do we want Iran to have a nuclear weapon? Of course not. What have we done about it? Under the Obama administration, we negotiated international inspectors to go into Iran to see whether or not they were developing a nuclear bomb. I met with some of those inspectors on a regular basis. They were getting doors opened and questions asked and answered, photos being taken, and a reporting at the time.

What happened with President Trump in his first term? He eliminated the agreement that created the inspectors. Then what did he replace it with? Nothing. Nothing until he invaded Iran 2 months ago.

We need international inspectors in place to make sure that Iran does not develop a nuclear weapon, and we certainly are not moving in that direction with the President Trump invasion.

So we have the situation in which the President's chaos and cost-of-living increases and confusion have really created problems for families across the United States. It is time for us to remember that our goal is to make it better for those who are raising children and trying to feed a family. This war in Iran is not the answer to that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

IRAN

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, we are now 46 days into President Trump's war on Iran and Lebanon. This war is wrong. This war is hurting the United States, our citizens, and our security. This war is destabilizing the Middle East and spreading to Iraq, Kuwait, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Qatar, Jordan, and, of course, not to mention Lebanon.

This war has imperiled our economy, imposing unsustainable burdens on the American family. The average American family will pay \$2,000 more for gas each year if prices stay this high. The average Vermont household will pay another thousand dollars to heat their home this year. Farms across rural

America are going to pay tens of thousands of dollars extra for fertilizer because of the closure of the Strait of Hormuz.

The war is imperiling our world economy. The IMF has concluded that the growth in the economy around the world could drop by 2 percent, risking a global recession. Food prices are increasing around the world. In Sudan, the price for wheat is up 70 percent because of the war, and that is in a country on the brink of absolute starvation.

How did this happen? How did it happen? We got here because the President disregarded his own promises of staying out of Middle East wars. He disregarded the American people by not leveling with them about what his plan was and what his intentions were. He disregarded Congress entirely, and he has totally disregarded our allies. So is it any surprise that we find ourselves right now with President Trump stuck dealing with this situation that he created pretty much by himself?

Instead of consulting with our allies or even his own administration, the President relied on Prime Minister Netanyahu, inviting him to the Situation Room—never been done before.

Netanyahu assured him: No problem. You bomb, we bomb—the regime will collapse. You bomb, we bomb—the Strait of Hormuz will stay open.

President Trump accepted that advice and rejected the advice of his own Cabinet officials, who called that for what it was. The Netanyahu advice was farcical. We have seen what happened. Oil has gone from \$70 a barrel to a high of more than \$120 a barrel. Fertilizer prices have jumped from \$400 a ton to \$700 a ton. Helium prices, which none of us really thought much about, have gone up 100 percent, and that has created an enormous supply chain crisis for the semiconductor industry upon which all of us are dependent.

President Trump is now in the remarkable position of closing the Strait of Hormuz himself, supposedly for the stated purpose of opening it. For those of us who were here in the Vietnam years, that is very reminiscent of the administration position that we had to destroy a village in order to save it.

It has just become indisputably clear that the President and Secretary of War Hegseth really had no plan other than, as President Trump put it, to bomb Iran into the stone age. And that is what is happening. The bombing has been among the most intense bombing campaigns in the history of air warfare. The United States has carried out more than 13,000 airstrikes. Israel has carried out more than 10,000 strikes, dropping over 18,000 bombs. In the first 100 hours, the United States and Israel hit more targets in Iran than in the first 6 months of the bombing campaign against ISIS.

These strikes have taken a devastating toll on civilians and clearly civilian targets. Just talk about in Iran. U.S.-Israeli strikes have hit 60 hospitals; 44 schools, including that

girls school that was horrifying to all of us; the major B1 highway bridge, used by civilians, killing 13 civilians; major pharmaceutical plants that were producing anti-cancer drugs and had associated with them 200,000 jobs; desalination plants; sports stadiums; Tehran's synagogue.

While the President says the Iranian people are not our adversary, thousands of civilians have been killed in these strikes. On average, 10 children a day have been killed in U.S.-Israeli airstrikes. Nearly 40 percent of the attacks have taken place in the heart of Tehran, a dense urban area, and 95 percent of those killed by bombs are civilians.

This kind of bombing tells us that President Trump has made the Iranian people—the very people he promised to save—the adversary, the enemy, much more so than the ayatollahs.

It is time to end this war of choice, this war that was chosen by a very in-temperate decision by our President, this war that is making Americans less secure, and this war that is and will continue to impose extraordinary economic pain on our citizens.

It is very clear that President Trump and his negotiators—Mr. Witkoff and Mr. Kushner—have a fundamental misunderstanding of the regime they are dealing with.

In the course of this war, President Trump has changed the narrative. Three months ago, we were focused on the violence of the Iranian regime toward its own people. Today, with the closure of the Strait of Hormuz and the economic pain that the ayatollahs have been able to inflict on the world, the narrative is about the ayatollahs standing up to the United States and Israel.

Trump's bombing has damaged Iran, and it has hurt the Iranian people, but it has also given everyone and the ayatollahs leverage over our economy and the world economy. The threats that the President makes to the ayatollahs don't particularly move them, and it is something he doesn't understand. This is not a real estate deal. What the ayatollahs have shown—and this is horrifying—is that they are prepared to destroy their own country if that is what it takes for them to stay in power. So these threats the President makes fall on deaf ears.

As a first step in ending this war, I urge my colleagues to support Senator SANDERS' joint resolutions of disapproval, which we will be taking up later today. Those resolutions would stop the United States from sending bombs—thousands of bombs—and armored bulldozers to Israel.

These weapons are paid for by the American taxpayers. We will be sending bombs to Israel at a time when we are in a cease-fire, which I hope will continue. These bulldozers are being used, literally—literally—to bulldoze entire villages in Lebanon on behalf of Israel's intentions.

And I want to note that if this vote is successful on the JRDs, it would

simply force a debate. It wouldn't stop anything. It would require those of us in the U.S. Senate, those of us who by virtue of our election have the article I authority to declare war—it would require us to say yes or no on where we stand. It would require us to accept our responsibility under the Constitution to do our job on the most profound question that affects the people of this country, and that is when, whether, and why to commit this country to war.

I hope my colleagues will vote in favor of these JRDs, and I am disappointed that we rejected Senator DUCKWORTH's resolution. We need this cease-fire to continue. We need the bombing to stop and stay stopped.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

BEAUTIFYING FEDERAL CIVIC ARCHITECTURE ACT

Mr. BANKS. Mr. President, as you know, one of the great privileges of this job is to come down and to speak on this floor—the floor of the U.S. Senate—about the important issues of the day. What an honor it is as new Senators to come and look around and be stunned by this building, by this room, this floor.

There is something truly inspiring about such a beautiful room as this Chamber. In fact, I encourage everyone here—my colleagues, the pages, the staff, all of those in the Gallery who are with us today—to marvel at just how beautiful this room is. It is truly stunning.

Take a look around, and take it in. I have been here for a year and a half now. It never gets old, walking onto the floor of the U.S. Senate and being in this room, the Senate Chamber.

Look at the attention to detail, every bit of it, from the carpet to the ceiling, from the doors to the ornaments on the wall, the Senate floor is just one room in one of the most beautiful buildings in the entire world.

Beautiful architecture is a vital part of civic life. What any society builds is representative of the values that that society holds dear. A society that believes in its goodness and beauty will build beautiful things.

A great country will build great and beautiful buildings like this one, and then they will be shaped by them. In fact, it was the great Winston Churchill who said:

We shape our buildings and afterward our buildings shape us.

So well put.

But a society that has given up on believing in its goodness and beauty will fall into a cult of ugliness.

Sadly, the classical style of architecture that brought beauty to so much of the world has come under serious attack, and it is time to reverse that trend.

Last year, President Trump issued an Executive order just like one that he

signed at the end of his first term and that he signed again at the beginning of his second term, called Making Federal Architecture Beautiful Again. And that Executive order mandates that classical and traditional architecture is the design for Federal buildings.

Shortly after President Trump signed that Executive order, I introduced the Beautifying Federal Civic Architecture Act, which would make it the policy of the United States that classical and traditional architecture should be the preferred design for all Federal public buildings.

My bill also directs architects and buildings to consult with local communities where building projects are taking place and to hear directly from them about what they want to see built in their own communities.

I hope that my bill will soon get a vote on this floor to codify and make permanent what President Trump has done in his Executive order.

But I want to spend a few minutes on the floor today explaining why beautiful architecture really matters and what is lost when we abandon it.

I have talked before on this floor about my background. I grew up in a trailer park, the son of a factory worker in a small town in Indiana. The neighborhood that I was raised in, I suppose, didn't exactly have what you would call beautiful buildings that you would look around and admire.

But I didn't have to travel too far away from that trailer park to see beautiful architecture. I got used to seeing the magnificent county courthouse—the Whitley County Courthouse—in Columbia City, IN, my hometown, that is right in the middle of the town square. Every time I saw it, from the time I was a little boy until even today, when I drive by it and see it regularly, I am always inspired by the dome of that beautiful courthouse building in my small town.

I was the first in my family to go to college. And when I got to Indiana University, I looked around, and there were several beautiful buildings on the campus. The building that I spent the most time in was Woodburn Hall, and the intricate mural that was painted in Woodburn 101, where I heard most of my boring political science lectures, was painted by Thomas Hart Benton. I remember looking at that incredible mural during those lectures and being inspired by something beautiful.

Now, my Fort Wayne office, which is my State headquarters, was also the same office that I occupied when I served in the House of Representatives for 8 years in my district. My office in the E. Ross Adair Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, in downtown Fort Wayne, is another great, classical-style building that is built in my State.

When I say that these buildings are inspiring, I am referring to that feeling that you get when you see something beautiful, something that is built to last, something that is transcendent.

Beautiful buildings make us look upward, toward the heavens, reminding

us that there is something out there that is bigger than ourselves. That is the transformative power of beautiful architecture.

Across so much of Europe, you see these magnificent buildings that were built hundreds of years ago that are still standing today. We should still be able to build those same types of beautiful, long-lasting buildings in the United States of America.

Take a look at these two Federal courthouses, just as an example. Look at the Federal courthouse in my capital city, in Indianapolis, and then the Federal courthouse in Salt Lake City. And look at how the courthouse in Indianapolis looks sturdy and solid and how regal and beautiful it really looks with that design. It is a testament to the importance of the law.

And then take a look at the Federal courthouse in Salt Lake City—in downtown Salt Lake City—and you don't see any of that. In fact, frankly, it looks like a prison—I mean, literally. It lacks symmetry, and it is anything but beautiful. It is actually really gross, and a lot of people who live in Salt Lake City agree with that.

In fact, Indiana has a great track record of really building beautiful buildings, using classical architecture.

After I graduated college and worked at a few jobs here and there and moved back to start a family in my same hometown, outside of Fort Wayne, I went to work for a fifth-generation family commercial construction company called Hagerman Construction. They have built a lot of buildings from the early 1900s to today that use classical architecture styles.

But one of my favorite buildings that they ever built is the famous Lincoln Bank Tower in downtown Fort Wayne. It is built in art deco style, and it incorporates classical design elements. The Lincoln Bank Tower started construction in 1929, and it was finished in less than 1 year.

You think about that, and when I was working at that construction company, I used to talk to the project managers and the construction superintendents, and they used to tell me that there is no way you could build a building like the iconic and most beautiful building in downtown Fort Wayne, the Lincoln Tower, in less than a year.

In fact, it would take several years to build something like that today, and it would cost a whole lot more in today-dollars versus dollars in 1929 to do it. That is because of how much we have done that has created so much more redtape when you build buildings and all the hoops that you have to go through to build something as beautiful as something like that today.

Another example is the Christ Chapel at Hillsdale College. It is another beautiful, neoclassical building that happens to have been built by another company headquartered in Fort Wayne called Weigand Construction. It is truly one of the most beautiful build-

ings that I have ever seen or been in, in our great country.

Hoosiers know how to build beautiful things and build beautiful buildings. I am very proud of both of those buildings that have Hoosier roots.

As I said, I am the son of a factory worker and a nursing home cook. But though I come from humble beginnings, I couldn't help but be moved by these beautiful buildings in Indiana and other places I visited. Those beautiful buildings, which I still see today, made me realize that beautiful architecture really is for everybody.

They are not simply architecture—these big buildings, these beautiful buildings—they are not simply for rich people or the elites or the upper classes of our society. Everyone deserves to be surrounded by beauty, especially in this great country. That is especially true in Washington, DC, our Nation's Capital.

Washington, DC, is the most important and powerful city in the entire world, and I can't think of any other city that has been as consequential in world affairs as Washington, DC, the city that we are in today.

Given this city's power and importance, it should follow that DC would be beautiful, every bit of it. For large parts of DC, this city is truly magnificent.

Washington, DC, is home to some of the most beautiful buildings certainly anywhere in our country but anywhere around the world. We have the grandeur of the White House, the U.S. Capitol Building, the Library of Congress—truly one of my favorites—the Department of Agriculture, and many other beautiful buildings that make up this Capital City.

Because these buildings are built in classical and traditional styles, these buildings convey a sense of importance, power, and dignity. They tell us that those who pass through them and by them on sidewalks are important and that consequential things are happening inside of these buildings.

The old Senate Chamber, by the way, just down the hallway, is another incredible room that was designed by a brilliant architect named Benjamin Latrobe.

And when he built it, he talked about building the old Senate Chamber, and when he expanded it as the country expanded, he talked about how it represented a great and growing Nation. And then Dr. William Thornton was the original architect of the U.S. Capitol the guy who designed and built the place.

And he talked about how he designed it in a way for the Presiding Officer and I to be inspired as lawmakers to do good things. It just goes to show that architecture matters. And that is how we should think about the buildings all across Washington, DC, that they represent the very best of our Nation.

When President Trump decided to build a new White House ballroom, many of the so-called elites sneered at

it. They made fun of it. They said it was gaudy and imperial, but really it was nothing like that. In fact, most Americans saw the ballroom as a return to grace. Finally, the White House would have a beautiful place to gather a lot of people, fitting of the important role for our Nation's most famous building to bring people together in an even more beautiful place than what it already is.

I am glad that President Trump is making Washington, DC, and the White House even more beautiful than what it was before, but, tragically, DC is also home to some of the ugliest buildings that you can find anywhere. They are some of the ugliest buildings certainly that I have ever seen, and it is because we allow brutalism to infect our Nation's Capital. Brutalism is an architectural style that emerged in the 1950s.

Brutalist buildings all look alike because they are all alike. They are made out of raw concrete. They are big blocks of raw concrete, and they are ugly because of that. They look like they are built on top of each other.

In fact, the J. Edgar Hoover Building the home of the FBI is an ugly brutalist disaster. The Hubert Humphrey Building home to the Department of Health and Human Services looks straight out of a communist, nightmarish block. In fact, Dr. Ben Carson who used to serve in that building referred to it as "10 floors of basement," is what he called it.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is another awful building. These brutalist buildings have no place in our Nation's Capital because our country is not ugly. Actually, Dr. Carson served in the HUD building, and he called that 10 floors of basement.

We deserve to be inspired by the buildings around us, not depressed by them. The buildings that we build leave an impact on all of us. The question to ask is, How did we get here? How did we allow a cult of ugliness to take over large parts of the United States?

And make no mistake, this didn't happen by accident. Cultural elites did this on purpose. They made our world uglier because when you do that, you change what citizens expect from public life. A world that looks ugly produces a culture that only sees ugliness.

That is why the targets of the ugliness were often Federal and civic buildings. When official government business takes place in ugly buildings, the citizens lose belief in their government's goodness. But I am telling you, because of President Trump's Executive order and the bill that I have introduced, we can really change that one building at a time.

President Trump is leading the charge with his White House renovations and his Making Federal Architecture Beautiful Again Executive order, and President Trump is making our country great and beautiful again. And

that is why it is really important that we pass my bill the Beautifying Federal Civic Architecture Act.

We need to make sure that classical and traditional architecture are the preferred design preferences for all Federal buildings and that residents have a say in the types of buildings that are built in their communities. Elitist architects shouldn't be allowed to steamroll over regular Americans and force anti-American building designs on all of us.

Our country is beautiful. Our country is the greatest country on Earth in the history of the world, and we owe it to ourselves and our children to build beautiful buildings that reflect who we really are as a country.

And sure, maybe sometimes building beautiful buildings will cost more than building ugly ones—I will grant you that—but beautiful buildings last. They are transcendent; it is worth it. That is what our country deserves, especially this great country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). The Senator from Virginia.

SUDAN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I come before you today to mark the third anniversary and, unfortunately, the start of the fourth year of conflict of the war in Sudan.

Sudan is home to the largest humanitarian and displacement crisis in the whole world. This conflict and the resulting humanitarian crisis are largely being ignored by people across the world, including in our country, who are best positioned to make a difference.

The war in Sudan started because a few years back, one of the most brutal dictators of the 20th century was actually overthrown by civil society and young people in Sudan looking for a better country. It was an effort to move toward a democracy, but that move was suddenly halted by two generals, each of a separate warring party and, unfortunately, fueled by external actors.

The violence in Sudan has caused upwards of 15 million people to flee their homes—a quarter of the population—and has left literally half of the country's 50 million people on the brink of starvation and acute hunger. Yet, still now 3 years in—and I understand how they feel—the Sudanese people feel basically forgotten by the world.

Now, I have come to the floor previously to speak out on this issue, and I rise again today because this conflict cannot continue to be ignored. America must lead, not back away, in times like these when suffering and terror are at their peak.

At the heart of this crisis is the ongoing violence between the Sudanese Armed Forces—remnants of the previous government—called the SAF, and the Rapid Support Forces—another militia group—both fighting against each

other for control of the country. It is estimated that the fighting and resulting food crisis may have killed more than 100,000 Sudanese and left millions more on the verge of starvation.

The remarkable thing is that there are no good guys here. Both the SAF and the RSF have inflicted horrible atrocities on the people of Sudan. The U.S. Government has accused members of both SAF and the RSF of war crimes, while in January of last year, the State Department issued a determination that genocide had literally been committed by the RSF and its allied militias in the Darfur region of Sudan.

The World Food Programme, which we are huge supporters of, has declared a famine in parts of southern and western Sudan, and there is a high risk of this famine condition spreading across the balance of the country.

Sudan's economy has collapsed. Unemployment now is close to 50 percent of the whole population. A generation of children risk being denied education because of how dangerous it is to even go to school.

Conditions, unfortunately, may actually get worse. We have seen the war in Iran dramatically disrupt fuel and fertilizer shipments—particularly devastating as Sudan enters what should be its planting season in coming months. Globally, the United Nations has warned that the impacts stemming from these fuel, fertilizer, and supply chain disruptions would place more than, again, 45 million people in Sudan at risk of acute hunger.

Let's be clear. This is a catastrophe. In fact, more people die every day in Sudan than Gaza and Ukraine combined.

It is not a new issue. I pushed the Biden administration repeatedly. But the U.S. response in addressing the scale of suffering that we see remains, unfortunately, woefully inadequate.

First and foremost, the Sudanese people need humanitarian aid. They need aid workers, humanitarian organizations. And the local Sudanese volunteers, many who put their lives at risk on a daily basis, need the access to respond.

Unfortunately, the current administration dismantled USAID and the broader U.S. foreign assistance infrastructure, so there is no clear and coordinated diplomatic strategy for addressing this conflict, for rallying the international community, for coordinating with local responders and organizations on the ground.

Now, because of the war with Iran, foreign policy choices risk dramatically worsened conditions. When we dismantled USAID and the funding of the administration, we literally had a situation where American food and medicine that we had paid for were sitting on ships in the port of Sudan, and the workers that were literally paid a dollar or two a day to take that food and distribute it, because we shut down USAID, were left without any distribution network. So in some cases, this

extraordinarily valuable food and medicine literally rotted on the ships.

Due to the absence of strong U.S. leadership in addressing this conflict and the fact that the international bodies have not been coordinated, there has been an opening here for outside influence. Foreign entities and governments are backing their surrogates on each side in a way that is, again, chilling.

In my State, in Virginia, we have a large Sudanese diaspora. Since the conflict began, I have sat with and heard from many members of that community, and it is clear what must be done.

I still remember a young family. Literally, they were in their late twenties. They had to rush and leave the country because the civil war was breaking out. They left behind at that point, I think, their 6-month-old daughter. Three years later, their aging parents are not really able to take care of that daughter, who is now 3½ years old. The parents have not seen the daughter in 3 years, and they have no idea what will happen to her on a going-forward basis.

The Sudanese people did not ask for this war. As I mentioned at the outset, the outbreak of this violence and this civil war between these warring generals, warring groups trying to divide the spoils of the country, came literally 4 years after pro-democracy protests swept parts of Sudan in 2019.

In 2019, literally the young people of Sudan overthrew al-Bashir, the previous dictator who had been around for close to 40 years. What happened was there were literally hundreds of civic, professional, and political organizations that came together at that moment in the revolution—this was a people's revolution—and they thought that after the long term of this dictator, they might finally have civil liberties and an actual democracy.

I believe very strongly that the Sudanese people deserve an opportunity to live in peace and to have a responsive, democratically elected government that incorporates civil society, women, and youth. Instead, we have some of our allies in the region—Saudi Arabia backing one side and the Emirates backing another. Because of this divide, you now have other countries, like Russia and Iran, coming in to try to make more mischief and try to bring about more hardships.

Again, I urge all of us on both sides of the aisle to do more about this crisis in Sudan. I urge the administration to go forward and choose an envoy in the way the Biden administration had chosen former Congressman Tom Perriello. Please choose an envoy that can represent the President. This is a conflict by which the President of the United States, with the enormous influence he has with countries in the gulf, could use that power to, frankly, cut off the aid that funds this civil war tomorrow.

As we enter the fourth year of this conflict, please, regardless of partisan affiliation, we all ought to urge Presi-

dent Trump to make sure this conflict comes to an end so that, at the end of the day, the Sudanese people, whether they are in Sudan or are part of the diaspora around the world, can actually live in peace, have a government that reflects their needs, have a country that is blessed with lots of natural resources, and can actually enjoy the potential prosperity that was promised—that held out that hope—back in 2019 when young people overthrew the prior dictatorship. We should no longer allow this crisis to go unheard or unrecognized. Part of the problem is that, unfortunately, the country has barred a lot of the international press.

I urge any of my colleagues, as there are Sudanese diasporas in every State in our country, to meet with those communities, to hear their stories, to hear their struggles.

You know, again, there are no good guys in this battle between these warring factions. American leadership could bring this war to an end. It would go a great deal toward restoring people's trust around the world of the value of strong, moral American leadership.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

DIRECT FILE ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, it is tax day, April 15—the anti-holiday.

This tax day, in particular, is a tough one. Tax day 2026 is a reminder that Donald Trump and Republicans will put the interests of giant corporations ahead of the interests of typical Americans. There is no clearer example of Trump corruption in practice than betraying taxpayers and killing the Direct File Program as a favor to his allies.

Here is what this is all about: When it comes to taxes, Democrats start with the proposition that for the vast majority of Americans—wage-earning workers whose taxes really aren't complicated—filing your taxes ought to be free and easy. Our view is you shouldn't have to pay a penny to perform your basic civic duty.

That is why, back in 2022, after years of hard work, we passed funding for the IRS to build a Direct File Program, a way for taxpayers to file directly with the IRS online for free. The IRS launched a pilot project for 2024. They expanded it in 2025. Hundreds of thousands of people used Direct File. It was hugely popular—in effect, a beloved program. A lot of people are skeptical that the government is still capable of building useful things. Direct File proved the skeptics wrong. It proved that the Federal Government can still come up with great public services from the ground up.

Well, the tax prep giants saw it as a threat, and over the years, I saw them spend millions to try to defend the status quo that was failing. The prep giants unleashed a tidal wave of lobbying

to try to squash the program before it reached escape velocity. They found some willing partners in Republicans here. Going into this year, Trump and Republicans killed Direct File. Millions of Americans should have had an opportunity to use it to file for free, but now, they are back at the mercy of the tax prep companies.

The Republicans who killed Direct File say it is no big deal because there are other free options out there, programs that partner with the private companies. The reality is that tax prep companies have already demonstrated they can't be trusted. The worst example was with Intuit. When Intuit was involved with the Free File Program, it was caught burying the free option on a website you couldn't find with a traditional search engine. It steered users toward options that battered them with upcharges and misleading marketing. Finally, they quit offering Free File when they got called out on what were genuinely underhanded tactics.

My view is, the debate over this subject isn't that complicated. The government requires people to file and pay taxes, so the least the government can do is to make the filing process simple and free and as painless as possible. Donald Trump and Republicans don't agree because they destroyed a wonderful, new public service when they shut down Direct File.

My Finance Committee colleague Senator WARREN has been a terrific partner and a champion of Direct File. I have enjoyed working with her over the years on this critical issue. I am behind her effort 100 percent as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee to revive Direct File. We are not going to let this go no matter how long it takes, and I urge all of my colleagues here in the Senate—as it used to be bipartisan—to support Direct File.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

DIRECT FILE ACT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today is tax day. Today is a day when millions and millions of Americans file their returns. On average, Americans spend about \$270 and 13 hours preparing their taxes for filing. That is just nuts. That is a higher expense and a higher amount of time than millions of Americans should be spending. Look, for people who have complex holdings and lots of economic interests, that is one thing, but for tens of millions of Americans, the Federal Government already has all of their critical data, and their tax filings should be quick and free.

The simple idea behind a bill that I am cosponsoring with Senator ELIZABETH WARREN the Direct File Act is that there ought to be a program. In fact, there used to be a program. Congress told the IRS several years ago to create a way for Americans to file their taxes quickly, simply, and for free, and

they started a pilot program. The IRS started a pilot program called Direct File in 2024.

I used to be the senior Democrat on the Appropriations subcommittee that oversees the IRS and was actively involved in trying to develop and improve this program just from the Senate's side. It was exciting to me to get the initial reports that hundreds of thousands of Americans used Direct File in its first year, and after several years, they demonstrated that, on average, folks were saving \$160, and 90 percent had a positive experience—either an above-average positive or an excellent experience. Many did their taxes in less than an hour—13 hours?—1 hour—accessing all of the government information that they had already in their database and then simply confirming it and filing versus having to work with someone and pay someone to prepare their taxes.

Well, President Trump shut down this program last year. Why? I don't know, but it is certainly uncomfortable that there was a major donation to his inauguration from the leading company that makes you pay taxes to file taxes—that makes you pay a fee to them to file and pay your taxes.

So, folks, today on tax day most Americans are looking for whether there is a way for them to file quicker, cheaper, and more easily. Three-quarters of Americans feel like they have paid as much as they expected, if not more, this year in spite of the No. 1 priority of the Republicans in this body last year, which was a big tax bill that gave tax cuts to millionaires. Working Americans did not see the tax relief from the so-called Big Beautiful Bill that they expected. They mostly saw cuts to healthcare and to food assistance.

It costs \$160, on average, to pay someone to prepare your taxes. Well, that may not seem like a lot to a business executive—to a big tax company executive—who got a big tax cut himself, but it means a lot for tens of thousands of my constituents, of working Delawareans. It does not have to be this way again next year. We should pass this bill and, once again, make it easy, free, and fair to file your taxes.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I am excited to join with so many of my colleagues in advocating that, by unanimous consent, we simply reopen the path toward easy, free tax filings for Americans next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

DIRECT FILE ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here on tax day to highlight how the Trump administration has made filing taxes more costly, more complicated, and more time-consuming for working Americans. Nobody likes paying taxes. It is painful, but this administration somehow has managed to make it even more painful. From

eliminating a free, easy-to-use tax service program to cutting funding and staff at the Internal Revenue Service, the Trump administration has made it needlessly harder for millions of Americans to meet their tax obligations this season.

On tax day, we recognize there is an obligation. Most Americans fulfill it. But, at the very least, the government can make it less painful, not more so. But, in late 2025, at the behest of giant tax preparation companies like TurboTax and H&R Block, President Trump canceled the popular Direct File Program. That was a free online service that allowed taxpayers to file their Federal income taxes directly with the IRS.

By every measure, believe it or not, this government program was a runaway success. It received overwhelmingly favorable reviews. Remember, this is a service enabling people to pay taxes, and people loved it. Ninety percent of survey respondents ranked their experience as “excellent” or “above average.” It was estimated to save the average taxpayer \$160 and hours of their time.

In short, this program worked. No more third-party companies nickel-and-dime taxpayers with expensive rates and junk fees. It was just straightforward, no cost, an option that hundreds and thousands of families relied on to pay their taxes.

And studies projected that a full-scale, permanent Direct File Program would have saved Americans \$11 billion annually in combined filing fees and time costs.

The Direct File Program also helped lower income families because they were able to access millions of dollars in unclaimed tax credits, with projections suggesting it would have delivered up to \$12 billion in additional tax credits annually. That is a lot of money. As costs increase for everything—food, housing, healthcare—this program was an easy way to give working Americans a well-deserved break.

But the Trump administration canceled the program. It caved to the tax software companies, and, yet again, it put profits over people. Frankly, this is just stupid. It is dumb. It is crazy, if you consider the public interest.

Americans are required to pay taxes. So the Federal Government should have an easy way for them to do it, and I am proud to have introduced the Direct File Act with my colleagues. Our bill would reinstate the Direct File Program and prohibit the IRS from entering into agreements that restrict its ability to provide these free services.

Sadly and unforgivably, Republicans are opposing the Direct File Act. I guess, instead, they are cozying up to the Big Tech companies and putting corporate interests above those of everyday Americans. You would think, in this kind of issue, we would have common ground. It is an easy issue.

And taxpayers deserve better from the IRS. They need an Agency that is

fully staffed, adequately resourced, and capable of delivering timely, reliable service, including refunds.

A lot of people say: Oh, well, the IRS. We hate the IRS.

Well, you hate the IRS until you are owed a refund or until the IRS makes a mistake because they are understaffed or because they don't have modern technology that could save all of us money.

And that is why I recently sent a letter to the IRS, urging them to take immediate steps to ensure it is fully prepared to meet American taxpayer needs during this 2026 filing season.

President Trump seems to be on a mission to make life more difficult and more expensive for Americans, and he seems to be succeeding. Eliminating the Direct File Program, as well as cutting funding and reducing staffing at the IRS, is simply increasing costs and making the system more difficult, more painful, more onerous for all taxpayers—maybe except for the millionaires and billionaires who can well afford their accountants and wouldn't use the Direct File Program. But for most of the people of America who want to pay their taxes and do it, it simply imposes an additional unnecessary burden.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3948

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to say thank you to my partner in these efforts, Senator BLUMENTHAL, and to all the others who have come here to speak on tax day about how outrageous it is that a program to actually let people pay their taxes online for free has been destroyed by Donald Trump and the Republicans.

So I am about to call up a bill to the floor that would let Americans file their taxes for free directly with the IRS. It is amazing to me that anyone could oppose this, especially when filing your taxes is something that Americans are required by law to do every year. But as sure as the Sun will rise, Republicans are going to block my bill.

For years, giant tax prep companies like TurboTax and H&R Block have rigged our system so they can cash in on your hard-earned dollars, and the result is that people spend now an average of 8 hours and \$160 each year just to file their taxes using tax prep services.

These big companies don't just take a fee for filing your taxes; they have actually become experts at figuring out ways to upsell, to charge junk fees, and to make money off your personal information. It is really outrageous.

So I drafted a bill that would allow Americans to file their taxes online for free and directly with the IRS through a program called Direct File.

Now, tens of millions of people wouldn't have to go to a paid preparer if they didn't want to. They could just file directly with the IRS.

Over 160 Members of Congress have joined me on this bill. Over 100 unions

and advocacy groups and national organizations have endorsed this bill. And I am forcing the Senate to decide today: Will we pass this bill?

During the Biden administration, the IRS ran a pilot program for Direct File. People who had a chance to use it loved it. Ninety-four percent of taxpayers who used the program described their experience as “excellent” or “above average,” which, by the way, is not exactly how most Americans describe paying their taxes most of the time. But Direct File worked. We have seen it. We actually made it work.

And once it was fully operational, Direct File was projected to save taxpayers \$23 billion a year and more hours than anyone could count.

So why do we not have Direct File today? We already had it. We set it up during the Biden years, ready to go, and had it underway. It was working. Well, the answer is tax prep companies hated it, and they hated it because it cut into their bottom line.

Why would people pay for TurboTax if they could easily file their taxes online for free?

And that is why, for years, big tax prep companies have lobbied the government to keep people from using a program like Direct File.

Now, the Direct File pilot project was a huge success, and yet it was dropped. Why? Well, first, the company that runs TurboTax, Intuit, donated a million dollars to Donald Trump's inauguration. And then, a few months later, reports came out that Donald Trump and Elon Musk wanted to kill the free tax filing program. And last fall, they delivered. That is exactly what they did.

This story tells you everything you need to know about why Republicans will block my bill today. This is all about money and power. It is about letting big corporations donate to politicians and then politicians just opening the doors so those big companies can rip off the American people.

To Republicans who say that making filing your tax for free with the IRS is too expensive, I just want to point out that for one day of bombing in Iran, we could pay for 20 years of Direct File.

And to Republicans who say that it is already free to file your taxes, I say: Go talk to the millions of people who paid over 100 bucks to file their taxes this year and ask them just how free it was, even when they click on the “free” buttons, and how it is that these guys have managed to put them in places where they end up paying.

And to the Republicans defending the status quo, just ask yourselves: Why are you on the side of TurboTax and H&R Block, instead of your constituents?

Filing your taxes should be easy and free, and I urge every Senator to vote yes on the Direct File Act. Let's save people some time and some money and show the American people that we can actually make government work not just for giant corporations, but we can make government work for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3948; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise in opposition to S. 3948, the Direct File Act of 2026.

After listening to those who have described why we need it, you might say: Well, how could there be a different story or another side of the coin?

I will tell you. There is a huge disagreement about the facts, and there is a huge disagreement about what has happened, and there is another side of the coin.

This bill seeks to reverse the Treasury Department's recent suspension of the Direct File Program. Direct File was an unauthorized, unnecessary program that wasted taxpayer funds and presented a clear conflict of interest by empowering the IRS to be not only the evaluator of tax returns and the enforcer of tax returns but the preparer of tax returns, empowering the IRS to prepare tax returns for the same taxpayers that it was later going to audit.

And, by the way, when that did happen with some of these taxpayers, they were successfully audited by the IRS for errors in their returns.

As part of the Biden administration's so-called Inflation Reduction Act, congressional Democrats provided the IRS with \$15 million to study the feasibility of providing a new, direct e-file program. On the same day that the study was due to Congress, the Biden administration announced the launch of a limited pilot Direct File Program. This so-called pilot program quickly expanded, spending tens of millions of dollars, despite the narrow mandate provided by Congress.

As part of the Working Families Tax Cut Act, Congress further directed the Treasury Department to evaluate and study alternatives to direct file.

Treasury's subsequent October 2025 report found significant concerns with the Biden administration program, warranting its suspension.

What were those concerns? In its report, the Treasury found that the Direct File Program accounted for just two-tenths of 1 percent—get that—0.2 percent of the 146 million tax returns filed in the year 2024.

Yet despite its small footprint, Direct File cost taxpayers at least \$41 million to administer. That is \$138 per return in 2024 and nearly three times the total funding authorized by Congress. Alarming, the Treasury acknowledged that these figures likely underestimate the true cost of the Direct File Program with the IRS failing to include costs for employee support, online services, and submission processing—among others.

A later report from the nonpartisan Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration further confirmed that Direct File had poor performance. Contrary to what you had been told, that everyone loved it, it had poor performance.

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration report found that nearly 60 percent of the registered users abandoned their return before they even filed it, meaning that less than half of the registered users even ended up using Direct File to submit a return.

The Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration also estimated that over 3,000 returns were filed with preventable errors burdening taxpayers and delaying refunds.

There are actually free file options available. This notion that this is TurboTax and H&R Block trying to divert people into its system is simply false. Ultimately, the Democrats' Direct File experiment demonstrates that the IRS can better serve taxpayers by highlighting existing free filing options and improving basic customer service rather than diverting a growing share of its resources and attention to redundant, expensive government-run programs.

Now, what do I mean when I say there are alternatives? Looking at the last year when Direct File was operational, it processed 296,531 accepted returns out of 160 million total filings. That is the .2 percent number.

There are multiple options available to almost all U.S. taxpayers to be eligible to use programs like IRS Free File, a public-private partnership that has no cost. In the same year that 296,000 people used Free File, after I think—I don't know if that number is before or after 60 percent of them declined to stay in the program—Free File filed 1.9 million returns for those who wanted to do it—a public-private partnership.

In addition, there is a group called the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Program and the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program—both of which provide free, in-person preparation at thousands of locations nationwide. And these two programs themselves prepared approximately 2.7 million more tax returns for free for people in 2024, vastly exceeding Direct File's reach at a fraction of the cost.

The myth is that people have to go pay money to get their tax returns prepared, when the reality is there are multiple private sector and private-public partnerships that are available for almost all Americans to have their tax returns prepared for free.

Ultimately, the Democrats' Direct File experiment demonstrates that the IRS can better serve taxpayers by highlighting existing free filing tax options and improving its own basic customer service, which it did this year, rather than diverting a growing share of its resources and attention to a redundant, expensive government-run program. Therefore, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I truly am shocked to hear my colleague from across the aisle describe Direct File as too expensive for the American people. I think he said it cost \$41 million to administer this system. If it is fully operational, Direct File is projected to save taxpayers \$23 billion a year and countless hours of hassle. There are very few things that happen here in Washington that give such a good return on investment to taxpayers.

Senator CRAPO said that people didn't use Direct File and suggested they didn't like it somehow. You know why people didn't use Direct File last year with the Republicans in charge? Maybe it was because the Trump administration and the Republicans accepted millions of dollars from the tax prep companies and did their best to sabotage the program. Here is what we know for sure: Polling shows that over 75 percent of Americans support free tax online filing from the IRS. If you invest in free tax filing, Americans are going to use it.

In fact, we know that because in the pilot project run by the Biden administration, 94 percent of those who used the program said it was excellent or above average. Not usually the kind of responses we get from people when they are paying their taxes.

The argument that Republicans make that Americans can already file their taxes for free with Free File, all I will say is: Well, tell that to the millions of people who paid more than a hundred bucks each to file their taxes this year. Independent watchdogs have concluded over and over and over again that the tax prep companies that run Free File make it incredibly hard for people to find it; and, once they find it, incredibly hard for them to use it. So what do people do? They end up paying through the nose just to file their taxes.

And you know who never got charged to file their taxes? The people who used Direct File. Direct File is the only truly free online filing option for Americans.

You know, the Republicans have argued that it presents conflict of interest for the IRS to both prepare and audit your taxes. I think somehow they seem to misunderstand how Direct File works. People who use Direct File are the ones preparing their own taxes, not the IRS—just like the people who use TurboTax are the ones using a program to prepare their own taxes.

And you know what happened when people used Direct File to prepare their taxes? Their returns got accepted at a higher rate than any other self-prep software—that is, it worked better than TurboTax; it worked better than the services that Americans are paying for.

Look, we know what is going on here, and that is that the Trump administration and the Republicans are accepting

millions of dollars in donations—a point that was not refuted by the objector to this bill. They are accepting millions of dollars in donations from these tax prep companies; and then in return for that money, shutting down Direct File. That is where the real conflict of interest is.

Look, we have a choice to make as a U.S. Senate, and that is: Who are we here for? Why are we here to protect two multibillion-dollar companies that manage to make big bucks by charging individual families \$100, \$150, \$175 just to pay the taxes that they are legally required to pay?

We have a system that works. It would save people billions of dollars across this country. The only reason that we are not doing this is because the tax prep companies have figured out that making political contributions to the Republicans pays off big time. They can kill off a program that would be good for the American people but would hurt their own profitability.

You have got to make a decision: Whose side are you on? The Democrats are on the side of saving money for American taxpayers. The Republicans are on the side of two big tax prep companies because they get paid to be on their side.

So we may not get this one through today, but we will keep coming back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

INFLATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is Mr. John Lowery one of my colleagues from my office.

I think I get it, Mr. President. I know you do. Tonight, millions of moms and dads will lie down to sleep, and they won't be able to because they are worried. One of the things that they are going to be worrying about is the cost of living. I get it.

We had really bad inflation under President Biden. It was, like, 9 percent. The President just spent so much money and injected so much money in the economy without increasing supply that prices went through the roof. That is what inflation is: creating more demand than supply. And prices went up.

We have gotten it down to about 3 percent—the inflation rate I am talking about. It jumped up a little last month—about 90, 95 basis points as a result of the price of gas, but I think after the fighting stops in Iran, the price of gas will come back.

That doesn't mean the problem is solved. When you reduce inflation from 9 percent to 3 percent, that is good, but all that means is that prices are rising much quicker. They were going up really quickly when they were rising at 9 percent. Now that they are back down to rising 3 percent, that is better, but they are still going up.

What people want—what I want, from one perspective—is deflation. You want prices to go down, not to just rise less

quickly. Well, the problem with deflation is that we can cause deflation, but the cure will be worse than the disease because we will have to endure unemployment of 9 or 10 percent, and I don't want to see that many Americans—I don't want to see any Americans, but I certainly don't want to see that many Americans thrown out of work.

So what do we do about the cost of living? Look, no amount—no amount—of guilt can change the past. It can't. It doesn't mean you shouldn't learn from the past, but no amount of guilt can change it. And no amount of anxiety can change the future. I mean, it is human nature to worry, but it is not going to change the future.

The only thing we have is the present if we want to make things better. I want to tell you what we are doing—we are doing. We passed a major piece of legislation that is just starting to take effect. It is going to impact every American. They came up with a new name for it because they didn't like the old name, but I kind of like the old name so that is what I am going to call it: the One Big Beautiful Bill. It is really breathtaking in its scope—and will be in its effect.

We cut taxes. Right now—don't take my word for it, just pick up the phone and arbitrarily call some Americans who have filed their taxes. They are getting money back. The average tax refund is up, like, 11 percent. The average American who normally gets a refund and who is already filing is going to get what works out to be an extra \$250 to \$300 a month, so that is going to help them deal with the higher prices.

We also extended the prior tax cuts from 2017 that were about to expire. We made them permanent. Anybody who voted against making them permanent wanted to raise your taxes by \$3.4 trillion. We beat them back.

We increased the standard deduction. Whether you get a refund or not, you are going to pay lower taxes because we increased the standard deduction. We gave Americans a larger child tax credit. We cut taxes for many Americans on Social Security. We cut taxes on tips. We cut taxes on overtime. We gave many Americans a deduction on the interest they pay for a car loan. Not everybody—I don't want to overstate the case here—but many Americans, and I hope you qualify.

For people in business—most businesses in America today are small businesses. I know you read about Google and Meta and all of the biggies, but most businesses in America and most of the jobs in America are created by small businesses. And most of the small businesses are what we call LLCs or sub S corporations. They are passthroughs. They are passthroughs. And we have provided that they don't have to pay any income tax on their first 20 percent of income. That may sound complicated; it is really not. But I can tell you it means more money in the pockets of small business women and small business men.

If you are in business, we have also provided for full expensing of research and development, full expensing of new equipment and machinery. Why does that matter? That means you can buy new equipment to grow your business and deduct it from your income tax, which lowers your taxes.

This is a major piece of legislation, and it is taking effect now. It is not going to solve the problem completely, but it is going to go a long way because the best way to deal with inflation is to grow your way out of it. If prices are going up between 2 and 3 percent, rather than suffering 10, 8, 12 percent unemployment to get prices down, to have deflation, you are better off increasing income so people's wages and income will go up faster than prices. And that is what the One Big Beautiful Bill is going to do.

So don't think we are not doing something. We are. We have. And that bill is just starting to take effect right now.

The second thing we have done—and I am not going to talk about all of them. We have a problem with housing in America. You don't have to be an astrophysicist to figure that one out. You don't have to be able to explain the law of special relativity to know that the cost of a home is breathtaking or to know that rents have gone up. Why is that? It is because of the lack of supply. Duh. It is because of a lack of supply.

So what do you do to make a new home or a used home more affordable? What do you do to make rents go down? You increase the supply. And that is what we are trying to do.

I sit on the Banking Committee. We have passed—the Senate has—twice, a housing bill. It is right in front of the House of Representatives right now, and I hope my friends in the House pass it.

I will tell you one of the things it will do. It will increase housing starts. If you don't think this works, just go read an article about what is going on in Austin. They increased the housing supply in Austin. You know, rents are dropping in Austin like a fat guy on a seesaw. They are going down. Why? Because they increased supply.

Our bill I hope the House will pass will offer local governments—local governments control the supply of housing. It is not the Federal Government. It is not the State government. It is local government. Do you know why? Because they have control of the zoning office, and they have to give you—the contractors—the permits to build. If they want to restrict the supply of housing, they just make it very difficult to build a new home. If they want to expand the supply of housing, they make it easy.

For a variety of reasons I won't go into, many local governments have been restricting the supply of housing. So what our bill does—we say: Look, that is up to you, local government. It is your call. We don't want to be in

charge of zoning laws in America. We don't want to be in charge, at the Federal level, of permitting. But you do rely on us for money.

Every year, we send about \$3.3 billion—\$3.3 billion every year like clockwork—to local governments, called community development block grants. They love it. It is free money, and they can pretty much spend that \$3.3 billion—these local governments can—on anything within reason that they want to. They love this free money.

So what we did—this is in the housing bill, among other things that we passed—we said: Look, this \$3.3 billion, you like it?

Yeah.

Well, if you will increase your housing starts—here is the good news. We started out with the sugar. We said: If you will increase your housing starts—you don't have to, but if you will increase housing starts in your city or local area, we will give you an extra dose of that community development block grant money.

Here is the bad news for them. And we also said: Now, you don't have to increase housing starts, but if you don't, we are going to pay the cities that did increase their housing starts with the money that we were giving you that you don't get because you chose not to.

So this bill isn't going to cost the American taxpayer any more money. The \$3.3 billion is going to remain the same. But those cities that do a better job of increasing housing are going to get more money. Where is that money going to come from? It is going to come from the cities that didn't want to increase housing starts. And it will work. All you have to do is go look and see what is going on in Austin.

I have two more topics I want to talk about.

(Mr. MORENO assumed the Chair.)

IRAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, look, everybody has got an opinion about Iran. I get it. That is good. Americans are entitled to have an opinion. Every Member of the Senate has an opinion. Every Member of the House has an opinion. Obviously, the President has an opinion. The Pope has an opinion. Everybody has an opinion, and that is a good thing.

I can tell you why I think we did the right thing by going into Iran. First of all, the people of Iran are wonderful people. I am not talking about the people; I am talking about their government, which is run by their Supreme Leader. Now, the old Supreme Leader is now as dead as Woodrow Wilson, but they have a new Supreme Leader. It is the son of the old Supreme Leader, and he is just as crazy as his daddy was.

The people in charge in Iran—they are a theocracy. That means, unlike America, where we separate church and state, in there, they marry their church to their state. And the Supreme Leader, who rules Iran, thinks that he

is speaking for God. He really thinks God is telling him to do all this stuff. The Supreme Leader believes that if you disagree with his version of his religion, you should die.

They hate America, and they hate Israel. They do. They want to kill us and hurt us the entire time we are dying.

They are trying to get a nuclear weapon. This isn't like China having a nuclear weapon or Russia or India or Pakistan.

Let me ask you a question. Would you give Charles Manson a nuclear weapon? That is what we are talking about here. Charles Manson is also as dead as Woodrow Wilson. But would you give a Charles Manson-type person a nuclear weapon? No. That is why we can't let the Supreme Leader and his minions in Iran have them.

Now, how do we stop them? Well, this is what Iran was up to. First of all, President Trump and Israel went in in June and bombed the living daylights out of their nuclear facilities, destroyed them substantially.

To develop a nuclear weapon, you have to have fissile material, enriched uranium. We hit their production facilities so hard that a lot of that uranium is buried underneath the ground, but it is still there, OK. We bombed the hell out of it, and we set them way back in terms of their nuclear ability, but it still exists.

We received intelligence saying that Iran has started to take some baby steps to restart their nuclear program that we bombed to hell and back last June. But that is not really why we went in. We also received intelligence that said Iran has a new game plan. The Supreme Leader—nutty as a fruitcake—the Supreme Leader has decided—here is his game plan—he is going to double and triple missile production.

Ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, also drones—they were producing those things at anywhere from 200 to 600 a month, maybe more, and the Supreme Leader was going to stockpile all these new missiles and these new drones, and then he was going to turn to America and Israel and the rest of the world and say: I am restarting the nuclear program. You can bomb me, you can bomb us if you want to, but we have got all these missiles, and some of these missiles can reach Berlin and Paris and London and Türkiye, and we are going to use them. The first thing we are going to do is destroy the Middle East. We don't care. We are Charles Manson. We are going to destroy the Middle East, and then we are going to start on anybody else that we are mad at.

We couldn't let that happen. We couldn't. So Israel and the President attacked. Now, whether you think it was a good idea or a bad idea, that is up to you. I can tell you the effect of it, though, because this—the media won't report it, but this is undeniable. We hit Iran so hard, they are coughing up bones. The public sector but also

the private sector today in Iran—it doesn't give me any joy to say this. We had no choice. I don't know how they are standing. They are held together with duct tape and spit.

Israel and America ran 21,000 bombing runs. We bombed seaports, airports, the electrical grid, railroads, the petrochemical industry, the farm industry, their steel industry.

Six out of ten Iranians of adult age don't have a job and don't have any prospect of getting a job. Many parts of the country don't even have electricity.

We knocked out two-thirds of the Supreme Leader's missile launchers. Does he still have some left? Yeah. They are buried underground. He has to dig them out. You probably saw pictures on TV of the bulldozers. We think we have knocked out half of their cruise missiles and ballistic missiles. We are not sure how many drones.

They don't have an air force anymore in Iran. They don't have a navy either. They still have some small boats that the Revolutionary Guard, which is part of their military, runs, but they don't have a navy. We sunk all their ships. We attacked virtually every single building we know of which is run by the Revolutionary Guard, which is part of their military.

I don't think the American people, because the press hasn't reported it, have a full appreciation for the damage that we did and had to do. I have seen estimates as high as a trillion dollars for them to rebuild.

I know the press glibly reports: Oh, you know, China and Russia will help them build back. What is the point of the war?

Well, the point of the war: They are not going to have a nuclear weapon anytime soon. Charles Manson may be able to find a knife, but he is not going to have a nuclear weapon.

And in order to rebuild Iran, it is going to take 20 to 25 years. And I don't know if we will be able to recover all of the enriched uranium. Some of my Democratic colleagues and some of our colleagues in the media are saying: It is a failure because you didn't get their enriched uranium.

I never figured we would get it.

And a lot of my colleagues are saying: Well, it is a failure because you didn't effect regime change; that nutjobs are still in charge.

That is true. We can't dictate regime change. That is up to the Iranian people. The only way we can dictate regime change is sending in troops, and I don't want to do that.

But the fact of the matter is that if you think the theocracy run by the Government of Iran—the Charlie Mansons—who is dangerous to the world—and I do—then the world is a much safer place today, and that is just a fact. That is a fact.

It is going to be a long time before Charlie Manson can rebuild, and it is going to be a hell of a long time before the new Supreme Leader is going to get a nuclear weapon.

Third and final point. I don't know whether I will do this, but I will just do it. I don't hate anybody. I have said that before standing here, I don't. I do not. When I pray, I pray. God, don't let me hate because it is hard up here. It is not worth it.

But if I had a short list of people that I would consider hating, Congressman Eric Swalwell would be on it. He has undermined the confidence of the American people in this body.

Here is my impression of Congressman Eric Swalwell eating an ice cream cone.

You know why I do that? Life is hard, but it is harder when you are stupid. And if you are going to be stupid, by God, you better be tough. This is no country for creepy old men, and Congressman Swalwell, he is about to find that out. Karma may be slow, but it is almost always on time.

I yield to my friend Senator KELLY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for Senator SANDERS to make motions to discharge S.J. Res. 32 and S.J. Res. 138 from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate debate the motions to discharge concurrently; further, that the following Senators be permitted to speak on the motions to discharge, and upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the motions to discharge in the order in which the motions were made: SANDERS for up to 20 minutes, VAN HOLLEN for up to 10 minutes, MERKLEY for up to 5 minutes, KAINE for up to 5 minutes, MARKEY for up to 5 minutes, and RISCH for up to 5 minutes.

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

WEAPONS SALES

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, later today, we are going to take a vote on the delivery of bulldozers and 1,000-pound bombs to Israel. First, let me say that I cannot and will not abandon Israel. Israel is one of our closest partners. They have a right to defend themselves, and I will always support Israel's right to exist as a successful and prosperous nation.

As the Israeli people face the threat of missile and rocket attacks from Iran and its proxies, that support continues to be important today. Supporting a partner doesn't mean that we don't ask tough questions, and it doesn't mean that we always agree.

Our support for our allies must always be about what makes us stronger and safer, and we can look at what is happening in the region right now and understand that this is not business as usual, and it is not making us safer.

The United States and Israel are fighting a war against Iran without a clear strategy or goal. I have been

clear that I oppose this war in Iran and the reckless decisions being made by Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Trump.

Under Prime Minister Netanyahu's government, we have seen an expanded war in Lebanon that is putting innocent Lebanese civilians at risk and ongoing violence against Palestinians and their homes being demolished in the West Bank. All of this—all of this—has undermined the path forward for peace.

That matters when we are making decisions about sending these weapons, including bulldozers, that could be used to level more homes and put a two-state solution further at risk.

I flew 39 combat missions in Operation Desert Storm. I have been trusted with the grave responsibility of using deadly force against our enemies. It is not something I take lightly. Neither is the responsibility we have here.

That is the lens I have looked at these two votes through. We are in a moment where we have to ask ourselves: Does this bring us closer to peace and security?

So, today, I have decided to vote yes on these resolutions to stop these transfers. Our partnership matters for Israel and for the United States. I have been clear about that, and I will continue to be.

Israel must maintain the capabilities and means to protect its people. I am confident they can do that today and will be able to do so in the future with our partnership, and I will always support that.

We have to work together toward a future where the Jewish State of Israel is secure and where there is a durable peace in the region.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED FOREIGN MILITARY SALE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES—Motion to Discharge

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 32, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED FOREIGN MILITARY SALE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES—Motion to Discharge

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 36(b)(1), I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 138.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 138, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Senator KELLY not only for his remarks and his work as a U.S. Senator but for his service to our country in the military, and I very much appreciate his support for these resolutions.

Mr. President, 60 percent of our people here in the United States live paycheck to paycheck. They are struggling to pay for groceries, for housing, for healthcare, and, increasingly, the ability to fill up their gas tanks in their cars in order to get to work.

We also have a \$37 trillion national debt. Bottom line: The American people—whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or Independents, conservatives, moderates, or progressives—want to make certain that their tax dollars are spent responsibly.

And in strong and growing numbers, they do not want us to continue spending billions of their taxpayer dollars in support of the illegal, horrific, and expansionist war policies of the Netanyahu Government in Israel.

Since October 7, 2023, the United States has provided over \$21 billion—\$21 billion—in military aid to Israel. And today, we are saying loudly and clearly: Enough is enough.

We all know that on October 7, 2023, Hamas, a terrorist organization, attacked Israel. They killed more than 1,200 innocent men, women, and children and took hundreds of hostages. I believe that there is no disagreement in this Chamber that like any other country on Earth, Israel had the absolute right to respond to that barbaric Hamas attack.

But Israel did not have the right to violate international law and wage an all-out war of unspeakable destruction against the entire Palestinian people in what experts have correctly concluded is a genocide.

Israel did not have the right out of a population of 2.2 million to kill more than 72,000 Palestinians in Gaza and wound over 170,000. That is more than 10 percent of the population.

If that happened here in America, that would be over 30 million Ameri-

cans dead or wounded. And in Gaza, a strong majority of the dead and wounded are women, children, and the elderly.

By the way, that number is likely an underestimate as to the tragedy as bodies are literally being pulled out of the rubble every single day.

Israel did not have the right to destroy virtually all of Gaza's infrastructure, including its water and sewer systems and its supply of electricity. They did not have the right to demolish every one of Gaza's 12 universities, along with hundreds of schools, dismantling their entire educational system. A vast majority of the children in Gaza today are not in school.

Israel did not have the right to indiscriminately bomb civilian neighborhoods and damage or destroy over 90 percent of the housing units in Gaza—over 90 percent damaged or destroyed—resulting in the vast majority of the population there now sleeping in tents.

That is where they are today.

Israel did not have the right to bomb over 90 percent of the hospitals in Gaza—hospitals—and kill 1,700 healthcare workers.

And Israel did not have the right to impose a blockade which prevented food, water, and medicine from entering Gaza, resulting in thousands of Palestinians being diagnosed with malnutrition and hundreds actually starving to death.

But, today, we are not just talking about Gaza. In the West Bank, in direct violation of international law that protects Palestinian territory, Israeli soldiers and settlers, since 2023, have killed over a thousand Palestinians, including 233 children. During that period, they have demolished more than 6,000 Palestinian homes and established more than 200 new illegal settlements and outposts in Palestinian territory.

And let us be clear, because I think there is some confusion about this. These actions are not just the results of some extremist, out-of-control settlers who are just doing whatever they want. Those actions are consistent with Israeli Government policy.

Netanyahu's Security Cabinet has approved the most sweeping changes to the West Bank's legal status since 1967, removing nearly all constraints on settlement expansion. Netanyahu himself declared:

There will never be a Palestinian state.

And I say that to some people here who still say: Well, we are in favor of a two-state solution.

That is not Mr. Netanyahu's position. He said:

"There will never be a Palestinian state."

His Finance Minister, Bezalel Smotrich, bragged that new settlement construction in the West Bank would "bury"—that is his word—"bury" the idea of a Palestinian state.

But it is not just Gaza and the West Bank. We now know that Netanyahu convinced President Trump to start an unprovoked and unconstitutional war on Iran.

For 40 years—for 40 years—Netanyahu had wanted the United States to participate with Israel in a war against Iran, and, finally, after 40 years of effort, he finally found in Trump a President willing to go along.

He couldn't get Democratic Presidents in the past and couldn't get Republicans in the past. In Trump, he finally found a President willing to go along.

This war, in violation of international law, has resulted already in the deaths of thousands of civilians, including hundreds of children in Iran and Lebanon, including 26 Israeli civilians who are now dead and 13 American soldiers who have lost their lives so far in this conflict.

All over the world, certainly including the United States, hundreds of millions of innocent people are suffering the economic consequences of this war, with higher prices and growing scarcity of basic goods.

I believe that in Vermont, now, the price of regular gas is about \$4 a gallon, and in parts of the country, it is even higher than that.

But for Netanyahu, Gaza was not enough. Attacking Iran was not enough. Netanyahu is now waging a full-blown war of expansion against Lebanon. That war in Lebanon has not only killed more than 2,000 people but has resulted in Israel occupying 14 percent of Lebanese territory.

Let me repeat that. The war in Lebanon has not only killed more than 2,000 people but has resulted in Israel occupying 14 percent of Lebanese territory.

The Israeli Defense Minister, Israel Katz, has announced that all Lebanese border villages will be demolished—will be demolished—his exact words, following "the model in Gaza"—demolish border villages.

Bezalel Smotrich, the Finance Minister, has warned that Dahieh, a suburb of South Beirut, will look like Khan Yunis, a city in Gaza that Israel reduced to rubble.

In other words, what they did in Gaza is now what they intend to do in parts of Lebanon. And these are not threats. They are promises.

For all of the reasons that I have given and more—and you are going to hear more from some of my colleagues, in a few moments—support for Israel in this country has plummeted. Today, according to a recent Pew poll, 80 percent of Democrats now have an unfavorable opinion of Israel, and 41 percent of Republicans share that view.

And the numbers in all parties, among young people, are even higher. Young people, whether they are young Democrats, progressives, or conservatives, do not want us to continue to fund the horrific war policies of Netanyahu.

A recent Quinnipiac poll also found that 60 percent—including three-quarters of Democrats, two-thirds of Independents, and 37 percent of Republicans—I say that to my Republican

colleagues: 37 percent of Republicans do not want the U.S. sending more military aid to Israel.

And that is why I am offering, today, two joint resolutions of disapproval, the only formal mechanism Congress has to block an arms sale.

The first resolution would block the sale of \$151 million in 1,000-pound bombs. The second would block \$295 million in bulldozers, the machines used to demolish homes in the West Bank and Gaza and make a Palestinian state physically impossible.

The time is long overdue for Members of the U.S. Senate to start listening to the American people and not to AIPAC. The time is now for us to end all U.S. military aid to the extremist Netanyahu government, and a “yes” vote is an important way forward.

Mr. President, with that, I yield to my colleague from Maryland, Senator CHRIS VAN HOLLEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the two resolutions offered by my colleague Senator SANDERS that would bar the transfer of certain offensive weapons and equipment to the Netanyahu government.

Specifically, these resolutions would block the transfer of 12,000 1,000-pound bombs and 132 armored bulldozers, valued at more than \$446 million and funded entirely by American taxpayers.

We cannot continue to provide a blank check to the Netanyahu government as it continues to use U.S. weapons in violation of U.S. and international law.

As I have long said, Israel was justified in its war against Hamas after the horrific attack of October 7, 2023. But the Netanyahu government is not justified in imposing collective punishment on all the people of Gaza.

As Senator MERKLEY and I wrote in our report after traveling to the region in August 2025, “The Netanyahu Government is Implementing a Plan to Ethnically Cleanse Gaza of Palestinians. America is Complicit.”

And now, as Senator SANDERS indicated, Israeli leaders are saying out loud they plan to apply the same plans in southern Lebanon as they implemented in Gaza.

Senator SANDERS mentioned threatening what they did in Khan Yunis. As recently as March 31, Israeli Defense Minister Katz said:

All homes in Lebanese villages near the border will be destroyed—in accordance with the Rafah and Beit Hanoun model in Gaza.

Well, colleagues, I visited Gaza. I visited the Gaza crossing—the Rafah crossing—twice, along with my colleague Senator MERKLEY, first in January 2024, when Gaza’s population had quadrupled from prewar levels to more than 1 million people who had been displaced within Gaza, from northern Gaza.

And then we traveled to the Rafah crossing, in August 2025, after the IDF’s offensive against Rafah, one that

the Biden administration claimed that they tried to stop. And on that visit, Senator MERKLEY and I climbed a rooftop, and you could look into Rafah—obliterated, reduced to absolute rubble.

And as we were told by former IDF soldiers—eyewitnesses who had the courage to speak with us—Israel has systematically dismantled essential infrastructure and brought near-total destruction of civilian sites throughout Gaza, including through the use of these bulldozers and 1,000-pound bombs. And now the Israeli Minister of Defense says they are going to do the same thing in southern Lebanon.

And, indeed, since the war in Lebanon restarted, Israeli forces have killed over 2,000 people, including 250 people in 10 minutes, the day after the cease-fire was announced. Entire villages have been destroyed and over 1.1 million people displaced.

Now, let’s not forget how we got into this most recent round of destruction in the region. President Trump is fully responsible for getting America into this war, period.

But we know from Trump administration officials and public reporting how Prime Minister Netanyahu, for his own reasons, was pushing Trump to attack Iran. Indeed, he said it himself on April 11. Netanyahu boasted to the Israeli public that Israel was “first to act because we knew what was at stake. But if I had told you a year ago that our pilots, men and women, would fly in Iran, who would have believed it?” So said Prime Minister Netanyahu.

He went on to say:

If I had told you a year ago that the United States of America, the strongest power in the world, would fight by our side, shoulder to shoulder, wing to wing, for nearly 40 days against the common enemy, who would have believed it?

And then Prime Minister Netanyahu went on to say:

All this happened because we initiated, we acted, we attacked.

Now, those of us who have been around here a little while know that Prime Minister Netanyahu has been pushing for a war with Iran for a very long time. In fact, he recently publicly acknowledged that the current U.S.-Israeli war on Iran “allows us to do what I have been hoping to do for 40 years.”

That is what Prime Minister Netanyahu said.

I remember when Prime Minister Netanyahu actually spoke before a joint session of Congress, asking us not to support the JCPOA, which, of course, prevented Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Of course, the current President then tore that up when he first came into office.

So Prime Minister Netanyahu had been trying to get previous Presidents to join him in attacking Iran, but no previous President was stupid enough or reckless enough to actually do it.

So here we are without facing any imminent threat, and President Trump

and Prime Minister Netanyahu started an illegal war against Iran.

It is a gross violation of international law. Indeed, on April 2, a group of over 100 international law experts, people who actually believe in international law, which included former U.S. and U.N. officials, published an open letter stating that “the initiation of the campaign was a clear violation of the United Nations Charter” and that the conduct of the United States and Israeli forces in the war “raise serious concerns about violations of international human rights and international humanitarian law, including potential war crimes.” That is on top of the illegality of initiating a war against Iran.

Look, earlier this afternoon, nearly all Democrats voted together to end Donald Trump’s illegal war against Iran. Many of us have vowed that we will not support 1 taxpayer dollar to continue this war that is making us less safe and less well-loved.

Well, that commitment and determination should apply to the Trump administration and to the Netanyahu administration. We need to rein in Trump in this illegal war, and we need to rein in the Netanyahu administration in this illegal war.

Now, colleagues, I want to focus for a moment on the portion of the Sanders resolution that bans the transfer of bulldozers to the IDF. These are the bulldozers that helped raze Rafah in Gaza to the ground.

For those who don’t remember, I ask them to recall the case of Rachel Corrie, a 23-year-old American peace activist who was killed by an Israeli bulldozer while trying to block the razing of buildings in Rafah over 20 years ago. Rachel Corrie has never gotten any justice, and her family will tell you that today.

In fact, just since January of 2022, at least nine more American citizens have been killed by extremist Israeli settlers or security forces in the West Bank. Not one of them—not one—has gotten justice, just like Rachel Corrie—no accountability.

There is no piece of equipment that has helped Israel and the Netanyahu government destroy civilian infrastructure in the West Bank and Gaza and now Lebanon more than the bulldozer.

Just look at the titles of some of the reporting coming from what is happening in southern Lebanon. The Guardian title: “‘Everything is gone.’ Israel destroys entire villages in Lebanon.”

And you can see it for yourself. I really encourage my colleagues just to look at the videos. Some of them have been shared by members of the Israeli military themselves. They showed controlled detonations and destruction of entire villages.

This isn't new. During the last war in Lebanon, Amnesty International documented how the Israeli military carried out extensive and deliberate destruction of civilian property across almost the entire Lebanese border with Israel, including 10,000 structures, primarily through the use of manually laid explosives and bulldozers.

In the West Bank, as we speak, we are seeing violent Israeli settlers kill Palestinian citizens with impunity. We are also seeing the use of these bulldozers to demolish Palestinian homes in the West Bank and other civilian infrastructures. Again, you can see it for yourselves in the videos.

This is all part of a slow-motion ethnic cleansing effort in the West Bank and de facto annexation of the West Bank. Indeed, the New York Times in September 2024 spoke about raids in the West Bank villages of Tulkarm and Jenin. The headline is this: "Israeli Bulldozers Flatten Mile After Mile in the West Bank." In total, since the Gaza war started, Israeli authorities have demolished at least 4,900 structures in the West Bank and displaced 9,000 Palestinians there.

As this has gone on, so has settler violence, often with the complicity of the IDF. In the West Bank, over 1,000 Palestinians, including 230 children, have been killed with virtual impunity since October of 2023—with impunity. The Israeli human rights organization Yesh Din said that between 2000 and September 2025—that is a 20-year period—more than 93 percent of police investigations into settler violence in the West Bank concluded without an indictment.

So what are we going to do about this? We need to stop providing the Netanyahu government with an absolute blank check. We need to demand accountability for American citizens who have been killed there.

So I urge my colleagues now to support this resolution. If we want to rein in a Trump administration that wants an illegal war against Iran, we should also rein in the Netanyahu administration. It is doing exactly the same thing with American taxpayer dollars.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon Mr. MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, on February 28, in coordination with and at the urging of Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu, President Trump attacked Iran without congressional authorization—that is, without the authority required under our Constitution. Almost immediately, Hezbollah, Iran's proxy, engaged in a battle with Israel. Now we have Israel invading southern Lebanon.

The Netanyahu government is exercising the same strategy they pursued in Gaza: Drop massive bombs, level entire towns, block routes for civilians to

leave, and block access for humanitarian relief.

And the United States? We are partners in this. We are complicit in this—not just because we partnered with Israel to ignite the war with Iran but because we sold the bombs and the bulldozers that Israel is using. We didn't stop supplying the Netanyahu government with weapons years ago even when it became clear that they were deliberately targeting homes, schools, and hospitals; when they were blocking deliveries of humanitarian aid, including water, food, and medicine; when the result was mass malnutrition, particularly among mothers and children and the elderly.

We must not continue to be complicit in these tragedies by selling these tools of destruction—the bombs and the bulldozers—to Israel.

The administration says: Let's sell them 12,000 more 1,000-pound bombs.

Picture 12,000 1,000-pound bombs dropping on neighborhoods—that is what we are enabling—or a vast number of bulldozers to destroy homes and buildings. We have seen it in the West Bank—homes and villages bulldozed, ancient olive groves bulldozed—and now we are seeing it in Lebanon, with the Netanyahu government bragging about doing the same thing to Lebanon they did to Gaza: Make it uninhabitable.

Let's be clear. Bulldozers are not defensive weapons.

Recent satellite images of southern Lebanon show the Netanyahu government flattening towns, destroying bridges, cutting off civilian movement, and cutting off humanitarian access in a replay of the destruction we saw in Gaza, not to mention the Netanyahu government has supported settlers in their expansion, massive expansion, of outposts and settlements on Palestinian land in the West Bank, in their mass increase in construction of homes and villages, and most disturbing of all, supporting the settlers in their violent attacks on Palestinian communities—all of this in the goal of creating a greater Israel by destroying any prospect of a Palestinian state.

Let's not forget, as my colleague from Maryland mentioned, it was a bulldozer operated by the Israeli Defense Forces that killed American citizen Rachel Corrie in Rafah in 2003—the first of 14 Americans citizens who have been killed by Israeli soldiers since then.

Approving this sale of the bombs and bulldozers deepens our responsibility for these tragedies and for the suffering.

Colleagues, when we became Senators, we swore an oath to take on the responsibilities designated to Congress in the Constitution, including the question of war.

As Madison summarized: The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone

to it. Thus, the Constitution has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature.

That is the Constitution we swore an oath to, and it is the Constitution that President Trump violated by launching a war without congressional authorization.

In 1973, during the Vietnam war, Congress approved the War Powers Act to, in their words, "fulfill the intent of the Framers of the Constitution" and rein in the President from waging wars without congressional approval.

The War Powers Act does allow the President to respond to an imminent threat that is "a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its territories, possessions, or its Armed Forces." But in this case, no such condition existed and thus the violation of the Constitution.

Yet, earlier today, my colleagues across the aisle voted to allow the President to continue to violate the law and violate the Constitution. When will we say enough is enough?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute to close.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, let us today, all 100 Senators, uphold our oath to the Constitution. The indiscriminate use of American bombs in Iran and Lebanon and Gaza that targets civilians and infrastructure by Israel must end. We should not sell these bulldozers and these bombs to Israel.

I urge my colleagues to vote for these two joint resolutions of disapproval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise tonight in support of Senator SANDERS' joint resolutions of disapproval for select arms sales to Israel. The Senate has voted on similar resolutions in the past, all of which I have supported. The last time this Chamber voted on prior resolutions, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu was bombarding Gaza. A cease-fire had collapsed, hostage release negotiations had stalled, and innocent children and families in Gaza were starving and suffering. That was because the Netanyahu government, fueled by extremist Israeli National Security Minister Ben-Gvir and Finance Minister Smotrich and supported by the Trump administration, was blocking humanitarian aid from reaching Palestinians in Gaza. The large-scale bombs covered by those resolutions went far beyond what Israel needed for its defense. Their use would cause indiscriminate damage and only worsen the humanitarian catastrophe in Gaza.

Now, the need for restrictions on military aid to Netanyahu has only taken on renewed urgency. The Trump administration is proposing to sell to Netanyahu 1,000-pound bombs and armored bulldozers that Netanyahu could

use not only in Gaza, the West Bank, and Lebanon but also in Trump's illegal and unnecessary war in Iran. I fully support the current cease-fire with Iran, but tenuous as it may be, Vice President JD VANCE's bid for a peace deal in Pakistan last weekend failed, and fighting could resume at any time.

So make no mistake, a vote to approve arms sales to Israel at this time would be seen as a message of approval for Trump and Netanyahu's disastrous war against Iran. I will not send that message. Trump's war of choice in Iran is a moral tragedy and economic disaster playing out before our eyes. It is only making the United States, Israel, and the world less safe.

Let us count the ways:

One, we have seen thousands of civilian deaths in Iran and Lebanon. More than 100 Iranian schoolgirls have been killed by American weapons, and 13 American servicemembers have been killed and hundreds injured.

Two, the United States and the Netanyahu government are losing credibility. In particular, President Trump's threats of war crimes and genocide against Iran are a total abdication of moral leadership on the global stage and must be opposed here and everywhere.

Three, the United States and Iran are blockading the Strait of Hormuz—crippling the global economy and sending energy prices sky high.

Four, gas prices in America are \$1.20 a gallon higher than before the war. Vehicle owners will be paying \$500 to \$600 more here in the United States over the course of this next year. It is going to be Trump at the pump. The American people are going to be paying for this war.

Five, this dangerous, unnecessary, and expensive war has cost the American taxpayer about \$50 billion so far, with the Trump administration seeking hundreds of billions of dollars more as part of a \$1.5 trillion military budget, which must be rejected.

Six, Iran still controls its uranium.

Seven, there has been no regime change. We just swapped out one Ayatollah for another.

And, eight, Iranians are still not free.

Why would we send American military weapons that could prolong, escalate, or worsen this horrible situation in the Middle East?

I say no more. The Senate should express its opposition to Trump and Netanyahu's needless war and seek to stop it.

No. 1, we should pass these resolutions to block 1,000-pound bombs and armored bulldozers for use in this war.

No. 2, we should pass a War Powers Resolution that denies President Trump the authority to continue this war.

And, No. 3, we should reject any request for funding to pay for Trump's war of choice.

Today, we must send a clear message that the U.S. Senate opposes—in the strongest possible terms—Trump and

Netanyahu's dangerous, expensive, unnecessary, and immoral war.

There is no military solution to this crisis. We must solve this at the negotiating table. We must end this war now. We must pass these resolutions in order to have the U.S. Senate speak to our outrage at what is happening in the name of the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator SANDERS' resolutions. I will be voting for both of them.

On February 21, 2024, I wrote a public letter to President Biden, and I said: The Hamas attack on Israel is devastating and Israel faces threats from other adversaries in the region and we should help Israel defend its civilians, but we should do so only by providing defensive weapons to Israel and not offensive weapons.

Why defensive weapons?

We have long been a security partner of Israel. Those who follow the relationship understand there are threats to Israeli civilians that are very present because of actors in the region like Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Houthis; and Iran and Iranian-backed militias and Israeli civilians do face threats that warrant the United States providing defensive support.

But I took the public position more than 2 years ago now that it would be wrong to send offensive weapons to Israel, and that position was based on exactly the same reason, to protect civilians—protect Palestinian civilians, protect Lebanese civilians—to protect civilians. Offensive weapons delivered to Israel in the way they are using them, particularly bombs, are guaranteed to cause mass civilian suffering. That is what has happened in Gaza, and that is what is happening in Lebanon.

Anyone who has paid attention to this region just has to answer this question: Is more civilian death going to get us to the right place?

This is a region that has been replete with the deaths of civilians, and the U.S. taxpayer and this body should not be pouring gasoline or adding tinder to a fire where more and more civilians are in jeopardy.

So, since that public letter to President Biden, I have supported Senator SANDERS and other resolutions before. If weapons are offensive in nature, the United States shouldn't be transferring them, and I will support the resolutions for that matter. We need to protect civilians. We don't need to pour gasoline on a fire in the region and accelerate more deaths of civilians.

I have received some outreach about this particular vote from some who say this is a vote to deny all military aid to Israel. That is not what this vote is about. This is about denying particular weapons that are offensive in nature.

Just to give you an order of magnitude, during this term of Congress, the President has noticed 27 different arms transfers to Israel; and with these

two joint resolutions of disapproval, we have challenged 6—6 of those 27 arms transfers—as being offensive in nature. We have not challenged 21 of the arms transfers that are primarily defensive in nature. There has not been a single Senator who has brought up a challenge to the defensive arms sales because we want to protect civilian lives; but when weapons like this that are offensive in nature are guaranteed to lead to the deaths of civilians, I think it is appropriate to challenge them, and that is why I am going to support these resolutions.

I have also had some say that, if these resolutions succeed, the United States is reducing its support for Israeli defense. That is also not true. The support for Israeli defense is the result of a 10-year memorandum of understanding that has an annual allocation for Israeli defense that has been supplemented by a supplemental bill that was passed by this body in April of 2024. That amount of money, which is an annual allocation, gets drawn down by these transfers.

I would urge my colleagues to support the cessation of offensive weapons transfers. If this bill succeeds, it doesn't reduce support for Israeli defense by a single penny. It just means that Israel should request and the United States should consider transferring defensive weapons to enable Israel to defend its own civilians but not to carry out military action that would harm other civilians.

The principle of "let's just stop the damage to civilians in the region" seems to me to be overwhelming. If the deaths of civilians were accomplishing anything, we would have seen that accomplishment long before now. So stopping the transfer of offensive weapons seems to me to be the right thing to do not just for the United States security interests and the safety of our servicemembers in the region, but it is also the right thing to do to promote regional stability and the security of Israel.

For that reason, I will vote for the resolutions, and I appreciate my colleague for introducing them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank Senator VAN HOLLEN, Senator MERKLEY, Senator MARKEY, Senator KAINE, and, before that, Senator KELLY for their remarks.

The American people increasingly are sick and tired of spending billions of dollars in support of illegal, horrific military actions on the part of the Netanyahu government. We have spent tens of billions of dollars already. Gaza has been destroyed—10 percent of the population dead or wounded. Netanyahu got Trump into a war in Iran. Thousands of civilians are now dead, including many children, and now Netanyahu is at war in Lebanon—thousands of civilians dead, civilian neighborhoods bombed, a million people displaced from their homes, and 14

percent of Lebanese territory occupied by Israel.

What the American people are saying is: Enough is enough.

By the way, this is bipartisan. It is not just Democrats, and it is not just Independents. It is a significant number of Republicans who remember President Trump talking about “America First” and talking about the need to invest in this country, not in bombs and bulldozers to destroy people in the Middle East.

With that, I would hope that we would have a very strong vote in support of these resolutions to tell Netanyahu and to tell the world that enough is enough.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, as everyone in this Chamber knows, Israel is one of the closest allies in the Middle East. No one can discount the fact that without Israel and President Trump's maximum pressure campaign, Iran would have nuclear weapons, would still be exporting terror throughout the region, and would still pose a significant military threat to its neighbors and, indeed, to a good share of the rest of the world.

Unlike some of our other allies, Israel has stood side by side with the United States, working hand in glove to advance our shared objectives and to keep American citizens safe. Passing these two resolutions would embolden our adversary Iran and call into question American reliability in the region. Refusing to send help to allies and to sell weapons to allies would be incredibly debilitating to our ability to work together. It would send the message that the United States is prepared to leave our ally Israel vulnerable to further Iranian attacks and put the tens of thousands of Americans who are living there at risk. This is not acceptable.

Again, I come to the floor and tell Iran: No one is coming to help you, not China, not Russia, not North Korea, not Venezuela, not Cuba—except for the 47 people that sit over here. They are trying to help you, Iran.

We are not going to let that happen. We are not going to abandon our ally Israel. We are not going to abandon the fight that is taking place. We are going to win this fight and have already won it, to a very large extent.

Let us not forget the Iranian regime has been exporting terrorism and chanting “Death to America” and “Death to Israel” consistently since the founding of this regime 47 years ago. Enough is enough.

It is time to continue this until we get to the end. This is not going to be a forever war. The country of Iran is very badly debilitated right now. I would hope that common sense prevails and they reach an agreement with the administration and get to a permanent cease-fire.

I would urge all of my colleagues: Oppose these resolutions. They will not help the United States of America.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 32.

Mr. RISCH. 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 Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS).

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 59, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—40

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

NAYS—59

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

NOT VOTING—1

Lummis

The motion was rejected.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 138.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Alsobrooks	Booker	Gallego
Baldwin	Cantwell	Hassan
Bennet	Duckworth	Heinrich
Blunt Rochester	Durbin	Hickenlooper

Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
Kim
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey

Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Sanders
Schatz
Schiff

Shaheen
Slotkin
Smith
Van Hollen
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Wyden

NAYS—63

Armstrong	Fetterman	Moreno
Banks	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Paul
Blackburn	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Reed
Boozman	Hagerty	Ricketts
Britt	Hawley	Risch
Budd	Hoeven	Rosen
Capito	Husted	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Collins	Johnson	Schumer
Coons	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Warner
Curtis	McCormick	Whitehouse
Daines	Moody	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that, for the remainder of the votes this evening, all votes be limited to 17 minutes and, at the end of 17 minutes, voting automatically expire ipso facto without any discretion whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO PUBLIC LAND ORDER NO. 7917 FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LANDS; COOK, LAKE, AND SAINT LOUIS COUNTIES, MN—Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate has received H.J. Res. 140 from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THUNE. I move to proceed to H.J. Res. 140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.J. Res. 140, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to Public Land Order No. 7917 for Withdrawal of Federal Lands; Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, MN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to make a point of order, and I ask for 1 minute of comment without objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, allowing public land orders to be rescinded under the Congressional Review Act, which is what would be happening here tonight, is a dangerous precedent that would affect every State in our country. Public land orders have never been previously submitted by any administration, including the first Trump administration, as a rule under the CRA. Using the CRA to undo this public land order would establish a new precedent, allowing future Congresses to undo with no time limit any public land order and potentially any administrative action.

Think of what this might mean, colleagues. Examples of orders that would be overturned years after the fact would include fossil fuel and mining leases, permits, and permitting denials—any rule or determination of any administrative law matter. So, colleagues, I ask you not to set this precedent today that any land order dating back to 1996 could be overturned on a party-line vote, with no environmental review.

Mr. President, I make a point of order that H.J. Res. 140 is not entitled to expedited procedures under the Congressional Review Act because Public Land Order No. 7917 is not a rule within the meaning of the Congressional Review Act, and H.J. Res. 140 does not meet all of the requirements of section 802 of the Congressional Review Act under the precedent set on May 21, 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair submits the question to the Senate.

It is a point of order well-taken.
The majority leader.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to table the point of order, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.
Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Armstrong	Curtis	Lankford
Banks	Daines	Lee
Barrasso	Ernst	Lummis
Blackburn	Fischer	Marshall
Boozman	Graham	McConnell
Britt	Grassley	McCormick
Budd	Hagerty	Moody
Capito	Hawley	Moran
Cassidy	Hoeven	Moreno
Cornyn	Husted	Murkowski
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cramer	Johnson	Ricketts
Crapo	Justice	Risch
Cruz	Kennedy	Rounds

Schmitt
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)

Sheehy
Sullivan
Thune

Tuberville
Wicker
Young

NAYS—48

Alsobrooks
Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt Rochester
Booker
Cantwell
Collins
Cooms
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Gallego
Gillibrand
Hassan

Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
Kim
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters

Reed
Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Schiff
Schumer
Shaheen
Slotkin
Smith
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. THUNE. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Armstrong
Banks
Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Britt
Budd
Capito
Cassidy
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Curtis
Daines
Ernst

Fischer
Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeven
Husted
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Justice
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
McCormick

Moody
Moran
Moreno
Murkowski
Paul
Ricketts
Risch
Rounds
Schmitt
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Sheehy
Sullivan
Thune
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

NAYS—49

Alsobrooks
Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt Rochester
Booker
Cantwell
Collins
Cooms
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Gallego
Gillibrand
Hassan
Heinrich

Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
Kim
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed
Rosen

Sanders
Schatz
Schiff
Schumer
Shaheen
Slotkin
Smith
Tillis
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. HUSTED assumed the Chair.)

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT RELATING TO PUBLIC LAND ORDER NO. 7917 FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LANDS; COOK, LAKE, AND SAINT LOUIS COUNTIES, MN

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 140) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to Public Land Order No. 7917 for Withdrawal of Federal Lands; Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, MN.

MORNING BUSINESS

FAITH MONTH

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, every April, faithful Americans come together in prayer and thanksgiving to celebrate Faith Month. I embrace the unique opportunity that we have to recognize this time and acknowledge one of the foundational virtues of our great country. I also commend Concerned Women for America, the Nation's largest public policy organization for women, and other faith-based organizations for encouraging people to use this month to actively strengthen their faith.

A group of courageous Americans met in Philadelphia 250 years ago to sign a document declaring the birth of a new nation, one "conceived in Liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Thus was born a nation that became the greatest force for prosperity, goodness, justice, and freedom that the world has ever known.

Those words were only made possible by a culture founded on faith. Generations before that clandestine meeting, the Pilgrims, fleeing religious persecution in their European homelands, sailed to the shores of Massachusetts. They undertook a perilous journey to an unknown world in pursuit of the right to freely worship God. Ever since, that right has been central at the heart of the American experience.

Our Founders understood that belief in God was key to the success of the new Nation. When tensions ran high at the Constitutional Convention, Benjamin Franklin proposed that the delegates begin each day with prayer, arguing that "God governs in the affairs of men." John Adams believed that our Nation could not function without faith, famously writing that "Our constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of any other." Thomas Jefferson promoted and attended regular church services

here in the Capitol, recognizing that faith was a core part of the Republic.

The United States is the result of a people, a society, steeped in the tenets of the Christian faith. America as we know it would not exist otherwise. Only through Christianity can men be created equal in the image of their Creator. Only through ultimate allegiance to a God in Heaven can a people declare themselves free of the yoke of tyrannical, earthly governments. By accepting “the Laws of Nature” established by “Nature’s God,” we can claim to have inalienable rights that are not granted by any legislative body.

On this, our 250th anniversary as a nation, we look back to our beginning, rooted in faith in God. By our continued steadfast trust in Him, we see how richly we have been blessed. Americans have reached heights no nation has ever dreamed of, from the wild Western frontier to the surface of the Moon, the eradication of slavery and the fight against communism, by the animating spirit of faith.

Yet millions around the world do not have the freedom to practice their faith that we do here. As we celebrate Faith Month in America, there are Christians in Nigeria, Syria, and Bangladesh having their churches burned, their businesses destroyed, and their families tortured or murdered simply for their belief in Jesus Christ. We can never take for granted the blessed freedom that we have as Americans.

Though the faithful here do not face that level of persecution, the erosion of faith’s influence in our society is evident. The climbing rates of abortions, the declining numbers of marriages, confusion over sexual reality, normalization of assisted suicide, the loss of Christianity’s moral foundations are sadly more apparent.

As we look forward to the next 250 years, we must remain diligent against efforts to further remove faith from the public square. Let us remain on guard against those who wish to restrict this most cherished right of freedom to worship, which has made America great.

This Faith Month, I join Concerned Women for America and millions of Americans to celebrate our shared Christian foundations. We thank God for the riches our Nation has enjoyed so far, for the blessing it is to live in a country that cherishes the right to worship freely. May we hold steadfast to our national motto, “In God We Trust,” and continue to look for guidance from Him who has made this Nation great.

REMEMBERING RICHARD OTTINGER

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today we honor and remember Richard Ottinger, a mentor and friend and an historic environmental champion whose life and career is an inspiration to all dedicated to fighting for the people and the planet.

After serving in the U.S. Air Force and cofounding the Peace Corps, Ottinger served in Congress for 16 years from 1965 to 1971 and then again from 1975 to 1985. In his first year in Congress, he wrote and passed the Hudson River Compact Act, establishing an interstate commission to clean up the river. He continued to be the environmental visionary, being one of the first to call for addressing climate change as a moral, economic, national security, and health imperative. He helped found the bipartisan Environmental Study Conference and served as a moving force behind several landmark pieces of environmental legislation, including the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act, PURPA.

Congressman Ottinger’s leadership also extended to the foundational goals for a healthy democracy. He was a bold and effective advocate for peace and diplomacy, civil rights, consumer protections, and the day-to-day concerns of working families, often battling and winning against the powerful special interests and political players. He was a vocal opponent of the Vietnam war, and in 1969, Ottinger introduced the Vietnam Disengagement Act and in 1970 co-authored an amendment to end that unjust war. He never shied from the big challenges confronting the times in which he lived.

From serving as dean of Pace Law School and founding the Pace Energy and Climate Center to working closely with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature—IUCN—Ottinger continued to be a champion for climate solutions even after leaving office. I am deeply grateful to Richard Ottinger for being a pioneer in environmental legislation and advocacy and for paving the way for a fairer, cleaner, more just future for us all.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING AMERICAN AIRLINES

• Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and commend the employees of American Airlines on the remarkable occasion of its 100th anniversary of service. For a century, American Airlines has played a pivotal role in connecting communities, strengthening the U.S. economy, and advancing the aviation industry at home and abroad. Headquartered in Fort Worth, TX, American Airlines plays a key role in driving the Dallas-Fort Worth metro area’s rapid development. As one of the State’s largest private employers, American Airlines contributes to economic activity, with a multiplier effect across tourism, trade, and local businesses.

Today, the airline operates more than 6,000 daily flights, serving nearly 350 destinations across more than 60 countries, and safely transporting more than 200 million passengers each

year. Throughout its history, American Airlines has been at the forefront of innovation and industry leadership. One example of the airline’s ingenuity and leadership was the introduction of its AAdvantage program, the world’s oldest and largest frequent-flyer program, which has transformed the way Americans travel, allowing millions to use its services and travel across the globe.

American Airlines currently operates 10 airport hubs, the largest of which is at Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport. This hub drives Texas tourism, business travel, investment, and international connectivity, contributing billions of dollars annually to both the regional economy and the State of Texas.

American Airlines has distinguished itself through a commitment to safety. It leads the industry in equipping its mainline fleet with Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast In (ADS-B In), enhancing pilots’ situational awareness in the national airspace system. The airline’s entire fleet of more than 300 Airbus A321 aircraft is equipped with ADS-B In, more than any other airline worldwide. Reaching 100 years of continuous service is a milestone achieved by only a select few companies, and it is a testament to the vision, leadership, and hard work of the generations of employees who have made American Airlines what it is today.

On behalf of the people of Texas and in my capacity as chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, I congratulate American Airlines’ employees on this historic achievement and extend my best wishes to them for the company’s continued success in Texas in the years ahead.●

RECOGNIZING THE GATHERING PLACE

• Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, as a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each month I recognize and celebrate the American entrepreneurial spirit by highlighting the success of a small business in my home State of Idaho. Today, I am proud to honor The Gathering Place in Rupert as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for March 2026.

The Gathering Place quilt shop has been in business since 1998, after owners Ron and Joyce Jensen purchased the 100-year-old building in the historic Rupert town square. The couple undertook a significant remodel to meet the needs of their quilting store and transform the space into a vibrant, beloved destination.

Ron and Joyce started the store to boost tourism to their small town and offer resources to local quilters. Since then, The Gathering Place has proven to be a successful tourist spot, gaining national recognition, and Joyce continues to serve new customers almost

daily. With seemingly endless fabric, books, patterns, and samples, the store is a great destination for crafters and a staple within the Rupert community.

Joyce, her three children, and 11 grandchildren, all of whom reside in Rupert, have carried on the store's success since Ron passed away. Together, the Jensen family hopes to keep running the store for years to come and weave The Gathering Place into Rupert history.

Congratulations to Joyce, the Jensen family, and all employees at The Gathering Place on being recognized as the Idaho Small Business of the Month for March 2026. Your dedication to excellence makes Idaho proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:30 a.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, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1011. An act to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 to remove barriers to agricultural producers in accessing funds to carry out emergency measures under the emergency conservation program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1431. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2407 State Route 71, Suite 1, in Spring Lake, New Jersey, as the "James J. Howard Post Office".

H.R. 1706. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1200 William Street, Room 200, in Buffalo, New York, as the "William J. Donovan Post Office Building".

H.R. 3393. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12208 North 19th Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the "Officer Zane T. Coolidge Post Office".

H.R. 4635. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 890 East 152nd Street in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Technical Sergeant Alma Gladys Minter Post Office Building".

H.R. 4707. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1019 Avenue H in Fort Madison, Iowa, as the "Martin L. Graber Post Office".

H.R. 5058. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 46164 Westlake Drive in Sterling, Virginia, as the "Firefighter Trevor Brown Post Office Building".

H.R. 5773. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 1300 East Northwest Highway in Palatine, Illinois, as the "Bernie Bluestein Post Office Building".

H.R. 5831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 South Main Street in Waupaca, Wisconsin, as the "Master Sergeant Melvin O. Handrich Post Office Building".

H.R. 6020. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14855 South Van Dyke Road in Plainfield, Illinois, as the "Staff Sergeant Jose Dueñez Jr. Post Office Building".

H.R. 6247. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13355 North Lon Adams Road in Marana, Arizona, as the "Mayor Ed Honea Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 6310. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3570 Olney Laytonville Road in Olney, Maryland, as the "Edward L. Ramsey Olney Post Office Building".

H.R. 6317. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12109 New Kent Highway in New Kent, Virginia, as the "Patricia Paige Post Office".

H.R. 6808. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 417 West 7th Street in Columbia, Tennessee, as the "Pharmacist's Mate First Class John Harlan Willis Post Office Building".

H.R. 6995. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 825 Highway 198 in Beaumont, Mississippi, as the "Jermy Malone Post Office".

H.R. 7613. An act to require certain aircraft to be equipped and operating with collision prevention technology, to improve helicopter route safety and separation around airports, to update air traffic control processes and procedures, to address national airspace system safety in Department of Defense activities, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 1095 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2026 (Public Law 119-60), the Minority Leader appoints the following individual to the Commission on the National Defense Strategy: Ms. Jane Harman of Venice, California.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1431. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2407 State Route 71, Suite 1, in Spring Lake, New Jersey, as the "James J. Howard Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1706. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1200 William Street, Room 200, in Buffalo, New York, as the "William J. Donovan Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3393. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12208 North 19th Avenue in Phoenix, Arizona, as the "Officer Zane T. Coolidge Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4635. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 890 East 152nd Street in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Technical Sergeant Alma Gladys Minter Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4707. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1019 Avenue H in Fort Madison, Iowa, as the "Martin L. Graber Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5058. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 46164 Westlake Drive in Sterling, Virginia, as the "Firefighter Trevor Brown Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5773. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 1300 East Northwest Highway in Palatine, Illinois, as the "Bernie Bluestein Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5831. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 South Main Street in Waupaca, Wisconsin, as the "Master Sergeant Melvin O. Handrich Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6020. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14855 South Van Dyke Road in Plainfield, Illinois, as the "Staff Sergeant Jose Dueñez Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6247. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13355 North Lon Adams Road in Marana, Arizona, as the "Mayor Ed Honea Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6310. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3570 Olney Laytonville Road in Olney, Maryland, as the "Edward L. Ramsey Olney Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6317. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12109 New Kent Highway in New Kent, Virginia, as the "Patricia Paige Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6808. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 417 West 7th Street in Columbia, Tennessee, as the "Pharmacist's Mate First Class John Harlan Willis Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6995. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 825 Highway 198 in Beaumont, Mississippi, as the "Jermy Malone Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 7613. An act to require certain aircraft to be equipped with collision mitigation technology, to improve helicopter route safety and separation around airports, to update air traffic control processes and procedures, to address national airspace system safety in Department of Defense activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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-3121. A communication from the Senior Bureau Official, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2025 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3122. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2025 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3123. A communication from the Chairwoman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's fiscal year 2025 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation

Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3124. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) for Fiscal Year 2025”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3125. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Chief Human Capital Officers Council 2025 Report to Congress”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3126. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clarifying and Streamlining the Regulatory Procedures for Requesting a Challenge to the Census Bureau’s Annual Population Estimates” (RIN0607-AA72) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2026; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3127. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Streamlining the Regulations Governing Requests for Special Census Services and Studies” (RIN0607-AA73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 6, 2026; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3128. A communication from the Acting Chief, Ethics Transparency and Integrity Branch, United States Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the office’s Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2026–2030 and the Congressional Budget Request, Fiscal Year 2025 Annual Performance Report, and Fiscal Year 2027 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3129. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office’s fiscal year 2025 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3130. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office’s fiscal year 2027 Congressional Budget Justification; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3131. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3132. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3133. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3134. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade

of general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3135. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of vice admiral general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3136. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3137. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3138. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3139. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3140. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3141. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Fiscal Year 2025: Annual Report to Congress on the Open Payments Program”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3142. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Nashoba Valley Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AD07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3143. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Nine Lakes of East Tennessee Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AD00) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3144. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements” (Announcement 2026-8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 31, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3145. A communication from the Social Insurance Specialist, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Incorrect Terminology in Regulatory Text; Technical Amendments” (RIN0960-AI99) received dur-

ing the adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3146. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expansion of Buprenorphine Treatment via Telemedicine Encounter and Continuity of Care via Telemedicine for Veterans Affairs Patients” ((RIN1117-AB40) (RIN1117-AB78) (RIN1117-AB88) (Docket No. DEA-948)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 15, 2026; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3147. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Controlled Substances Ordering System (CSOS) Modernization” ((RIN1117-AB79) (Docket No. DEA-732)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3148. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedules of Controlled Substances: Extension of Temporary Placement of Clonazepam, Diclazepam, Etizolam, Flualprazolam, and Flubromazepam in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act” (Docket No. DEA-989) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3149. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Requiring Online Submission of Applications for and Renewals of DEA Registration: Technical Correction” (Docket No. DEA-1111) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3150. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of N-Desethyl Isotonitazene and N-Piperidinyl Etonitazene in Schedule 1” (Docket No. DEA-1143) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3151. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of 4-Chloromethcathinone in Schedule 1” (Docket No. DEA-1246) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3152. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of 4-Fluoroamphetamine in Schedule 1” (Docket No. DEA-1180) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3153. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Temporary Placement of N-pyrrolidino metonitazene and N-pyrrolidino protonitazene in Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-1337) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3154. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Specific Listing for Dipentylone, a Currently Controlled Schedule I Substance" (Docket No. DEA-1390) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3155. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Temporary Placement of MDMA-4en-PINACA in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act" (Docket No. DEA-1356) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3156. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Specific Listing for 1-boc-4-piperidone, a Currently Controlled List I Chemical" (Docket No. DEA-1394) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3157. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Seven Specific Fentanyl-Related Substances in Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-1457) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3158. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of Ethyleneoxynitazene, Methylenedioxynitazene, 5-Methyl Etodesnitazene, N-Desethyl Etonitazene, N-Desethyl Protonitazene, N, N-Dimethylamino Etonitazene, and N-Pyrrolidino Isotonitazene in Schedule I" (Docket No. DEA-1494) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3159. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registering Emergency Medical Services Agencies Under the Protecting Patient Access to Emergency Medications Act of 2017" (RIN1117-AB37) (Docket No. DEA-377) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3160. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reducing Bureaucracy and Burden for Refugee Resettlement Programs" (RIN0970-AD28) received during the adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2026; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3161. A communication from the Research Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of the recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 84th Plenary Session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*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 Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Nominee: Yeouk Kim

Post: Asean

Nominated: March 2, 2026.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Yeouk Kim, \$500, 10-17-24, Trump National Committee.

*Ademola Adewale-Sadik, of New York, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years.

*Catherine Dillon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

Mr. RISCCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Edgard Daniel Kagan and ending with Dean Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 25, 2026.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Nancy E. Abella and ending with Janine S. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 25, 2026.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Ernest J. Abisellan and ending with Paul V. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 25, 2026.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. LEE):

S. 4295. A bill to prohibit aid that would benefit Hamas, to place restrictions on funding for United Nations entities that are led by countries that support terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. RICKETTS, and Mr. BUDD):

S. 4296. A bill to amend the Anti-Boycott Act of 2018 to apply the provisions of that Act to international governmental organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. REED, Mr. LUJAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. COONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WELCH, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KING, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KIM, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KAINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4297. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the tax credit for contributions of individuals to scholarship granting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KIM, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4298. A bill to provide appropriations for the Internal Revenue Service to overhaul technology and strengthen enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 4299. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit Presidents and Vice Presidents from receiving damages payments from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 4300. A bill to promote interagency coordination for reviewing certain authorizations under the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 4301. A bill to improve the access of consumers to professional sports broadcasts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4302. A bill to improve services provided to taxpayers by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 4303. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for escalating civil penalties

for fraudulent or negligent importation of unauthorized electronic nicotine delivery systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SHEEHY (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 4304. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assign physicians of the Department of Veterans Affairs to temporarily serve as traveling physicians in the territories and possessions of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 4305. A bill to increase the criminal penalties for assaulting a Bureau of Prisons correctional officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

S. 4306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a surtax on high income individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KING):

S. 4307. A bill to expand the scope of the Do Not Call rules under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act to include all telephone subscribers, to expand the private right of action for calls in violation of those rules, and to modify the definition of the term "automatic telephone dialing system"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4308. A bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financing to persons with seriously delinquent tax debt; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JUSTICE:

S. 4309. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a pilot program for small, nonlethal deescalation unmanned aircraft to be used for law enforcement and public safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JUSTICE:

S. 4310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for certain overtime compensation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 4311. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide for equitable relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 670. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the 2026 Day of Silence in bringing attention to anti-LGBTQI+ bullying, harassment, discrimination, and other forms of victimization faced by individuals in schools, and calling on communities across the country to take action to demand equal educational opportunity, basic civil

rights protections, and freedom from erasure for all students, particularly LGBTQI+ young people, in K-12 schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MOODY:

S. Res. 671. A resolution prohibiting the use of funds for official travel by Senators during Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LEE:

S. Res. 672. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should prioritize bilateral security partnerships over multilateral security partnerships and institutions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. Res. 673. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 119

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to discontinue the collection by the Federal Government of firearm transaction records of discontinued firearms businesses, to require the destruction of such already collected records, and for other purposes.

S. 410

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 410, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 470

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend the CARES Act to remove a requirement on lessors to provide notice to vacate, and for other purposes.

S. 478

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 478, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from transmitting certain information to the Department of Justice for use by the national instant criminal background check system.

S. 485

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 485, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from

Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 567, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 645

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 645, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the individuals and communities who volunteered or donated items to the North Platte Canteen in North Platte, Nebraska, during World War II from December 25, 1941, to April 1, 1946.

S. 1039

At the request of Mr. SHEEHY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1039, a bill to amend the definitions of firearm silencer and firearm muffler in section 921 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1156

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1156, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to ensure that striking workers and their households do not become ineligible for benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 1564

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1564, a bill to amend the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 to address ecosystem restoration projects, and for other purposes.

S. 1716

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1716, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve health care coverage under vision plans, and for other purposes.

S. 2858

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2858, a bill to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes.

S. 2955

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2955, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal penalties for the knowing and intentional administration of any abortion-inducing drug to a woman without

her informed consent, if the abortion-inducing drug has been shipped or transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 3394

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3394, a bill to direct the United States Sentencing Commission to amend the sentencing guideline relating to child sexual abuse material.

S. 3397

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSOFF) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3397, a bill to make coercion of children to commit harm a criminal offense, and for other purposes.

S. 3398

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3398, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to criminalize intentional threats to distribute child sexual abuse material, and to provide appropriate penalties for the use of child sexual abuse material to extort or coerce victims.

S. 3448

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3448, a bill to prohibit and prevent seclusion, mechanical restraint, chemical restraint, and dangerous restraints that restrict breathing, and to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint in schools, and for other purposes.

S. 3456

At the request of Mr. SHEEHY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3456, a bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for a free annual National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass for law enforcement officers and firefighters.

S. 3823

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3823, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 4.1 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 4066

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. MORENO) 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. 4115

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. KIM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4115, a bill to ban certain types of wagers.

S. 4280

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4280, a bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to reauthorize and reform certain authorities and to provide greater transparency and oversight.

S.J. RES. 32

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 32, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. RES. 161

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 161, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S.J. RES. 182

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 182, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan (Direct Loan) Program".

S. RES. 236

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 236, a resolution calling for the return of abducted Ukrainian children before finalizing any peace agreement to end the war against Ukraine.

S. RES. 657

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 657, a resolution commending Taiwan on the 30th anniversary of its first direct presidential election in 1996, and expressing support for Taiwan in the preservation of its democratic institutions.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KING):

S. 4307. A bill to expand the scope of the Do Not Call rules under the Tele-

phone Consumer Protection Act to include all telephone subscribers, to expand the private right of action for calls in violation of those rules, and to modify the definition of the term "automatic telephone dialing system"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4307

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 "Protecting American Consumers from Robocalls Act".

SEC. 2. EXPANDING SCOPE OF DO NOT CALL RULES AND PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 227(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "residential";

(2) in paragraph (3)—
(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "residential"; and
(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking "residential"; and

(3) in paragraph (5)—
(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "more than one telephone call within any 12-month period by or on behalf of the same entity" and inserting "a telephone call by or on behalf of an entity"; and
(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "up to".

(b) REVISED REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall revise the regulations prescribed under section 227(c) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(c)) as necessary to implement the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF AUTOMATIC TELEPHONE DIALING SYSTEM.

Section 227(a)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "or a list of telephone numbers" after "using a random or sequential number generator"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting "successively without human intervention" after "to dial such numbers".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 670—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE 2026 DAY OF SILENCE IN BRINGING ATTENTION TO ANTI-LGBTQI+ BULLYING, HARASSMENT, DISCRIMINATION, AND OTHER FORMS OF VICTIMIZATION FACED BY INDIVIDUALS IN SCHOOLS, AND CALLING ON COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE COUNTRY TO TAKE ACTION TO DEMAND EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY, BASIC CIVIL RIGHTS PROTECTIONS, AND FREEDOM FROM ERASURE FOR ALL STUDENTS, PARTICULARLY LGBTQI+ YOUNG PEOPLE, IN K-12 SCHOOLS

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 670

Whereas, for every year since its initiation in 1996, LGBTQI+ students, teachers, and allies have recognized a National Day of Silence to bring attention to the silencing of LGBTQI+ students through harassment and bullying;

Whereas, for more than 2 decades, Congress has supported a resolution for a National Day of Silence and a resolution for No Name-Calling Week, and most recently, Congress has supported a "Rise Up Resolution" to demand equal educational opportunities, basic civil rights protections, and freedom from erasure for all students;

Whereas young people, teachers, school staff, families, and communities must be free from transphobia, homophobia, racism, sexism, and ableism in K-12 schools;

Whereas K-12 schools must be safe and inclusive learning environments that include and affirm LGBTQI+ young people, especially those who are transgender, nonbinary, intersex, Black, Indigenous, people of color, and people with disabilities, and those who are from communities that experience marginalization;

Whereas LGBTQI+ young people frequently experience bias-based bullying and harassment, discrimination, and punitive discipline that increases the likelihood they will enter the school-to-prison pipeline;

Whereas Glisten's 2025 National School Climate Survey showed that—

(1) 58 percent of LGBTQI+ students reported being verbally harassed by their peers at school because of their sexual orientation, and nearly 57 percent because of their gender identity;

(2) nearly 23 percent of LGBTQI+ students reported being physically harassed by their peers at school because of their sexual orientation, and 23 percent because of their gender identity;

(3) 8 percent of LGBTQI+ students reported being physically assaulted by their peers at school because of their sexual orientation, and over 9 percent because of their gender identity; and

(4) for Black, Indigenous, and students of color, these trends were exacerbated, with 75 percent of students reporting experiencing harassment or assault related to their sexual orientation or gender identity;

Whereas Glisten's 2025 National School Climate Survey found that 67 percent of LGBTQI+ students reported that they felt unsafe in school because of their sexual orientation or gender identity in 2025, and nearly 30 percent reported missing at least 1 entire school day in the preceding month because of safety concerns;

Whereas over 200 anti-LGBTQI+ education bills have been introduced each year in State legislatures across the United States, the majority of which specifically target transgender and nonbinary young people, including—

(1) in the 27 States that have enacted policies between 2021 and 2025 that prohibit transgender students from playing alongside their peers on school sports teams; and

(2) in the 20 States that have enacted laws between 2021 and 2025 that prevent transgender students from using the school bathroom or locker room that corresponds with their gender identity;

Whereas LGBTQI+ young people are more likely than their non-LGBTQI+ peers to experience mental health concerns, including stress, anxiety, and depression;

Whereas nearly half of LGBTQI+ young people seriously considered suicide in the last year, a trend that increases among Indigenous, Black, and multiracial LGBTQI+ young people;

Whereas Glisten's 2025 National School Climate Survey found that 7 percent of LGBTQI+ youth surveyed had to change schools in the previous year because they felt uncomfortable and unsafe at school, and more than a quarter of LGBTQI+ students who did not see themselves graduating from high school said that anti-LGBTQ+ policies or practices at school were a contributing factor;

Whereas States have passed or attempted to pass legislation that erases or censors LGBTQI+ individuals, history, and contributions from classroom literature and curricula, including the 14 States that enacted laws censoring instruction related to LGBTQI+ people;

Whereas these laws harm students and force families to consider leaving their homes, as demonstrated by Williams Institute reporting, which found that, in the year following the 2022 passage of the Parental Rights in Education Act by the Florida State legislature, 56 percent of LGBTQI+ parents of students in the State of Florida considered moving out of the State, and 16.5 percent have taken steps to move out of the State;

Whereas 90 percent of transgender and nonbinary young people say that recent debates prompted by State legislation restricting the rights of transgender individuals have negatively impacted their mental health;

Whereas data provided by the Department of Justice shows that there were a reported 222 anti-LGBTQ hate crimes in schools in 2024;

Whereas every young person must have equal educational opportunity and freedom from the fear that their basic civil and educational rights will be taken away from them;

Whereas young people who develop in positive school climates that are free from bullying, harassment, and discrimination report greater physical and psychological safety, greater mental well-being, and improved educational and life outcomes;

Whereas positive school transformation must recognize that safety is too low of a bar and that all communities deserve to be acknowledged and affirmed in schools;

Whereas students, families, educators, and community members in every State and territory are advocating for safe and inclusive

learning environments that affirm LGBTQI+ young people, particularly those who are transgender, nonbinary, intersex, Black, Indigenous, people of color, and people with disabilities;

Whereas affirming policies such as enumerated anti-bullying protections, gender neutral dress code guidelines, and inclusive learning practices are proven strategies to address hostile learning environments for all students; and

Whereas we must all demand the best possible future for all young people in schools, particularly those who identify as LGBTQI+, without exception: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the "National Day of Silence";

(2) recognizes the contributions of students, families, educators, and community members who participate in the "National Day of Silence" to draw attention to the bullying, harassment, assault, and discrimination faced by LGBTQI+ students; and

(3) encourages each State, city, and local educational agency to adopt laws and policies to prohibit bullying of and discrimination against students, teachers, and other school staff on the basis of their sexual orientation, gender identity, or sex characteristics (including intersex traits), so that the schools of the United States are institutions where all individuals are able to focus on learning.

SENATE RESOLUTION 671—PROHIBITING THE USE OF FUNDS FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL BY SENATORS DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS

Mrs. MOODY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 671

Resolved,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR OFFICIAL TRAVEL BY SENATORS DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS.

Amounts made available to a Senator from the Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account may not be obligated or expended to directly pay for, or reimburse a Senator for, the cost of official travel by the Senator that occurs during a period during which there is a lapse in appropriations for 1 or more Federal agencies.

SENATE RESOLUTION 672—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD PRIORITIZE BILATERAL SECURITY PARTNERSHIPS OVER MULTILATERAL SECURITY PARTNERSHIPS AND INSTITUTIONS

Mr. LEE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 672

Whereas alliances have historically allowed states to combine their capabilities to combat shared security challenges and promote shared values and interests;

Whereas, in the era of great powers and regional hegemony that followed World War II, alliances have operated with small and medium states standing behind great powers;

Whereas the United States is the most free and powerful state in world history;

Whereas the United States has a duty to secure the blessings of liberty and provide for the common defense of the homeland;

Whereas the United States historically contributes almost one third of the total funds of the United Nations budget, yet has the same voting power and influence as all other member states in the United Nations;

Whereas the United States historically spends more than twice as much money on defense as all the other member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization combined;

Whereas the United States historically contributed almost one quarter of the total funds of the World Health Organization budget when the United States was a member of the World Health Organization;

Whereas the United States has contributed significantly to other multilateral institutions and multilateral security agreements at the expense of United States taxpayers and has failed to deliver returns on investment to Americans;

Whereas the significant financial and security contributions the United States has provided to multilateral institutions has not served United States interests of securing the blessings of liberty or providing for the common defense of the homeland;

Whereas bilateral agreements deliver stronger outcomes for the United States and put the United States in a more favorable position to advance its interests;

Whereas bilateral negotiations give the United States more leverage, and diplomacy is tailored to the culture, needs, and capabilities of each partner country;

Whereas bilateral agreements are often stronger, easier to secure, and can be amended more feasibly as the security environment and the interests of the United States change;

Whereas the United States is not coerced to relinquish its interests at the expense of the interests of other great powers and adversaries which are hostile towards the United States;

Whereas many multilateral agreements and institutions have outlived their original objectives and do not accurately represent the shared interests of the member states;

Whereas the United Nations is fraught with ideologies that do not align with the United States, including Marxism, antisemitism, climate alarmism, and other extremist ideologies that contradict the values of liberty and prosperity represented by the United States;

Whereas many of the countries that perpetrate gross violations of human rights against women, children, and minorities are active and influential members in the very United Nations bodies tasked with human rights protections;

Whereas the World Health Organization proved to be a puppet of the Chinese Communist Party, an adversary of the United States during the COVID-19 pandemic, and failed to make meaningful reforms following the pandemic;

Whereas the United Nations repeatedly protects the interests of adversaries of the United States by excluding Taiwan from participating in the United Nations system and elevating false Chinese data over other countries' data through the World Health Organization;

Whereas the objectives of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization outlined in the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington on April 4, 1949, were reached upon the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and several member states within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization no longer share values and interests with the United States;

Whereas the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have failed to assist the United States during its time of crisis facing the Iranian regime, which repeatedly

threatened the interests of all North Atlantic Treaty states with terrorist proxies; and

Whereas the interests and priorities of the United States are best served by bilateral security agreements with its partners and allies and not by multilateral security agreements or institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses that the United States must use its power, influence, and resources to encourage small and medium states to choose the United States as its great power partner and ally of choice;

(2) recognizes that the United States should prioritize bilateral security agreements over multilateral security agreements and institutions; and

(3) determines that the United States should withdraw support for multilateral security agreements or institutions that undermine United States interests.

SENATE RESOLUTION 673—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAFE DIGGING MONTH

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 673

Whereas, each year, the underground utility infrastructure of the United States, including pipelines, electric, gas, telecommunications, fiber, water, sewer, and cable television lines, is jeopardized by unintentional damage caused by those who fail to have underground utility lines located prior to digging;

Whereas some utility lines are buried only a few inches underground, making the lines easy to strike, even during shallow digging projects;

Whereas digging prior to having underground utility lines located often results in unintended consequences, such as service interruption, environmental damage, personal injury, and even death;

Whereas the month of April marks the beginning of the peak period during which excavation projects are carried out around the United States;

Whereas, in 2002, Congress required the Department of Transportation and the Federal Communications Commission to establish a 3-digit, nationwide, toll-free number to be used by State "One Call" systems to provide information on underground utility lines;

Whereas, in 2005, the Federal Communications Commission designated "811" as the nationwide "One Call" number for homeowners and excavators to use to obtain information on underground utility lines before conducting excavation activities (referred to in this preamble as the "One Call"/811 program");

Whereas the nearly 4,000 damage prevention professionals who are members of the Common Ground Alliance, States, the "One Call"/811 program, and other stakeholders who are dedicated to ensuring public safety, environmental protection, and the integrity of services, promote the national "Contact 811 Before You Dig" campaign to increase public awareness about the importance of homeowners and excavators contacting 811 to find out the location of underground utility lines before digging;

Whereas the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-90; 125 Stat. 1904) affirmed and expanded the "One Call"/811 program by eliminating exemptions given to local and State government agencies and their con-

tractors regarding notifying "One Call"/811 centers before digging;

Whereas, according to the 2024 Damage Information Reporting Tool Report published by the Common Ground Alliance in August 2025—

(1) "No notification to the 811 center" remains the number 1 top root cause of damage;

(2) failure to notify 811 prior to digging contributed to 25 percent of damages; and

(3) fencing and landscaping are the top types of work performed when professionals cause no-notification damages; and

Whereas the Common Ground Alliance has designated April as "National Safe Digging Month" to increase awareness of safe digging practices across the United States and to celebrate the anniversary of the designation of 811 as the national "Contact Before You Dig" number: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month;

(2) encourages all homeowners and excavators throughout the United States to contact 811 by phone or online before digging; and

(3) encourages all damage prevention stakeholders to help educate homeowners and excavators throughout the United States about the importance of contacting 811 to have the approximate location of buried utilities marked with paint or flags before digging.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4791. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4201, to require the Chief of Space Operations to submit a feasibility report on expanding the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 4792. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4201, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4791. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4201, to require the Chief of Space Operations to submit a feasibility report on expanding the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Indo-Pacific Space Partnership Act of 2026".

SEC. 2. FEASIBILITY REPORT ON EXPANDING MULTINATIONAL FORCE OPERATION OLYMPIC DEFENDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commander of the United States Space Command shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the feasibility and advisability of expanding the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender to include additional allies in the Indo-Pacific region, including Japan and the Republic of Korea.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of current activities and initiatives to facilitate the expansion of the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender to allied countries in the Indo-Pacific region, including Japan and the Republic of Korea.

(2) An identification of any policy change the Government of Japan, the Government of the Republic of Korea, and the government of any other allied country in the Indo-Pacific region identified by the Commander of the United States Space Command would need to make in order for the United States to extend a formal invitation for such countries to join the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender.

(3) An identification of any funding or policy change necessary to facilitate the accession to the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and any other allied country in the Indo-Pacific region identified by the Commander of the United States Space Command.

(4) An assessment of each of the following:

(A) The manner in which the accession to the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and any other allied country in the Indo-Pacific region identified by the Commander of the United States Space Command would affect United States national security interests.

(B) Whether the accession to the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender of Japan and the Republic of Korea—

(i) is feasible; and

(ii) would be in the national interest of the United States.

(C) The additional resources or authorities needed from the executive and legislative branches to carry out the accession to the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender of Japan and the Republic of Korea.

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

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 4792. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4201, to require the Chief of Space Operations to submit a feasibility report on expanding the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “To require the Commander of the United States Space Command to submit a feasibility report on expanding the Multinational Force Operation Olympic Defender.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 10 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, April 15, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, immediately following the business meeting, to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 3:30 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, April 15, 2026, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 15, 2026, at 3 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

NATIONAL SLAM THE SCAM DAY

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 627.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 627) designating March 5, 2026, as “National Slam the Scam Day” to raise awareness about pervasive scams and to prevent government imposter scams and other types of scams by promoting education about such scams.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. RICKETTS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 627) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 5, 2026, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL SAFE DIGGING MONTH

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 673, which is at the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 673) supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month.

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

Mr. RICKETTS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 673) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

INVESTING IN ALL OF AMERICA ACT OF 2025

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2066 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2066) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to exclude from the limit on leverage certain amounts invested in smaller enterprises located in rural or low-income areas and small businesses in

critical technology areas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. RICKETTS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2066) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2026

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 140, and that at 11 a.m., all time be expired on the joint resolution, it be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage; and that following disposition, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of Calendar No. 671, Andrew Davis, and notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture at 1:45 p.m.; further, that if cloture is invoked, all time be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader no earlier than Monday, April 20.

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

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. RICKETTS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand in recess under the previous order following the remarks of Senator SMITH.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

H.J. RES. 140

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise tonight thinking about my beloved Minnesota and thinking about all of the people in Minnesota and around the country that love the Boundary Waters.

And I want to talk for a while about the Congressional Review Act resolution—this is H.J. Res. 140—that is before us tonight, and I want to speak directly to my colleagues about the CRA and why I think it is so important that we vote no on this CRA.

So what this CRA would do is it would roll back protections for the Boundary Waters Wilderness, which is

in Northeastern Minnesota. This is a picture of just one of the many glorious scenes of what you find in the Boundary Waters, which I will be talking about more this evening. This CRA, as I said, would roll back protections for the Boundary Waters Wilderness in Northeastern Minnesota. What it would do is it would allow copper sulfide mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters, and this would be devastating to the wilderness.

The decision that this body makes will have long-term implications for the Boundary Waters, and it will also have long-term implications for how we protect public lands around this country going forward.

So I want to start with the core point that Minnesota is a mining State. We support mining—just not mining in this place. Minnesota is a mining and natural resources State. Mining is so important to our economy. We are proud to be the No. 1 source of iron ore in the whole country, and we produced three-quarters of the iron that went into the tanks and planes that led us to victory in World War II. And we are still producing most of the Nation's iron ore today.

And it is also true that there are other potential mines currently under consideration and development in Minnesota—not iron ore mines but other mines—that would produce copper and nickel.

Responsible mining is an economic driver in our State. It is part of our history, and it is part of our future.

So why oppose this CRA? Why would we oppose this CRA, which, I will tell you, will pave the way for developing a copper sulfide mine right on the doorstep of the Boundary Waters?

Well, I want to start this discussion tonight by giving three simple and basic reasons. The first is that this is an incredibly special place, beloved by Minnesotans and beloved by people all around the country, and this mine poses an unacceptable threat to this place.

The Boundary Waters, if the Presiding Officer has not been there, is a million acres of lakes and bogs and rivers. It is a wealth of hunting and fishing resources. People go there to canoe all the time. They go there in the wintertime to dogsled and to ice-fish.

I was there last summer, and I saw two wolves just in one day, on a day trip to the Boundary Waters.

It is some of the cleanest water that you will find anywhere in this country. You can drink the water right out of the middle of the lakes. You will find lake trout and northern pike and walleye. There is no better place in the world for it.

Over 150,000 people visit this incredible place every year, and so what that means is that the outdoor recreation economy in Northern Minnesota benefits greatly from the Boundary Waters.

This generates thousands of jobs and supports hundreds of local, small businesses, and it generates millions in economic activity.

Outdoor recreation is also a significant economic driver in the region around the Boundary Waters Wilderness. What happens here with this mine that will be allowed by the CRA is that this mine puts this incredible resource and the economic benefits of this resource at great risk.

It is kind of unbelievable to know that this kind of mine in 100 percent of the instances where they have been built has caused pollution.

What happens is you bring up the rock from underground. The sulfide in the rocks interacts with the water and the oxygen. My colleague Senator HEINRICH is an expert on this. That rock interacts with the water and the oxygen, and it creates basically sulfuric acid. That sulfuric acid flows directly into the Boundary Waters and on into Voyageurs National Park.

We have a map here so you can see how the water flows. This sulfuric acid, of course, is extremely dangerous, not just for fish and wildlife and the whole ecosystem in the Boundary Waters but also for the humans that recreate there, that swim in this water, that canoe in this water.

This is why Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, why sportsman's groups, why Trout Unlimited, and Pheasants Forever, and outdoor people of all kinds have weighed in and said: No. Simply, this is the wrong thing to do. Not this mine in this place. Even descendants of the great President Theodore Roosevelt have said that we should protect this national treasure and "leave it as it is."

This is also why this mine is so unpopular in Minnesota. A recent poll showed that 70 percent of Minnesotans across the political spectrum—Independents, Republicans, and Democrats—agreed that protecting the Boundary Waters from sulfide-based mine pollution should be a very important priority for elected officials in the State. And 61 percent of Minnesotans have said that they support establishing a permanent protection for public land within the Boundary Waters Watershed.

So that is the first reason because this place is so special and because this mine is so dangerous to this place.

But the second reason why, colleagues, we should oppose this CRA is that it sets an incredibly unprecedented and dangerous use of the Congressional Review Act. Now, we know that the Congressional Review Act is a way for Congress to doublecheck the executive branch if Congress feels that the Executive has passed a regulation that goes too far, that didn't follow the laws that Congress passed.

If the Executive passes a regulation that Congress feels doesn't reflect the will of Congress, then Congress can within 60 days say: Nope. You can't do that. That doesn't make sense.

But that is not what is happening with the CRA before this body tonight because for the first time ever, the House is asking the Senate to apply

the CRA process not to a rule, but to a statute, to a public land order.

They want to claw back a public land order that was put into effect legally and lawfully 3 years ago. This was never the intention of the Congressional Review Act. It has never been used in this way, to overturn a mineral withdrawal or any public land order, and especially not a mineral withdrawal that was finalized 3 years ago like this one was.

Now, I know that many of my Republican colleagues are thinking about this, and they are asking themselves: What does this mean? What are the implications of this? What would happen if this were to pass—this CRA were to pass?

And ask yourself: What would you do if the shoe was on the other foot? What would you do if we set this precedent where we say that with a simple partisan majority, Congress can claw back a public land order that has been in place potentially for years or decades? What might that mean in North Dakota? In Montana? In Utah? In Arizona? In any State in the country if these public land orders could be undone so easily? I mean, it would be chaos, I think.

The third reason that I want to talk about why it is so important to oppose this Congressional Review Act before us today, this House resolution, is that this will violate Tribal treaty rights in a way that is strongly opposed by Tribal Nations not only in Minnesota, but also around the country.

These are Tribal Nations, indigenous people, that have lived in Northern Minnesota, on the borderlands of Northern Minnesota, for time immemorial. They have treaties with the Federal Government, particularly the treaty of 1854, which grants to these Tribes in exchange for the land that they gave up hundreds of years ago, it grants them hunting and fishing rights, and also the rights to harvest manoomin, which is wild rice.

And yet, this CRA before us today completely aggregates those Tribal treaty rights. It ignores the responsibility of the Federal Government to consult with Tribes, which has not been done. That is why so many of the Tribes across the country have come together to oppose this.

This includes the Grand Portage Band and all the other members of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. It includes the National Congress of American Indians which passed a resolution urging the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs to at least hold a hearing on the implications of this before this legislation—this resolution—passes the Senate.

Tribal Nations across the country have spoken out, including the Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes, White Earth Nation, Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation, the Eastern Shoshone. They have all come out in opposition to the CRA.

So before I hand over to my dear colleague from Minnesota the senior Sen-

ator from Minnesota, Senator KLOBUCHAR, I want to address one question that I have heard made in favor of this mine and just kind of flush this out for folks.

Now, some people will say that we need to pass this CRA for its national security benefits. They claim that this mine will provide much-needed sources for critical minerals.

But I ask, colleagues, to think about what is really going on here and who will be the owner of these minerals because that is very important as you think about this national security argument.

Just because these minerals are mined on American land, on public land, on national forestland, that does not mean that they will be reserved for American markets. In fact, the copper and nickel mined in the Duluth Complex which is where the Boundary Waters is, where this mine would be, would essentially be brought out of the ground. They would be shipped to the Pacific Coast. They would be taken to China where they would be smelted, and there, they will either be sold by the company that is doing all of this, a foreign international conglomerate from Chili, Antofagasta. It will either be sold there or sold back to the United States to be paid for by all of us.

This mine is wholly owned by Antofagasta, a massive Chilean conglomerate with billionaire owners. It is one of the largest foreign mining companies in the world. They have deep ties to the Chinese Government in its mineral processing operations. Most recently, Antofagasta secured record-breaking, zero-cost processing agreements with the Chinese copper smelters, all of which are state-owned in whole or in part.

So what we are doing here is we are creating a pathway for this foreign company to build a mine, pollute the Boundary Waters, send the minerals to China where they will be processed with this sweetheart deal, and then sold on the open market. And that is not an America-first strategy.

So I encourage my colleagues to take a look at who is benefitting from this mine, and it certainly won't be in the long run Minnesotans. There are no real winners here except for this massive Chilean company.

So in a few hours, we are going to be voting on this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on rolling back protections for the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area. We can support mining in Minnesota and in this country, but not this mine in this place.

We can be good stewards of our natural resources and support mining, but not this mine. These public lands belong to all of us, and we should not allow them to be exploited for our loss and the gain of others far, far away.

With that, I would yield the floor to my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR who has been such a strong champion for Minnesota for so many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, this bill is an unprecedented use of a procedural mechanism that would have far-reaching consequences, not just for the Boundary Waters, as Senator SMITH has explained, but for public lands across our country.

I have always supported science-based review, especially a project so close to this cherished Boundary Waters canoe area, and I continue to have concerns about this administration's disregard for science.

So as many of my colleagues know, I am the granddaughter of an iron ore miner. My great-grandparents came from Slovenia, and that was the job that my great-grandpa came to do. He died very young from his work, and then my grandpa took it up. He started very, very young in underground mines with a number of brothers and sisters that he took care of when his parents died, married my grandma, and this was his life. And he loved that life.

But he mostly also loved the time he had in the outdoors. He loved to hunt. He loved to fish. Every day he would go down 1,500 feet in that cage in that mine and always thought about what he thought about with that black lunch bucket that my grandma packed for him every single day in that little house that they had taken when a mine closed down in Babbitt. They put it on the back of a flatbed truck and they blew a hole with dynamite in the ground and put that house on top of it. That was their life.

My grandpa worked most of his life in the mines as did so many friends. He became, in his later years, the foreman of the mine, and I would meet people when I was first running for U.S. Senate up in Northern Minnesota that would say to me: You know, my dad worked with your grandpa. And whenever they explored a dangerous part of the mine, the other foreman wouldn't go. They radioed down from above. But your grandpa, he went first. He went with the guys, and he went down in the mine.

Such a big part of my life. That is why I have stood with our miners. I have stood with them when we had steel dumping from China and brought President Obama's chief of staff up to Northern Minnesota, met with our steel workers and our unions.

I have stood with our workers through good times and bad and will continue to do that. We have, as Senator SMITH explained, some exciting new projects up there like Mesabi Metallics which is going to be a big taconite mine, a modern mine with some of the biggest equipment in the country. And we will have more.

But what this is about today is something else because my grandpa always got that balance. It was a balance of the working life that we must continue up in Northern Minnesota and a balance of the world around him, that world where he loved to hunt and he loved to fish.

I was 18 years old before I took a vacation that didn't involve a tent or a camper in one way or the other. I grew up in a family that valued the outdoors. My mom and dad met in the Twin Cities Hiking Club and generations of Minnesotans have found this same joy: hiking, paddling, camping in the Boundary Waters, and our beautiful parks. But I don't think they would have ever expected this.

H.J. Res. 140, as I noted, is an unprecedented use of a procedural mechanism that would have far-reaching consequences, not just for the BWCA but for other public lands. Secretaries of the Interior have long had the ability to issue public land orders to reserve Federal land for specific uses, setting it aside for things like infrastructure, certain military purposes, training and border security, or protection and conservation.

And public land orders are carefully made. The U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management gather public input. They hold townhalls. They analyze inputs.

But now for the first time, the Congressional Review Act is being used to rescind a public land order. Public land orders have never been considered rules under the CRA and have never been submitted to Congress as rules.

Today, the CRA before the Senate is being used simply as a way of revoking the land withdrawal without having to conduct that public engagement. And this unprecedented use of the CRA will have broader disruptive impacts on land management agencies' ability to oversee public lands all across the country.

This process is focused on Northern Minnesota today, but this new precedent could lead to Congress overturning public land orders elsewhere.

The Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have long been trusted with working with landowners, nearby towns, and counties, and others to develop plans for managing public lands. This is often a give-and-take process built on trust. But this Congress, for the first time, has disrupted decades of work by the Bureau of Land Management and has stepped in the way of locally led land management.

These CRA resolutions disregard extensive public input. If this CRA resolution were approved, public access to some of the Nation's most treasured landscapes could be lost and the careful management of their lands and waters eliminated.

There are hundreds of public land orders that have been issued to protect our public land that could be put at risk: The Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge in Montana, considered a sportsman's paradise for its elk and bighorn sheep hunting; the 355,000 acres of Federal land near the Chaco Canyon National Historical Park in New Mexico. The precedent potentially being established today could pave over the comprehensive process undermining these landowners.

The CRA even threatens the protected status of the Grand Canyon, which happens to sit on significant mineral deposits. This precedent could lead to CRA resolutions beyond the BLM's work. Forest Service plans might be the next Land Management Agencies Congress attempts to disrupt using this process.

This ultimately could lead to Washington micromanaging public lands rather than letting the people and experts that live near the forest, grasslands, and waterways have a say.

So look at who is concerned about what is happening in the Senate today, the groups that are supportive of what I have been talking about here and are against this effort: American Fisheries Society, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, American Hunters & Anglers, Angler Action Foundation, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, Bass Anglers Sportsman Society, Fly Fishers International, the Izaak Walton League of America, Minnesota Trout Unlimited, Minnesota Wildlife Federation, National Deer Association, National Wildlife Federation, North American Falconers Association, North American Grouse Partnership, Pheasants Forever, Quail Forever, Sportsmen for the Boundary Waters, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Trout Unlimited, Whitetails Unlimited, Wildlife Management Institute, the American Canoe Association, the Outdoor Alliance, Outdoor Life, Outdoor Realm.

So maybe some time should be taken to listen to what some of these national groups are saying that care about what my grandpa and my dad cared about, and that is public lands that can be used for recreation, for canoeing, for hunting, and for fishing.

So I will end with this: Sigurd Olson, the great Ely, MN, author and conservationist, wrote that "joys come from simple and natural things, mists over meadows, sunlight on leaves, the path of the moon over water."

This is the Boundary Waters. So Sigurd Olson just happened to be the dean of Ely Junior College and yet he rose to this national fame and that is when my dad met him because my dad went to a 2-year college, Ely Junior College, because my grandma believed that somehow that would launch his career in journalism. She happened to be right, but no one would have believed it then.

But Sigurd Olson was then the college dean. My dad and Sigurd Olson maintained a friendship for many years, powered by their shared love for the written word, for the Boundary Waters, and for their efforts to preserve Minnesota's forests and parks.

In 1977, President Jimmy Carter signed into law Hubert Humphrey's bill, and this is the desk that I stand at today—Hubert Humphrey's desk—to protect this area by creating the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

And the Boundary Waters are now the most visited wilderness area in the

country, welcoming 150,000 people each year. Over the course of my dad's career, he wrote 8,400 columns, more than a few of which were dispatches from the Boundary Waters. Speaking to the complexity of this national wonder, my dad wrote about the Boundary Waters: This is a place of woods and lakes and repose most of the time where a person can roam or drift or watch and listen. And that is not so much different in winter than in summer.

He called it a million acres of waterway and forest unlike any in the United States.

And my grandpa who loved that area, loved the forest, understood that you can make both things work but not when you are messing around with rules, not when you are not even taking the time to look at what is happening here to our public lands, and instead are just making this decision at night and going home for the day.

I thank Senator SMITH for her work, and I ask my colleagues to vote with us and listen to us about what is going on here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Thank you, Senator KLOBUCHAR.

Senator KLOBUCHAR, you and I have known each other for many years, and I never knew that your father was friends and colleagues with Sigurd Olson, which is really incredible. He is such a storyteller of this particular part of this amazing, beautiful part of the world. So thank you for sharing that. And also thank you for the incredible representation that you have provided to Northern Minnesota and all of Minnesota for so many years. Your deep roots in Minnesota's Iron Range gives you so much credibility across the State, particularly on this issue. So thank you.

Mr. President, I believe that Senator BALDWIN wants to say something.

Ms. BALDWIN. Thank you for your leadership, Senator SMITH.

And I also want to note the powerful words that Senator KLOBUCHAR just shared. She took me down memory lane as we remember the conservationists and the folks that came from our States.

And just earlier today, I was noting with my staff that next week we will be commemorating the 56th anniversary of Earth Day, the first Earth Day, and it was Gaylord Nelson, a Senator in this body who brought forth the whole concept of respecting the Earth and celebrating with a day focused on celebration of the Earth.

Wisconsin was also home for large portions of their lives, Aldo Leopold and John Muir. And hearing those accounts makes me feel especially humbled and honored to rise to speak to this resolution, this joint resolution that is before the Senate right now that we really must defeat.

I want to share with my colleagues what is at stake if the Senate removes

protections from the Boundary Waters. The Boundary Waters Wilderness Area is one of the most pristine freshwater systems in the entire country.

And if these protections are rolled back and mining moves forward, there is no restoring, there is no restoration of this watershed. It will be risking permanent damage for the profits of a multibillion-dollar foreign mining company, and I will return to that in a moment.

We must recognize who will be most affected by revoking the protections that have been in place for decades and for good reason.

Tribal nations in this region have lived with and depended upon the Boundary Waters for generations. These lands are sacred to the Ojibwe people. Tribes have treaty rights to hunt, to fish, and to gather. Voting for this resolution would betray our centuries-old treaties between the United States and the Chippewa of Lake Superior.

We cannot say that we respect Tribal sovereignty while undermining the very resources that those rights depend upon.

There is a reason that the Boundary Waters is also America's most popular and water-rich wilderness area. Its 1.1 million acres contain more than a thousand pristine lakes and 1,200 miles of river and stream.

Voting for this resolution risks the destruction of the region's prized natural resources, where the wild rice beds and the fisheries are thriving, and the water is clean and safe to drink.

People come from all over this country to recreate on the Boundary Waters, fish in the lakes, hunt in the forests. Before my colleagues vote to greenlight a mining operation, I urge them to come and see the beauty and the magic of the Boundary Waters. I have done so. It was an amazing experience. And I have heard from so many Wisconsinites who have shared their stories, their memories. And they cannot fathom the idea that Congress would take the step that we are on the precipice of taking.

As well, I have heard from our 11 federally recognized Tribal nations and their strong opposition. Our waters, our rivers, our lakes are all a part of the way of life in the Midwest. They provide fresh drinking water; they are endless sources of recreation; and they bring tourism to our States.

You know, this area, in particular, generates over \$900 million in annual tourism revenue and sustains roughly 17,000 jobs. Rural towns across the region depend on the protection of the wilderness area and its natural resources. Family-owned small businesses that provide guiding and fishing and outdoor recreation will not survive if the water is polluted and the wilderness is degraded.

The Boundary Waters must not be put at risk of perpetual pollution, which is what this resolution would do. I also just want to make it clear to my

colleagues who actually stands to benefit if this resolution passes the Senate.

While we have heard that rolling back protections for the Boundary Waters would bring economic opportunities for the region, that is false. The profits from the mining contract that this resolution aims to fast track are ultimately going overseas to benefit a Chilean multinational organization and China's industrial supply chain.

That is right. After enabling the destruction of one of our most pristine natural resources, those very resources are expected to be sold to China. With this resolution, the majority will be cashing out on a mining deal that has no long-term benefit to our economy or workforce.

The short-term gain of a mining contract cannot compete with the benefits of protecting the region that already generates, as I said earlier, over \$900 million annually in tourism revenue and sustains nearly 17,000 jobs.

This resolution does not invest in the future of communities across the Boundary Waters, nor does it respect the treaties with our Tribal nations. Its passage would come at public expense while the profits from the project flow to foreign corporations.

I invite my colleagues who have never yet made it to the Boundary Waters to come and experience it for yourself.

I encourage you to meet with the Tribes and small businesses in the region and see for yourself what we stand to lose. I implore my colleagues not to jeopardize the future of one of the most pristine freshwater ecosystems in America and override Tribal rights.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to just thank my colleague from Wisconsin for her powerful words and her longtime support for the Boundary Waters and for treaty rights and for American jobs and American-made products.

And I just so greatly appreciate your being here today in support of this and appreciate very much—and I also really appreciate my colleague Senator HEINRICH from New Mexico being here today as well to talk about how important this is and why this matters so much to him.

I know Senator HEINRICH is planning a trip to the Boundary Waters this summer, and we will all be able to hear stories of that when you get back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Minnesota for her endless advocacy for this special place, one of America's true gems.

I do hope to make it to the Boundary Waters this summer. Last July, I was supposed to be in the Boundary Waters.

I had long planned a trip with my family. It was to be our first time exploring the Boundary Waters.

My family made it; I did not. My wife Julie and my sons Micah and Carter had an incredible time that they will always remember. They paddled their canoes across lakes. They portaged from lake to lake. They slept under a blanket of stars that most people in Washington, DC, could never imagine because they can't see it.

I was supposed to be part of that trip. I was stuck here, fighting to strip out the public land selloff language from the Republican budget bill. They sent me lots of pictures afterwards, pictures of the northern pike here that my son caught—my son Micah.

My wife Julie was able to spend some really quality wilderness time with both of our sons before they went off to their respective colleges for the year. She basically told me that they ate more food on this trip than most rugby teams.

Like my family, millions—literally millions—of Americans have hunted and fished and paddled and traversed the Boundary Waters. In fact, it has an almost religious connotation among sportsmen in particular.

It is somewhat amazing to me to see a Republican Party that used to have such fidelity to hunters and anglers basically roll all of the organizations that my colleague from Minnesota rattled off which said this is not the right place for this—organizations like Pheasants Forever, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, and Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership and on and on and on—but that is where we are today.

You know, stories from the Boundary Waters, stories of stalking whitetail and grouse are passed down from generation to generation in the Midwest. Legendary stories of lake trout and northern pike and walleye abound, sometimes with the fish actually getting bigger with each telling of the story. The water, as the Senator from Minnesota, Senator SMITH, said, is some of the cleanest you will find anywhere in the lower 48. It is a bucket-list, once-in-a-lifetime designation for so many public land owners. And that is precisely what is at risk with this vote—one of our Nation's true crown jewels.

So let's back up a little bit for folks who don't have firsthand knowledge of what the Boundary Waters is, where it is, and do a little explaining.

The Boundary Waters is one of the most incredible intact wilderness landscapes left in our Nation. It is an absolute tapestry of lakes and streams, consisting of well over 1,000 individual lakes, 2,000 designated campsites, and hundreds of miles of rivers and streams. The Boundary Waters contains the largest contiguous landscape of uncut forest remaining in the Eastern United States.

The 3 million-acre Superior National Forest in which the Boundary Waters

sits contains fully 20 percent of all the freshwater in the entire National Forest System—an incredible figure.

In fact, this wilderness was so important that Teddy Roosevelt himself, President Roosevelt, set it aside as part of the Superior National Forest all the way back in 1909. Almost half a century later, Congress voted overwhelmingly to include the Boundary Waters as one of the original units of the National Wilderness System.

In many ways, Minnesotans rely on the Boundary Waters to support their local economy. Every year, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness draws more visitors—more visitors—than any other wilderness area in the entire Nation. This recreation supports 17,000 Minnesotan jobs, contributes roughly \$1 billion in annual sales, and preserves and shares, more importantly, a way of life—a way of life that has been passed down from generation to generation.

This is a place, this is an area that is no stranger to threats. In addition to containing so many of the natural resources that come with the wilderness, the area also contains copper.

I should say, you know, for one, there is a long history of iron mining in this area. I grew up the son of someone who worked for Anaconda Copper, the grandson of somebody who was a gold miner. But I want to talk a little bit about the difference between some of these Iron Range mines that mine ore that is just chemically inert. It is chemically stable.

When you mine for iron, you are basically mining iron oxide. You are mining rust, and then you are turning that back into iron. This is not that kind of mine. This is a copper sulfide mine, and the company that wants to mine here is called Twin Metals. And that sounds so Minnesotan. I think they might have picked it to sound Minnesotan. It is actually a subsidiary of a Chilean mining company called Antofagasta.

They want to build this copper-nickel mine less than a mile upstream from the Boundary Waters on a spit of land between two waterways.

Let me explain a little bit about what it looks like to mine copper in a place like Boundary Waters, particularly when you are mining copper sulfide ore. The company will have to dig some very deep shafts to reach these very deep ore bodies. They will then remove many millions of tons for processing, millions and millions of tons of copper sulfide ore. After they remove what copper and nickel are economically recoverable in that ore, they will dump as much as 100 million tons of waste rock and low-grade ore on the site, never to be removed.

Now, deep underground, the copper is locked up in this ore rich in sulfur, but that ore has never been exposed to water. It has never been exposed to oxygen or air. And when you bring it to the surface and you let it sit out in a pile and you expose it to air and water, oxygen bonds with that sulfur, and

when you bond oxygen to sulfur, you get sulfuric acid. Sulfuric acid is one of the hardest waste products you can imagine to try to control.

The waste rock that has been dumped on the site will naturally form sulfuric acid. That acid will then dissolve toxic heavy metals present in the waste rock, and then you have this toxic stew of heavy metals along with sulfuric acid.

Now, there is no plan to remove all this waste from the mine site, so it is basically a ticking time bomb of acid and heavy metals.

Studies by the EPA say that the odds of sulfuric acid polluting the Boundary Waters under this scenario are highly likely. And I will do you one better: It has a perfect track record of polluting water. That is according to the peer-reviewed study on sulfide-ore copper mining that drove the 2023 decision to ban mining in the area. It is also my personal experience as a former natural resources trustee who had to negotiate with copper companies that polluted water with this same technology.

So it is not just highly likely; it is guaranteed. Sulfide mining in the Rainy River watershed will cause certain irreversible pollution to the Boundary Waters. Think again about eating those fish that you caught or drinking that water you dipped from the middle of the lake, because the thing about sulfuric acid poisoning is it is invisible. You can't see it, but it makes water unsafe to drink.

Sulfuric acid also lowers the pH level of water, changing entire ecosystems. At high levels, fish that rely on healthy water to live literally experience respiratory failure in water poisoned by sulfuric acid. They literally drown to death. They will not be able to reproduce normally. Their food sources will be tainted, meaning entire fish populations of lake trout and smallmouth bass will be at risk.

The sulfuric acid produced by this mine will leach heavy metals like lead, mercury, or copper into that same water. That will then accumulate in the bodies of fish and wildlife that consume that water. And when people eat meat and fish with heavy metals, they accumulate in our bodies too.

This isn't a myth; it is a virtually guaranteed outcome because we know that plans for the mine include storing over 100 million tons of toxic waste rock on the edge of the wilderness upstream of the Boundary Waters. Think about how much that is. Let's visualize how much waste rock we are talking about being dumped and never removed from this mine site. A hundred million tons is like 740,000 Boeing 777 airplanes. It is twice the mass of all the living people on Earth. It is 500 times the weight of the Empire State Building sitting there, generating toxic acid. It is the amount of toxic waste that Antofagasta—a foreign mining company that plans to sell the copper to foreign countries—plans to store on the edge of the largest patch of wild rivers

and forests in our country, the place that has 20 percent of all the freshwater in our National Forest System.

The damage is really unthinkable, but it is also irreversible because currently we don't have any technology available that is capable of reversing sulfuric acid contamination.

This is bad. It is so bad that in 2016, even before there was a mineral withdrawal, the Obama administration canceled the mine's lease. And in 2023, after years of review and overwhelming public support, a 20-year mineral withdrawal was established in the Rainy River watershed, home to the Boundary Waters. That decision reflects common sense. Some places are too valuable to gamble with.

With today's technology, if it is a gamble, why not wait 30 years when maybe that technology is a sure bet? But it is not a sure bet today.

That decision also reflected the voices of the American people because the assessment that led to the mineral withdrawal was completed by the U.S. Forest Service in 2022, and it included hundreds of thousands of public comments—675,000 public comments—over 95 percent of which favored the withdrawal area being withdrawn from non-ferrous mining, sulfide mining.

Today, 70 percent of Minnesotans oppose mining in the Boundary Waters. Instead of listening to Minnesotans and Americans from all over the country who care about this place, Republicans today are using an unprecedented, blunt-force legislative method that includes zero public comment—no comment period—to make decisions about our public lands without any input from the people to whom those lands actually belong.

We can't talk about the Boundary Waters without also speaking of belonging and Tribal communities. Three Tribes—the Bois Forte Band, the Fond du Lac Band, and the Grand Portage Band of Chippewa—have extensive treaty rights in Northeastern Minnesota. These are rights to do things like hunt and fish and gather wild rice. These rights are guaranteed to them by the 1854 Treaty of La Pointe and have been reaffirmed by Federal courts over and over again. By overturning the public land order with a CRA resolution, Senate Republicans will not only cut Tribes out of the conversation, but they disrespect the Tribal treaty rights and directly risk those Tribes' guaranteed access to their traditional way of life and subsistence use of this place.

So since my Republican colleagues are refusing to include constituents' voices in this process, I will bring a few of those from New Mexico to the floor here today.

Dr. Brown, from Santa Fe, wrote me in urging that we oppose this vote. He said:

I've canoed the Boundary Waters many times and can attest to its uniqueness . . . with some of the purest water in the U.S., these lakes are visited and admired by thousands of Americans . . . Pollution of the

Boundary Waters would be a tragedy for the nation and the world.

Dr. Merriman, from Albuquerque, said:

Please vote no on HJ Res 140. Some things are worth more than money.

Lee, from Los Alamos, wrote:

I am writing to ask you to oppose H.J. Res 140 . . . The [Boundary Waters Canoe Area] is a national treasure—not just for Minnesotans but for me and other New Mexicans as well.

From Naima in Santa Fe:

This is a hideous giveaway to corporate profiteers and cannot stand. Please vote NO.

From Dr. Bagne in Silver City:

Any short-term economic gains would clearly not outweigh the long-term risks to the ecosystem and water supplies. Although it is in Minnesota, many similar public lands in New Mexico would be threatened by . . . relaxing mining rules. Please oppose.

Judy, from Albuquerque, wrote:

I am aghast . . . Please do all that you can to stop this giveaway of our wonderful public lands. This happened despite all the thousands of citizen signatures against the vote.

From Roxane in Rio Rancho:

Please vote against reversing the ban on mining . . . I am very concerned that the Trump Administration is flying under the radar and doing a lot of damage that will be difficult, or even impossible, to reverse.

From Amy in Albuquerque:

Please do not allow this to happen. [The Boundary Waters] belong to all Americans, not to a Chilean mining company with contracts to [process ore in] China.

Their voices matter because the Boundary Waters are our public lands—all of ours. President Teddy Roosevelt, who had the incredible foresight to protect this beautiful place, had it right when he said that we “should see to it that they are preserved for [our] children and [our] children’s children forever, with their majestic beauty all unmarred.”

The way I look at public lands is that they are the closest, most tangible thing we have to being able to represent true Jeffersonian democracy.

They are the thing, as we saw last June, that often unites us across the political spectrum. If you take these public lands away, you tear away the places where we are the most free. This is an issue of our heritage, and it is an issue of our inheritance.

It is an issue for Minnesota, but it is not just an issue for Minnesota—it is an issue for our Nation. It is about something bigger. It is a test of whether our public lands—as a friend of mine likes to say—our public lands that are the anvil upon which we have forged our collective identity.

Can that be stripped from us? Can it be stripped of their protections?

You know, I am going to summarize this one more time. We are going to allow a foreign mining company to take our minerals, to ship those minerals to China for processing, and then to sell those back to us with a tariff on top.

Like, how is that “America First”? It is not. And to risk this globally, in-

credible rare asset that is the Boundary Waters for that, boy, that just seems really shortsighted to me.

I would urge every one of my colleagues—I would urge you—to vote no on this Congressional Review Act resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from New Mexico for laying out the issues so ably that are before us with this House resolution on the Boundary Waters. It is wonderful to have a colleague who not only is really good at being a legislator but who is also an outstanding hunter and fisherman and then, on top of that, is also an engineer so that he can explain to us the impacts of this kind of mining on the environment with a scientific expertise that I just really value.

I thank Senator HEINRICH so much for being here tonight to help tell the story of what the impact of this mine would be on this incredible place and why it is so important that this CRA be defeated.

As I think about what I want people to know about this place, I can’t help but think about the first time that I saw the Boundary Waters myself. Some of my colleagues may know that I was originally born in New Mexico. I have lived in Minnesota for over 40 years now, but I was originally born in New Mexico. New Mexico is a desert climate. So, when I first went to Minnesota, I didn’t quite know what to make of all of the lakes and rivers and streams and the beautiful green everywhere.

But I was married to a man who had spent his high school years up in the Boundary Waters. He went to a camp up there where he would go up for weeks at a time and canoe throughout the Boundary Waters. The Boundary Waters are connected to a big Canadian provincial park called the Quetico, and you literally can canoe from surface water in the Boundary Waters and get all the way to Hudson Bay, which is just remarkable. I went up there for the first time to see this incredible place after Archie and I had lived in Minnesota for a few years, and I think, in a lot of ways, it is when I first fell in love with Minnesota—the place of Minnesota—because I just couldn’t believe all the water and the green and the wildlife and also how wild it was and to be able to be out on the water, in a canoe, and feel like you were just so far away from the pressures of modern civilization.

Yet, the Boundary Waters is really quite accessible to people. It is not one of those areas that is a wilderness area that is impossible to get to, which is why, as you know, we are talking about it tonight. People have been—you know, hundreds of thousands of people are able to visit the Boundary Waters each year and are able to experience what it is like to be in this place.

As I said earlier, the last time I was there was at the end of last summer. We were in the Boundary Waters just for a day trip, and even on that day trip, we saw two wolves, which is, like, really incredible. You can imagine in the wintertime, when it is so dark in that part of the world—long, long nights—the opportunity to see the aurora borealis, or the northern lights, which are just really phenomenal. Then, in the summertime, the long, long northern summer evenings stretch on until, you know, 9:30 or 10 at night, and you have incredible opportunities to go fishing and just be at the camp and just enjoy it. It is really amazing.

When I first went to the Boundary Waters with our kids, I started to get really interested in the history of this place, and I found it just fascinating to think about. So you have got, you know, what today we think of as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, which is a million areas of protected wilderness. It is important, I think, as I was diving into the history of this place, to understand that, historically, this has been the home of the Anishinaabe people, the Ojibwe people, in Northern Minnesota. They lived in this place for, you know, generations and generations. They canoed and hunted and fished to support themselves and their families and their communities, and that was their home.

Starting in the 18th century, the Boundary Waters got connected up through the fur trade routes as the voyageurs came, you know, all the way from across the Atlantic and in through, you know, what is now Northern Minnesota and Canada; but it was at that point that this was just an incredible resource for these fur trading routes that were a hugely—hugely—big deal. That fur trade really, you know, drove what was happening in that part of the country. In the 1700s and 1800s, French explorers and traders really opened up the area. The North West Company established a trading post at Grand Portage, and that was really kind of the economic driver.

In this moment, this part of the country that is now the Boundary Waters experienced some, you know, huge transitions, but I think it is important for us all to understand that, even though this is a wilderness place—it is a wild place—it has also always been a place where people were, where people were a part of what was happening in this country and in this particular part of the country.

Of course, you know, over time, as the United States became a country and entered into relationships with the Tribal nations that lived in this part of the country, that became sort of what drove a lot of the geopolitics, I guess you could say, of this part of the Nation.

In 1857, there was the Enabling Act, and the U.S. Congress was granted land to support schools through the University of Minnesota. Then a little bit later—this is right about the time of

the statehood for Minnesota; Minnesota was admitted into the Union in 1858—you know, there was additional negotiating that happened, and Congress granted the right to the State to swap lands in order to, you know, pull, you know, big chunks of land together.

By the time of about 1902, the U.S. Land Office—what it did is it withdrew a half a million acres in what is now the future—what was the future WCA wilderness area, and they withdrew it from settlement, which was a really, really important thing because, at this time, we were seeing massive development in Northern Minnesota, a huge—you know, massive timber resources were present in the State and, of course, mineral resources, including iron.

In 1904, at the request of the State's forestry board, Congress granted 20,000 acres to the State for the Burntside Forest Reserve, and it said in that situation that State forest reserves should be devoted not alone to the business of raising timber but to the pleasures of all the people. It is interesting to me. I think about how Minnesota—even, you know, back more than a century ago—was thinking carefully about how to balance the power and the vitality of our economy in Northern Minnesota with also the understanding that some of that most precious land needs to be set aside in a place where people can enjoy it.

Over time, in 1909, the Superior National Forest was created by President Theodore Roosevelt—a great conservationist in our country's history. I often think of him as the man who really was the leader of the powerful Republican conservation movement in this country. So, in 1909, President Theodore Roosevelt created the Superior National Forest from previously withdrawn lands that had been set aside, including what is now part of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. There was continuing work both at the State level and at the Federal level to create sort of game refuges—yes, refuges—and other places that would be places where, you know, the moose and the caribou and other wild creatures would have a place to live even as Northern Minnesota was becoming increasingly developed.

In 1926, the roadless wilderness area in the Superior National Forest was established by the Secretary of Agriculture at the time, which was 640,000 acres. At that point, they said the policy here was to retain as much as possible the land which had recreational opportunities of this nature in the wilderness.

The efforts of this country to continue to protect this area went forward in the 1930s with the passage of the Shipstead-Newton-Nolan Act to protect water levels and lakeshores. There had been some dams and other sort of navigational structures that had been built that were having an impact on how the water flowed in the Boundary Waters. So here we had kind of a prohibition of

those dams and logging within 400 feet of this recreational area just to sort of protect the natural area.

And then in the late 1920s and early 1930s, work continued to sort of establish what was this special place that was going to be protected.

In 1938, the U.S. Forest Service established the Superior Roadless Primitive Area, with boundaries that, today, are quite similar—quite similar to what today is the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

In Minnesota, we know a lot about something called Thye-Blatnik. I can talk more about that, but in 1948, Congress passed the Thye-Blatnik area. And what happened then is that, through the Thye-Blatnik Act, resorts and other private lands in the wilderness were bought up, and we established something that is still very important to this day, something that I work on all the time, that in lieu of the property taxes that might have been achieved through those lands, there is a payment in lieu of taxes called Thye-Blatnik that goes to the counties up in Northern Minnesota—Cook County and Lake County, St. Louis County—in exchange for what was this wilderness area for all of us to enjoy.

In 1949, President Truman issued an Executive order for basically an airspace reservation over the wilderness area to prohibit planes from flying in on the lakes and disrupting the experience of nature that people could have there. You were not allowed to fly lower than 4,000 feet over the wilderness.

And then in 1958, the Forest Service changes the name of this place to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, and it becomes a part of what we now know as the Boundary Waters.

In 1964, another really important milestone happened for the protection of this incredible place, and that was when Congress passed the Wilderness Act, and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area became part of the National Wilderness Preservation System with a clause that allowed for some logging and some use of motorized vehicles to continue in this area.

In 1965, the Secretary of Agriculture at the time was Orville Freeman, who was a Minnesotan, and Secretary Freeman issued all sorts of management changes that were recommended to kind of further protect this area from logging and from motorized boats and zoning to make sure that it would stay in its most natural state.

In 1978, Congress enacts the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act, which protected this place in perpetuity—we would hope—to be the wilderness area that it is. This was a very, very important thing.

It was somewhat controversial in Minnesota at the time, there is no doubt, but it has, today, become one of the most beloved places in Minnesota, thanks to the prescience of State and local leaders who went forward to protect this place.

And I am thinking—as I think about all of the people over so many generations who have been in this place for sustenance, for their food, for their housing, and in more modern times, for their ability to get away from it all and to enjoy this place in ways that is so difficult, I am thinking about all the people that I have heard from who have asked me to make sure that we are protecting this place.

I think, today—a big thanks to everybody who has reached out to our office. I think, today, we had hundreds of phone calls into the office asking me to do everything I can to protect the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area. And, honestly, over the last many weeks that this issue has been on the forefront of people's minds, we have gotten, I am sure, just thousands and thousands and thousands of messages from people.

And what is interesting about these messages is, you know, one, how many people have firsthand experience of this incredible place and what it means to them and just the diversity of the stories that people have.

I find this all the time when I go around Minnesota, and people will stop me and thank me for the work that I have done to protect this place, just the way that people want to tell the stories of what it has meant to them.

I think, today, especially in this time when it is so hard, especially for our young people to get—I mean all of us, however old you are—to get away from technology and to just sort of be centered in that experience of being, you know, out in nature, that it is causing people to be even more appreciative of what it means to have a wilderness area like this.

So I am going to just take a moment to read some of the stories that have been forwarded to me about the power of this place and the lives of people in Minnesota and across the country.

This is a story from Grand Rapids, MN, which is in the, kind of, northern part of the State, still south of the Boundary Waters, and it says:

I am a 53-year-old that has lived in Northern Minnesota her whole life. My family and I have enjoyed God's great Northwoods and all it has to offer through canoeing and camping, water skiing, biking, campfires, hiking, swimming, and much more. To see and hear about the Boundary Waters possibly condemned would be beyond a travesty. Just think of all of the animals, all of the family trips ended, tree growth, the disaster that would happen there, not to mention what it would do to the ecosystem and whatever else I cannot fathom right now.

This is a message that was sent in to me from Mahtomedi, MN, which is more in the Twin Cities, South Central part of the State in the Twin Cities area. This person wrote:

The Boundary Waters have been a very special place to me for a long time. I was first taken there by my father and my uncle, and it was the start

of my relationship with my uncle who was previously more distant from our family due to work. Since then, I have gone to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness once a year for the past few years with my father and my uncle. So many of my fondest memories are all from the Boundary Waters, and I hope to continue to make more of them, not only with my father and my uncle but with my own children in the future as well.

This is a message from someone from Farmington, MN. Farmington is also in the suburban metro area of Minneapolis and St. Paul. And this person said:

Me and my dad take a trip once yearly to canoe the Boundary Waters. I am 23 years old, and every year is incredibly special because the Boundary Waters are so important to my family. My dad proposed to my mom in the Boundary Waters. The Boundary Waters represents love; the wild, untamed American spirit; and my family. I want to be able to show my children pristine wilderness. I am begging you to act to protect the Boundary Waters.

This is a message from Rochester, MN, the home of Mayo Clinic and University of Minnesota Rochester, an incredible community. This person has written this:

I was 10 years old when I first visited the Boundary Waters with my dad and my grandfather. I have since visited numerous times, including in 2020 when my grandfather, who had been going to the Boundary Waters for 40 years, made his final visit. This place is now, to my family, not just a tranquil retreat but also a time-honored family legacy and an act of remembrance for my grandfather. To allow the Boundary Waters to be permanently open for mining is to destroy one of the great natural gifts God has given Minnesota for current generations and generations to come.

Now, I just want to pause on this because I think it is an opportunity to talk a little bit more about—kind of help to locate in colleagues' and people's brains like where this mine will be, and I have a map which shows how this all flows.

So the Boundary Waters is this huge area, as we have said, a million acres of wilderness. And I am going to orient you here. The green here is the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. And this is the border between Minnesota and Canada here. And this is the Quetico Provincial Park, which is this huge Canadian national park. It is really quite incredible.

And then here you see Ely, MN, which is a major entry point into the Boundary Waters. If you were to go over here, you would find—oh, I guess it is down here as I am orienting myself on this map. I guess it is over here. There is another access point that is commonly used by people in going into the Boundary Waters through the Gunflint Trail and Grand Marais, which is right here on Lake Superior.

And what we are talking about here, here you can see—I am going to give you the orientation here—the red—this area here, the yellow and green stripes, which you can see here, this is where the Twin Metals deposits are, this mine that we are talking about. These are the deposits that would be developed by Antofagasta, by the Twin Metals Mine, right here.

The red area shows how the water flows on the map, and it gives you an idea of why, even though this mine is just slightly outside of the actual boundaries of the Boundary Waters, that, for the practical purposes of the watershed and how the water moves, it might as well be inside the watershed in terms of how the damage to the water would flow because you can see, it is all connected. I mean, that is what happens with water, it flows.

And so here you have Birch Lake. It flows up this way. This is the Namakan River, Namakan Lake. Up here is Rainy Lake. This is close to where our kids went to camp. Kabetogama Lake is up here.

All of this area is connected. And so when you hear, colleagues, people telling you: You don't need to worry about this because this mine isn't in the Boundary Waters, that is not the point. The point is that it is in the watershed of the Boundary Waters, and that is how the damage is done.

(Mr. ARMSTRONG assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, I was showing colleagues this map because I wanted to make a couple of points about how this works—how the waterflow works.

One is that even though the mineral deposits and how they are going to be developed are just barely outside of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, the impact of the mine and the impact on the water spreads not only through the Boundary Waters, but it also flows up through these rivers that essentially form the border between Minnesota and Canada—the United States and Canada—and then into Voyageurs National Park. I think sometimes we don't talk enough about the impact on Voyageurs, which is an incredible park.

Together, Boundary Waters and Voyageurs offer people so many different ways of experiencing this wilderness, and the impact on both of them is really significant.

I think sometimes also it is hard for folks to fully understand and appreciate what is the impact on water quality of this kind of mine. And so I want to just share some of that with you as well as you think about what is the risk that is actually posed by this?

And I am going to get into this a bit more in some detail, but I think it is important, as you are considering this, to understand that during the mineral lease withdrawal process that happened in—well, really, stretched over time between, roughly, 2016 and 2021, when it was brought to a conclusion, there was a massive amount of effort, scientific research study that was done, huge

amounts of public comment to gather information about what people thought about this that became the basis for the decision to do this mineral withdrawal.

The mineral withdrawal process is defined in the Federal Land Management Policy Act. I believe it is the FLPMA, as people call it around here. And that was followed to a tee. And that congressional law allows for mineral withdrawals when it is determined that the potential risks of mines or other kinds of natural resources development pose too great a risk to the public resource that belongs to it all. So I will talk about that in a little bit more detail, but I wanted to just share with colleagues this background on why sulfide ore copper mining poses such a unique risk to the Boundary Waters of Minnesota.

So the background here is that a Chilean mining company operating under the name of Twin Metals—Senator HEINRICH said it sounds like a nice Minnesota name, and it is, but it is essentially a wholly owned subsidiary of Antofagasta.

So this Chilean mining company has proposed this mine—a large copper-nickel mine immediately upstream of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. And this proposed mine would extract copper from a geological formation called the Duluth Complex.

The Duluth Complex really runs kind of this way. It runs from northeast to southwest across Minnesota. This is important because there are lots of places where the Duluth Complex can be developed in addition to this particular place where these leases in question are right on the border of the Boundary Waters. There are huge resources all across the way. And, in fact, there are other mines under development down in this part of the State that are going through the process of getting developed.

So this Duluth process, which has a specific type of sulfide ore that interacts with water in ways that can create—that do create permanent contamination risks. And so the question is, How does this mechanism work? What exactly happens? And why is it so particularly difficult to manage in this watershed? Part of why the water quality is of such a big concern in this area is that the baseline condition here is just so outstanding.

A 2017 report by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency describes the water within the Boundary Waters watershed as “exceptionally clean and immaculate.” It concludes that the majority of the water bodies within this watershed have exceptional biological, chemical, and physical characteristics.

So the water in the Boundary Waters is so clean that visitors frequently drink right out of the lakes. There is no need for any purification. I have done this myself. When you are canoeing—now, you are not going to want to drink the water right next to the shore

because that is where the wild animals are, but you can go out into the middle of the lake and dip your mug into the water in the middle of the lake, and the water is incredible. So the fundamental hazard of sulfide ore mining is this acid mine drainage that happens.

When sulfide-bearing rock is excavated and exposed to oxygen and water, a chemical chain reaction begins, and what happens is that the sulfide minerals here, primarily—I might not say this exactly right—pyrrhotite, which is in the Duluth Complex, it oxidizes upon exposure and then you have sulfuric acid. And sulfuric acid then dissolves the surrounding rock and leaches out heavy metals—including copper and arsenic and lead and cadmium—into the water. And the resulting contaminated water, which is the acid mine drainage, is very acidic, and it is also laden with heavy metals, and that, of course, is toxic to aquatic life.

And the mining operations are going to dramatically increase the surface area of this rock as it is exposed to water and oxygen, and that accelerates the oxidation by many orders of magnitude compared to what you would see with natural weathering rates. And once this acid mine drainage has started, it is incredibly difficult to stop it, and it can continue for centuries or in perpetuity after the mine closes—a problem that is sometimes called perpetual treatment.

So if you think about it, this mine—the mining company itself says that they think that the mine would probably be in operation for, I think, 10, 15 years or in that area. Yet you are going to have centuries of impact from this so-called perpetual treatment issue.

A secondary chemical hazard, when you are doing sulfide ore mining in this particularly damp environment of the Boundary Waters watershed, would also substantially increase sulfite loading in the water. So elevated sulfate triggers a separate but related chemical reaction with serious consequences for human health.

Sulfate-reducing bacteria in sediment can convert sulfate to sulfide under low oxygen conditions and then the sulfide can react with inorganic mercury, which is naturally present in the environment, to produce methylmercury. And methylmercury bioaccumulates in the food chain, concentrating in fish at levels that can be dangerous for human consumption.

Sulfate discharges from existing disturbed areas of sulfide ore in the watershed have already elevated sulfate levels in the BWCA headwaters, and analysis of monitoring data indicates that there is a measurable water quality degradation that is already occurring.

So this is important because the Boundary Waters fisheries—particularly walleye, the most beloved fish in Minnesota—are central to the recreational and economic value of this place. And, of course, mercury contamination resulting in consumption advisories would have a significant im-

pact for the sport fishing industry, certainly for Tribal subsistence rights, and overall for the negative impacts on the regional tourism economy.

So I think, as you think about this, I mean, you have got to sometimes think: Wow, like, that sounds bad, but is that really going to happen? Do we really have to worry about that? Won't there be a way of avoiding this? And I just want to point out that we can look at the precedence of what has happened in the other places around the country to help answer that question.

The chemical risks that I have just described are not theoretical. In fact, there are two sites in the United States where this AMD from sulfide ore mining has caused serious and long-lasting harm. This is the acid mine drainage—AMD.

So the first site is the Gold King Mine in Colorado. This is from 2015. In August of 2015, an EPA contractor crew working at the abandoned Gold King Mine near Silverton, CO, accidentally breached a plug, releasing approximately 3 million gallons of acid mine drainage into Cement Creek, which is a tributary of the Animas River.

So this plume, which was literally visible orange from dissolved iron and heavy metals, it traveled more than 100 miles downstream through Colorado and New Mexico. It crossed into the Navajo Nation. The Navajo Nation relies on the San Juan River for irrigation and for drinking water, and three States had to declare emergencies.

The Navajo Nation had to shut down all water withdrawals from the river, farmers lost crops and were forced to sell their livestock, and some metals were measured at hundreds of times the legal limits for drinking water. Now, a treatment plant costing \$1.5 million to build and \$2.4 million per year to operate was still running as of 2024—9 years after the spill. This treatment plant is treating an estimated 300 gallons of contaminated water per minute draining continuously from the mine.

Local communities have declined Superfund designation for years out of concern for tourism, but the spill forced their hand, and victims have filed hundreds of millions of dollars in claims. None has been paid because the EPA evoked sovereign immunity.

So this was a breach in this gold metal mine in Silverton talking about a plume of this polluted acid drainage that is traveling more than 100 miles. And I know my Minnesota pretty well, but I would say that—I mean, certainly from Birch Lake to Voyageurs National Park is less than 100 miles. So it gives you an idea of how far this polluted water can spread in these kinds of dangerous environments.

I want to tell colleagues about another example of this kind of failure, and that is the Summitville Mine in Colorado. At the Summitville Gold Mine in southern Colorado, acid- and metal-laden runoff killed all biological life in a 17-mile stretch of the Alamosa River.

The operator declared bankruptcy in 1992 and abandoned the site midoperation, leaving EPA to manage the ongoing emergency, and the site was designated a Federal Superfund site, and Federal cleanup costs have exceeded \$210 million. The Alamosa River has never fully recovered.

I think it is important that we think about these things as we consider the risks of this kind of mine. And, again, I want to remind colleagues that that is one of the reasons why this mineral withdrawal was done—because the Forest Service considered these risks. They did an environmental assessment, and they concluded that this risk was too great to bear.

When we weigh these substantial risks of mining near the Boundary Waters, it is important for us to ask: What is the benefit? What might we see here? Where might we benefit? And this is, I think, really important to understand because where would these minerals go?

There has been an argument made that this is an “America First” national security priority to develop these minerals, but the question is, Who would own the minerals that are brought up from this piece of land right here near Birch Lake in Northern Minnesota? And the answer to that question is these minerals are going to go to China.

Antofagasta—the Chilean company that is wanting to develop these leases—operates a number of copper mines in South America, and it sends the majority of the ore that it pulls out of the ground to Chinese state-owned refineries for processing.

This year, in fact, these Chinese refineries have agreed to an unprecedented zero-dollar contract for processing Antofagasta ore. So if you think about it, what this means is that China is in such great need of copper ore to develop their energy and their AI infrastructure—and all of the reasons that they need copper ore—that they have agreed to directly subsidize Antofagasta's copper production by providing free processing of its ore.

So what this means, of course, is that the copper nickel that is pulled out of these deposits is going to probably travel by train to the Pacific coast, where it is then going to be transported to China, where it will be smelted in China, and it will be used.

Those minerals aren't going to then be sent back to us free. They are going to be maybe, at best, sold back to us in iPhones or other kinds of consumer products. But they are not ours to develop. We are going to have to buy them back.

So I question, colleagues: What is the advantage here? Where is the national security advantage? Where is the “America First” advantage that we are looking for?

With a critical minerals trade war already underway, shipping American minerals to China seems to run counter to so much of the work that Congress

is trying to do to onshore critical minerals and critical mineral supply chains.

So as I have been looking at this, I think it shows us that the proposed risks of this mine are substantial. They arise from the chemistry of the ore itself and, specifically, the chemistry in this very particular climate. And here in the particular rock and the particular climate in Minnesota, you have got the inevitability of AMD, this acid mine drain-off, from this sulfide-rich rock. You have the absence of any natural acid buffering capacity in the watershed. And then you have this sort of sulfate-driven methylmercury pathway that is developed.

These chemical realities, combined with the connectivity of this water across so many miles between the mine site here, the BWCA immediately adjacent to it, and then all of this watershed mean that the consequences of contamination would be really severe. They would be long-lasting, and they would be effectively irreversible.

And as we consider the risks that come from this mine proposal, I think we really have to ask ourselves if it is worth endangering one of our most beloved wilderness areas so that American minerals can be processed and used in China.

Now, colleagues, I want to turn to an issue that is a little bit geeky and nerdy. If you are in Congress, though, you appreciate the value of it. And this has to do with, sort of, what is the process that we are using right here, right now, to pass this CRA. Let me just kind of talk about that a little bit because I think it is important for us to understand the precedent that we will be setting if we pass this resolution.

So we have before us H.J. Res. 140, which would essentially apply the congressional review authority process, with all of the privileges of that process, to something that is not a rule—which is what the congressional review authority is all about—but is a public land order. And this is important to understand.

The mineral withdrawal that was done here was done under the authorities of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. And in that Federal Land Policy and Management Act, there are processes that Congress defined if they don't like what happened, if they don't like what the executive branch did. There are processes for congressional disapproval of a public land order.

And so under this Federal Land Policy and Management Act—I am going to call it FLPMA because that is what everyone calls it around here—there is an existing process for Congress to express its disapproval with a public land order, like the 2023 mineral withdrawal which is under consideration here on the Senate floor tonight. In that process that is described, Congress is given 90 days to adopt a concurrent resolution of disapproval.

So what is interesting is that, following the 2023 mineral withdrawal, which was completed in 2023, a resolution of disapproval on that mineral withdrawal was actually introduced. It was introduced on the House floor, and it passed out of the House Natural Resources Committee—all done, sort of, under the rules of sort of what FLPMA establishes. But it was never brought to the House floor, never brought to the Senate floor. And, in fact, Congress never acted on it.

And what happened, of course, is that under FLPMA you have 90 days to review or disapprove of an action, and that 90-day window opened and closed, and it passed.

So now what is happening—you might be asking: So why are we dealing with this now? This was in 2023. It actually came up on the House floor, and nothing ever came of it. Why are we dealing with this now?

Well, so the reason for that is that Republicans in the House are trying to use the congressional review authority, basically, to get a do-over. They are ignoring the fact that the CRA wasn't created to overturn a public land order, especially one that was 3 years old.

The CRA was designed by Congress to say: If the Federal Government passes a rule that we don't like, within 60 days we have the right to say: No, that is not what we meant; we want to draw it back again.

But, of course, that is not what is going on here. We are talking about not 60 days, not 90 days; we are talking about 3 years. We are not talking about a Federal regulation; we are talking about a public land order that has been standing for 3 years.

And I just think we have to think about what are the impacts of this precedent if this is the step that the Senate decides to take, because, if we are allowing these public land orders to be rescinded under the Congressional Review Act—I mean, this is a really dangerous precedent. Public land orders have never previously been submitted by any administration, including the first Trump administration. They have never previously been submitted as rules subject to the congressional review authority. This is the first one, submitted 3 years after the public land order was issued by the Department of the Interior. And, in fact, as I have just said, Congress set up a completely different set of procedures specifically to reconsider public land orders under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

So what we are seeing here is using the CRA to undo this public land order, which would establish an entirely new precedent. It would allow future Congresses to undo public land orders with no time limit on any public land order. And potentially, based on this precedent, it could allow future Congresses, with a simple partisan majority vote, to undo any administrative action.

So what would that look like? What would that mean? Because I think, as

we are making this decision, colleagues, you always have to think about that sometimes you are in power, sometimes you are out of power. But you have to think about what are the long-term implications of your decision.

So if this precedent is set—if we say, yes, the CRA could be used to undo a public land order, like we have here in the Boundary Waters—well, then, I would think that some future Democratic Congress might think: Hmm, let's use the CRA to undo a fossil fuel lease or a mining lease or a timber lease that we don't think makes sense in South Dakota. Maybe we could use—this precedent would suggest that you could use the CRA to undo a permit or undo a permit denial. In fact, it seems so broad, this precedent, that it could probably undo any determination on an administrative law matter.

So that seems to me to be really risky—because one of the things that matters in this country is that you might not always agree with what happens, but there has to be some continuity, some consistency. If we are constantly doing something and then undoing it and then doing it again, I can tell you from my business background that that is a disaster, because how do you decide to make investment decisions if you think that willy-nilly, depending on who is in power and what the environment is, what the political environment is, an investment that you made in one area, under one administration, is going to be undone by another administration at another time—because that is exactly what is happening here. One administration, one party, is undoing what was done perfectly legally 3 years ago.

Now, it makes sense to me, right, that if something is done that Congress just disagrees with, that you would have a window of time to undo it—like, I think, 60 days, 90 days, as we have with the CRA and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. That makes sense.

Congress says: No, that is not what we wanted. That is not what we intended. That was not our legislative intent when we wrote this. We are going to undo it.

Then that makes sense to me.

If an administration does a mineral withdrawal like we did here, like the Biden administration did here, and Congress says, "That was a mistake; that doesn't comply with the laws as we wrote them; we are going to change it," then, by all means, go ahead and try to change it, but not 3 years later and not in this way, not using a tool that was not—the CRA tool was not built for this. It was built to change a regulation that Congress disagreed with.

I think that it is a very dangerous—very, very dangerous—precedent, and I think it is the kind of precedent that, honestly, when the shoe is on the other foot, it creates problems. And I know that I have spoken with my colleagues

on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, who are concerned about this precedent and wonder what it might mean. And the Presiding Officer and I both have experience in the private sector, and I think we could relate to the idea that capital likes certainty, capital likes to minimize risk by knowing what is going to—what they can count on. And that is, I think, one of the gravest dangers of this action that the Senate seems poised to take.

In a world where the Senate is always going to be a place where people disagree with one another, where we are not always going to see things the same way, where a project that I might think shouldn't be permitted somebody else might think is reasonable to be permitted—those disagreements will always be there. But if we get into a situation where different parties, depending on whether they are in power or not, are just sort of—kind of randomly—undoing what has been in place for several years, I just think it further undermines the need for—it adds to chaos, it undermines certainty, and it certainly doesn't contribute to the problem-solving mentality that I think that we need around here.

And, of course, for my precious Boundary Waters, it has potentially really significant impacts, as I have described here, with the likely impact of water pollution on this precious place. And it also just leads to more lawsuits and more, sort of, legal wrangling that, in my mind, I wish we could just avoid.

In my life as a political leader, I have always found that the best ideas usually come from the people that are closest to the ground and closest to the work and do understand best what is going on, and so I am going to just take a few more minutes to read some of the comments that have come my way from people who have firsthand experience with the Boundary Waters and know what an incredible place it is.

This is a note from a constituent of mine from Medina, MN, which is, again, in the Twin Cities Metro Area. They write:

I know all the facts and arguments below are important, but for someone who went on Boundary Waters trips growing up, to bring my own girls starting at ages 5 and 8, it is truly a place like no other. It is my dad's happy place. He has led and gone on hundreds of BWCA trips over his lifetime, and at the young age of 72, he continues to go.

This is what I was talking about earlier about how, even though this is a very wild place, it is also so accessible to people.

This person goes on to write: He told myself and my husband when we were packing up for our first trip ever with the girls that from the moment that they were born, he has dreamt of this moment. The girls love it there. We have gone every year since. They adore being in the wilderness, seeing nature, and disconnecting from a world that

can be so overwhelming. They look forward to it every year. As a mom, I am truly proud that my two girls are getting these opportunities. They are learning valuable life skills while being up there, and it doesn't hurt that we all get to disconnect from technology for a few days. I beg you to work as hard as you can to save this special place so that my daughters' kids will be able to enjoy it all in its splendor for years to come.

This is a message that came to me from Waconia, MN, and this is what this person writes: I first visited the BWCA on a church retreat in 2001, and it has been a magical place for me since then. As someone with a wildlife biology degree who also happens to have conservative political beliefs, I believe that protecting our country's pristine wilderness should take precedence over any financial partnerships with other countries. While it may momentarily create jobs for people in the Iron Range, those benefiting the most will be in Chile and China. Let's protect one of our country's last natural treasures so it will be around for generations to come. I have a close group of nine girlfriends from high school, and we have been making an annual trip to the BWCA just outside of Ely—this is it; this is what it looks like—just outside of Ely for 23 years now. I am now a 41-year-old mother, and it is still my favorite weekend of the year. Please vote no to protect the environment, the animals, and my own personal sanity. I need the BWCA to remain protected. Remember, take nothing but pictures; leave nothing but footprints; kill nothing but time.

I love that.

This is making me think that there has been, you know, some things written—some things said—about what is it that Minnesota wants when it comes to this mine and this place and protecting this place. The stories that I am reading give wonderful anecdotes about what people think about it, but I think I am just going to bring some polling into this here because this is polling that shows what Minnesotans think about this broadly across different parties.

I think it is important to know that this was research that was done just in December of 2025. That is quite recent. This research shows us that Minnesotans are deeply connected to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and intensely support its protection. Multiple polls over the last 10 years have consistently shown this deep connection amongst voters across all political alignments.

This connection drives opposition to sulfide ore copper mining within the Boundary Water watershed by double margins. Minnesota voters are generally pro-mining, as I talked about earlier. They are pro-mining for iron ore, taconite, and for copper-nickel with one important exception: They overwhelmingly oppose sulfide ore copper mines that would be located in the watershed of the Boundary Waters.

I am going to give you some of the data in a minute, but I think this is something that I was saying earlier and that I want to return to. Minnesota is a pro-mining State. We are so proud of our mining heritage, and we are very, very proud of the continuing contributions we make to the Nation's economy through iron ore. We are the No. 1 producer of iron ore in the whole country. It is a crucial part of our economic foundation, and we are excited about the opportunity to develop new precious metals mining in Minnesota as these new deposits in the Duluth Complex are being explored. But Minnesota's view is, not this mine in this place. That is the issue here because they understand how popular, they understand how precious this place is.

So here is some of the data that I think is interesting. The Boundary Waters is uniquely popular, and voters across all political parties—all political parties—say protecting it is an important priority.

Sixty percent of Minnesotans say that they have been to the Boundary Waters. That is kind of incredible.

The Boundary Waters is viewed favorably by nearly all Minnesotans across the State. Eighty-six percent of Minnesotans have a favorable view and 67 percent of Minnesotans have a very favorable view of Boundary Waters.

Now, I don't know what your State is like, Mr. President, but to find something that 60 percent of people say they have done and—what was it here?—86 percent of people have a favorable view of, that is a pretty big deal in our State, that everybody agrees on this.

I think it is important to understand—let me kind of break that down a little bit because you might be thinking: Is this something that is driven by party politics? And I can tell you as a Senator from Minnesota that there is nothing political about people's love of the Boundary Waters. It is not a Democratic love or a Republican love or an Independent love, and you see that in this data.

When you ask Minnesotans “How much of a priority do you think it should be for Minnesota elected officials to protect the Boundary Waters from mining pollution,” overall, 68 percent say it is a priority. Eighty-seven percent of Democrats say this, 66 percent of Independents say this, and 50 percent of Republicans say this. So, again, it is not a partisan issue. By more than a 2-to-1 margin, Minnesota voters oppose sulfide ore copper mining in the Boundary Waters watershed, and opposition is consistent. It has been consistent over quite a few years because this issue has been very much on Minnesotans' minds for quite a few years. This has been in the works for nearly 10 years. So I think it is important to understand that this is consistent.

It is also interesting that support for sulfide ore copper mining in the Boundary Waters watershed has actually dropped in 8 years—over the last 3

years. So there is strong support for the Boundary Waters, strong opposition to developing a mine right in the watershed of the Boundary Waters, and actually a growing concern for what this might mean.

It says—I will just read this—it says: This is consistent with the view that Minnesotans generally support mining outside the Boundary Waters watershed by a 14-percent margin—40 percent favor, and only 26 percent oppose—and they strongly oppose sulfide ore copper mining within the Boundary Waters watershed.

I love this because it sort of shows that Minnesotans—I guess it is no surprise that as a Minnesota Senator, I should be reflecting the views of my constituents, and I think that is the case here—being pro-mining, wanting to see that opportunity, wanting to see that developed but not this mine in this place.

If you look at the biggest differences in opposition between mining in Minnesota versus mining in the Boundary Waters watershed, it is really quite interesting. The difference amongst Independents is plus-62. That is a very big number for people who look at polling across the board.

I don't know if it shows this in this memo that I am referring to, but I can tell you, because I have seen the data, that this is also not a regional thing. Even in Northern Minnesota, even in the Eighth Congressional District where this mine would be, a majority of people in the Eighth Congressional District would agree with this statement: not this mine in this place.

So you can imagine what Minnesotans are thinking about tonight if they are watching me talk here and thinking about what the Senate is doing, and they are asking themselves: Why is the Senate—why did the U.S. House—why are they undoing this protection that we had in place that we wanted? Why are they ignoring what we think should be happening in our State? Why are they ignoring or undermining or undoing the protections we want to see in place for these public lands that matter so much?

I can tell you from the conversations I have been having that it is contributing to their lack of trust in this body, the ability of this body to, you know, produce action and legislation that actually reflect what they want to see happen. It is frustrating to them, and they are asking me: Why is this happening? Why is it even possible that something that was done and done correctly and done legally, you know, years ago is now being undone by a lot of people who have never even been to Minnesota and don't really even know what this is all about?

You know, it is difficult for me to explain exactly why this is happening. That is why I am here tonight to talk about this in all the ways that I can and help to try to change the flow of this debate as I am trying to change the flow of this polluting water through the Boundary Waters.

I would like to take a couple of minutes and talk a little bit about the work that was done to establish this mineral lease withdrawal because I think there has also been some discussion about what was really involved in that and shouldn't we just really let sort of the permitting process play out as it normally would?

I would say I understand that argument that there is a—you know, we have established a permitting process at the State level and at the Federal level, and that should be allowed to play out. But, you know, it is interesting because Congress also, in this Federal Land Policy and Management Act, said that there might be occasions when there are places where we want to be able to withdraw those mineral leases because we can see ahead of time—before all of the work has been done, we can see ahead of time based on our environmental assessment that this is not wise, that this doesn't make sense.

That is exactly what happened with the Rainy River withdrawal environmental assessment, which was done with extensive work.

I have it all right here. I do not think that I will read it all to you tonight, but I want to just highlight some of the pieces of this so that it can give colleagues an idea of how comprehensive this environmental assessment was—I mean, honestly, much more comprehensive than the Congressional Review Act resolution that is before the Senate right now that included, you know, no outreach, no scientific evidence.

There was nothing that was presented in this CRA that says “Nope, this is all wrong” that was done in this environmental review. There was none of that at all.

So let me just highlight some of what is in this Rainy River withdrawal, which is the basis for the mineral lease withdrawal, to give you some confidence that it was done with a lot of integrity and a lot of scientific back-drop.

The environmental assessment says this: The purpose of the requested withdrawal is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the Rainy River watershed, including the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Mining Protection Area, and the 1854 ceded territory.

Let me just let everyone know that that is the ground that is covered by the 1854 treaty between the Federal Government and the Chippewa Tribes of Northern Minnesota that gives them hunting and fishing and wild rice-harvesting rights.

So it is saying basically that the purpose of this requested withdrawal is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the Rainy River watershed from the known and potential adverse environmental impacts arising from exploration and development of federally owned minerals.

The withdrawal is needed because the Forest Service and the BLM have seen and can reasonably anticipate increasing interest within the private sector for developing the copper, nickel, ore mines in the Duluth Complex that may adversely impact the Rainy River Watershed.

This goes on to describe what the decision-making process looks like under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and describes how this act, written by Congress, of course, signed into law, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make and modify and extend or revoke withdrawals, in accordance with the terms of the law. And that is what this is all about.

So what happens in this environmental assessment is that they look at alternatives, they look at an alternative where the leases are withdrawn, for 20 years to be clear, or a second alternative where there is no withdrawal and the leases continue.

And they evaluate what is likely to happen, what is likely to happen to the environment. They also evaluate what is likely to happen to the socioeconomics of the region because, of course, these things are always a balance.

We don't want to live in a world where all we do is to protect environmental resources but there is no way for people to earn a living or to feed their families or to own their own home.

So let me just talk, let me just highlight some of this because I think it is interesting and gets to that point.

It says, the region—this region around the Boundary Waters has a long history of mineral exploration and extraction with mining activity attracting migrants and establishing communities since the 19th century. Similarly, the region's unique natural amenities and recreation opportunities have been a source of recreation and tourism and an amenity-based economy. The relative concentration of jobs in both mining and tourist and related sectors demonstrate these economic dependencies within the region, which I can say from personal experience is very true.

So in 2019, the mining-related employment was estimated at 3 percent of total employment in St. Louis County, Cook County, and Lake County, that is this region. So think about that, 3 percent.

This represents over 40 percent of all mining sector jobs in the State. Sectors associated with recreation and tourism also make up a higher proportion of total jobs in the study area relative to the State average.

In 2019, recreation and tourism-dependent jobs—so that includes retail trade, arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services—that was 22 percent of total employment in the three-county analysis plan.

But, of course, job numbers tell only part of the economic picture, average

annual wages vary substantially by sector. The average wage and natural resource extraction sector was generally high compared to wages in many other sectors. That is certainly the case. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness—this goes on to say—provides many thousands of visitors with a unique, primitive, and nature-based recreation experience. The wilderness area also provides economic drivers to the local communities and the State of Minnesota. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is surrounded by resorts, outfitters and guides, campgrounds, and other visitor service businesses and hundreds of homes and cabins.

In 2018, visitors to the wilderness area were estimated to contribute between 230 and 570 jobs and 6 million to 14.8 million in labor income all across this region, which we call the Arrowhead Region in Minnesota.

So I like that this is looking at the socioeconomic of this and kind of what are we going to do, how do we kind of maximize the benefit here.

I want to also just say I think it is important, because I always come back to this, the impacts on Tribes in Northern Minnesota. And this assessment points the following out: The lands proposed for withdrawal include the homeland and traditional use areas of the Lake Superior Chippewa Tribe, comprised of multiple independent bands living around Lake Superior and what is the northern parts of Minnesota.

And this, I think, is important. The Ojibwe bands were signatories of key treaties executed by the Federal Government in the 19th century. This withdrawal application area falls entirely within the 1854 ceded territory of the Lake Superior Chippewa from lands deemed to have been under the sole control of signatories at signing.

So every single thing that we are talking about here falls within the 1854 ceded territory, and this is not some historical document that is interesting to know about that has no impact on our daily life. This treaty is still in effect. It still establishes these hunting and fishing and wild rice harvesting rights that exist to this day. It still establishes the right that the Lake Superior Chippewa people, the Anishinaabe people of Northern Minnesota have around moose and deer and fish and berry and wild rice, their sugar bush sites, their maple stands, their white cedar stands, ducks, and other forest resources.

Of course, these resources are available to everybody, but they have a particular legal access point for the folks—for the Tribal nations. It is not known in many parts of the country, but in Minnesota, wild rice, manoomin, is a hugely important food source and also very important culturally to Native people, and it is a very important part of the ecosystem of this part of Minnesota.

And wild rice is a wetland plant that grows in exactly this kind of eco-

system, and it is, again, super important to the Ojibwe people. And this wild rice, it grows in very shallow freshwater marshes on the edges of lakes and rivers, and typically it grows only to about 3 feet high. And it is a very, very important part of what is included in these treaties. I think it is important to understand that.

As I go through this environmental assessment to share what it evaluates in terms of the opportunities in this area, what needs to be protected and what impacts you might see from the mine, I want to just share a little bit of that with you. I just need to find it here. This talks about—let me find it here.

Here we go. This is a good summary, I think, of what the environmental assessment finds. It says: The greatest potential risk to water quality of the wilderness area and lands within the withdrawal area comes from the catastrophic failure of a wet basin tailings storage or impoundment dam. Wet basin tailings storages pose the risk of dam failure and the potential release of a large volume of contaminated sediment or tailings into the water to a nearby water body, the potential transport of that downstream in water bodies and receptors.

Dam failures have the greatest potential of traveling downstream at a volume that could impact receding wilderness area water resources. Impacts would be most severe for streams and wetlands and lakes most adjacent to the failure. Failure would be highly likely to result in increases of total solids, sulfates, metal, or other constituents, exceedance of water quality standards, and observable impacts of aquatic bio and habitat in Birch Lake becoming successively less severe, of course, as the water moves forward.

But it assesses that the risk effects to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area would be significant and can't be—can't be—you know, mitigated in any way.

I think that that is the reason why this environmental assessment forms the basis for the mineral lease withdrawal. And, again, the mineral lease withdrawal is for 20 years, and 20 years seems like a long time. I have been in the Senate for 9 years—half of that time—but the idea here is that you don't want to lock these minerals up forever. That doesn't seem reasonable. But given what the technology is right now, given what we know about the environmental risks and what this kind of mining would do, something is going to have to change before this makes sense, before this is a risk worth taking.

And I believe that that is really—the message that I take out of this environmental assessment, along with, you know, the many hundreds of thousands of people who wrote in talking about this and saying why—why this mattered to them.

I think during the course of this discussion when we are talking about the

special place that this is, also talking about the unusual precedent, the remarkable and dangerous precedent that the CRA establishes should it pass and also talking about the special consideration that I think that we need to give to Native people who have particular and sovereign treaty rights related to this place.

And I want to just, if I can, take a minute to go over in a bit of detail what some of the Tribes have said about this because I think it gives a good impact—it gives a good sense of why this is important to them.

And let me just find this for you before I—while I am looking for that, I want to share these other things with you because I think they are helpful.

Senator HEINRICH spoke about this earlier, and it was really remarkable to me that as we were considering this CRA, as it was coming over from the House to the Senate, that we received here in the Senate an open letter from President Theodore Roosevelt's direct descendants talking about the importance of saving the Boundary Waters. I am going to just read this letter to make sure that people have had a chance to understand what it says.

The letter says: Dear United States Senators, the purpose of this letter is to strongly recommend all Senators vote against House Joint Resolution 140 and to ask you to work with President Trump to seek ways to permanently protect the Boundary Waters and to send a unified message that America is still a land that relentlessly protects its greatest wilderness terrain.

The proposed House resolution erroneously uses the Congressional Review Act to disallow the current withdrawal of over 225,000 acres and the headwaters of the Boundary Waters and would green-light exposure of this national treasure to the highly toxic and destructive impacts of sulfide-ore copper mining.

It is faulty on several key fronts. First, it is the opposite of "America First." The mining company in question is foreign-owned, will use Chinese state-owned smelters, and will then sell the extracted metals on the open market.

Next, it removes the American public from public land decision making. A key priority of American public land policy has always been to have a strong bias towards obtaining robust public input. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have already weighed in on the Boundary Waters, and they overwhelmingly want it protected forever.

Next, it discards sound science. A detailed environmental assessment has already documented the substantial risk copper mining poses to this highly-valued ecosystem.

It sets a very bad precedent for other public lands. Using the CRA in this fashion, which has never been done before, would put at risk other public land withdrawals across America to

similarly irresponsible actions. Finally, the proposed resolution is diametrically at odds with the conservation legacy of President Theodore Roosevelt.

For all these reasons we feel a deep obligation to T.R.—as they call him in this letter—to speak out loudly in support of this exceptional American wilderness area.

As T.R. said at the Grand Canyon in 1903, we now reiterate with the Boundary Waters today “leave it as it is.” Vote no on House Joint Resolution 140 or any other similar legislation and seek creative ways to protect the Boundary Waters forever.

Frankly, T.R. would have been appalled at House Resolution 140 and the misguided and harmful effort to revoke sound and necessary mineral withdrawals in the headwaters of the Boundary Waters.

To understand T.R.’s perspective on all of this, it is important to review a little of his history starting with Minnesota.

T.R. had a strong affinity for Minnesota. T.R.’s love of Minnesota emanated directly from Lincoln and Grant’s leadership during the Civil War. Minnesota immediately stepped up to support the dire cause.

T.R. had a huge amount of respect for the 1st Minnesota Infantry Regiment, who literally saved the Union at Gettysburg. It is perhaps why, shortly after the Civil War, as a 10-year-old sitting in Germany, T.R. dreamed of proudly going to Minnesota someday. He hoped to get there when he was 14, and he cheered in his diary about the prospect: Hip, hip, hoorah.

In 1880, T.R.’s first extended hunting trip to the West brought him as far as the Red River in Moorhead, MN, way up in the northwestern quadrant of our State, where he briefly ducked into the Dakota Territory for the first time. From then on, T.R.’s strong historical connections and interest in Minnesota accelerated exponentially.

In 1838, he signed his first cattle ranching contract in Saint Paul. In the rest of the 1880s and in the 1890s, he crossed through the State on many memorable occasions.

In 1900, he launched his Vice Presidential campaign in Minnesota. In 1901, he gave his famous “Big Stick” speech at the Minnesota State Fair.

These are just a few small samplings of T.R.’s oversized affection for Minnesota, which helped to catapult him toward his destiny.

T.R. worked exceedingly hard to protect Minnesota’s forests and water. It should come as no surprise that T.R.’s appreciations for Minnesota translated into an aggressive pursuit of protecting the State’s favored forests and water.

In 1902, shortly after taking office, T.R. used scientific forestry to establish the Minnesota Forest Reserve, which was later renamed the Chippewa National Forest. It was the first national forest reserve in America east of the Mississippi River and the first one

set aside through an act of Congress, rather than by a Presidential proclamation.

Around the same timeframe, closer to America’s northern border, T.R.’s administration withdrew hundreds of thousands of acres in Lake and Cook Counties in the vicinity of the Boundary Waters to get a jump start on protecting this even more pristine source of water.

Finally, in 1909, for the public good, T.R. formally established the much broader Superior National Forest, where the Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness Area resides.

Based on all of these proactive measures, there is no doubt T.R. wanted Minnesota’s greatest natural resource, its most beloved Boundary Waters ecosystem, protected in perpetuity for all future generations to enjoy. It was a central tenet of his balanced approach to conservationism.

Saving the Boundary Waters makes common, bipartisan sense. Because of the foresight of America’s early Republican leaders, the Boundary Waters has risen, as per the Department of the Interior, to become America’s most heavily visited wilderness area. Its greatness goes way beyond Minnesota. It is the fourth pillar of all of America’s greatest continental wilderness terrain—Yosemite, Lincoln and Harrison; Yellowstone, Grant; the Grand Canyon, Roosevelt; and the Boundary Waters.

Saving it from the devastating effects of copper mining is, therefore, the conservation imperative of our time and should be bipartisan in nature.

It is certainly bipartisan in Minnesota, as evidenced by the fact that 70 percent of Minnesotans want the Boundary Waters permanently protected. Minnesotans know, aside from the devastating impact on the environment, copper-nickel mining in the Boundary Waters would deal a crushing blow to a great rural American economy. It would kill jobs, dampen growth, decrease affordability, and erase any meaningful prospects for future economic prosperity in the region.

For all of these reasons, we are positive T.R. would want the Boundary Waters protected in a bipartisan fashion. But, sadly, the passage of H.J. Res. 140 in the House puts all of this in grave jeopardy.

Our specific ask of the United States Senators: To America’s Senators, please do all that you can to protect this national treasure. On both sides of the political aisle, we strongly ask you to vote no on this resolution and on any other similar legislation proposed in the future.

T.R. was active in the preserving of our greatest wilderness terrain on both the east and west coasts. It became one of the greatest enduring legacies of his life. It is now time for all of you to get in the arena with him.

We implore you to do your own parts to ensure T.R.’s commonsense approach to conservationism is as strong today as it was more than a century

ago. There is no better place to do this than to preserve the greatest wilderness terrain in the middle of America’s heartland: the Boundary Waters, the greatest “America 250” conservation gift, protecting the fourth pillar.

This letter concludes in this way: In conjunction with America’s 250th birthday, we ask you to honor President Theodore Roosevelt’s conservation legacy.

As T.R.’s Presidential Library formally opens in Medora, ND, on Independence Day, three pillars of T.R.’s life will take central stage: Leadership, conservation, and citizenship.

It is one thing for politicians to say they believe in these three pillars, and it is quite another to see them act that way. We humbly submit it would be hard to gift America a more meaningful fourth pillar, one that better unites these three aspects of his legacy, than a huge enduring present in the form of a permanently protected Boundary Waters.

Finally, it should be noted that the signatories below represent the three branches of Theodore Roosevelt’s family, emanating directly from his three sons, who all served in both World War I and World War II.

Quinton Roosevelt was, sadly, killed in action in World War I or he certainly would have risen to the call of service the second time.

The four of us below—this is important. The four of us below have never collectively cosigned a letter together, which should give an indication of how strongly we support voting no on this resolution and then voting yes on permanent Boundary Waters protection.

We greatly appreciate your time and attention to this matter.

This is signed by Theodore Roosevelt IV, Teddy Roosevelt’s great-grandson, and cosigned by Tweed Roosevelt, Kermit Roosevelt III, and Mark Roosevelt.

I think this is so interesting because, one, it speaks to the great tradition of conservationism in the Republican Party. And I love also that it highlights these other great pillars of American remarkable places. They talk about, in this letter, America’s greatest continental wilderness terrain: Yosemite, protected by Lincoln and Harrison; Yellowstone protected by Grant; the Grand Canyon and Roosevelt.

And, you know, just as it is impossible for us to imagine a big mine right on the doorstep of the Grand Canyon or Yosemite, it is impossible for us in Minnesota to imagine this mine right on the doorstep of the Boundary Waters. The Boundary Waters is the same caliber of national treasure as the Grand Canyon or Yosemite or Yellowstone.

And in this country, we certainly don’t say we don’t want to do any mining anyplace. But we also acknowledge that there are places that are so special, that that does not need to be the place where we look to meet our needs for precious metals, precious minerals.

I was searching, a moment ago, for—I had mentioned that I wanted to share some of the views of America's indigenous Tribes, talking about why they think that it is important to protect the Boundary Waters.

I have got a few here that I am going to read to you, and I am going to start with the letter from the National Congress of American Indians, which, as you no doubt know, is the oldest and largest organization of sovereign Tribal nations from around the country.

I am going to—this is actually not a letter. Forgive me. This is a resolution that the National Congress of American Indians put forward a few weeks ago, speaking on behalf of all of the Tribes, all of the Tribes that are members.

It is as follows. It is called: Calling on the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs to hold a hearing to consider and take testimony on H.J. Res 140, entitled, "Disapproving Public Land Order 7917" due to the impacted Tribal interests contained in the subject public land order.

It goes as follows:

Whereas we the members of the National Congress of American Indians of the United States, invoking the designed blessing of the Creator upon our efforts and purposes, in order to preserve for ourselves and our descendants the inherent sovereign right of our Indian Nations, rights secured under Indian treaties and agreements with the United States, and all other rights and benefits to which we are entitled under the laws and Constitution of the United States, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, to enlighten the public toward a better understanding of the Indian people, to preserve Indian cultural values and otherwise promote the health, safety, and welfare of the Indian people, do hereby establish and submit the following resolution:

And whereas the National Congress of American Indians, NCAI, was established in 1944, and as the oldest and largest national organization of American Indian and Alaska Native Tribal governments;

And whereas the Ojibwe people have resided in North America since time immemorial, and before the establishment of the United States, have resided among what has become the border between the United States and Canada and the places now called Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota;

And whereas the Ojibwe people entered into numerous treaties with the United States, ceding land and reserving rights within those lands in exchange for peace, protection, and services, including the Treaty of La Pointe, September 30, 1854;

And whereas in the 1834 treaty, the Ojibwe reserved rights to hunt, fish, and gather within the territory ceded in the 1854 ceded territory, and such rights remain intact and are presently exercised by the current beneficiaries of the 1854 treaty;

And whereas, over time, the Federal Government took land within the ceded territory for conservation and protection, including the Superior National Forest and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, both within the Rainy River Watershed, which runs along the current United States-Canada border and what is now Northeastern Minnesota;

And whereas the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a globally unique freshwater ecosystem with some of the world's cleanest water—it comprises 20 percent of the freshwater within the entire National Forest System. And through its interconnected system of lakes, forests, and wetlands, provides irreplaceable habitat for threatened species like the lynx and the loons, and, by doing so, offers invaluable and cultural recreational resources, including resources that the Ojibwe utilize when exercising their reserved treaty rights;

And whereas, as recognized in the NCAI resolution on FDA O2510, wild rice, manomin, is the sacred food of the Ojibwe people, integral to their identity and necessary for their subsistence, and the Federal Government must protect the waters of the 1854 ceded territory from contamination to maintain traditional harvesting of wild rice, which, as the Ojibwe treaty guaranteed, are usufructuary rights;

And whereas, on January 31, 2023, then Secretary of the Interior Deb Haaland issued Public Land Order 7917, withdrawing approximately 225,504 acres of National Forest System lands from disposition under the United States mineral and geothermal leasing laws for a period of 20 years to protect and preserve the 1854 ceded territory of the Lake Superior Chippewa in Northern Minnesota from the political adverse effects of mineral and geothermal exploration and development;

And whereas the order further provides that the purpose for the withdrawal is also to protect the health, traditional cultural values, and subsistence-based lifestyle of the Tribal nations that rely on resources in the region, such as wild rice, which are particularly susceptible to adverse impacts associated with mineral exploration and development;

And whereas NCAI acknowledges that any threats to Tribal rights and treaty rights of one Tribal nation erodes the reserved Tribal and treaty rights of all Tribal nations, thereby eroding Tribal sovereignty;

And whereas H.J. Res. 140, introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives on January 12, 2026, authorizes the disapproval of Public Land Order 7917;

And whereas the U.S. House of Representatives enacted H.J. Res. 140 without a hearing and without soliciting input from the impacted parties, including from the Tribal nations whose treaty rights are impacted by the disapproval;

And whereas pursuant to the rules of the Congressional Review Act adoption

and enactment of H.J. Res. 140 would permanently preclude any future consideration or action by the executive branch, forever stripping the impacted Tribal nations of their right to be consulted prior to Federal actions that materially impact their lives, lands, and interests;

And whereas H.J. Res. 140 has been transmitted to the U.S. Senate and because disapproval of the underlying public land order directly impacts more than one federally recognized Tribe's treaty guaranteed rights, the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs should hold a hearing on Public Land Order 7917 in order to solicit testimony from the impacted Tribal nations before Senate floor consideration;

Now therefore be it resolved that NCAI urges the U.S. Senate Indian Affairs Committee to expeditiously schedule a hearing regarding the contents of Public Land Order 7917 and the potential detrimental impact adopting H.J. Res. 140 would have on treaty rights by soliciting testimony from the Tribal nations impacted.

And be it further resolved that NCAI insists that the administration and the Congress protect the unique ecosystems of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness from contamination and encroachment, which is the underlying purpose of Public Land Order 7917.

And be it finally resolved that this resolution shall be the policy of NCAI until it is withdrawn or modified by any subsequent resolution.

Now, I think this is important for a couple of reasons.

One, this is such an important organization reflecting so many Tribal nations. It is important also that they are saying clearly that they believe that the public land order in place right now is protecting their Tribal sovereignty and treaty rights as they should be protected.

The resolution is also saying, if you are going to take such a dramatic step, U.S. Senate, you ought to at least have a hearing in the Senate Indian Affairs Committee to create an opportunity for Tribal nations to express their views on this.

Of course, that hearing hasn't happened. Because the CRA came before the Senate as a privileged resolution, it was not possible to refer this to the committee during these processes that were going on. There are so many things that the Senate is limited from doing because of the form in which the House sent this resolution over to the Senate; but I think it is a travesty that, at the very least, a hearing exploring the impacts on Tribal nations will not have been held before Members of the Senate are to make a decision that has such a significant impact on treaty rights and Tribal nations in Minnesota. As this letter says, what impacts one Tribal nation impacts all Tribal nations in this environment, in this situation.

Having the support of the National Congress of American Indians is extremely important, but I also want to just note that the Minnesota Chippewa Tribes—that all of the Chippewa Tribes in Northern Minnesota have also expressed their strong disapproval of this action that the Senate is contemplating tonight. So I am going to read the letter that the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe sent to Senator KLOBUCHAR and me so that everyone will—so that it will also be in the RECORD.

Here is the letter, which was written on March 4, my birthday. It's to Senator TINA SMITH and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR. Re: Vote No on Mining in and around the Boundary Waters: Dear Senators Smith and Klobuchar, I write at the direction of the leadership of the six bands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe—otherwise MCT—all of which are federally recognized Indian Tribes under the umbrella of the MCT.

As you know, in January, H.J. Res. 140 passed the House and rolls back the 20-year ban on mining in and around the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and within the Superior National Forest in Minnesota. The MCT strongly opposes any mining in that area and asks that you vote no on any companion bill in the Senate, and we thank you both for your public statements to date in opposition of this destructive measure.

Members of those MCT bands who were signatories to the 1854 Treaty of La Pointe, which encompasses the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, retain the right to enter millions of acres in the Arrowhead region of Minnesota to exercise their treaty reserved rights to hunt and fish and gather.

The entire area is Ojibwe homeland. In fact, one of the key purposes of the Bureau of Land Management order withdrawing the Superior National Forest lands from potential mineral and geothermal leasing was to protect and preserve the fragile and vital socio-natural resources, ecological integrity, and wilderness values from the potential diverse effects of mineral and geothermal exploration and development. The 1854 ceded territory was expressly called out as one of the areas that must be protected.

The letter includes a map of the ceded territory, and the letter concludes by saying: Again, we appreciate your opposition to lifting the mining ban and your support of Tribes in this region. Thank you.

I have here also letters from the White Earth Indian Reservation expressing their opposition to mining in or near the Boundary Waters Wilderness.

I have a letter from the Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes, and all of the Anishinaabe Tribes across Minnesota and Wisconsin are all relatives.

This is another letter basically saying: We are writing to you today on an issue of utmost importance to all of our members. It is our understanding

that the House joint resolution may soon be brought to the floor. This resolution is a measure brought under the Congressional Review Act to repeal a current rule banning copper-sulfide mining. We urge you and your colleagues to vote no on this measure.

I have here a letter from the Eastern Shoshone Tribe, which is a Wyoming Tribe, sent to Senator LUMMIS, Senator THUNE, and also to Senator SCHUMER and Senator BARRASSO. It includes opposition, saying clearly, on behalf of the Eastern Shoshone Business Council, it urges the Senate to oppose H.J. Res. 140.

I have a letter from the Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation urging opposition to this resolution.

I have a letter from the Rosebud Sioux Tribe from Rosebud, SD, urging opposition to this CRA.

I have here a letter from early February to all of the Members of the Senate, and I am just going to read you a bit of it, but I think what I want you to know is that, at the end of this letter, it is signed by—I mean, my word. I would have to count them all up—I would guess, 40 or 50 small businesses in Minnesota. Many of them are from the area—you know, they benefit so much from the natural resources of Northern Minnesota and from the outdoor recreation economy of Northern Minnesota.

They are urging the U.S. Senate to oppose H.J. Res. 140, and I am just going to read you a bit of it.

It says: The Boundary Waters and downstream Voyageurs National Park are currently protected by Public Land Order 7917—the 20-year mineral withdrawal banning copper and nickel mining on Federal public lands in the headwaters of these beloved wildlands. This mining ban is based on the U.S. Forest Service's comprehensive environmental assessment, which concluded that sulfide-ore copper mining near the Boundary Waters would cause irreversible harm to the region's watershed, fish, and wildlife, treaty and Tribal rights, and robust recreation economy.

The analysis completed by the Forest Service in 2022 included 675,000 public comments, over 95 percent of which favored protecting the Boundary Waters and Voyageurs from sulfide-ore copper mining. Overturning the mining ban puts at risk the forests and the clean waters of the region as well as its town's indigenous communities and the regional economy.

The love for the Boundary Waters powers a strong and enduring recreation economy in Northeastern Minnesota—responsible for 17,000 jobs and over \$1 billion in sales annually in the region. This includes the many businesses many of us have created and grown which will be seriously damaged if sulfide-ore copper mining were allowed in this fragile environment.

The wilderness is also a crown jewel of Minnesota and important to the State's growing \$13.5 billion outdoor economy. Economic studies show that

protecting the Boundary Waters would be better for the economy than opening the area to copper mining.

The letter goes on to say: Once compromised, the Boundary Waters cannot be restored. This region is much more than a beautiful place. It embodies the best of our public lands: clean water, expansive habitat, world-class recreation, vibrant wilderness communities, and sustainable local economies. Generations of Midwesterners and Americans from across the country have formed deep connections to nature through hunting and fishing and camping and canoeing and hiking in the Boundary Waters.

We urge you to vote no on H.J. Res. 140. Do not sell out our wilderness, our way of life, and our businesses.

This letter is signed by—and I won't read all of the people who have signed it—Ely Outfitting in Ely, MN; Freedom Explorer; the Lodge of Whispering Pines; River Point Resort; Wilderness Cabins; Piragis Northwoods Company; Voyager Outward Bound School; North of North Resort; Ely Cabin Collective; Final Touch Proofreading and Editing.

I am sure there are, you know, advertising and marketing jobs connected to the Boundary Waters.

White Pine Productions. All of these are in Ely, MN.

Then there are many others: North Shore Adventure Park in Silver Bay; Big City Mountaineers in Tower; Granite Gear in Two Harbors; Madison Elyse, LLC, in Alexandria; Littlebug Enterprises in Bemidji; Java Moose in Grand Marais; the Fisherman's Daughter in Grand Marais.

I mean, there are dozens of businesses that are listed here, and I think this just goes to show how the outdoor recreation economy powers these small businesses. They are the employers and the drivers of Minnesota's economy. So listening to them and hearing what they have to say as we make this decision is just so important.

The hour grows late, and I know we have people who have been here all day long, so I am going to take a couple of—a bit more of the time that I have—5 hours all in—on this extremely important topic just to talk a little bit more about some of the feedback that I have gotten from Minnesotans before I wrap up tonight.

Here is something that I think is really an important and interesting note that I have gotten from Lakeville, MN.

This person says the following: I moved to Minnesota over a decade ago from Chicago. As someone born in Iowa, I visited Minnesota often. When making the decision to move to Minnesota, a huge draw for us was outdoors. We visit the Boundary Waters Canoe Area every year, and my kids know the feeling of a great hike and the beautiful scenery to go with it. If this resolution passes Congress, not only will my grandchildren not be able to enjoy this beautiful place, but my kids will watch it disappear before

their eyes. Please protect this land, protect beauty, and protect the feeling of a great hike.

This is a letter from Lake Elmo, MN. It is very short.

She says: I am a 79-year-old woman who goes to the BWCA with my kids and grandchildren. Chilean mining in the area will hurt the tour industry.

Thank you for sending that.

I will read a couple more here before I close.

This is from St. Augusta, MN, and it says: I am a 45-year resident of Minnesota. I am an Eagle Scout, husband, and father of three daughters. I have been an outdoor enthusiast from a very early age—deer hunting with extended family and camping with the Scouts. When my daughters were old enough, I began planning annual trips into the BWCA for 4 to 6 days, acquiring all of the equipment necessary and passing on my knowledge and appreciation of the outdoors, hoping that, one day, they will take up the mantle with our children and help protect these critical ecosystems. I also require that no phones or electronic devices accompany us on our BW adventures—something my daughters label as a technology detox and, in my opinion, provides a type of reset against an increasingly technological existence.

Here is a note from somebody from Big Lake, MN: I am Minnesota born and raised. I grew up in a Republican household with a father who showed me all the true beauty and wonder of this State through fishing, hunting, foraging, and camping. The land that makes up this State and all the creatures and features within it have given me a purpose and a mission. I went to college at Gustavus Adolphus, where I studied the environment, and I got a job there guiding others on how to enjoy the outdoors and invest in protecting the wonderful State that gives them these opportunities.

I have seen the impact firsthand on how countless times people's whole worlds have changed when they are introduced to the beauty and recreation of the Land of 10,000 Lakes, of which you are representing me.

If I could sit down with you face-to-face, Mr. EMMER, you would see the absolute fear in my eyes at the prospect of losing more wild areas than we already have. And I can assure you that sentiment is shared by a vast majority of Minnesotans. No matter what side of the aisle people are on, they can unite over the unique beauty and foundational importance that our ecosystems have, not only on the very water we drink and the air that we breathe but in the foundation for pride in our chest when we beam that we are from Minnesota.

I sincerely urge you to consider this deeply, to talk to those you represent about the impact that this would have, and to take heed to science. This isn't

about me. This is about every little kid who is growing up or who is about to be born in this great State. Will they still hold that pride in their chest when they declare where they are from if the very thing that makes us Minnesotans is ripped away from them?

Already I have taught young people who have never seen an unobstructed night sky or know what it is like to catch a firefly. I have taught young people who know what it is like to fish at a lake their grandfather recommended and to catch nothing because the fish are gone and hear nothing but machinery instead of loon calls while they are out. Please, I am begging you on behalf of all our legacies, please fight for us.

Mr. President, I think I wanted to just clarify that this letter was forwarded to me, but it was sent to Congressman EMMER of Minnesota, and this Minnesotan is begging him to listen and fight.

Here is a letter from a Minnesotan that says: I am devastated to learn that the U.S. House of Representatives has voted to repeal the longstanding ban on mining near the Boundary Waters. I have been going on yearly BWCA trips with my mom since 2009, when I was 10 years old. I am now 27, and she is now 70, and we plan to continue our annual tradition for as long as we can. Though I haven't yet started a family, my mom has always hoped she will be around to introduce her future grandchildren to this beautiful wilderness. I now fear, though, that the Boundary Waters themselves won't be around for my children to enjoy.

My mom raised me to care for nature, to leave each BWCA campsite cleaner than I found it, and it grieves me that I am powerless to preserve the Boundary Waters beyond these small actions.

When we go on our 2026 trip, I will continue to treat each campsite and portage and lake with respect and love. I can only hope that those with power in this country can, from afar, do the same.

I don't think I could possibly read all of the letters and messages that have come from Minnesota to me over the last many months about this, and you may be wondering why I am standing here at nearly midnight keeping everybody up, and here is why: because I know there are so many people in Minnesota who are wondering—excuse me. I am losing my voice. I know there are so many people in Minnesota who are wondering whether anybody in this building cares about what they think, and the one thing that I can do is to be here, speaking to this mostly empty room, making sure that, to the best of my abilities, that their voices will be heard. Their voices will be heard, regardless of what the Senate does.

I dearly hope that the Members of this body will think about their legacy

in protecting the great places in this country, to think about the risks—there are risks in this time that you must take, but then there are other risks like the risk of polluting this beautiful place that is not necessary. It is not necessary to take.

And I hope that my colleagues will also think about the precedent that taking this action will take and the ways in which other politicians down the road will look back on the actions that this Senate is taking right now and saying: They gave us permission to do the same thing because they said it was OK. And that will have impacts not only on the Boundary Waters, this precious place, but it will have impacts on precious places all over the country, and it will have impacts on the overall integrity of our government if actions that are taken that are legal can just be undone willy-nilly. And that just seems to me to be so bad for this body, to be bad for the public lands that we all love, and to be bad for this country that we all love so much.

So I stand here tonight with a mostly gone voice to give voice to all of those people in my home State and in States all over this country who feel like what they think doesn't really matter, and I am here to tell you that it does. And the power of the organizing that has happened over the last many weeks to raise up this issue in the face of a time in our country when there are so many issues that demand so much attention: a war in Iran, the brutal attacks on my home State of Minnesota by Federal agents, so many worries, so many worries that so many people have in this country right now—worries, fundamentally, about how they are going to put food on the table and how they are going to pay rent and how they are going to hold their lives together. But they organized to make sure that their voices were heard on this thing that they care so much about, and so it has been my honor and also my responsibility and my obligation to help to lift those voices up tonight.

Tomorrow, I believe the Senate will vote on this, and I hope that the Senate makes a good decision—a good decision not only for my home State of Minnesota and for this precious place but also for the good of the whole, for the good of the whole country, and the protection of our public lands and the integrity of our democracy.

I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:38 p.m., recessed until Thursday, April 16, 2026, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING BEN FAHRMANN

HON. MIKE EZELL

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. EZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a special accomplishment by someone connected to my office—Ben Fahrman, the brother of my Director of Operations, Olivia Fahrman—on his graduation from the police academy on April 9, 2026.

Ben is returning to serve as a Patrol Officer with the Gulf Shores Police Department after previously serving as a detention officer. This is not just a career move, it's a calling. It takes dedication, commitment, and a strong work ethic to answer that call, and Ben has demonstrated all of those qualities. He is also known for being kind and caring, traits that are just as important in law enforcement as strength and discipline.

As a former law enforcement officer myself, I know the sacrifices that come with wearing the badge. Ben is stepping into a role that demands courage, integrity, and service to others.

We are proud of Ben. I thank him for his service, and may God keep him safe.

RECOGNIZING DR. MICHELLE E. RICHARDS IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Michelle E. Richards in Honor of Women's History Month. I include in the RECORD the following proclamation:

Whereas, Women's History Month is a time to recognize and celebrate the extraordinary contributions of women who have shaped communities, inspired generations, and demonstrated unwavering leadership, compassion, and excellence; and

Whereas, Dr. Michelle E. Richards is a Jamaican-born evangelist, humanitarian, entrepreneur, and visionary leader whose life's work reflects a steadfast commitment to faith, service, and empowerment; and

Whereas, Dr. Richards received her early education at Holy Childhood High School and later earned a Bachelor's Degree from the University of Technology in Kingston, Jamaica, before relocating to the United States in 1999 and continuing a distinguished professional career in the banking industry; and

Whereas, answering her divine calling to ministry, Dr. Richards was baptized in 2003, ordained in 2006, and later established Visions International Ministries, a global ministry that has impacted lives through preaching, mentorship, humanitarian outreach, and purpose-driven initiatives across multiple nations; and

Whereas, through her humanitarian work and global outreach, Dr. Richards has provided food, clothing, school supplies, and essential resources to communities throughout the Caribbean, Africa, and beyond, while leading mission efforts that uplift individuals and families in need; and

Whereas, her influence as a preacher, motivational speaker, humanitarian, and community leader continues to inspire individuals around the world to pursue faith, purpose, and service while uplifting others through compassion and leadership; and therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Florida's 20th Congressional District, proudly recognize and honor Dr. Michelle E. Richards during Women's History Month for her outstanding leadership, dedication, and service, inspiring others through her example of faith, compassion, and achievement.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LAURA CANALES

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Ms. Laura Canales, a trailblazing Latina artist widely recognized as a pioneer of Tejano music.

Ms. Canales was born in Kingsville, Texas, where she emerged as a powerful force in Tejano music during a time when the industry was overwhelmingly male dominated. Through her early work with groups such as Los Unicos and El Conjunto Bernal, and later with Laura Canales & Encanto and Los Fabulosos Cuatro, she helped elevate the genre and expand opportunities for Latina artists. Her album *No Regrets* achieved notable success, and between 1983 and 1987, she earned multiple honors as Female Vocalist and Female Entertainer of the Year at the Tejano Music Awards.

Ms. Canales is often remembered as the "grand dame of Tejano music," a title which reflects both her musical excellence and her role as a mentor and inspiration to others. Among those she influenced was the late Selena Quintanilla, who would go on to achieve global recognition. Laura Canales helped pave the way for Selena and many other inspirational women, demonstrating that women could lead and thrive in Tejano music.

Beyond her musical accomplishments, Ms. Canales was deeply committed to education and personal growth. She earned a degree in psychology from Texas A&M University and continued her studies at the graduate level, embodying her belief in the importance of creating opportunities beyond the stage.

Mr. Speaker, Laura Canales's contributions to music and culture continue to resonate across South Texas and beyond. Her legacy lives on in the artists she inspired and the doors she helped open.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 14, 2026, I missed votes due to personal reasons.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 109, and YEA on Roll Call No. 110.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRITTANY PETTERSEN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I missed two votes in the vote series on April 14, 2026. Had I been present, I would have voted: YEA on Roll Call No. 110, passage of H.R. 7613, the ALERT Act, and YEA on Roll Call No. 109, passage of H.R. 1011, the Emergency Conservation Program Improvement Act.

HONORING DAVID ROUSSEAU

HON. GREG STANTON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor David Rousseau on his retirement after nearly four decades of service to the Salt River Project, the Valley, and the State of Arizona.

Since 1903, the Salt River Project has provided reliable and affordable water and power to Arizona communities while safeguarding a stable water supply for future generations. Mr. Rousseau's leadership has helped carry forward that mission at a time of rapid growth and change across our state.

A proud fourth-generation Arizonan, Mr. Rousseau reflects a legacy of stewardship and public service deeply rooted in Arizona's history. His family's connection to SRP dates back more than a century—his great-grandfather served on the original council that helped bring the Theodore Roosevelt Dam to life, and his father later served on the SRP Board. Raised on a family farm in the West Valley, Mr. Rousseau learned early the values of hard work, responsibility, and commitment to community.

Mr. Rousseau's own service to SRP began in 1990, when he was elected to the SRP Council. After years of leadership on the Council and Board, he became Vice President in 2006 and President in 2010, a role he has held for more than a decade. Throughout his tenure, he has remained focused on ensuring that SRP continues to provide reliable, affordable, and sustainable water and power to the communities it serves.

• 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.

Under his leadership, SRP has advanced critical initiatives to support Arizona's future. These efforts include expanding energy storage capacity, increasing access to electric vehicle infrastructure, and strengthening grid reliability during periods of peak demand. SRP has also worked to support rural and Tribal communities, including expanding broadband access in northeastern Arizona and bringing electricity to families on the Navajo Nation who previously lacked service.

Mr. Rousseau has also championed collaboration across sectors to address Arizona's long-term water and energy challenges. His leadership has helped guide SRP's role in supporting sustainable water management and ensuring that Arizona remains prepared for future growth.

Beyond SRP, Mr. Rousseau has contributed to numerous civic and nonprofit organizations, including the Banner Health Foundation, the Phoenix Art Museum, the Nature Conservancy, and the Greater Phoenix Economic Council. His service reflects a deep commitment to strengthening Arizona's economy, culture, and quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing David Rousseau for his extraordinary career of service. His leadership has strengthened Arizona communities, supported our state's continued growth, and set a lasting standard for stewardship and public service.

HONORING THE WOMEN AT THE WOMEN ARISE CONFERENCE AT REDEEMING WORD CHURCH IN FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the remarkable achievements and inspiring contributions of women at the Women Arise Conference, which took place on Friday, March 27, 2026, at Redeeming Word Church in Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

This annual conference celebrates the leadership, faith, and service of women who uplift and strengthen their communities through ministry, mentorship, and civic engagement. It is a testament to the power of women's leadership, spiritual dedication, and the unifying influence of faith in building stronger families and neighborhoods.

This year, we proudly recognize a distinguished group of women whose work has impacted countless lives in Broward County and beyond. These remarkable women exemplify dedication, compassion, and service, inspiring others through their commitment to faith, community, and leadership.

I include in the RECORD the following 2026 Women Arise Conference Honorees:

Colleen Edwards, Minister Malone Angella Fleming, Lovetta Thomas, Carolyn Powell, H.E. Amb, Dr. Sharon Wiles, Sushana Cole, Danielle Davis, Winsome Robertson Green, Elder Cholla Williamson, Overseer Lady Jacqueline D. Lloyd, Chief Apostle Prelate Dr. Gillian Thompson Biscette, Chief Apostle Janice L. Dillard, Apostle Dr. Sonia B. Lee, Mother Sonia Barnes, Minister Donna Massias, Delores Facey, Elaine Stewart, Norma Russell, Carleen Carla Richards, Pas-

tor Dr. Althea Butler, Samantha Luke Sookraj, and Evangelist Dr. Michelle Richards.

These honorees represent the heart of Broward County, exemplifying faith, leadership, and dedication. Their service and mentorship ensure that women's voices, leadership, and contributions remain celebrated and valued, inspiring current and future generations to embrace service, spiritual growth, and civic engagement.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and celebrating these remarkable women for their leadership, contributions, and unwavering commitment to their communities. Their work exemplifies the strength, resilience, and enduring legacy of women's faith and leadership.

Their dedication and accomplishments not only enrich Broward County but also serve as a lasting example of the impact one can have through faith, leadership, and service. By honoring these women, we celebrate the enduring legacy of women in ministry and the vital role they play in shaping stronger, more vibrant, and connected communities.

RECOGNIZING ARTEMIS II MISSION ENGINEERS DANIEL BACA AND JEREMIAH HALL

HON. RYAN K. ZINKE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the achievements of Daniel Baca and Jeremiah Hall from Montana's Flathead Valley, who both played key roles in NASA's historic Artemis II mission.

On April 1, 2026, the Artemis II mission sent four astronauts on a journey around the moon and back, marking our Nation's first crewed return to the Moon in more than half a century. This mission is testing critical systems that will eventually pave the way for future lunar landing and an eventual mission to Mars.

For the first time since the Apollo era, astronauts are venturing beyond our planet. The Artemis II mission is a symbol of American leadership in space and a bold step toward the future. Among those contributing to this historic effort are Flathead Valley natives Daniel Baca and Jeremiah Hall. Working as aerospace engineers they help ensure the performance and success of this mission, showing the talent and determination that is found in Montana.

Jeremiah Hall works within the thermophysics group on the spacecraft and Daniel Baca is the lead for the European Service Module, the spacecrafts powerhouse. Both Montanan's work with essential systems that keep the astronauts aboard alive in the harsh environments of space and their contributions are the foundation to the mission's success.

For the Flathead Valley, this achievement is a source of immense pride. These two engineers' journeys from local schools in Montana to the forefront of space exploration prove that no dream is too big. Their success serves as an inspiration to the next generation of scientists and engineers across Montana.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate this historic mission, I ask we also honor the hardworking

Americans behind it. The West has always been home to pioneers and adventurers. From those who risked everything to homestead in the Dakota Territory to those pushing the frontier today, that spirit of exploration and willingness to brave the unknown still lives in our communities. Daniel and Jeremiah embody that tradition and have made Montana proud.

RECOGNIZING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF LEE VANOY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish a very happy 80th birthday to my dear friend, Lee Vanoy. Lee McMickens Vanoy was born on April 9, 1946, in rural Mississippi. She and her sister Ann were soon adopted by Horace and Polly McMickens of Bessemer, Alabama. She and her childhood friend Ramona enjoyed piano lessons, tea parties and trips to the beauty parlor. Now they still enjoy trips to Florida beaches and spa days.

On August 26, 1965, she married Jim Vanoy in Bessemer, Alabama and was blessed with wonderful children and grandchildren: her sons, Van (Deanne) and Ben (Mieka); and her grandchildren, Courtney (Schylar McBride), Taylor, Blake and Alex.

Lee spent most of her career working as administrative assistant beginning at BellSouth in Bessemer and then at various churches in Opelika, Alabama, but her greatest joy was being a wife and mother. She has also been a cherished member of my district staff for over 20 years. Aunt Lee, as she is called by her many nieces/nephews, great nieces/nephews, and even great-great nieces/nephews, is known for her big heart and the dressing she makes for Thanksgiving at the old Vanoy home place in Vance, Alabama.

Jim and Lee moved to Opelika in 1970 and call Opelika home. They like being close to Auburn University and enjoy football games, baseball games, and all alumni activities. Lee has served as a member, secretary, and chairman of the Lee County Republican Executive committee for many years. She is also involved in many Republican and social clubs in and around East Alabama. Lee also enjoys hosting receptions for political candidates in her home.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Lee a very happy 80th birthday.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MRS. SALLIE CHEW BAKER

HON. EUGENE SIMON VINDMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. VINDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mrs. Sallie Chew Baker also known affectionately as "Dear Mama." Born in 1885, Mrs. Baker was a respected businesswoman, educator, and spiritual leader who left a lasting impact throughout the Caroline County Community.

Mrs. Baker's legacy continues to live on through the countless lives she touched.

Alongside her late husband, Dansberry Abraham Lincoln Baker Sr., she raised six children—Judge, Napoleon, Druscilla, Dansberry Jr., Proft, and Lloyd. However, she didn't just stop there, she opened her home to children across the community, creating a safe, nurturing environment where everyone felt welcomed and cared for.

A devoted community leader, Mrs. Baker owned and operated a grocery store that not only provided essential goods but also served as a critical place for families in need to shop. Her kindness and compassion were evident in every part of her work, always putting others before herself.

Her commitment to preserving history was equally remarkable. Mrs. Baker played an important role in protecting the historic Guinea one-room schoolhouse, which served Black students from 1918 to 1959. When the community plan to convert the site into a beer garden, she fought tirelessly to preserve its legacy. In a defining moment, she attended an auction at Union Bank & Trust and successfully put in a bid for \$575 to reclaim the building—an act that earned her deep respect not just from her immediate community, but those who also doubted her abilities.

After securing the property, she transformed the schoolhouse into the Ever-Ready Club, a space to uplift children and ensure they had access to the resources and opportunities needed to succeed.

In 1962, Mrs. Baker then donated the land to be used for the new Macedonia Baptist Church in Woodford, Virginia. In recognition of her remarkable gift, she was honored as the church's first "Mother" and had the distinction of cutting the ribbon on Easter Sunday, April 14, 1963.

More than six decades later, the church continues to serve as a spiritual home for many Virginians.

I want to personally honor Mrs. Baker for her contributions and unwavering commitment to the Caroline County community. I also want to thank family, friends, and members of Macedonia Baptist Church for their ongoing service and dedication to strengthening our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mrs. Baker, and her legacy of faith and community leadership.

HONORING THE RICHMOND FREE PRESS AND ITS ENDURING LEGACY

HON. JENNIFER L. McCLELLAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Ms. McCLELLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the extraordinary legacy of the Richmond Free Press, a publication that, for decades, served as a trusted voice, vigilant watchdog, and cultural cornerstone for Black communities across Central Virginia.

From its founding in 1992 by Raymond H. Boone to its final issue earlier this year, the Richmond Free Press stood as a powerful testament to the importance of independent Black journalism. At a time when too many stories impacting Black communities went under-reported or unheard, this Black-owned publication filled a critical gap by elevating voices,

shining a light on injustice, and celebrating the achievements, resilience, and contributions of Black Virginians.

For more than three decades, the Richmond Free Press provided in-depth coverage of issues that matter most—from education and economic opportunity to health disparities, housing, and civil rights. It chronicled both the challenges and triumphs of our communities, ensuring that the lived experiences of Black Virginians are not only acknowledged but preserved for future generations.

Importantly, the Richmond Free Press also played a vital role in strengthening civic engagement. By informing readers, holding institutions accountable, and fostering dialogue, it empowered individuals to participate more fully in our democracy. Its impact extended far beyond the pages of a newspaper as it helped shape public understanding, influence policy conversations, and build a more informed and engaged citizenry.

As the Richmond Free Press concludes its print circulation, we reflect not only on the end of an era but on the profound and lasting imprint it leaves behind. While its physical pages may cease publication, its legacy endures in the journalists it inspired, the stories it told, and the communities it uplifted.

The closing of the Richmond Free Press also serves as a sobering reminder of the challenges facing local and community-based journalism, particularly outlets that center historically underrepresented voices. It also underscores the importance of sustaining and supporting diverse media institutions that are essential to a healthy and inclusive democracy.

On behalf of Virginia's 4th Congressional District and the many readers whose lives have been touched by its work, I extend my deepest gratitude to the editors, reporters, photographers, and staff who made the Richmond Free Press a beacon of truth and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the Richmond Free Press for its remarkable service and enduring contributions to the Commonwealth of Virginia and to our Nation.

RECOGNIZING COMMISSIONER HAZELLE P. ROGERS IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Commissioner Hazelle P. Rogers in Honor of Women's History Month. I include in the RECORD the following proclamation:

Whereas, Hazelle P. Rogers has dedicated her life to public service, leadership, and community advocacy, serving as a Democratic member of the Broward County Commission, former Mayor of Lauderdale Lakes, and as a member of the Florida House of Representatives; and

Whereas, born in Kingston, Jamaica, and immigrating to New York City as a teenager, Commissioner Rogers has demonstrated remarkable perseverance, earning her education and advancing through roles of increasing responsibility while remaining committed to uplifting her community; and

Whereas, Commissioner Rogers served on the Lauderdale Lakes City Commission beginning in 1996, championing initiatives that improved the quality of life for residents, and later represented the 94th and 95th Districts in the Florida House of Representatives, advocating for legislation to support education, property rights, and community development; and

Whereas, since her election to the Broward County Commission on August 23, 2022, Commissioner Rogers has continued to exemplify leadership and dedication, bringing her wealth of experience to address the needs of Broward County residents and striving to ensure equitable and inclusive governance; and

Whereas, Commissioner Rogers has been a mentor and advocate for women and young leaders, inspiring others through her example of integrity, resilience, and service, and fostering opportunities for the next generation of public servants; and

Whereas, throughout her career, Commissioner Rogers has been a trailblazer for women in government, inspiring others through her unwavering commitment, integrity, and advocacy for public service and civic engagement; and therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, Florida's 20th Congressional District, proudly recognize and honor Commissioner Hazelle P. Rogers during Women's History Month for her exemplary leadership, dedication to public service, and tireless efforts to improve the lives of her constituents, serving as a role model and inspiration for women and future leaders in Broward County and beyond.

RECOGNIZING APRIL AS THE MONTH OF THE MILITARY CHILD

HON. MATT VAN EPPS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. VAN EPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize April as the Month of the Military Child and to honor the youngest heroes of the great State of Tennessee.

As a graduate of West Point and a Soldier who has served both on active duty and in the Tennessee Army National Guard, I have seen firsthand that when a service member puts on the uniform, the entire family serves. While our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Guardians, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen stand on the front lines, their children serve on the home front, navigating the challenges of frequent moves, the uncertainty of new schools, and the long, quiet absences of a parent deployed in harm's way.

In Tennessee, we are blessed to be home to a vibrant and resilient community of military-connected youth. These children embody the true Volunteer Spirit, demonstrating a level of adaptability and courage that inspires us all. From the Great Smoky Mountains to the banks of the Mississippi, their presence is felt in every corner of our state.

In the Clarksville and Fort Campbell area, thousands of children support the elite warriors of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), the quiet professionals of the 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne), and the Night Stalkers of the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment. They are joined by the families of the Air Force's 19th Air Support Operations Squadron and Detachment 4 of the 18th Combat Weather Squadron, who together form the heart of a uniquely proud and patriotic community.

In West Tennessee, the children of Naval Support Activity Mid-South in Millington and Coast Guard Sector Lower Mississippi River in Memphis provide the essential foundation of support for those securing our Nation's maritime interests and vital inland waterways.

In Middle Tennessee, families at Arnold Air Force Base in Tullahoma and Coast Guard Station Buchanan on the Tennessee River contribute to the vanguard of our Nation's aerospace testing and riverine security.

Across the state, our Tennessee National Guard and Reserve families serve in nearly every county, proving that the strength of our military is rooted in the very neighborhoods we call home. Our commitment to these children goes beyond words; it is etched into our state's laws. Tennessee is a proud member of the Military Interstate Children's Compact, ensuring that the children of our service members face a seamless transition as they move between school districts and states. By removing barriers to enrollment, placement, and graduation, we ensure that their education is never a casualty of their parents' service.

According to recent data, Tennessee is proud to support over 34,000 military-connected children. Roughly 15,800 of these children belong to active-duty families, while more than 18,500 are the sons and daughters of our dedicated National Guard and Reserve members. Whether in a classroom in Clarksville or an armory in rural Tennessee, these children are the backbone of our military families, ready to adapt and thrive wherever life takes them.

To honor their sacrifice, I strongly encourage all government offices, local businesses, and private citizens across Tennessee and this Nation to proudly display and wear purple throughout this month. We Purple Up because that color represents the blending of all service branches. It is a visible and powerful symbol of our unified gratitude for the resilience of our military families.

We see the sacrifice made by the military children of Tennessee's 7th District and across this Nation, we thank them for their bravery, and we remain committed to ensuring they have the support and resources they deserve.

HONORING THE CAREERS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF RON JOLLY AND COLLEEN WARES McCLELLAND

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor two remarkable voices of Northern Michigan, Ron Jolly and Colleen Wares McClelland, whose decades of service in the broadcasting industry informed, entertained, and connected communities across the state of Michigan. As they signed-off for the final time on April 10, 2026, we honor their lasting contributions to local journalism and public discourse.

For more than 30 years, Ron Jolly was a trusted voice for communities in Northern Michigan. Joining WTCM (AM) in Traverse City in 1994, he became a constant presence in the lives of countless listeners. Alongside

him, Colleen Wares McClelland built an equally impressive career, spanning over 45 years with Midwestern Broadcasting. Her steady presence and thoughtful engagement helped shape the Ron Jolly Show into one of the region's most beloved morning broadcasts.

Together the pair created more than just a morning radio program: they built a community of listeners who tuned in every weekday morning from 7 to 10 a.m., bringing high-level discussion of local, state, national, and global issues into cars, homes, and businesses across Northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula. Their conversations invited diverse perspectives and reminded listeners that even without seeing each other, as Michiganders, we are all connected. Their open phone lines fostered meaningful dialogue and thoughtful conversations, strengthening civil engagement throughout the region. When announcing their retirement, they spoke candidly about how difficult it will be to step away, yet, easy or hard, they would "hold hands and jump at the same time," a final testament to their partnership that was built on trust, respect, and a commitment to serving others.

Mr. Speaker, let us all join in recognizing Ron Jolly and Colleen Wares McClelland for their dedicated service to informing the public, preserving local history, and entertaining communities throughout our great state. On behalf of Michigan's 1st Congressional District, I extend my deepest gratitude to Ron and Colleen and wish them all the best in a well-earned retirement.

CELEBRATING 175 YEARS OF THE SISTERS OF NOTRE DAME DE NAMUR IN CALIFORNIA

HON. SAM T. LICCARDO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mr. LICCARDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise along with my colleagues, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN and Congressman KEVIN MULLIN, to honor the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, an International Apostolic Congregation of Catholic Sisters, on the historic occasion of their 175th anniversary. The Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur believed that educating young women could transform the world. Modern development economics has confirmed their guiding intuition: the very nations that most rapidly accelerate living standards have focused on widening access of women to education and careers. Their vision and network of schools now stretch across continents, generations, and countless lives—continuing to empower women and girls.

Born out of revolution-torn France in 1804, two women, Julie Billiart and Françoise Blin de Bourdon, founded the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur to provide schools for girls in what we now know as Belgium. Julie's guiding spirit reflected a simple and bold vision: "Hearts as wide as the world." She believed in a God whose goodness knew no limits. Their congregation of sisters grew, as did the reach of their schools.

In 1843, Jesuit Father De Smet invited the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur to the Pacific Frontier to open schools and orphanages for the Clatsop Native Americans. While Julie and Françoise never saw America, six of the Notre

Dame Sisters boarded the Indefatigable ship in Belgium, endured a months-long voyage to Astoria, Oregon, and carried out their vision of serving children in need.

In 1848, many families uprooted themselves to seek fortune in the California Gold Rush. Then, in 1850, typhoid swept the region, and the Sisters assumed nursing duties, caring especially for the orphans left in its wake. The following year, two Sisters traveled from Oregon to San Francisco to welcome four new members of their congregation from Belgium. Archbishop Joseph Alemany, O.P., saw that these women could provide what California needed and asked them to open schools in San José.

With faith as their guide, they purchased property in San José and built a school from salvaged structures: a frame house for living, an adobe classroom, and a barn transformed into a kitchen. On August 4, 1851, Notre Dame College opened on Santa Clara Street, offering day, boarding and college programs to girls of every background—Mexican, Irish, French Canadian and Native American. The Sisters lived simply, raised vegetables, kept a cow, stretched every dollar, learned Spanish, and expanded opportunity when education for girls remained far from guaranteed.

True to Julie's spirit, no child was turned away. The school grew, the curriculum evolved, and in 1868 it was chartered as the College of Notre Dame—the first college for women in California, which many celebrated as "the best school for young women in the West." In 1923, the college moved to the Ralston Mansion in Belmont. Originally founded as a women's institution, the college became coeducational in 1969 and now operates as Notre Dame de Namur University.

In 1928, Notre Dame High School, San José, moved from the Santa Clara Street campus to its present location at Second and Reed Streets. Over the following decades, Notre Dame opened schools across California—in Marysville, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Alameda, Redwood City, Petaluma, Carmel and Watsonville—and eventually expanded into Oregon, Washington and Hawaii.

Saint Julie prayed that her Sisters would spread their vision throughout the world. Today, the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, U.S. East-West Province, sponsor or co-sponsor 19 ministries across the United States. The Congregation has a global presence, serving on five continents, in 16 countries, and across 23 U.S. states and the District of Columbia.

One hundred seventy-five years after those first fragile beginnings in San José, California, Saint Julie's prayer has come to fruition, and her vision continues to guide their work. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this monumental anniversary and commemorating the legacy of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur in California.

RECOGNIZING DR. KARRI BRYANT IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. SHEILA CHERFILUS-McCORMICK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 2026

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Karri Bryant in

honor of Women's History Month. I include in the RECORD the following proclamation:

Whereas, Women's History Month is a time to honor women who have demonstrated excellence, leadership, faith, and service in their communities and beyond; and

Whereas, Dr. Karri Bryant is an ordained clergywoman, author, entrepreneur, mentor, and public speaker, dedicated to empowering individuals—especially women—to grow in faith, purpose, and leadership; and

Whereas, she has achieved significant academic success, earning a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from Morris Brown College, a Master of Divinity from the Candler School of Theology at Emory University, and a Doctorate in Ministry focused on leadership and Christian renewal; and

Whereas, through initiatives such as Life Behind the Collar and The NUDGE Mentorship Initiative, Dr. Bryant provides mentorship, spiritual guidance, and leadership development to emerging leaders and women navigating faith and purpose; and

Whereas, she serves faithfully alongside her husband, Dr. Jamal H. Bryant, as First Lady of New Birth Missionary Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia—one of the Nation's most influential congregations advancing ministry initiatives that uplift families, strengthen communities, and inspire faith-based leadership; and

Whereas, Dr. Bryant exemplifies grace, resilience, and authenticity, inspiring others through her faith, scholarship, entrepreneurship, and national recognition, including the Presidential Lifetime Achievement Award; and

Therefore, be it *resolved* that we, Florida's 20th Congressional District, proudly recognize and honor Dr. Karri Bryant during Women's History Month for her outstanding leadership, dedication, and service, inspiring others through her example of integrity, faith, and achievement.

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, April 16, 2026 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 20

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Energy's atomic energy defense activities and Department of De-

fense nuclear weapons programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2027 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

APRIL 21

8 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold closed hearings to examine the posture of United States Indo-Pacific Command and United States Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2027 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by an open session at 9:30 a.m. in SD-G50.

SVC-217

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for the fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Energy.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kevin Warsh, of Florida, to be a Member and Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

SD-538

10:15 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on the Constitution

To hold hearings to examine Arctic Frost, focusing on conspiracy and coordination.

SH-216

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the National Guard and Reserves Forces.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-124

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Seapower

To hold hearings to examine maritime unmanned surface vessels.

SR-222

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy

To hold hearings to examine the U.S. approach to counterterrorism in Africa.

SD-419

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine Iran's support for Russia and lessons learned from Ukraine.

RHOB-2247

APRIL 22

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for

fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Commerce.

SD-192

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of the Interior.

SD-124

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of the Treasury.

SD-138

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine federal boxing laws.

SR-253

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-215

10:15 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine China's ongoing theft of U.S. innovation.

SH-216

2 p.m.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-430

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Agriculture.

SD-106

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Energy.

SD-124

3 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and United States Capitol Police.

SD-138

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the United States Central Command and United States Africa 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.

SD-G50

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

(Legislative Day of Tuesday, April 14, 2026)

Routine Proceedings, pages S1747–S1806

Measures Introduced: Seventeen bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4295–4311, and S. Res. 670–673. **Pages S1784–85**

Measures Reported:

S. 545, to prohibit certain uses of xylazine, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Measures Passed:

National Slam the Scam Day: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 627, designating March 5, 2026, as “National Slam the Scam Day” to raise awareness about pervasive scams and to prevent government imposter scams and other types of scams by promoting education about such scams, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1789**

National Safe Digging Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 673, supporting the goals and ideals of National Safe Digging Month. **Page S1789**

Investing in All of America Act: Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2066, to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to exclude from the limit on leverage certain amounts invested in smaller enterprises located in rural or low-income areas and small businesses in critical technology areas, and the bill was then passed. **Pages S1789–90**

Measures Considered:

Hostilities Within or Against the Islamic Republic of Iran: By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 79), Senate rejected the motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 123, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities within or against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress, pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a), and in accordance with section 601(b) of the Inter-

national Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act. **Pages S1749–62**

Foreign Military Sale to the Government of Israel: By 40 yeas to 59 nays (Vote No. 80), Senate rejected the motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 32, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act. **Pages S1774–79**

Foreign Military Sale to the Government of Israel: By 36 yeas to 63 nays (Vote No. 81), Senate rejected the motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 138, providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act. **Page S1779**

Withdrawal of Federal Lands: Senate began consideration of H.J. Res. 140, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to Public Land Order No. 7917 for Withdrawal of Federal Lands; Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, MN, after agreeing to the motion to proceed, and taking action on the following motion proposed thereto: **Pages S1779–80**

Rejected:

Smith point of order that the joint resolution was not entitled to expedited procedures under the Congressional Review Act because Public Land Order No. 7917 is not a rule within the meaning of the Congressional Review Act, and the joint resolution does not meet all of the requirements of section 802 of the Congressional Review Act under the precedent set on May 21, 2025. (By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 82), Senate tabled the point of order.) **Page S1780**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 83), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to consideration of the joint resolution. **Page S1780**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the joint resolution at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, April 16, 2026, and at 11 a.m., all time be expired on the joint resolution, and Senate vote on passage, and following disposition, Senate resume consideration of the nomination of Andrew B. Davis, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, and notwithstanding Rule XXII, Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 1:45 p.m.; and that if cloture is invoked on the nomination, all time be expired and Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader in consultation with the Democratic Leader no earlier than Monday, April 20, 2026.

Page S1790

Messages from the House: Page S1782

Measures Referred: Page S1782

Executive Communications: Pages S1782–84

Executive Reports of Committees: Page S1784

Additional Cosponsors: Pages S1785–86

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: Pages S1786–88

Additional Statements: Pages S1781–82

Amendments Submitted: Pages S1788–89

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S1789

Record Votes: Five record votes were taken today. (Total—83) Pages S1762, S1779–80

Recess: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and recessed at 11:38 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 16, 2026. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1790.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FIFA WORLD CUP

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies to examine preparations for the FIFA World Cup 2026, after receiving testimony from Robert O'Leary, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism, National Travel and Tourism Office, International Trade Administration; Rear Admiral Christopher J. Tomney, USCG (Ret.), Director, Office of Homeland Security Situational Awareness, Department of Homeland Security; and Doug Olson, Special Agent

in Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

APPROPRIATIONS: CBO, GPO, GAO

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Congressional Budget Office, Government Publishing Office, and the Government Accountability Office, after receiving testimony from Phillip L. Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office; Hugh Nathaniel Halpern, Director, Government Publishing Office; and Orice Williams Brown, Acting Comptroller General, Government Accountability Office.

FTC OVERSIGHT

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Trade Commission, after receiving testimony from Andrew Ferguson, Chairman, and Mark Meador, Commissioner, both of the Federal Trade Commission.

ENERGY LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Energy concluded a hearing to examine S. 465, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reform the interconnection queue process for the prioritization and approval of certain projects, S. 1327, to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to establish a shared savings incentive to return a portion of the savings attributable to an investment in grid-enhancing technology to the developer of that grid-enhancing technology, S. 3034, to amend the Federal Power Act to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review regulations that may affect the reliable operation of the bulk-power system, S. 3192, to require Transmission Organizations to allow aggregators of retail customers to submit to organized wholesale electric markets bids that aggregate demand flexibility of customers of certain utilities, S. 3269, to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a technology assessment focused on liquid cooling systems for artificial intelligence compute clusters and high-performance computing facilities, and S. 3947, to amend the Federal Power Act to establish a categorical exclusion for reconductoring within existing rights-of-way, after receiving testimony from David Morenoff, Deputy General Counsel, and Kal Ayoub, Director, Office of Electric Reliability, both of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

GREAT LAKES REGION

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine restoration efforts in the Great Lakes Region, including S. 528, to reauthorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, after receiving testimony from Mary Mertz, Ohio Department of Natural Resources Director, and Christopher Winslow, The Ohio State University College of Food, Agriculture, and Environmental Sciences Stone Laboratory Ohio Sea Grant Program, both of Columbus; and Holly Bamford, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Washington, D.C.

IRS 2026 FILING SEASON

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the IRS 2026 filing season and IRS operations, after receiving testimony from Frank J. Bisignano, Chief Executive Officer, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Catherine Dillon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary (Educational and Cultural Affairs), Ademola Adewale-Sadik, of New York, to be United States Director of the African Development Bank for a term of five years, 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, and routine lists in the Foreign Service all of the Department of State.

REFORMING THE UN

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reforming the United Nations, focusing on assessing United States efforts and priorities, after receiving testimony from Michael Waltz, Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, and Jeff Bartos, Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations for United Nations Management and Reform, both of the Department of State.

SECOND AMENDMENT

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Second Amendment, after receiving testimony from Representative Massie; Kenneth T. Cuccinelli, II, Center for Renewing America, Spotsylvania Courthouse, Virginia; Erich Pratt, Gun Owners of America, Springfield, Virginia; Dudley Brown, National

Association for Gun Rights, Loveland, Colorado; and Stephen I. Vladeck, Georgetown Law, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Justin D. Smith, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Hawley and Schmitt, Jeffrey M. Kuhlman and Anthony J. Powell, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Kansas, who were both introduced by Senators Moran and Marshall, and Anthony W. Mattivi, to be a United States District Judge for the District of Kansas, who was introduced by Senators Moran and Marshall, and former Senator Pat Roberts.

JUSTICE-INVOLVED VETERANS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine programs for justice-involved veterans, after receiving testimony from Dana DiGiacomo, Assistant Director, Reentry Services Division, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice; Thomas O'Toole, Acting Assistant Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health for Clinical Services, Veterans Health Administration; Lawton R. Nuss, former Chief Justice Kansas Supreme Court, Topeka; Major General Clyde Tate II, USA, (Ret.), All Rise, Fairfax Station, Virginia; Brigadier General David MacEwen, USA, (Ret.), Council on Criminal Justice, Washington, D.C.; and Rose Carmen Goldberg, University of Washington School of Law, Seattle.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held a closed hearing to examine certain intelligence matters, receiving testimony from members of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

SENIORS AND FINANCIAL LITERACY

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine empowering seniors through financial literacy, focusing on tools to protect savings, prevent fraud, and promote independence, after receiving testimony from Christine Kieffer, FINRA, Sam Kunjukunju, American Bankers Association, Carly Roszkowski, AARP, all of Washington, D.C.; and Scott Kahan, Financial Asset Management Corporation, Chappaqua, New York.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 35 public bills, H.R. 8283–8317; and 6 resolutions, H. Res. 1176–1181, were introduced. **Pages H2923–25**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H2926**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 1174, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6387) to amend the Clean Air Act to require revisions to regulations governing the review and handling of air quality monitoring data influenced by exceptional events or actions to mitigate wildfire risk; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6398) to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6409) to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 1156) expressing support for tax policies that support working families (H. Rept. 119–609);

H. Res. 1175, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8035) to amend the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 to extend the authorities of title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 through October 20, 2027, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 119–610);

H.R. 7688, to modernize and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–611);

H.R. 5877, to strengthen the authority of the United States Secret Service to investigate various crimes related to digital asset transactions and to counter transnational cyber criminal activity, including unlicensed money transmitting businesses, structured transactions, and fraud against financial institutions, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–612, Part 1);

H.R. 5587, to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to waive the requirement for a Federal drilling permit for certain activities, to exempt certain activities from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–613);

H.R. 2289, to provide that an eligible facilities request under section 6409(a) of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 is not subject to requirements to prepare certain environmental or historical preservation reviews, with amendments (H. Rept. 119–614, Part 1);

H.R. 7386, to amend the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 to reauthorize the First Responder Network Authority, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–615); and

H.R. 7022, to provide for the transmission of emergency alerts by satellite, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–616). **Page H2923**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Fine to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2889**

Whole Number of the House: The Chair announced to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Gonzales, the whole number of the House is 431. **Page H2889**

Order of Business: Agreed by unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 40 in the House if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion except for one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by Representative Mast of Florida and Representative Meeks of New York, or their respective designees. **Pages H2889–90**

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Yakym wherein he resigned from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H2891**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 1176, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Pages H2891–92**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:19 a.m. and reconvened at 1 p.m. **Page H2898**

Requiring the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status: The House considered H. Res. 965, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1689) to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status. Earlier the House agreed to the Pressley motion to discharge H. Res. 965 by a yea-and-nay vote of 219 yeas to 209 nays, Roll No. 113. **Pages H2899–H2902**

Foreign Emissions and Nonattainment Clarification for Economic Stability Act: The House considered H.R. 6409, to amend the Clean Air Act to clarify standards for emissions emanating from outside of the United States. **Pages H2902–09**

H. Res. 1174, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6387), (H.R. 6398), (H.R. 6409), and the resolution (H. Res. 1156) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 112, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 yeas to 211 nays, Roll No. 111.

Pages H2898–99

Reducing and Eliminating Duplicative Environmental Regulations Act: The House considered H.R. 6398, to amend the Clean Air Act relating to review by the Environmental Protection Agency of proposed legislation.

Pages H2909–13

H. Res. 1174, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6387), (H.R. 6398), (H.R. 6409), and the resolution (H. Res. 1156) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 112, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 yeas to 211 nays, Roll No. 111.

Pages H2898–99

Expressing support for tax policies that support working families: The House considered H. Res. 1156, expressing support for tax policies that support working families.

Page H2913–20

H. Res. 1174, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 6387), (H.R. 6398), (H.R. 6409), and the resolution (H. Res. 1156) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 214 ayes to 212 noes, Roll No. 112, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 yeas to 211 nays, Roll No. 111.

Pages H2898–99

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, April 16th.

Page H2921

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H2898, H2899 and H2899–H2900.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Energy. Testimony was heard from Chris Wright, Secretary, Department of Energy.

MEMBER DAY

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Member Day”. Testimony was heard from Representatives Amo, Baird, Barrett, Budzinski, Carter of Louisiana, Castor of Florida,

Feenstra, Garcia of Texas, Vicente Gonzalez of Texas, Hernández, Johnson of Texas, Kaptur, Kennedy of New York, Lee of Nevada, Leger Fernandez, Lucas, Pfluger, Randall, Scholten, Titus, Yakym, Biggs of South Carolina, Bilirakis, James, and Scanlon.

FY27 MISSILE DEFENSE AND MISSILE DEFEAT PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled “FY27 Missile Defense and Missile Defeat Programs and Activities”. Testimony was heard from Marc Berkowitz, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; General Gregory Guillot, Commander, U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command; General Michael Guetlein, Direct Report Program Manager for Golden Dome for America, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Heath Collins, Director, Missile Defense Agency, Department of Defense; and Lieutenant General Sean Gainey, Commanding General, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command.

MILITARY READINESS FOR FY27

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled “Military Readiness for FY27”. Testimony was heard from General Shawn N. Bratton, Vice Chief of Space Operations, U.S. Space Force; General Bradford J. Gering, Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps; Admiral James W. Kilby, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy; General John Lamontagne, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force; and General Christopher C. LaNeve, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

THE PRESIDENT’S FISCAL YEAR 2027 BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on the Budget: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “The President’s Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Request”. Testimony was heard from Russell Vought, Director, Office of Management and Budget.

BUILDING AN AI-READY AMERICA: UNDERSTANDING AI’S ECONOMIC IMPACT ON WORKERS AND EMPLOYERS

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled “Building an AI-Ready America: Understanding AI’s Economic Impact on Workers and Employers”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HEALTHIER AMERICA: LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE PUBLIC HEALTH

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing entitled “Healthier America: Legislative Proposals to Improve Public Health”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

COMPUTING POWER AND COMPETITION: EXAMINING THE SEMICONDUCTOR ECOSYSTEM

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Computing Power and Competition: Examining the Semiconductor Ecosystem”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SAFEGUARDING MAIN STREET: COMBATting FRAUD AND EXPLOITATION IN OUR CAPITAL MARKETS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets held a hearing entitled “Safeguarding Main Street: Combatting Fraud and Exploitation in Our Capital Markets”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

HELPING AMERICAN BUSINESSES WIN ABROAD: STRENGTHENING U.S. COMMERCIAL DIPLOMACY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: East Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee; and Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee held a joint hearing entitled “Helping American Businesses Win Abroad: Strengthening U.S. Commercial Diplomacy”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FRAUD PREVENTION: UNDERSTANDING FRAUD IN FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS RUN BY THE STATES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “Fraud Prevention: Understanding Fraud in Federally Funded Programs Run by the States”. Testimony was heard from Seto Bagdoyan, Director, Forensic Audits and Investigative Service, Government Accountability Office; Allison Ball, Auditor of Public Accounts, Kentucky; and public witnesses.

THE STATE OF SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHING: ASSESSING TRENDS, EMERGING ISSUES, AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing entitled “The State of Scientific Publishing: Assessing Trends, Emerging Issues, and Policy Con-

siderations”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LOWER TAXES, STRONGER MAIN STREET: THE BENEFITS OF THE WORKING FAMILIES TAX CUTS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Lower Taxes, Stronger Main Street: The Benefits of the Working Families Tax Cuts”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FASTER DECISIONS, STRONGER OUTCOMES: VETERANS ADMINISTRATION’S WORK TO STREAMLINE THE DISABILITY CLAIMS BACKLOG

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Faster Decisions, Stronger Outcomes: VA’s Work to Streamline the Disability Claims Backlog”. Testimony was heard from Margarita Devlin, Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Benefits, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a markup on H.R. 7950, to establish the Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; H.R. 7683, the “VA Fiscal Management and Modernization Act”; H.R. 8052, the “Veterans Infection Prevention Act”; H.R. 6654, the “VAMOS Act of 2025”; H.R. 8043, the “Vets CLEAR Act”; H.R. 7280, the “Veteran DATA Act”; H.R. 8041, the “Supporting VA Families Act”; and H.R. 8010, the “VA Police Recruitment and Retention Act of 2026”. H.R. 7950 and H.R. 7683 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended. H.R. 8052, H.R. 6654, H.R. 8043, H.R. 7280, H.R. 8041, and H.R. 8010 were ordered favorably forwarded to the Full Committee, without amendment.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D373)

S. 1884, to clarify the Holocaust Expropriated Art Recovery Act of 2016, to appropriately limit the application of defenses based on the passage of time and other non-merits defenses to claims under that Act. Signed on April 13, 2026. (Public Law 119–82)

S. 3971, to extend the SBIR and STTR programs. Signed on April 13, 2026. (Public Law 119–83)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2026

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the President's fiscal year 2027 budget proposal, 10 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John Breslow, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Cyprus, Fleet White, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Political-Military Affairs), Todd Steggerda, of Virginia, to be Representative to the Office of the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Geneva, with the rank of Ambassador, Preston Wells Griffith III, of Virginia, to be Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador, and Adam Cassady, of Virginia, to be Ambassador at Large for Cyberspace and Digital Policy, all of the Department of State, 10:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine making medicines more affordable, focusing on how competition can lower drug prices, 10 a.m., SD-430.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing entitled "For the Purpose of Receiving Testimony from the Honorable Michael S. Selig, Chairman, U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission", 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense, budget hearing on the U.S. Army, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Army Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, 10 a.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, budget hearing on the Department of Homeland Security: U.S. Customs and Border Protection, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 10 a.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Agriculture, 10:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 11 a.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, budget hearing on the Department of Homeland Security: Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Secret Service, and Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2 p.m., 2362-A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Health and Human Services, 2 p.m., 2358-C Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the U.S. Forest Service, 4 p.m., 2008 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations, hearing entitled "Defense Intelligence Enterprise—Challenges, Priorities, and Resourcing for Fiscal Year 2027", 3:30 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Workforce, Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, hearing entitled "Examining the Policies and Priorities of the Employee Benefits Security Administration", 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled "The Fiscal Year 2027 Department of Energy Budget", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, hearing entitled "Promoting Access to Credit for Everyday Americans", 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, hearing entitled "Latin America After the Fall of Maduro", 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Oversight with Secretaries of State: List Maintenance and Eligibility Verification", 10:15 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing entitled "The Human Toll of Sanctuary Policies: Stories from Victims and Families", 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries, hearing on H.R. 4219, the "National Wildlife Refuge System Invasive Species Strike Team Act of 2025"; H.R. 6251, to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to allow importation of polar bear trophies taken in sport hunts in Canada before the date the polar bear was determined to be a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; H.R. 7288, the "Western South Dakota Water Supply Project Feasibility Study Act"; and H.R. 8195, the "Responsible Cormorant Management and Control Act of 2026", 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled "Subsurface Science and Technology: American Energy and Mineral Dominance", 10:15 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, markup on H.R. 2283, the "Recognizing Community Organizations for Veteran Engagement and Recovery Act"; H.R. 6993, the "BEACON Act of 2026"; H.R. 6652, the "U.S. Vets of the FAS Act"; H.R. 6444, the "Blast Overpressure Research and Mitigation Task Force Act"; H.R. 5999, to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish an opioid antagonist to a veteran without requiring a prescription or copayment; H.R. 6848, the "Whole Health for Veterans Act"; and H.R. 6001, the "Veterans with ALS Reporting Act", 10:15 a.m., 360 Cannon.

Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, hearing entitled “Bounce Houses, Drones, and Massage Chairs: A Review of VA’s Purchase History in the Veteran Readiness and Employment Program”, 2 p.m., 360 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing entitled “Hearing with Health and Human Services Secretary Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.”, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Defense Intelligence and Overhead Architecture, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Request for the National Reconnaissance Office, the National Geospatial-

Intelligence Agency, and the United States Space Force”, 10 a.m., HVC-304 Capitol. This hearing is closed.

Subcommittee on the National Intelligence Enterprise, hearing entitled “Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Request for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security”, 1 p.m., HVC-304 Capitol. This hearing is closed.

Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party, Full Committee, hearing entitled “China’s Campaign to Steal America’s AI Edge”, 11 a.m., 390 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, April 16

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, April 16

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of H.J. Res. 140, Withdrawal of Federal Lands, and vote on passage of the joint resolution at 11 a.m.

Following disposition of the joint resolution, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Andrew B. Davis, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture thereon at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E330
Cherfilus-McCormick, Sheila, Fla., E327, E328, E329,
E330
Ezell, Mike, Miss., E327

Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E327
Liccardo, Sam T., Calif., E330
McClellan, Jennifer L., Va., E329
Mfume, Kweisi, Md., E327
Pettersen, Brittany, Colo., E327
Rogers, Mike, Ala., E328

Stanton, Greg, Ariz., E327
Van Epps, Matt, Tenn., E329
Vindman, Eugene Simon, Va., E328
Zinke, Ryan K., Mont., E328



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.