



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2026

No. 81

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 13, 2026.

I hereby appoint the Honorable AARON BEAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK: TEXAS HONOR GUARD

(Ms. DE LA CRUZ of Texas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Police Week, I rise to recognize two exceptional officers from Texas' 15th Congressional District, Trooper Juan Zuniga and Trooper Roman Gonzalez.

Trooper Zuniga, a McAllen native, has spent over 12 years protecting the citizens of our State. Since graduating from the Department of Public Safety

Academy in 2013, he has served as a mentor and a highly skilled expert in crash reconstruction and drug recognition.

Edinburg native, Trooper Roman Gonzalez, has led a life defined by sacrifice. Before his 17-year career as a trooper, Roman served as a U.S. marine in Iraq where he earned the Combat Action Ribbon for his courage on the front lines.

Both of these men continue to go above and beyond as members of the elite Texas DPS Honor Guard. They ensure that our fallen heroes are laid to rest with dignity, precision, and respect.

Troopers Zuniga and Gonzalez represent the very best of south Texas. I thank them for their service.

POLICE CHIEF JAIME AYALA

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Police Chief Jaime Ayala of the Edinburg Police Department who was recently awarded the Mike Gentry Executive Leadership Award by the Texas Police Chiefs Association. This award is reserved for those who embody exceptional leadership in law enforcement.

Since stepping into his role, Chief Ayala has shifted the department's focus from simply responding to crime to actively preventing it. By building a proactive agency and deploying drones for real-time emergency responses, he has ensured that Edinburg remains at the cutting edge of public safety innovation.

Under his leadership, the Edinburg Police Department was awarded the Rio Grande Valley's Favorite Law Enforcement Agency for the third year in a row.

This honor reflects his team's deep commitment to serving and connecting with our beautiful community.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Chief Ayala on this incredible achievement.

HONORING SERGEANT JOSHUA ROQUE

Ms. DE LA CRUZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Alice native Sergeant

Joshua Roque for his outstanding service and leadership at the Jim Wells County Sheriff's Office.

Since joining the department 6 years ago, Sergeant Roque has demonstrated exceptional work ethic and leadership. Moving from his role as a correctional officer to patrol sergeant, he has distinguished himself not only as a deputy but also as a resilient member of the SWAT team.

He is known throughout the agency for his professionalism and positive attitude that he brings to every shift. Whether he is supervising his squad or making critical decisions under pressure, he leads with integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Sergeant Roque for his dedication to public safety and unwavering commitment to the mission of the Jim Wells County Sheriff's Department.

RECOGNIZING BURTON DECKER CORWIN, PH.D.

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

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the exceptional life and times of Burton "Burt" Corwin, a longtime resident of Larchmont who passed away peacefully at the New York State Veterans Home at Montrose on April 29 at the age of 83.

Burt was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and he graduated from Bethel Park High School. Burt attended Lehigh University where he graduated with honors and fulfilled his ROTC requirements, then commissioned as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army. He went on to receive a master's degree and a Ph.D.

Burt served in the U.S. Army at the Pentagon and then served his country as a captain at Long Binh in Vietnam. He received a Bronze Star for his service.

His business career with IBM spanned 33 years in varied roles. He later taught

□ 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.

H3397

part time in the MBA programs at Fordham and Iona. Most importantly, he served as commander of the David Potts, Jr. VFW Post 1156 in Larchmont for 10 years. Under his leadership, the post focused on service to veterans and service to the community. He also served on the board of the Westchester Board of Veterans Services and was a member of The American Legion.

Throughout his life, Burt was praised for his great intellect, leadership, gentle nature, intention to get it right, and sense of fairness. He was a peacemaker, and he abhorred pettiness. He cared about people and demonstrated it throughout his life. His family and friends will miss him terribly.

Burt is survived by his wife, Deirdre, his two sons, and his stepdaughter. From the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, we salute Burt Corwin and his life of service and dedication to his family, neighbors, and country.

PRICES AT THE PUMP

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Speaker, not quite 2 months ago, March 21 to be specific, I filled the tank of our family car at the local gas station three blocks from my home. It was near empty in the gas tank. The price for regular gas was \$4.19 per gallon, \$4.59 for plus, and \$4.99 for super. Twenty gallons later, I paid \$85.80 and headed back home.

This past Monday night before coming here to Washington by Amtrak, I did the same thing: \$4.79 per gallon, \$4.99 for plus, and \$5.59 for super. It was 60 cents more per gallon in just 50 days. The same gas cost me \$95.80, \$12 more than it did 50 days before. It was even higher back in March than it was in January.

If I needed a full tank once a week and prices were to freeze at today's rate, I would be paying \$600 more per year. That is a 15 percent increase.

With a congressional salary, I can afford it.

But what about the waitress? What about the factory worker? What about the home healthcare aide, the truck driver or the firefighter?

What about the nurse or the clerical worker? Are they getting a 15 percent pay raise this year?

Many of these people don't know much about the Strait of Hormuz. They don't know much about the shifting rates of tariffs. Maybe they care, maybe they don't, but they care that it costs more today on May 13 than it did on March 21 or on January 1.

Mr. Speaker, you can't blame this on Biden, although you will try. You can't blame this on Obama or Hillary or, for that matter, FDR, Grover Cleveland, or any and every Democrat that ever existed.

The fact is that on January 19, 2025, the Strait of Hormuz was open. The fact is on January 19, 2025, there were no across-the-board tariffs on products, including those from our friends, Canada, Mexico, Europe, and Japan. They are all rethinking what friendship means now.

Let's see what it costs me to gas up on June 23 or on September 5 or perhaps on the morning of November 3.

Mr. Speaker, you can gerrymander all you want. Everyone sees the signs in neon lights all over their town: \$4.19, \$4.39, and \$4.79. You can't gerrymander that.

CONGRATULATING ALPHA DELTA PI SISTERS

(Ms. FOXX of North Carolina was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of a milestone for women: to congratulate my Alpha Delta Pi sisters on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the founding of our sisterhood.

Established as the Adelphean Society on May 15, 1851, at Wesleyan Female College in Macon, Georgia, Alpha Delta Pi is the oldest secret society for college women, founded at the first college chartered to grant degrees to women.

The sorority encourages its members to "Be the First" and counts among its members the first female attorney to practice law in Missouri, the first woman to pass the Georgia bar, the first female president pro tempore in any State's senate, the first woman to lead the Marine Corps band, the first woman elected to executive office in Colorado, the first female inspector general for the 82nd Airborne Division, the first woman to join the United States Navy Blue Angels, the first female Lieutenant Governor of Arkansas, and countless other firsts in the fields of medicine, education, science and technology, athletics, business, journalism, and the arts.

Founder Eugenia Tucker Fitzgerald encouraged sisters to "never forget the unselfish devotion to service that our motto expresses."

For more than 45 years, the sorority has partnered with Ronald McDonald House. Chapters, alumnae associations, and individuals support their local Ronald McDonald House chapters through fundraising and volunteering, and collectively, Alpha Delta Pi has contributed more than \$25 million and countless hours to the organization.

Alpha Delta Pi recognizes that not all women participate in sororities as collegians. Therefore, the sorority encourages the proactive recruitment of alumnae initiates who exemplify the high ideals upon which the sisterhood is based.

It was a great honor for me to be invited to be an alumnae initiate of Alpha Delta Pi 5 years ago and to count these trailblazing women among my sisters.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STICKNEY MAYOR JEFF WALIK

(Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mayor Jeff Walik of Stickney, a man whose life was inseparable from the village that he loved.

Jeff served his community first as a police officer and later as mayor, always a fighter for Stickney. Mayor Walik never stopped pushing, never stopped advocating, and, frankly, never took "no" for an answer when it came to his home and his people.

Even those who disagreed with him knew one thing to be true: His commitment to Stickney was real. He carried his community in his heart everywhere he went. He never walked away from service, always protecting and fighting for the town he believed in.

Jeff was part of an era of public service that people will speak about with pride.

We extend our deepest condolences to the Walik family, the residents of Stickney, and all those mourning this tremendous loss. May he rest in peace.

□ 1015

RECOGNIZING ST. PROCOPIUS CHURCH'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate St. Procopius Church—my first parish when I arrived in Chicago—on their 150th anniversary.

Founded in 1875 and located in the historic Pilsen community in my district, St. Procopius was first built to serve the growing population of Czech immigrants who settled in the neighborhood after the Great Chicago Fire.

Since then, the church has evolved alongside the community from its roots as a predominantly Czech parish to serving a very large and vibrant Mexican-American community that Pilsen is known for today.

The parish, now merged with Providence of God Parish and Holy Trinity Croatian Parish, continues to contribute greatly to the Pilsen neighborhood and the city of Chicago through community outreach, hosting cultural and religious celebrations, and providing education to children from 15 communities across Chicago through a dual-language parish school that I am proud to be an alum of.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate St. Procopius Church for marking a century and a half of faith, resilience, and dedicated service to the people of Chicago.

HONORING JUAN DIES AND VICTOR G. PICHARDO

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Juan Dies and Victor Pichardo, Mexican folk musicians who were recently recognized by the National Endowment for the Arts with the 2026 National Heritage Fellowship awards.

Juan and Victor cofounded Sones de Mexico in Pilsen, Illinois, and have dedicated their lives to preserving, sharing, and uplifting the rich traditions of Mexican folk music for new generations.

Through workshops, seminars, residencies, and performances, they

have taken Mexican music from neighborhood events in Pilsen to Carnegie Hall, The Kennedy Center, and the Smithsonian Folklife Festival.

For 35 years, Victor and Juan have taught hundreds of students in Mexico and the U.S., keeping traditions alive and strengthening cultural identity.

This award is a recognition of their contributions to enriching America's cultural tapestry.

"Juan, Victor, your music and achievements fill us with great pride"; "Juan, Victor, su musica y sus logros nos llenan de orgullo."

RECOGNIZING COACH MIKE PICKETT

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

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, in soccer, the final whistle marks the end of a match, but today, it marks the close of a legendary career.

I rise to recognize an extraordinary coach, mentor, and leader from my district, Coach Mike Pickett of St. Johns Country Day School in Clay County, Florida, who is retiring after an incredible 28-year career.

Madam Speaker, his record is astounding: 28 years in coaching, 684 games, 23 district championships, 22 regional championships, and 22 Final Four appearances. His teams earned an astounding 15 State championships, ranking him second all-time in Florida and fifth in the Nation. Along the way, his program achieved 9 top 10 national rankings, including three times as the number one team in the country.

Coach Pickett's legacy goes far beyond the scoreboard. He helped shape the lives of countless young athletes, including more than 50 student athletes who went on to play collegiate soccer. Through his leadership, he instilled discipline, teamwork, and a lifelong love of the game.

Madam Speaker, Coach Pickett didn't just build a community program. He built character and opportunity for his students. As he steps away from the sidelines, we thank him for his dedication, his impact, and the example he has set both on and off the field.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Coach Pickett on an outstanding and incredible career. The final whistle has sounded, but his legacy will play on. I wish him all the best in the next game of life. Clay County and all of north Florida are very proud of Coach Pickett.

Go get 'em, Coach.

RECOGNIZING SKIN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. BEAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, they call it the Sunshine State for a reason. As a young kid growing up in Florida, I basked in the sun every day, going without a shirt. I lifeguarded. I did everything in the sun.

Years later, walking through the halls of the Florida Legislature, Dr. Ralph Massullo, who is now a State senator said, "Bean, there is a spot on

you that you might want to get checked out." I did. I saw my dermatologist, and it was bad skin that had to get removed immediately.

Happy ending, Madam Speaker. That dangerous, bad skin was successfully removed, thanks to early detection and thanks to Dr. Massullo. It taught me a valuable lesson and put me on a mission, letting everybody know they have to respect the sunshine.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Skin Cancer Awareness Month to remind us all that something as simple as stepping outside can have long-term consequences if we don't respect the sunshine.

Skin cancer is the most common cancer in the United States, with over 5 million cases diagnosed each year. The good news, Madam Speaker: It is also one of the most preventable cancers.

A little sunscreen, a hat, and some shade during the hottest part of the day are small steps that make a big difference. Also, visit your dermatologist regularly because early detection saves lives.

I am not here to sound alarms—or maybe—but just to make sure that people have the tools to protect themselves. I want families to enjoy the outdoors but be safe while in the sun.

Madam Speaker, in Florida, we say the sunshine is part of the good life. Let's make sure we are protecting that life while enjoying it.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF KATHLEEN ANNE KOCH

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

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life and legacy of Kathleen Anne Koch, who passed away on March 17, 2026, at the age of 78.

Kathy was a devoted wife and mother, a proud grandmother, and, above all, a relentless fighter for justice.

Born on January 20, 1948, to Michael and Jeanne Honan, Kathy learned at a young age the importance of community, looking out for your neighbor, and never backing down from doing what is right.

Kathy grew up in South Buffalo, where she met her husband, Wally. Together, they shared a marriage of 52 years filled with laughter, partnership, and an unwavering devotion to family.

Kathy and Wally lived a true love story. They met at a New Year's Eve celebration near McKinley Parkway and got married shortly after at St. Teresa's Church. They were inseparable. They devoted every waking moment to one another and, in the process, created a lifetime full of beautiful memories.

After receiving a degree in social work from D'Youville University, Kathy began a career as an employment counselor at the Erie County Department of Social Services. For decades, she helped people find dignity,

stability, and economic security. She saw people not as cases but as neighbors, often celebrating their victories as if they were her own.

She didn't stop there. Kathy frequently followed up to make sure that those she helped stayed on a path toward success. That is who she was. She never did the bare minimum. She poured her whole heart into helping others each and every day.

She passed that calling on to her children, my dear friends, Melanie, Mike, and Walt, each of whom followed in their mother's footsteps and chose a life of service.

Melanie became a supervisor of special education for the Buffalo Public Schools, helping students with special needs to reach their full potential.

Mike, my former classmate and the best OT to come out of our class at D'Youville University, works as an occupational therapist, helping patients regain independence following traumatic injuries.

Walt, one of the most selfless public servants I have ever had the privilege to work with, serves as deputy district director and senior caseworker in my Buffalo office, where he dedicates every day to the betterment of our community.

Kathy instilled in her children a deep belief in the power of civic duty and the promise of our democracy. Inspired by leaders like President John F. Kennedy, Kathy believed that if you want to see change, you must fight for it.

Kathy never missed an election. She never sat on the sidelines. She knew that one voice could make a difference, and she used her own for the betterment of our community.

Kathy was a happy warrior in the fight for a better world. Her compassion was evident in the small, quiet acts that revealed the depth of her character.

Kathy was also an avid Buffalo Bills fan who never missed a game. In 1974, when she was nearly 9 months pregnant with identical twins Mike and Walton, she went to Rich Stadium for a Bills playoff game. When the Bills lost their first Super Bowl, she forced her children to skip school to go to the rally in front of Buffalo City Hall to welcome her beloved Bills home.

Kathy passed away on St. Patrick's Day, her favorite day of the year, surrounded by her entire family. Like many South Buffalonians, she was proud of her Irish heritage and loved celebrating her roots alongside those she loved.

To Kathy's children, Melanie, Mike, and Walt, and her grandchildren, Norah, Nicholas, Noah, and Liam, our Nation mourns with you.

Though Kathy will be deeply missed, her legacy lives on in each of them in every life that she touched.

Western New York is stronger because Kathy Koch was a part of it. May we honor her by carrying forward her fight for a better, more just world.

On behalf of a grateful nation and on behalf of a grateful community, may Kathleen Anne Koch rest in peace.

FORT THOMAS HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL WINS 1A STATE TITLE

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

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Thomas High School boys' basketball team on winning the 2026 1A State championship.

The Apaches won their first title since 2020 with a score of 77-45 in the championship game. Nearly 10,000 fans were in attendance to cheer on Fort Thomas, making their victory that much sweeter.

Senior Damarae Dosela led the team, scoring 26 points, including three consecutive three-pointers at the end of the third quarter. His performance earned him the championship's MVP vote.

With this victory, the Apaches took home their 13th State title. Coach Matthew Dona, having led the team to this year's championship title, was named the Boys' 1A Conference Coach of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Coach Dona, the whole team, and everyone who made this win possible. Their hard work has made their school and our community very proud. I hope the Apaches enjoy their victory. They earned it. Here is to another successful season and many, many more.

PIMA HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL WINS 2A STATE TITLE

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pima High School boys' basketball team on winning the 2026 2A State championship title. The Roughriders took home the State title in a 40-29 victory over North Valley Christian, thanks to an incredible defense.

This victory marks the second State championship title the Roughriders have taken home in the last three seasons, after winning in 2023, as well, and their 12th overall.

Senior Keegan Corona scored 16 points, helping secure the win for Pima. Corona was also named the 2A East Region Offensive Player of the Year.

This victory caps off a 21-year career for Coach Cliff Thompson, with an impressive 475-173 record. This puts Thompson at 17th overall in Arizona history.

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

Roughriders, enjoy your victory. You have earned it. Here is to another successful season and many, many more.

PALO VERDE HIGH SCHOOL BOYS' BASKETBALL WINS 3A STATE TITLE

Mr. CISCOMANI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Palo Verde High School boys' basketball team on winning the 2026 3A State championship title.

The Titans made school history with this victory, taking home their first basketball State championship in school history. They earned the title with a score of 52-41 against Coolidge High School.

Junior Rashad Ortiz led the team with 19 points and was chosen as MVP for the 3A State tournament.

□ 1030

This amazing win comes after the Titans reached the 3A championship just last year.

Coach Anthony Smith has led the team since 2021, coaching the Titans to a State championship, a State runner-up, and a 96-40 record.

I congratulate Coach Smith, the whole team, and everyone who made this history-making win possible. Your hard work has made your school and our community very proud. May the Titans enjoy their victory. They have earned it.

Here is to another successful season and many, many more.

CELEBRATING JOHN McDERMOTT DURING NATIONAL FAIR HOUSING MONTH

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

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise to celebrate a longtime Chicago leader, an organizer for housing justice, my mentor, and a dear friend, John McDermott.

John's legacy fighting for affordable housing is written across our city. From his work as the executive director at the Lakeview Action Coalition to his tenure at the Palenque LSNA, and his work to protect and preserve affordable and public housing at Lathrop Homes, there are few people whose names are as synonymous with housing justice as John's McDermott's.

Because of his mentorship and organizing, the Preserve Lathrop Campaign secured the replacement, rather than the demolition, of 925 public housing units and the preservation of historic buildings.

But John's impact extends beyond any one single campaign. John's mentorship has built housing justice leaders, many of whom serve now as Chicago's public servants today. I count myself among them.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is my sincere honor to commend John McDermott for his lifetime of contributions in the fight for housing justice and affordable housing for all.

I congratulate John.

HONORING FELICIA DAVIS BLAKLEY

Mrs. RAMIREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Felicia Davis Blakley for her service to community, her commitment to women and families, and her fierce leadership.

A self-described girl from the South Side, Felicia has worked at the intersection of public policy and community

equity and inclusion for over three decades. Her notable and impactful career in nonprofit leadership and public service has blazed trails for women and girls across our entire city of Chicago.

Currently serving as the chief executive officer of Primo Center, Chicago's largest provider of services for families experiencing homelessness, Felicia's leadership is empowering families and creating equitable and sustainable communities across the city of Chicago.

As president and CEO of the Chicago Foundation for Women, she completed a historic \$45 million campaign, expanding critical resources for women and their families, and launching the SHEcovery initiative at a moment of profound need in response to COVID.

On behalf of Illinois' Third Congressional District, it is truly my privilege to commend Felicia Davis Blakley for her radical authenticity, her unparalleled passion, and inspirational vision which she uses to shape initiatives that address the root causes of instability.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Felicia. Her name and the impact she has made throughout the city of Chicago and Illinois is now permanently entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RECOGNIZING MAYOR MIKE LEONHARDT

(Mr. MOORE of Utah was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a man who has been a fixture of northern Utah for decades, who unfortunately passed away recently with a short but hard-fought battle with cancer.

It is hard to think of a man more dedicated to his community than Garden City Mayor Mike Leonhardt.

Mayor Mike spent his life serving his Garden City as a city council member, fire chief, Bear Lake County Search and Rescue volunteer, and most recently as a three-term mayor. When he wasn't serving his community, Mike was often found riding his Harley with his wife, Tami, and enjoying the scenic backdrop of northern Utah.

It has been an honor to serve Garden City alongside Mayor Mike, and I will miss him at the next Raspberry Days.

My heart is with Tami, his 7 children, 24 grandchildren, and the entire Rich County community as we remember and share our fond memories of Mayor Mike.

CONGRESSIONAL BASKETBALL GAME

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, on a court just blocks from here, Republicans and Democrats put aside the political divide, laced up our shoes, and went to battle.

The 26th Annual Congressional Basketball Game supports kids in our communities and stands as a reminder of what this place can be at its best.

I will be honest, the Members, a.k.a. the good team, the good guys, took a tough loss, 50-48. Yes, the lobbyists, a.k.a. the bad guys, are already talking

as if they had won a world championship. We will let them have their moment, and it will be brief.

Here is what matters. When we were down, this team didn't quit. Members rallied, a 10-0 run late in the fourth quarter, defense, hustle, and heart, the very opposite of what the opposing team stands for, which mostly consists of overwhelming the refs with their aggressive fouling and other shenanigans down in the paint that leaves many Members of Congress sore for weeks after, as I have experienced.

For a moment, you could feel it, though. We were right there late in that fourth quarter. But why do we do it? Not for bragging rights, not even for the win. We do it for the kids in our community, kids who need support, opportunity, and someone in their corner.

That is the side of Capitol Hill people don't always see, where competition meets compassion. For one night, we come together not as Republicans or Democrats, but as teammates.

I will just say this to team swamp—I mean, team lobbyists—enjoy the win. We will see you next year.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF ANTONIO ALEMAN DURING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Mr. VASQUEZ of New Mexico was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. VASQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my support for those who keep New Mexico safe.

It is National Police Week, and this week the House is considering a bipartisan resolution to honor law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice and lost their lives in the line of duty.

I strongly support this bipartisan resolution. One of the heroic officers honored in the resolution is Deputy Sheriff Antonio Aleman.

Deputy Sheriff Aleman was tragically killed in an on-duty crash while serving his community on July 8, 2025. He was with the Dona Ana County Sheriff's Office since 2021. He is remembered by his colleagues as a valued member of the department who will be deeply missed. Deputy Sheriff Aleman is survived by his wife and two children.

His service and sacrifice deserves to be honored by this body, along with the courage of all those who wear the badge honorably. That is what National Police Week should be about—honoring our law enforcement officers who have made the sacrifice to keep their neighbors safe and our families safe, listening to the concerns of those currently serving, and taking concrete steps to give them the additional funding and support to ensure that they can come home safe to their families every night.

That is why I have taken the asks that I have gotten from law enforcement in New Mexico and turned it into over \$3 million in direct investments to public safety.

I am also leading bipartisan bills to protect our officers, strengthen officer safety and retention, expand funding for bulletproof vests, and protecting first responders from exposure to dangerous substances such as fentanyl. I am proud that we are able to continue to work across the aisle on these issues.

Our law enforcement officers put on the uniform every day knowing the risks. They miss holidays. They respond to the toughest of calls. They comfort families in crisis, and they run toward danger to keep us safe.

They deserve police stations that are safe and functional, modern technology that helps them respond to crime quickly and safely, training that protects their physical and mental health, and leaders who listen when they tell us what they need.

I promise to keep listening and delivering results for New Mexico's law enforcement community.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

(Ms. JOHNSON of Texas was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize National Nurses Week and honor the extraordinary nurses serving North Texas and communities across our country.

Every single day, nurses are there for us in life's most difficult and vulnerable moments. They are the first hand a newborn feels, the calm voice in an emergency room, and a compassionate presence beside patients and families facing uncertainty.

Nurses do far more than provide medical comfort. They advocate for patients, comfort families, educate communities, and hold together a health system that too often asks them to do more with less.

Over the past several years, we have seen nurses carry unimaginable burdens, from staffing shortages to burnout, while continuing to show up for their patients with professionalism and compassion. They deserve more than our gratitude. They deserve safe working conditions, fair pay, mental health support, and investments in our own healthcare workforce.

To every nurse serving in hospitals, clinics, schools, veterans' facilities, nursing homes, and community health centers, I thank you. Congress and your country honor your service, your sacrifice, and your unwavering commitment to caring for others.

KEEPING VIOLENT OFFENDERS OFF OUR STREETS

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Republican Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act.

Let's be clear about what this bill does. It does not make our communities safer. It does not meaningfully address violent crime. What it does is continue a failed approach to a criminal justice system that punishes Tex-

ans in poverty instead of protecting public safety.

We have already seen the consequences of this approach in Texas and across the country. Cash bail systems have created a two-tiered justice system where wealth determines freedom. If you are rich, you can buy your way out of jail. If you are poor, you can sit behind bars for weeks or months before ever being convicted of a crime.

In Texas, we have watched State leaders exploit fear around bail reform while ignoring deeper problems in our justice system. County jails are overcrowded. Courts are backlogged. Public defenders are overwhelmed. Too many people accused of low-level, nonviolent offenses are trapped in jail simply because they cannot afford bail.

This bill attacks charitable, non-profit organizations who provide bail assistance. Whether you are eligible for bail should depend on the nature of the offense, your flight risk, and your prior criminal history, not whether you have the funds to post it.

If this Congress truly wants to address violent crime, then we should invest in evidence-based solutions: funding mental health services, reducing court backlogs, supporting victims, strengthening community violence intervention programs, and ensuring judges have the resources to make individualized decisions based on actual risk, not a person's bank account.

This bill ignores those solutions in favor of political talking points and fear-mongering. Americans deserve a justice system that is fair, constitutional, and focused on real public safety, not one that criminalizes poverty and expands mass incarceration.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

IMMIGRATION

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for too long, this Republican Congress has failed the American people on immigration. We have allowed a broken system to remain broken: one that is too slow, too chaotic, and too unfair for everyone involved.

The American people deserve an immigration system that is fair, fast, and final—fair for families seeking safety and opportunity, fast enough to reduce years of backlog that leave people in limbo, and final so that decisions are made efficiently, transparently, and with integrity under the rule of law.

We will not fix our immigration system by abandoning our constitutional values. We will not restore order by stripping away due process rights or criminalizing people without giving them a fair hearing before the law.

That is why I voted against the Lakin Riley Act and the Agent Raul Gonzalez Officer Safety Act. While supporters claim these bills are about safety, they expand mandatory detention and enforcement powers in ways that undermine due process and threaten our basic constitutional protections.

In this country, we do not decide guilt or innocence without a hearing or

access to an attorney. We do not throw away civil liberties because of political pressure or fear. Due process is not a loophole. It is a cornerstone of American democracy. It protects citizens and noncitizens alike from government overreach and ensures that our laws are applied fairly and consistently.

We can modernize our immigration system and protect public safety while still upholding the Constitution. Those goals are not mutually exclusive. In fact, our system works best when we defend both security and justice together.

We need comprehensive immigration reform that expands legal pathways, addresses workforce needs, invests in immigration courts, and creates clear, enforceable rules that reflect our values as a Nation.

America has always been strongest when we lead with both compassion and the rule of law. As a Member of Congress, I will never vote to sacrifice one for the other.

RECOGNIZING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS OF OHIO'S 13th CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

(Mrs. SYKES of Ohio was recognized to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mrs. SYKES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the courage, dedication, and sacrifice of the law enforcement officers serving in Ohio's 13th Congressional District and to honor those who have lost their lives in the line of duty.

Being a police officer is never easy. It is one of the most difficult and dangerous jobs in our society. In recent years, it has only gotten harder.

As I have met with law enforcement agencies across northeast Ohio, I continue to hear the same concerns: officers are overworked, stretched thin, and in need of better support and training to meet the demands of the job and the needs of our community and those that they are sworn to protect and serve.

That is why since coming to Congress, I have made it a priority to fight for legislation that gives officers the tools that they need to do their jobs, while also demanding accountability on behalf of the communities they serve.

After the horrific shooting of Jayland Walker in Akron, I spoke with members of our community and law enforcement. I then introduced the Law Enforcement Scenario-Based Training for Safety and De-Escalation Act.

This bipartisan legislation ensures law enforcement officers have the proper de-escalation training needed to handle complex situations that they often face in the field because, no matter what, we all want everyone to make it home safely at the end of the night.

□ 1045

This year, after the killings of Alex Pretti and Renee Nicole Good, I intro-

duced the COOL IT Act, which would require similar de-escalation training for ICE officers. We cannot ignore these tragedies. We must respond with solutions that promote safety, accountability, and, most importantly, trust. That is exactly what this legislation is designed to do.

These bills support law enforcement by helping departments build trust with the communities they serve, and this makes our community safer for both the officers and the public. Again, these are people whom they are sworn to protect and serve.

Certainly, these are not bills that will solve every single problem, but it is a piece of the puzzle ensuring safety and accountability. In fact, the law enforcement scenario-based training for Safety and De-Escalation Act is supported by the National Fraternal Order of Police and the Akron NAACP because we all share the goal of making sure everyone goes home safely at the end of the day.

Further, I introduced the Supporting Women with Career Opportunities in Policing Services Act. This is legislation to establish a Federal task force focused on improving recruitment, retention, and advancement of opportunities for women in law enforcement. This bill takes an important step toward building a stronger, more inclusive public safety workforce by helping departments recruit talented women, support them throughout their careers, and create pathways into leadership. When law enforcement agencies better reflect the communities they serve, our communities are stronger and safer.

When I came to Congress, I promised to put the people of Ohio's 13th Congressional District first. That means supporting our officers, rebuilding trust and public safety, and working across the aisle to get things done. That is exactly what I have worked to do and exactly what I will continue to do.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

O Lord, our guardian, guide, and stay, transform the thoughts of our minds, that what comes from our

mouths will reflect our love for You and our desire to serve You well in this place.

Guide our thinking throughout the day, in our comings and goings, our interviews, and exchanges, that what we perceive in these encounters would be seasoned with Your grace and that how we choose to respond would be leavened with Your mercy.

Stay our tongues, that we would not be quick to retort with unwholesome talk, but harness our passions, that they would be governed with kindness, directed toward the building up of others, according to their needs, and offered for the benefit of all those who bear witness to our words.

Lord, may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Your sight. We pray this day in the strength of Your name, O Lord, our rock and our redeemer.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. 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

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

RECOGNIZING TODD WARNER

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Todd Warner, who will be retiring as the Clinton County Director of Veterans Affairs in June.

Todd, of Port Matilda, Pennsylvania, graduated from Penn State in 1986. Following graduation, he was commissioned as an Army Reserve Second Lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps. Todd was assigned to the 442nd Field Service Company in Bellefonte from 1986 to 1992.

Todd led as a platoon leader with a joint task force in Honduras and, a few years later, went on to lead Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Through the 1990s and the early 2000s, Todd drew up the ranks as captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel.

Following assignments across Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and most recently at the Pentagon, Todd retired in 2016 after 30 years of service.

Todd assumed his current role with the Clinton County VA in 2023 and has supported hundreds of veterans across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Todd for his commitment to service and State. I thank him for his selflessness in helping other veterans across Clinton County. I congratulate Todd on this milestone. I salute him. May God bless him and his family.

SUPREME COURT ENGAGED IN UGLY RECIDIVISM

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

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court is engaged in an ugly recidivism to deny Black political representation in the South.

Not since 1877, when Rutherford Hayes ended Reconstruction, have we seen as fast a rollback of political rights for Black Americans.

The moral light has been extinguished from the Supreme Court. That is why we need term limits for Supreme Court Justices. Eighteen years, and you are out. That is why we need to expand the Court from 9 Justices to 13 Justices, like we have 13 circuits.

The next time the Democrats have power, we need to actually take action, not just appoint commissions.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 250th anniversary of our Nation, we need a modern Supreme Court to uphold our Nation's principles.

APPRECIATING POLICE

(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, in recognition of National Police Week, Americans appreciate all officers while honoring those who were wounded or lost their lives in the line of duty.

This year, we honor the following officers of South Carolina, who were added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial wall: F. Devin Mason, Nathaniel M. Ansay, Will G. Durant, Michael Charles Wood, Dennis D. Ricks, Jr., and Mark S. Reynolds. They all served in the tradition of the late Greg Alia of Forest Acres.

House Republicans stand alongside these courageous heroes. This week, there is legislation of commitment to those who serve our country, and we must restore law and order.

Mr. Speaker, I respect my hometown police chief, Andrew "Bear" Richbourg of Springdale.

God bless our troops as the global war on terrorism continues. Trump is reinstituting peace through strength, revealing war criminal Putin lies, in-

sulting Trump and mocking Trump, shamefully breaking the victory day cease-fire.

As war criminal Putin bombs civilian homes, Ukrainian parents provide their children at night with whistles to assist in recovery as Putin attacks their homes and murders children.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL POLICE WEEK AND HONORING OUR FIRST RESPONDERS

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise during National Police Week to honor the men and women who put their lives on the line every day to keep our community safe.

In 2016, Palm Springs Police Officers Lesley Zerebny and Gil Vega were killed in the line of duty. Because of their tragedy, I introduced the Heroes Lesley Zerebny and Gilbert Vega First Responders Survivors Support Act to strengthen the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program and make sure the families of fallen officers receive the support they deserve. With today's cost of living, they are struggling to make ends meet.

This bill will increase death benefits, so surviving families can pay off most of their debt, if not all of it. It will increase education benefits to cover the rising cost of an education. It will help officers' widows and children get on a stable footing.

Mr. Speaker, we can honor the sacrifice that families of fallen officers have made by passing this legislation, and we must.

□ 1210

CELEBRATING SLEEPY EYE ST. MARY'S KNIGHTS GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate an extraordinary achievement, the first-ever State championship for the Sleepy Eye St. Mary's Knights girls' basketball team. In an unforgettable performance, the Knights battled past top-seeded Mountain Iron-Buhl in an impressive 83-63 victory.

Appearing at the Class A title game for the second straight year, the Knight's relentless defense and explosive offense brought home this year's win.

Morgan Mathiowetz scored early three-pointers and finished the tournament with a remarkable 100 total points, including 27 in the championship matchup.

Olivia Schieffert followed with 25 points of her own, showcasing the teamwork and confidence that define this historic run.

The Knights capped off their 2026 season with a 32-1 record. All of us across the First Congressional District are incredibly proud to call them our own.

I congratulate the legend, Coach Bruce Woitas and his team on bringing home the first State title. They earned every moment of this championship. Way to go, Knights.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION VANITY PROJECTS

(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, President Trump is demanding \$1 billion of taxpayer money for his ballroom, while Americans struggle to put food on the table.

He wants to spend millions more to build an arch as a monument to himself, while parents can't afford childcare for their children.

He is spending millions on a no-bid contract to repaint the reflecting pool, while small businesses are closing down because of the high costs of energy caused by his unnecessary Iran war.

This is all taxpayer money we are talking about, by the way, and the Rhode Islanders whom I speak to don't understand why our colleagues in Congress are putting more energy into trying to use their taxpayer money to lavish the President with gifts and monuments instead of making healthcare more affordable for the American people, along with housing, food, and childcare.

We need to get our priorities straight as a Congress and as a country.

HONORING THE ANNAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT

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

Ms. ELFRETH. Mr. Speaker, this Police Week, I rise to honor the 20 members of the Annapolis Police Department who received the Life Saving Award and the Meritorious Service Award for their heroism on June 11, 2023.

On that afternoon, Paddington Place in Annapolis experienced a heart-breaking mass shooting at a birthday party that took the lives of three of our neighbors and injured three others.

In the face of an unfolding tragedy, these officers worked quickly to stabilize the scene and provide lifesaving aid to the gunshot victims.

The officers met the families and victims with extreme professionalism, compassion, and composure—working with extraordinary teamwork under challenging circumstances.

That night was just one example of how first responders rush to the scene and show up for our loved ones on their hardest days.

I thank the officers for their unwavering service on behalf of our community.

MEDICALLY TAILORED MEALS

(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, last week in Massachusetts, I had the pleasure of speaking at the AMPL Institute's annual convening to learn about the latest research and hear directly from experts in the field of medically tailored meals.

Based within Community Servings, the largest nonprofit provider of medically tailored meals in New England, the AMPL Institute combines pioneering research, policy work, and provider education aimed at transforming the healthcare system so that medically tailored nutrition becomes a universally accessible standard of care.

The incredible work of Community Servings is what got me interested in, and now passionate about, expanding the reach of medically tailored meals. They are the reason I have introduced a bipartisan bill to pilot coverage of MTMs in traditional Medicare at hospitals across the country.

Medically tailored meals have the power to transform lives. They improve health outcomes, support vulnerable patients, and strengthen the Food Is Medicine movement.

It is time to pass my bipartisan bill, the Medically Tailored Home-Delivered Meals Program Act, to really advance the Food Is Medicine movement in this country.

HONORING OFFICER SUZANNE O OF MAUI

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

Ms. TOKUDA. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, May 15, the Nation will observe Peace Officers Memorial Day. This year's observance is especially difficult and deeply personal for our Maui ohana.

Maui Police Department Officer Suzane O was added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial this spring. Officer O, a beloved daughter, sister, partner, auntie, and friend was killed in the line of duty in August 2025, when she encountered an armed suspect in response to a terroristic threatening call.

Raised in American Samoa and a graduate of Farrington High School, Officer O was a role model for many Pacific Islander girls. She was a dedicated public servant and a proud member of the MPD Honor Guard and had received a Certificate of Merit for her heroic efforts during our Maui wildfires.

Officer O is deeply missed by her family, friends, and colleagues.

All police officers and their families deeply understand the risks that come with putting on the uniform every single day. Today, we remember and honor the courage and the sacrifice of officers like Suzane O who have paid the ultimate price to keep our communities and our families safe.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5625, CASHLESS BAIL REPORTING ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6260, KEEPING VIOLENT OFFENDERS OFF OUR STREETS ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8365, MONITOR ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 96, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8469, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2027

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1275

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5625) to direct the Attorney General to make publicly available a list of each State and unit of local government that permits cashless bail, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6260) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit fraud in connection with posting bail. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 8365) to provide for conditions on the appointment of monitors by courts, and for other purposes. All points of order

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

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) expressing support for law enforcement officers. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the concurrent resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent 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 the Judiciary or their respective designees.

SEC. 5. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8469) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2027, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

SEC. 6. (a) No amendment to H.R. 8469 shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 8 of this resolution.

(b) Each amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 8 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 7. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en

bloc consisting of amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 8 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 8. During consideration of H.R. 8469 for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 9. At the conclusion of consideration of H.R. 8469 for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT). The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1220

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Rules Committee met yesterday and reported out a rule providing for consideration of five measures: H.R. 5626, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act; H.R. 6260, the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act of 2025; H.R. 8365, the Monitor Accountability Act; H. Con. Res. 96, Expressing Support For Law Enforcement Officers; and H.R. 8469, the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2027.

House Resolution 1275 provides for consideration of H.R. 5625, H.R. 6260, and H.R. 8365, each under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate for each bill, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees, and provides for each bill one motion to recommitment.

The rule further provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 96, Expressing Support For Law Enforcement Officers, under a closed rule with 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minor-

ity member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

Finally, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 8469, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2027, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees. The rule provides 1 motion to recommit and makes 51 amendments in order.

This rule will provide for consideration of several important bills, Mr. Speaker, that I believe will improve the safety of our local communities and the law enforcement officers that serve them. It will also bring the first appropriations bill for fiscal year 2027 to the floor so we can begin the process of passing the bills before the September 30 end of the fiscal year.

First, I would like to start by saying thank you to our law enforcement officers, particularly since this week is Police Week. We honor our law enforcement officers and the men and women who gave their lives in the line of duty.

I am glad we are bringing bills to the floor this week to do Congress' part in helping and honoring law enforcement officers. Among those is H.R. 6260, the Keeping Violent Offenders Off Our Streets Act. This bill provides commonsense accountability measures for charitable bail funds. These are organizations that use money given as donations to bail out defendants, many of whom have been charged with violent felonies or whom are repeat offenders.

Charitable bail funds have consistently helped release violent criminals back onto our streets where they have committed robbery, assault, kidnapping, and even murder in some cases.

H.R. 6260 closes loopholes that have allowed for potential fraudulent practices and include charitable bail funds as entities "engaged in the business of insurance," thereby ensuring that charitable bail funds will be subject to the criminal provisions under Federal law that apply thereto.

Another bill in this rule is H.R. 5625, the Cashless Bail Reporting Act. This legislation requires the Department of Justice to publish an annual report listing the State and local governments that allow cashless bail for criminals who pose a clear threat to public safety.

Recently, destructive policies in some States and cities are allowed for the gradual elimination of monetary bail systems and, as a result, has led to increased crime. According to a March 2023 study conducted by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, the percentage of violent felony offenders who were rearrested increased from 62 to 72 percent.

The correlation is clear: Cashless bail policy leads to increased crime in our communities, and the American people should know if their local governments are participating in these ill-advised programs.

Additionally, this rule brings to the floor H.R. 8365, the Monitor Accountability Act. This bill provides for needed reforms for court monitors, which are independent officials whose job it is to conduct oversight during court proceedings. While many court monitors have performed their duties well, others have initiated unnecessarily long agreements and have charged government agencies with the expensive fees.

H.R. 8365 curbs the excesses of court monitors by imposing a maximum term of service, regulates the fee amount a monitor may charge, and sets general expectations for the court monitor industry. This bill codifies many of the recommendations that then-Attorney General Garland put into place after the Biden administration reviewed the Federal monitoring program.

This rule also brings up H. Con. Res. 96, a resolution that supports National Police Week by honoring the courageous law enforcement officers across our Nation who put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe.

This resolution expresses Congress' immense gratitude for the service and sacrifice of law enforcement officers at every level. At a time when officers are facing growing dangers in carrying out their duties, it is important that the House stand in unison to honor these brave men and women.

Lastly, the rule provides for consideration of the first appropriations bill for fiscal year 2027, H.R. 8469, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. The bill provides robust funding for military housing, services for children and military members, and maintenance projects for military base facilities.

This legislation also takes care of our veterans by fully funding veterans' healthcare program benefits, and investing over \$2 billion in capital improvements for VA medical facilities and national cemeteries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8469 also bolsters our national security through continued investments for military bases and infrastructure for advanced weapons systems in places like the Indo-Pacific, where it is imperative that we strengthen our capabilities vis-a-vis China. As we heard in the Rules Committee last night, this appropriations bill, the MILCON-VA bill, passed unanimously, 58-0, out of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his remarks. I honor

our law enforcement officers, as does everybody on the Democratic side. Yet, as I look at the list of bills that Republicans are bringing to the floor this week, I have to say that the American people deserve way, way better than this.

I mean, Republicans love to talk about supporting the police, but talk is cheap. Look at what they do. There is not a single penny of public safety funding in any of these bills—not one.

I mean, these guys are more interested in passing press releases than they are in passing meaningful legislation that will make a real difference in our communities.

At the same time, Donald Trump's own budget—get this—calls for massive cuts to programs that support law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, go read it yourself. The President's budget cuts 55 percent from Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants. It cuts more than 60 percent from the COPS program, a program that Trump's own Justice Department calls the cornerstone of our Nation's crime-fighting strategy. I mean, how is this possible?

Let's not forget that mere hours after he was sworn in, on his very first day in office, President Trump pardoned the violent criminals who attacked police officers on January 6. Let me say that again in case anyone forgot. Donald Trump, on his first day in office, pardoned felons who viciously beat police officers at the Capitol Building.

Mr. Speaker, some of the people he pardoned have since gone on to do even more terrible things, including in my district, where one of them was just re-arrested on child pornography charges.

Don't come down to this Chamber and lecture people on law and order. The leader of the Republican Party wants to cut funding for public safety after he pardoned his own supporters who violently attacked police.

Talk is cheap around here. Look at what the radical, far-right people in charge of this government are doing. Look at how they vote. Look at their agenda for this week. Look at their priorities. This is another week without a single bill to make life more affordable and without a single bill to address the cost of living.

Why not? Well, the answer is simple: Republicans are not focused on your grocery bill. They are not focused on how much you pay at the pump. They are not focused on your rent, your healthcare, your utility bills, or your paycheck. They aren't focused on you.

They are focused on their obedience and obsession with Donald Trump, on his tariffs, his war, his billion-dollar ballroom, his arch, his reflecting pool paint job, and his golf course on the Potomac. Whatever he wants, they just say yes, and the rest of us pay the price for their radical MAGA extremism.

They ripped healthcare from millions of people in this country. They cut food assistance for kids, veterans, seniors,

and Americans with disabilities. They raised the price of everything from utilities to groceries. They did it all to give tax breaks to their billionaire donors and rubberstamp every dumb idea that President Trump comes up with.

Yesterday, the President said the quiet part out loud. He finally told the truth about something. When asked a simple question of whether he thinks about the terrible economic situation that he has put American families into, thanks to his illegal war, do you know what he said? "Not even a little bit."

Now, let that sink in. The President of the United States of America was asked if he cares how badly he screwed up your family's finances with his stupid, illegal war, and his answer was: "Not even a little bit."

Your gas is \$4.50 a gallon. He doesn't care, not even a little bit. Your pay isn't keeping up with inflation. He doesn't care, not even a little bit. Your health insurance is way up. He doesn't care, not even a little bit. Your fridge is empty until payday. He doesn't care, not even a little bit.

That is what he said. That is what he believes. That is how this radical, far-right majority in Congress is governing.

Those at the top are doing better than ever. The Epstein-class billionaires and special interests who write the campaign checks are doing great. They can't thank my Republican friends enough. Yet, the rest of us—for my constituents and for everyday people in this country—Donald Trump's economy sucks, and Republicans don't care, not even a little bit.

They tell themselves over and over again that everything is going well. Well, it is time for them to listen, to listen to the American people, who have had it up to here with these failed economic policies and who are sick and tired of a government that bends over backward to help those who are well-off and well-connected and turns a blind eye to the struggles of the working people in this country.

We have to do better. We have to do better.

Mr. Speaker, as we come together this week to honor our law enforcement officials, those who serve our communities and protect our communities, the least we could have done is brought a bill to the floor that would actually provide real help to our local police departments to be able to hire people and to be able to obtain the equipment that is necessary to protect our police officers.

Instead, we got a press release. We got a press release.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague with some interest. It sounds like he doesn't like the current occupant of the White House and has serious concerns about that, but it doesn't

sound like he dislikes any of the bills that much because he didn't spend much time talking about them.

That is what this rule is about—bringing those bills to the floor. In the MILCON-VA appropriations bill that passed out of the Appropriations Committee unanimously, I grant you, there were things in there that Democrats didn't like and things in there that Republicans didn't like. Yet, as we heard last night in the Rules Committee, the Appropriations Committee came together. They all had to compromise on certain things, but they got the bill done, and they felt like it was, overall, a good bill. There were certain disagreements, but overall, they felt like it was a good bill.

Then, we are doing some things, and they may want to do more, but we are doing some things that are very positive for law enforcement and for our local communities that will help communities be able to better figure out what is going on, whether it be bail or the monitoring system, et cetera.

That is what we are discussing here today. There is lots of time in the leadership hours and in the morning hour to give 1 minutes, 5 minutes, or an hourlong speech. Yet, today, we are supposed to be discussing during this time period the rule that brings to the floor four bills that are good bills and an appropriations bill.

I am glad to hear that there is not a whole lot of consternation about the bills that we are presenting this rule on. While there may be disagreement on other items, I am glad that we are moving forward on that.

It is always tempting when you are here presenting a rule to get dragged into the cesspool or the thoughts that the other side wants to talk about, but that is what I am here to talk about: the bills that are in the rule that we are presenting today.

Apparently, they are pretty good. I know they don't like them 100 percent, but they must be pretty good, or they would have spent more time talking about them in the opening salvo of this debate on the rule. So, I think that should encourage all Members, both Democrats and Republicans, to vote for the rule.

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

□ 1240

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

I would just say to the gentleman there will be at least 5 hours of debate to talk about these less than impressive bills that he is bringing to the floor today. There will be even more debate on a handful of amendments that have been offered.

We are talking about the rule today, and the rule basically is Republicans' agenda for the week. It is not about lowering the price of groceries. It is not about dealing with the high price of gas. It is not about dealing with the rising costs of healthcare. Republicans'

agenda is to avoid talking about the real problems that Americans are facing as we gather here on the House floor.

I want to talk about your agenda, and your agenda sucks. I mean, I don't know how else to put it more plainly. It is a disgrace that my Republican friends spend more and more time trying to avoid dealing with the real issues that are hurting their constituents, but that is what their agenda is all about.

I get it. Everybody over there is afraid of the guy in the White House. Maybe you should be more afraid of your constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we defeat the previous question I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 7711, which would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, it is Police Week, and Republicans will come to the floor, as we have just heard, and talk about how much they support and honor our law enforcement officers. We all support law enforcement officers who keep us safe and protect our communities. But what most, if not all, of these Republicans will fail to do, and have failed to do repeatedly, is condemn the pardons that Donald Trump issued to over 1,500 individuals that attacked this building and attacked our democracy on January 6. Many of them were convicted of violent felonies.

For those who weren't here that day, go back and look at the videos, and you will see exactly what I am talking about. Over 140 brave Capitol Police, the ones in this Chamber now, the ones protecting all of us every single day were injured. Some tragically died.

What did this President do on his first day in office? He pardoned every last one of those violent offenders.

Now, these rioters outrageously are seeking tens of millions of dollars in damages, claiming that the indiscriminate use of force by police officers repelling the attack caused them physical and emotional injuries. Are you kidding me? I mean, where is the outrage on the Republican side over this? It is a disgrace.

If my Republican colleagues cannot denounce the actions of the President's supporters that day or condemn the pardons maybe—maybe, at least they will vote to ensure that these convicted felons aren't awarded millions of taxpayer dollars by the Trump administration as a reward for attacking police officers. I will give them a chance to do that with the previous question.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member MCGOVERN for yielding time to me.

If we defeat the previous question, we will offer a bill, my bill, that will truly honor police officers: H.R. 7711, my No Rewards for January 6 Rioters Act.

On January 6, as we all know, violent rioters assaulted Capitol Police, beating them with flag poles, dragging them through crowds, and pepper spraying them in the face at point-blank range.

President Trump has not only called these criminals patriots, he decided January 6 insurrectionists deserved a blanket pardon for their attacks on police officers. It is shameful.

Now, the Trump administration is considering millions of dollars in payouts to these insurrectionists, which is a giant slap in the face to all the brave officers who fought to protect us—us, and our democracy on January 6.

My bill would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate any convicted January 6 rioter.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were serious about honoring police officers, they would take up my bill to prevent President Trump from paying off his favorite cop beaters.

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

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) said something last night about not having heard voices on our side of the aisle talking about the pardons, and Mr. SCOTT said: I did. I had a problem with it. That was Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT from Georgia.

I would remind the gentleman that he and I had a colloquy in the Rules Committee on February 4, 2025, on that same subject where I indicated that I had significant concerns about pardoning folks who had assaulted police officers.

It is not fair. That was something they pulled up because I am a member of the Rules Committee, and they brought it up in the Rules Committee meeting because I made a comment to the media in my home district. I am sure there are lots of other Republicans who have done the same, raised some concerns, raised some issues, and as a result, the White House came out with some explanations. People can choose to accept or not accept those explanations. It is what it is. But a number of us did raise concerns about that at the time.

Now, that being said, we have some bills before us today that are good bills. That is what we are supposed to be talking about.

We have got bills that deal with monitoring of courts. We have got bail bills that we are dealing with. There are a number of things. We have got a resolution that expresses Congress' support

for our law enforcement, which I think we are all in agreement on, and the gentleman said as much that we all support our local law enforcement and our law enforcement folks out there.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, let's look at these bills. That is what we are debating now is whether or not to bring these bills to the floor. I think all the bills that we presented should be brought to the floor. We can talk about other bills on another day, but these bills are appropriately before the House.

Then let's talk about the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies funding bill from Appropriations, which passed unanimously out of committee.

My colleague has indicated that we are offering a handful of amendments. Now, I have managed a couple of these rules before, and some of them have been closed. He consistently says: You haven't allowed any amendments, and now he depicts the amendments that we are allowing as a "handful." A majority of those—in fact, it is a supermajority of those that were theoretically in order, and it is 51.

Now, by my count, Mr. Speaker, that is 10 handfuls and a little bit more. It is not a handful of amendments. It is 10 handfuls. I would have to get a whole line of people here to hold on to all these amendments. We are going to hear debate on them, and we are going to have discussion about it.

So it gives you some idea of the hyperbole that my friends on the other side of the aisle are using when you take 51 amendments and depict them as a mere handful.

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

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

You have got to love these guys. I remind everybody, especially those who may be watching this on TV, that four out of the five bills that we are considering today are under completely closed rules, number one.

Number two, I appreciate the gentleman expressing some concern about what happened on January 6. He said that some of them, you know, expressed their concern about the President's pardon publicly, so I just kind of Googled what my colleague from Virginia said to his local newspaper. He said that he has mixed feelings about President Trump pardoning those who were charged in connection with the January 6 attack on the Capitol.

I don't know what "mixed feelings" means, but if my friend were genuinely outraged by what happened that day and by the pardoning of these people who violently attacked the police officers that were defending us that day, then I guess my question to the gentleman would be: Then why did you vote consistently against hanging a plaque honoring those police officers who protected our lives that day?

□ 1250

Again, I find the silence on the other side of the aisle not only in regard to

what happened in this Chamber on January 6—I find it particularly disturbing—but the silence in the aftermath of Donald Trump pardoning all of these criminals.

Again, we have police officers who were severely wounded. Some ended up losing their lives. I mean, if you have objections and you have concerns, and even if you have mixed feelings, whatever that means, about the President pardoning all of these people, then does that mean that the gentleman will support our amendment that we are bringing up here that would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021?

I mean, I am not going to hold my breath, but I am willing to bet that virtually every Republican, if not every Republican, will vote against this amendment.

Again, we get a lot of lectures about law and order from Republicans. Let's not forget, again, the leader of their party, the President of the United States, pardoned over 1,500 of his own supporters who violently attacked this building, including pardons for hundreds of convicted felons who violently and viciously beat law enforcement officers on January 6, sending many of them to the hospital with serious injuries.

Donald Trump pardoned every single one of them. Many are repeat offenders who are now back in our communities because of the radical, far-right policies of this President and because of the acquiescence and the silence of the party that controls this Chamber.

I mean, Matthew Huttel, a man with 12 prior criminal convictions, including a shocking case where he pled guilty to brutally hitting his 3-year-old son, leaving bruises all over his child's backside and neck, after he was pardoned by Donald Trump for the crimes he committed on January 6, went back to Indiana, where he was killed during a violent confrontation with law enforcement. He was a child abuser with a history of violence, who put law enforcement in danger again after he was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Theodore Middelendorf, accused of sexually assaulting a 7-year-old child—this guy pled guilty to this horrific crime in 2024, and he was sentenced to 19 years in prison. That wasn't all. He also pled guilty to destroying government property and using an American flagpole as a weapon during the Capitol riot. He was pardoned by Donald Trump.

Peter Schwartz, a man with 30 prior criminal convictions, including abusing and assaulting his wife, biting her and repeatedly punching her, was convicted of attacking police officers on January 6 with pepper spray. He is another repeat offender pardoned by Donald Trump.

Andrew Taake was arrested in 2016 for soliciting a minor online for sex, but his criminal history didn't stop

there. He assaulted police officers with bear spray and a metal whip on January 6. He is another repeat offender pardoned by Donald Trump.

Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress are complicit in these crimes. I mean, thanks to these pardons, we have child sex predators and violent criminals back on our streets. We even have January 6 perpetrators who have been rearrested on new charges after being pardoned.

Daniel Ball, a convicted felon because of his involvement in the Capitol insurrection, was pardoned by Trump on January 20, only to be rearrested 2 days later on gun charges.

How dare you guys come down here and talk about law and order when you are complicit in these crimes? How dare you come down here and talk about supporting the police after you let out violent criminals who attacked law enforcement officers on January 6?

I mean, I get it. We have different opinions on a lot of issues, but the one thing that should unite us is our praise and our respect for those who defended not only all of us who were here on January 6 but also defended our democracy.

Because the guy in the White House doesn't want anybody to acknowledge that that was a terrible day, everybody just caved. Everybody caves on the other side.

I don't have any mixed feelings about what Trump did. I think it was outrageous. I think most Americans that I talk to, and I think most Americans across this country, don't have mixed feelings. They think what happened that day was outrageous. These guys should not have been pardoned. Some of them should still be in jail.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If I am to be pilloried on the floor of the United States House, let us get the facts correct.

First, I am sure that WJHL, a television station, would not appreciate being called a newspaper. Second, let me read you the first quote.

Griffith: "I have mixed feelings. I personally think that some of those folks who assaulted police officers deserve some of the time they got." If I am to be pilloried, there is what I said.

The following week, in the Rules Committee, in response to questions from my colleague, I responded that I did not have every case in front of me, speaking of pardons. It is a difficult decision, and I would have had a hard time pardoning people who assaulted police officers on any occasion.

If I am to be pilloried, let's get the record straight, and I think the same would be true for many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

Let's talk about violent criminals because we have a bill in front of us today that will deal with that. We have the charitable—the phraseology is the "charitable bail funds." We have a bill

in front of us that will treat them as insurance.

Now, people may think at home, if they are watching this, what in the world do bail bonds have to do with insurance? Well, having been a criminal defense attorney, I can assure you that the insurance is to ensure that people show up for their court dates, and that is what bonds are for.

If you put up a bond, an insurance company usually writes that. If it is a corporate surety bond, that is usually what you have. Sometimes, you have property bonds, and there are other ways of doing it. If you have a corporate surety bond or a group comes forward and puts the money up for you, that group ensures that you will be present in court, or you forfeit the amount that you have put forward.

That is all fine and good. We have charitable groups out there, and they are looking at cases where you have people who can't afford it, but it is not a violent crime or something where there is a danger to the public. I understand that. That is what the bill does. It says we are going to treat them like they are insurance companies because they are, in fact, stepping into the shoes of an insurance company.

It is not grandma who is putting up her house, which many of my clients had their grandmas put up their houses to guarantee they would be present in court when they were supposed to be there to be tried for their offenses. They are acting like those corporate surety bonds. They are stepping into those shoes, and they ought to be treated accordingly under the law.

Then, we heard a whole litany—and I really didn't want to get into it—a whole litany of things that people did who were doing bad things on January 6 and did some bad things afterward, as well. I point out also that that is not before us at this very minute. What is before us is a bill on these charity bonds and cashless bonds.

When people are released on cashless bonds or artificially low bail, they have a greater propensity to reoffend, as I said in my opening. Because I feel compelled, for example, in Wisconsin, Darrell Brooks was released on a \$1,000 bond after running over a woman with a vehicle, despite a lengthy criminal history and an additional outstanding warrant.

Brooks was previously charged with aggravated battery and had an outstanding warrant in Nevada after skipping bail for a sex-related crime. Then, on November 21, 2021, Brooks drove through a Christmas parade, injuring over 50 individuals, killing 6, 1 of whom was an 8-year-old child.

A March 2023 study, which I mentioned before, by researchers at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, found that approximately 72 percent of violent felony offenders who were released without bail were rearrested.

We could stand here and go through hours of this, but, Mr. Speaker, we have before us a good number of bills

that deal with trying to make our communities a little bit safer, giving people more information, and trying to make sure we are getting it right, trying to help our police officers and our local communities be safer.

These are all good bills. They may not do everything that everybody wants, but these bills before us and this rule that we are presenting are good bills. Then, we have the MILCON-VA bill, which passed out of the Appropriations Committee unanimously, 58-0.

□ 1300

I believe that we should pass these bills. The first step in doing that is passing the rule so we can bring the bills to the floor with set time for debate. There will be plenty of time for debate. There will be time on the MILCON-VA bill to go over amendments and to then consider as a House, as the House for the United States, whether or not we want to pass them. I think we should.

The first step is we have got to pass this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to all vote "yes" to bring these bills to the floor. My colleagues on the other side can debate whatever deficiencies they may see in the bills and have their time to tell the American people about those bills.

I really wish they would focus, when we are talking about a rule, on the rule to bring the bills to the floor and not all these other matters. I understand they want to talk about other things. I get it. That is the role of the minority. However, Mr. Speaker, as the majority, we need to pass this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I advise that whenever my colleagues are ready, I am prepared to close. I urge my colleagues to pass this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me apologize to the TV station that I called a newspaper. What a terrible sin. I appreciate the gentleman's clarity in reading that I have mixed feelings because some of the people deserve some of the time. Boy, that is really a strongly worded condemnation.

I want to disagree with the gentleman on one thing he said, and that is somehow this is not on the agenda today. The gentleman just read off what the Republican agenda was and the votes that the Republicans want us to consider on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question.

Our staff handed my friend's team the amendment that we want to vote on. The next vote that we have, by the way, will be on whether we would prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021. I guess that is the next vote. So people are going to have to

vote "yes" or "no" on that, and it is in front of us.

I don't really understand why the gentleman would say that it is not in front of us. If he wants to support what we are trying to do here and make sure that the people who viciously attacked Capitol Police officers on that day on January 6 that threatened the lives of those who work here and who destroyed all of this property, that is well-documented, all of this is on video, I am happy to yield to the gentleman if he would like to endorse what we are trying to do so maybe we can agree on something.

Okay, well, I guess I am not going to get that support.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the next vote, again, I remind people, will be on whether or not we want to prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021.

The President is hinting that maybe he would be favorable to compensating some of these people who are responsible for the terrible crimes on that day. I find that sickening, quite frankly. He wants to give money to criminals, the people who attacked our democracy, who beat up our police officers, and yet he doesn't want to give money to our police officers, as I pointed out in the beginning. There is not a penny contained in any of these bills that actually help support our local police officers.

Let me also bring us back to what I think this debate is all about. It is about priorities. This is another wasted week, and the debate is really about what Republicans are not doing and what they refuse to do. It is about their wasted time in the majority and their total failure to bring up legislation to help everyday people.

People are begging us. They are begging us to do something about inflation. They are pleading with us to bring grocery prices down, to lower gas prices, to make life more affordable, and to stop the war and reverse the tariffs that are eating into their paychecks and killing their finances.

What do Republicans prioritize week after week after week after week?

It is billionaire tax breaks, loopholes for the rich and powerful, giveaways to the giant corporations, the price gougers, and the big donors who line their pockets with campaign cash.

Listen to me, America: These guys promised to lower your prices on day one. It is year two for God's sake, and who are you going to believe, them or your empty wallet?

Republicans have done nothing—nothing—to lower your costs. Their agenda does nothing to help everyday people. Their bills do nothing for working families. Their leader said so on TV yesterday.

He doesn't even think about how his reckless, illegal, vanity war hurts your pocketbook. He thinks about his arch.

He thinks about painting the reflecting pool. He thinks about his golf course on the Potomac River. He thinks about bailouts for foreign governments and corrupt, shady deals that enrich his inner circle.

He thinks about his ballroom. Boy, does he bring that up every day. He wants \$1 billion of your money for his tacky ballroom.

However, when it comes to helping you, when it comes to helping your family, when it comes to the medical bills piling up on your kitchen table, and when it comes to figuring out how to keep your fridge full until your next paycheck, he told us the answer himself: He doesn't care, not even a little bit.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have before us the MILCON-VA bill. For folks watching at home, I will translate: military construction at our bases and Veterans Affairs, which is our VA hospitals, et cetera. That is what this rule has in it. It also has a number of bills related to law enforcement making things better: the monitoring systems, the bail systems, cashless bonds, et cetera.

These are good bills, and the rule ought to be passed, as I said before.

I would be remiss if I didn't speak about the fact that this is Police Week. It is one of the reasons why we have these bills and others in front of us.

This year, unfortunately, and it has happened before since I have been in office, an officer was killed in the Ninth Congressional District. Officer Hall was killed in an inmate attack at the River North Correctional Center in Independence, Virginia, which is in Grayson County in November of last year.

Two additional officers were attacked at that time. Both are physically doing okay, but, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how you ever get over an act of violence where you witnessed a colleague, a friend, a brother in law enforcement, being murdered.

That is really what we are about this week, and this rule promotes four bills that will help. It doesn't solve everything. It doesn't resolve everything. Jeremy Hall will be remembered in another resolution coming up this week that we will be voting on to honor fallen law enforcement officers.

We can also honor them all by taking these steps forward in trying to make our system better and recognizing that we probably ought not let violent felons, people who have already committed crimes, out on either no bond or low bond. We probably ought to make sure that the folks posting the bonds are capable and available to actually ensure the presence of the defendant at trial.

□ 1310

Mr. Speaker, I left this out earlier, and I apologize. It is a big part of the bail system. It is also to ensure their good behavior while out on bond. It is both presence on the court date and good behavior between the time the bond is posted and the time of that court date.

What the data shows us is that without one of these bills, there is an increase from 62 percent to 72 percent of recidivism. That helps our police officers and honors those who have been wounded, physically or psychologically, while serving in law enforcement, and those who answered the last call, like Officer Hall.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will vote to put this rule forward. I urge the passage of the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1275 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 7711) to prohibit the use of Federal funds to compensate individuals who were prosecuted for their involvement in the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7711.

SEC. 12. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 7711 no later than three calendar days after passage.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PROVIDING THAT SECTION 11 OF
HOUSE RESOLUTION 1224 SHALL
HAVE NO FORCE OR EFFECT

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 1274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1274

Resolved, That section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. FISCHBACH. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today is simple. Two weeks ago, the Rules Committee met to provide for consideration of the farm bill, H.R. 7567, in addition to H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act.

Nothing in this rule changes that. Instead, the rule before us makes a procedural change, which will allow H.R. 1346 and the farm bill, both, to be transmitted to the Senate separately for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1346. For too long, the people of western Minnesota, along with families and farmers across the entire country, have been subjected to frustrating, outdated, and unnecessary regulations.

Currently, our growers are subjected to patchwork regulations that effectively ban the sale of E15 during the summer months. The summer ban is a direct hit to the American taxpayer. It limits consumer choice, drives up prices at the pump during the height of the summer travel season, and restricts the market for homegrown biofuels.

Because of these antiquated rules, farmers have been forced to rely on temporary, short-term emergency waivers that create confusion rather than progress.

The legislation before us today changes that. It includes text for permanent, year-round E15 to finally provide the certainty that our agriculture and energy sectors deserve. We are moving past the era of temporary fixes and toward a future of long-term stability.

The benefits of E15 are clear and backed by significant data. First, this is a major win for American consumers. E15 is a lower cost fuel option, typically priced 20 to 40 cents per gallon less than regular unleaded gasoline.

In a time of fluctuating global energy markets, providing this relief is a ne-

cessity for hardworking Americans. In fact, E15 adoption would save American drivers an estimated \$27 billion a year on gas purchases, putting roughly \$200 back into the pocket of the average American household annually.

Second, this is a win for our national security and energy independence. Ethanol is produced within American borders by American workers. Every gallon we blend is a gallon of oil we do not need to import from foreign countries.

By leaning into domestic production, we are strengthening our energy independence and reinforcing our commitment to American-made energy.

The American people understand this. Eighty percent of citizens believe renewable fuels, like ethanol, are necessary for our energy independence, and 71 percent support increasing the availability of E15 to help lower prices.

Year-round E15 is a massive win for the American farmer. In western Minnesota, our corn growers are large supporters of the biofuels industry. They deserve a fair and consistent market for their product.

Full adoption of E15 would increase corn consumption by 2.4 billion bushels, supporting our rural communities and ensuring steady, predictable demand year-round.

Beyond the farm, the economic impact is staggering. Full E15 adoption would add \$25.8 billion to the U.S. GDP and support an additional 128,000 full-time jobs.

Beyond the economic and agricultural benefits, H.R. 1346 provides essential regulatory and market certainty. It enhances fuel supply chain stability and improves certainty for the entire fuel industry by eliminating unfair advantages for some refineries over others.

By reforming the small refinery exemption process, this bill helps the Environmental Protection Agency set renewable fuel standard annual volumes in a timely, transparent, and fair manner. It removes the reoccurring tension between refiners and agricultural stakeholders, allowing everyone from farmers to fuel retailers to better plan for the future.

It is important to address the technical advancements of vehicles since the current regulations were created.

□ 1320

E15 is legally approved for all vehicles built since 2001 or later, which accounts for more than 96 percent of the cars on the road today. Furthermore, E15 burns cleaner and reduces emissions that harm our health and our environment.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to keep hitting the pause button on American energy every summer. This legislation removes the hurdles that have stifled E15 for decades. It gives farmers the confidence they need to plan, and it gives consumers a lower-cost option when they need it most.

The American people are calling for solutions. This bill provides more

choice at the pump and lower prices for America. It is real savings and real money back in the pockets of hard-working Americans.

It is time for a permanent, nationwide solution that supports our growers, lowers costs for families, and reinforces our commitment to American-made energy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule is what happens when you try to make a deal by telling people what they want to hear. It is what happens when you come to an agreement by telling one group of people one thing and another group of people the total opposite.

That is the situation that Speaker JOHNSON finds himself in. He can't keep his word to his own Members, can't manage his own Conference, can't figure out how to pass a bill, and apparently can't keep his stories straight between the two groups he was negotiating with. The incompetence takes my breath away.

We are now wasting floor time to basically undo something Republicans did last week, to unattach an E15 bill from the farm bill after Republicans had us vote to attach an E15 bill to the farm bill. You can't make this stuff up.

That is what this is all about: shady backroom deals falling apart because Republican leadership can't keep its word and just hoped that everything would somehow work out and nobody would notice anything.

Former Speaker Kevin McCarthy used to do the same thing: promise everything to everyone, cut one side deal after another, and hope nobody noticed. How did that work out for him?

Maybe, just maybe, there is a lesson here. If you are going to make a deal, make an honest deal. If you are going to write a bill, know what is in the bill. If you are going to promise your Members something, maybe don't come back 3 weeks later and say: Actually, never mind.

I have to say I am a little surprised that some of my Republican colleagues from the Midwest are going along with this strategy because if you think separating E15 from the farm bill will help you get what you want, I have a degree from Trump University for you.

This is not some brilliant legislative maneuver. It is a quick way to make sure the Senate never takes it up. The reason I know this is because the way the bill is written. The reason why this doesn't have much of a future is because—get this—this bill will cost over \$2 billion, billion with a b, and none of it is offset.

What happened to the deficit hawks? \$2 billion, basically, that is just going to be added to the debt. It will be dead

on arrival at the Senate, and again I think everyone knows that.

If I represented a corn-producing State, I would not be thrilled that my leadership took one of my top priorities and pulled it out of a bill that possibly had a chance to move and said: Trust us.

I don't know whether the gentlewoman read the rule because it sounded a little bit confused here, but here is the rule. It is one sentence. It doesn't talk about bringing E15 to the floor. It doesn't allow for there to be a debate or an amendment on an offset so that we don't add \$2 billion to the credit card. It basically just is a rule that will detach E15 from the farm bill. That is it. I don't know. I wouldn't feel particularly comfortable if that is all that we were doing today, that that is all that the bill is accomplishing.

What we have here is a majority that cannot manage its own Conference, cannot keep its promises, and cannot pass its own agenda without completely breaking into disarray. The American people see this.

They see a Republican majority that spent weeks fighting with itself over the farm bill.

They see a Republican majority that cannot decide whether E15 belongs in the farm bill, outside the farm bill, attached to the farm bill, detached from the farm bill, or shoehorned into something else.

They see a Republican leadership that panders to the American people talking about lowering costs and inflation and then does none of it.

Here is the thing. Republicans are bad at governing because they do not actually believe in governing. They believe in power for the sake of power. They believe in theatrics. They believe in blaming everybody else. When the time comes to do the basic work of this House, they fall apart. They block amendments. They shut down debate. They cut food assistance and healthcare, while protecting the rich and powerful. They fund Donald Trump's vanity projects, while families are getting crushed by the cost of groceries, rent, gas, and medicine. They know that their agenda is unpopular, and that is why they are not trying to earn people's votes anymore. They have given up on that.

Instead of changing their agenda, they are changing the rules of democracy itself. Instead of earning votes, they are rigging maps. Instead of persuading people, they are silencing them. Instead of serving voters, they are choosing their voters. Just look at what is happening across this country.

Donald Trump demanded that red States start gerrymandering so Republicans can cling to power in this House, and Republican politicians lined up to do it—the hell with democracy, the hell with what the people want.

It is a very different story in States like Virginia where they actually had a vote on the new maps. People voted. Guess what. Voters approved a redis-

tricting plan to fight back against the staggering Republican assault on our democracy. A narrow majority on the Virginia Supreme Court tossed it aside—an awful, awful decision in my view.

Now, the United States Supreme Court has taken another wrecking ball to the Voting Rights Act, a law that for generations helped protect many communities from having their voices diluted and their powers stolen.

Guess what, Mr. Speaker, we are not going back to the days of Jim Crow. Too many people have fought too hard for equal representation in this country.

A party that is confident in its ideas does not need to make it harder for people to vote.

A party that is proud of its record does not need to dilute people's representation.

A party that knows how to govern does not spend its time making shady side deals and begging courts to save it from voters.

But this Republican majority is not confident, not proud, and sure as hell not competent. Case in point: today's rule, a rule to undo just one more mess of their own making.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a hell of a lot better than this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, as it often happens with the opposition, they stray off into every topic that they can think of and forget to focus on what we are here to talk about. What we are talking about is a rule to allow E15 to come to the floor to have a vote, so we are talking about energy independence. We are talking about saving Americans dollars on their gas bill. I just wanted to remind the public that that is what we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MANN) to talk about E15.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for year-round E15, this rule, and the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, which finally makes it a reality.

For too long, Washington has prevented Americans from having more choices at the pump. E15 is an available, affordable, American-made fuel that can help lower costs, strengthen our energy independence, and support the men and women who feed, fuel, and clothe the world.

This is exactly the kind of commonsense, all-of-the-above energy policy that House Republicans were elected to enact—one that embraces American resources, reduces our dependence on foreign oil, and trusts the American people to make their own decisions.

In the Big First District of Kansas, our farmers work hard every day to produce the feedstocks that power American ethanol. Year-round E15 is a

win for those farmers, a win for consumers, and a win for American energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1346, this rule, and I support year-round E15.

□ 1330

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

Mr. Speaker, I think there is some confusion here. I have the rule. Maybe I have the wrong rule, I don't know, but the resolution says: "Resolved, That section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect."

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman if she could tell me where in this rule it says that we are bringing E15 to the floor. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman to tell me where in this rule it says that.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker and Mr. MCGOVERN, I believe that you understand that that is referencing the decoupling, and it does allow for E15 to be brought to the floor—I mean maybe not exactly in the language that is on the paper.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in the other rule we did, it makes it in order. It is already in order. It can be called up right this second, but in this, it basically doesn't make it in order. There is nothing here that says that this bill will be brought to the floor. This decoupling makes it more likely that the Senate could ignore it.

It doesn't even guarantee that we are going to have a debate on the House floor on this, otherwise, it would say that specifically.

The rule that we are voting on today does not bring E15 to the floor. If it did, it would say it.

Again, this is a good education, I think, for my colleagues here. Read the rule because my friends on the other side don't always explain the rule correctly and here it is. It is one line, and it does not bring it up.

What it does is, it decouples E15 from the farm bill, which makes it more likely that the Senate will kill it if it ever gets over there.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will clarify. I think my point was that the opposition went off on a whole bunch of other issues, and from his own admission, this is about E15. This is about decoupling from whatever the technical language is in that amendment.

We are talking about E15, not about all of the other issues that he spoke about earlier, so I will focus on E15.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying legislation for H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, which would finally allow the year-round sale of E15 fuel nationwide.

For States like Indiana, this bill is not just a fuel policy. It is about supporting our farmers, strengthening rural economies, and lowering costs of hardworking families. My district is home to the countless corn producers whose livelihoods depend on strong and reliable markets. Right now, corn prices are painfully low, and many farmers are facing significant uncertainty heading into another growing season.

Passing year-round E15 would provide immediate relief. Experts estimate this policy would increase corn demand by roughly 2.4 billion bushels and raise corn prices by approximately 35 cents a bushel. That matters to the family farms in my district. It means stronger markets, greater stability, and more confidence for producers making investments in the future.

The Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act is also a major win for American consumers. Year-round E15 is projected to save drivers nearly \$27 billion annually at the pump, with the average household saving around \$200 a year on gasoline purchases. This bill will bottom line lower prices at the gas pump and provide another source of fuel as we unleash American energy dominance.

Ethanol is already a powerful economic engine, generating more than \$9 billion in tax revenue in 2025 alone while supporting jobs across agriculture, transportation, and energy production. This is an American-made fuel that reduces dependence on foreign energy while supporting domestic manufacturing and agriculture at the same time. H.R. 1346 is a commonsense, bipartisan solution that benefits both producers and consumers.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to read the rule again for my colleagues on the Republican side: "Resolved, That section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect." Just like Midwest House Republicans if they agree to this deal.

Bottom line is, you fought to get this provision attached in the farm bill, and now we have a rule that basically detaches this issue from the farm bill. It doesn't even give us a pathway to bring it to the House floor. I am stunned by all of this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 8698, the Lower Prices at the Pump Act, which would make it a Federal crime for oil companies and gas stations to price gouge the American people under cover of President

Trump's illegal and misguided war in Iran.

Mr. Speaker, today, the average price of gas across the United States increased to more than \$4.50 per gallon. That is up from roughly \$3 per gallon a year ago before Trump launched this disastrous war.

What are Republicans doing about this price gouging? Nothing. Not a thing. They don't care if people are struggling to put gas in the tank. When asked just yesterday about the situation, the President said: "I don't think about Americans' financial situation." However, 1 month before the 2024 elections, Donald Trump said: "within 1 year, you are going to have electric bills and energy bills and gasoline for your cars is going to be 50 percent cheaper than it is right now." That is what Trump said. What a crock. What a crock. I need a neck brace for the whiplash here. If my Republican colleagues actually want to address the cost-of-living crisis, they will vote with Democrats to defeat the previous question, which would allow us to vote on legislation to bring down gas prices.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. SCHRIER) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. SCHRIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because people in the district I represent and across the country are being crushed by skyrocketing gas prices.

Prices have been rising since this President got into office for healthcare, for groceries, and now for gas prices because of this reckless war of choice.

Our constituents deserve better. They deserve immediate relief. They deserve better than emptying their wallet every time they fill up at the pump.

As we know from watching other crises, Big Oil and Gas will take any opportunity to pad their profits, so Congress should act now to protect consumers. That is why I am offering this bill, the Lower Prices at the Pump Act, the commonsense solution to protect the American people from price gouging.

The bill I am offering prevents Big Oil from price gouging in case they attempt to take advantage of the economic uncertainty and instability created by the war with Iran. They have done it before, and they could do it again.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to join us to bring this bill up for a vote.

Our constituents are being crushed by prices across the board as it is, and

President Trump has told us that he is too preoccupied with his ballroom to care.

We must protect consumers at the pump to protect them from big corporations who might try to pull a fast one.

Our jobs are to make lives easier, not harder, for Americans, and the time to act is exactly right now. That is why I am asking my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up this important bill.

□ 1340

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. FEENSTRA), the great E15 leader.

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of E15 year-round. This will lower gas prices. At a time when we need to help the family budget, today, we are doing something about it. Today, the Republicans are actually doing something to lower the gas prices for everyone in this great country.

I represent the Nation's largest agricultural district, and there is a reason why Iowa farmers and families are so passionate about this issue. It will expand the market for farmers. It will secure energy independence. It will lower the gas prices for all of our families.

Gridlock in D.C. has prevented the passage of E15 for over a decade. Today, we are finally taking action.

Trump called on Congress to get year-round E15 passed and to his desk when he was in Iowa earlier this year. I agree with President Trump that our farmers, our families, and our rural communities deserve this victory.

At the beginning of this year, I was appointed as co-chair of the E15 Rural Domestic Energy Council to find a solution, and that is what we have. From farmers to energy producers to fuel retailers to equipment dealers, support of year-round E15 spans all sectors of our economy.

In Iowa, the option to buy E15 means lower gas prices by up to 40 cents per gallon. It drives nationwide savings of about \$20 billion. It will boost corn demand by 2.4 billion bushels and increase farm income by \$14 billion.

E15 is truly a game changer for our State, and we want to see these benefits shared across the country. After months of negotiation and listening to the voices of all stakeholders, it is time to get this bill passed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support E15 and lower gas prices for all families, small businesses, and the agricultural community. That is what this bill will do.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am just kind of amazed listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Republicans fought tooth and nail to get this at-

tached to the farm bill. I mean, they said this was like a huge, huge issue, and now, they are leading the charge to detach it from the farm bill. I mean, I don't get that.

That means that if it gets sent over on its own to the Senate, and it is not going to have an offset, then it is not going anywhere, even if you can pass it in the House.

I mean, it is a complete capitulation by midwestern House Republicans. I mean, it is stunning to me that my friends are caving like this.

This whole E15 debacle is a great example, I think, of just how dysfunctional Congress has become under Republican rule. Year-round E15 was included in a bipartisan, end-of-year spending package back in 2024, a deal that was negotiated by none other than Speaker JOHNSON. That was 1½ years ago.

Guess what happened. Elon Musk and President Trump blew up the deal. Musk tweeted about how much he hated the bill over 100 times and, over a 2-day span, threatened to fund primary challenges to anybody who voted for it. Then, later that second day, President Trump came out against the deal.

Fast forward to this January, where Republicans in support of year-round E15 threatened to vote against their own party's agenda until they got an up-or-down vote on their proposal. They said that this issue was existential to the farmers they represent.

Yet, in the end, they caved like they always do, and a deal was cut between midwestern Republicans and the leadership to create an E15 Rural Domestic Energy Council. They didn't get a solution. They got a do-nothing task force.

At the time, Representative MILLER-MEEKS of Iowa said that the Council was created because Republicans "failed in our primary duty to deliver immediate relief to rural America."

The partisan task force failed to produce a bill by the February 15 deadline, breaking another promise. Months later, at the end of April, text mysteriously appeared from some back room in the Capitol.

The text was filed by Representative FISCHBACH as an amendment to the farm bill. She even tried to sweeten the deal by adding billions of dollars in taxpayer-funded handouts to the oil industry, but that amendment was, once again, blocked by Republican leadership, and it never got a vote.

Instead, Speaker JOHNSON told one group of Republicans that E15 will get its own vote and be added to the farm bill, while telling a different group of Republicans the exact opposite.

Now, here we are, debating a bill to detach the E15 proposal from the farm bill after just passing a rule that combined the E15 proposal with the farm bill.

I hope my midwestern Republican friends take note. They all got bamboozled. If this rule passes, E15 will be delinked from the farm bill and ignored

by the Senate, and they will be back at square one.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman FISCHBACH for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bill allowing for year-round sale of E15 fuel and bringing much-needed certainty to our Nation's fuel markets.

I remind people often that the number one industry in the State of Illinois is agriculture. It is not anything in Chicago or elsewhere. It is agriculture. We lead the Nation in soybean production. We are second in corn production.

My own district is the 10th largest ag district in the country. I am proud to have nine ethanol plants that touch my district. The bill here today will help our farmers, help rural America, and help agriculture.

Right now, outdated Federal rules create unnecessary barriers to selling E15 during the summer months. This leads to confusion, market disruptions, and, ultimately, higher costs for consumers.

Refiners are forced to make decisions months in advance, often without clarity on whether E15 will even be allowed when the fuel reaches the pump. That uncertainty ripples across the entire supply chain.

H.R. 1346, which we are debating and voting on today, fixes this problem with a simple, commonsense solution, allowing for year-round sales of E15 while making reasonable reforms to the small refinery exemption process.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. This bill does not mandate anything. It does not force retailers to sell E15, and it does not force consumers to buy it. What it does is expand choice. It allows retailers to offer E15 year-round if it makes sense for their businesses and their customers.

That is why this legislation has earned support from a broad coalition—farmers, biofuel producers, refiners, and fuel retailers alike. Groups that don't always get along have come together because they recognize the value of certainty, transparency, and fairness in our fuel policies.

For consumers, this means more options and lower prices at the pump. For farmers in districts like mine, it means stronger demand for our homegrown crops and greater economic stability in our rural communities.

For our energy sector, it means a more predictable regulatory environment that supports investment and long-term planning. At a time when American families are sensitive to energy prices and our farmers are navigating tight margins, we should be doing everything we can to promote stability, expand opportunity, and support more domestic production.

Year-round E15 is a win-win-win. It is a win for consumers. It is a win for our

farmers. It is a win for American energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1346.

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

Mr. Speaker, a couple of things I will say to my friends who are talking about how important E15 is. Supporting the rule makes it less likely that it is going to become law. I don't understand the way they think.

In any event, the gentlewoman earlier chastised me for talking about other things besides this one-sentence rule. The reason why is because the Republican agenda sucks. It is awful. It doesn't address what real people are dealing with every day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the Trump administration's own analysis of rising food costs.

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

There was no objection.

[From USDA, Apr. 24, 2026]

FOOD PRICE OUTLOOK—SUMMARY FINDINGS (By Hayden Stewart and Diansheng Dong)

FOOD PRICE OUTLOOK, 2026

This page summarizes the April 2026 Food Price Outlook forecasts, which incorporate the March 2026 Consumer Price Index and the March 2026 Producer Price Index numbers.

See the Overview page for Consumer Price Index and Producer Price Index datasets that include recent price changes and forecasts of price changes for all categories discussed in this summary.

Consumer Price Index for Food (not seasonally adjusted)

The all-items Consumer Price Index (CPI), a measure of economy-wide inflation, increased 1.0 percent from February 2026 to March 2026. It was up 3.3 percent from March 2025.

The CPI for all food increased 0.1 percent from February 2026 to March 2026. Food prices in March 2026 were 2.7 percent higher than in March 2025.

The level of food price inflation varied depending on whether the food was purchased for consumption at home or away from home:

The food-away-from-home (restaurant and other foodservice purchases) CPI increased 0.2 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and was 3.8 percent higher than in March 2025.

The food-at-home (grocery store or supermarket food purchases) CPI was unchanged from February 2026 to March 2026 and was 1.9 percent higher than in March 2025.

Rates of price change for the 15 food-at-home categories examined in the Food Price Outlook also varied widely. Average prices declined from February 2026 to March 2026 for eight of these categories, were unchanged for two categories, and increased for five categories. Two categories experienced a large price swing, defined as a 1-month price increase or decrease of at least 1.0 percent. Prices for sugar and sweets fell by 1.0 percent, while prices for eggs fell by 3.3 percent. No categories experienced a large price increase.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE (ERS) APRIL 2026
FORECAST

In 2026, prices for all food are predicted to increase 2.9 percent, with a prediction inter-

val of 1.3 to 4.6 percent. Food-at-home prices are predicted to increase 2.4 percent, with a prediction interval of 0.0 to 4.8 percent. Food-away-from-home prices are predicted to increase 3.6 percent, with a prediction interval of 2.8 to 4.5 percent.

The Food Price Outlook tracks and forecasts the annual percentage change in food prices by averaging observed and forecast prices for all months in the current year, compared to all months in the previous year. The Food Price Outlook does not forecast the 12-month year-over-year change from the month of the forecast. The Food Price Outlook forecasting methods are based entirely on statistical models that are fitted to recent trends in the data. These methods provide prediction intervals that narrow over the forecast period as more data become available and the degree of uncertainty declines. Discussions of price changes focus on the midpoint of these forecast intervals (titled "Mid" in the Food Price Outlook data files) and use the lower and upper bounds of a 95-percent prediction interval—based on past data the annual level of inflation is expected to fall in this interval 19 out of 20 times—to reflect the level of uncertainty (titled "Lower" and "Upper" in the workbooks, respectively). For a summary of forecasting methods used in the Food Price Outlook, see the article ERS Refines Forecasting Methods in Food Price Outlook.

RECENT HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Between the 1970s and early 2000, food-at-home prices and food-away-from-home prices increased at similar rates. However, between 2009 and 2019, their growth rates diverged; while food-at-home prices deflated in 2016 and 2017, monthly food-away-from-home prices rose consistently. Differences between the costs of serving prepared food at restaurants and retailing food in supermarkets and grocery stores partly explain this divergence.

In 2020, food prices increased 3.4 percent, including prices for food at home (3.5-percent increase) and food away from home (3.4-percent increase). This convergence in growth rates was largely driven by a rapid increase in food-at-home prices following the onset of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic, particularly for meats and poultry, while food-away-from-home price inflation remained similar to its 2019 rate.

In 2022, food prices increased by 9.9 percent, faster than in any year since 1979. An outbreak of highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) affected egg and poultry prices. The Russia-Ukraine war and economy-wide inflationary pressures, such as high energy costs, also contributed to food price inflation. Food-at-home prices increased by 11.4 percent. Food-away-from-home prices increased by 7.7 percent.

In 2023, food price growth slowed as economy-wide inflationary factors, supply chain issues, and wholesale food prices eased from 2022. Food-at-home prices increased by 5.0 percent. Foodaway-from-home prices increased by 7.1 percent.

Food prices rose by 2.3 percent in 2024 and 2.9 percent in 2025, slower than they had increased during 2020–23. Food-at-home prices increased by 1.2 percent in 2024 and 2.3 percent in 2025, lower than their historical average pace of growth (2.6 percent per year). Food-away-from-home prices rose by 4.1 percent in 2024 and 3.8 percent in 2025, still faster than their historical average (3.5 percent per year).

CPI FORECAST CHANGES THIS MONTH

In 2026, overall food prices are predicted to rise 2.9 percent. Food-away-from-home prices are predicted to rise 3.6 percent, faster than their 20-year historical average rate of price increase (3.5 percent). Food-at-home prices

are predicted to rise 2.4 percent, slower than their 20-year historical average rate of price increase (2.6 percent).

In 2026, among the 15 food-at-home categories examined in the Food Price Outlook, prices for 7 categories are predicted to grow faster than their 20-year historical average rate of growth. These include beef and veal, fish and seafood, fresh vegetables, processed fruits and vegetables, sugar and sweets, non-alcoholic beverages, and other foods. Prices for five other food-at-home categories are predicted to grow slower than their 20-year historical average rate of growth. These include pork, other meats, poultry, cereal and bakery products, and fresh fruits. Prices for eggs, dairy products, and fats and oils are predicted to decline in 2026 compared to 2025.

Beef and veal prices decreased by 0.4 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 after having increased by 1.4 percent from January 2026 to February 2026. Beef and veal prices were 12.1 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. The ERS Cattle & Beef—Sector at a Glance topic page reports that the U.S. cattle herd has decreased in size since 2019. However, according to analyses and forecasts reported in the ERS Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Outlook, consumer demand has remained strong in the face of tighter supplies. Beef and veal prices are predicted to increase 6.3 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 0.1 to 13.1 percent.

Pork prices rose 0.4 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 0.5 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Pork prices are predicted to increase 0.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of –3.8 to 4.8 percent.

Poultry prices increased by 0.4 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 1.5 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Poultry prices are predicted to increase 0.7 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of –2.6 to 4.1 percent.

Retail egg prices decreased 3.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 44.7 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. An ongoing outbreak of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) that began in 2022 has caused egg prices to increase by reducing egglayer flocks and egg production. Retail egg prices increased 32.2 percent in 2022, 1.4 percent in 2023, 8.5 percent in 2024, and 21.9 percent in 2025. However, USDA is projecting an increase in egg production in 2026 over 2025. There were fewer new detections of HPAI during the first quarter of calendar 2026 than there were during the first quarter of calendar 2025. Moreover, as discussed in the ERS Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Outlook, the availability of replacement pullets has been sufficient in 2026 to cover both regular flock turnover and unpredictable HPAI-related losses. Egg prices are predicted to decrease 29.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of –40.0 to –15.6 percent.

Retail fresh vegetable prices increased by 0.9 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 7.5 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices for fresh vegetables are predicted to increase 4.8 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 0.3 to 9.5 percent.

Retail fresh fruit prices increased by 0.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 1.2 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices for fresh fruits are predicted to increase 1.0 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of –2.2 to 4.4 percent.

Prices for sugar and sweets decreased by 1.0 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 8.1 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices have increased primarily for candy and chewing gum, a sub-component of the CPI for sugars and sweets that includes most types of chocolate candy.

Prices for sugar and sweets are predicted to increase by 8.1 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 5.5 to 10.7 percent.

Prices for nonalcoholic beverages decreased by 0.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 4.7 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Prices for nonalcoholic beverages have been increasing faster than the 20-year historical rate due in part to higher global coffee prices. Prices for nonalcoholic beverages are predicted to increase by 5.2 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of 2.6 to 7.9 percent.

PRODUCER PRICE INDEX FOR FOOD (NOT SEASONALLY ADJUSTED)

A Producer Price Index (PPI) resembles a CPI in that a PPI reflects price changes over time. However, instead of retail prices, a PPI provides a measure of the average prices paid to domestic producers for their output. PPIs are reported for nearly every industry in the goods-producing sector of the economy. Three major PPI commodity groups are of interest to food markets: (1) unprocessed foodstuffs and feedstuffs, (2) processed foods and feeds, and (3) finished consumer foods. The farm-level and wholesale-level prices of commodities in these groups give a general sense of price movements across various stages of production in the U.S. food supply chain.

The PPIs are typically far more volatile than the CPIs, which are further down the supply chain. Price volatility decreases as products move from the farm to the wholesale sector to the retail sector. Because of multiple processing stages in the U.S. food system, the CPI typically lags movements in the PPI. The PPI is thus a useful tool for understanding what may soon happen to the CPI. ERS does not forecast industry-level PPIs for unprocessed, processed, and finished foods and feeds. However, these prices have historically shown a strong correlation with the all-food and food-at-home CPIs.

PPI FORECAST CHANGES THIS MONTH

Farm-level cattle prices decreased 2.7 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 16.2 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. A cyclical contraction of the cattle herd has resulted in tight cattle supplies and driven farm-level cattle prices higher. Farm-level cattle prices are predicted to increase by 7.5 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -2.8 to 19.6 percent.

Wholesale beef prices increased 2.8 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 19.7 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Wholesale beef prices are predicted to increase by 7.8 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -6.6 percent to 25.4 percent.

Prices for farm-level eggs rose 31.6 percent in 2025, primarily due to the spread of HPAI and reductions in egg production. However, U.S. egg production is recovering. Farm-level egg prices fell 12.5 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 83.6 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level egg prices are predicted to decrease by 73.0 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -84.3 percent to -44.9 percent.

Prices for farm-level milk rose 5.3 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 but were 24.7 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level milk prices have been trending downward as U.S. milk production increases. Prices for farm-level milk are predicted to decrease 17.9 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -32.6 percent to 1.9 percent.

Vegetable prices can undergo large swings based on weather, production, seasonality, and other factors. Prices for farm-level vegetables decreased 7.1 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 after increasing 48.2 percent from January 2026 to February 2026.

Farm-level fresh vegetable prices were 49.0 percent higher in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level vegetable prices are predicted to increase 16.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -2.0 percent to 40.3 percent.

Prices for farm-level fruit decreased 14.0 percent from February 2026 to March 2026 and were 10.4 percent lower in March 2026 than in March 2025. Farm-level fruit prices are predicted to decrease by 6.0 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -16.3 percent to 6.0 percent. Prices for fruit, like those for vegetables, can undergo large swings based on weather, production, seasonality, and other factors.

Prices peaked for farm-level wheat in the first half of 2022 following the beginning of the Russia-Ukraine war. After decreasing by 23.1 percent in 2023, 22.3 percent in 2024, and 10.9 percent in 2025, farm-level wheat prices are predicted to increase 8.4 percent in 2026, with a prediction interval of -9.3 to 31.9 percent.

For official USDA farm-level price forecasts, see the World Agricultural Supply and Demand Estimates at a Glance report. For additional information, detailed explanations, and analyses of farm-level prices, see ERS outlook publications including the Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, Oil Crops, Wheat, Fruit and Tree Nuts, and Vegetables and Pulses reports.

See the Overview page for Consumer Price Index and Producer Price Index datasets that include recent price changes and forecasts of price changes for all categories discussed in this summary.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the USDA's April 2026 Food Price Outlook makes it clear that prices are not down. They are up. They are way up. Food prices are up 2.7 percent from last year. Restaurant prices are up 3.8 percent. Beef and veal prices are up over 12 percent. In fact, the average cost of a pound of beef is more expensive than the Federal minimum wage. I mean, let that sink in. Veal prices are up. Fresh vegetables are up 7.5 percent. Non-alcoholic beverages are up 4.7 percent. Grocery prices, overall, have gone up around 2 percent.

These are not Democratic talking points. These are the Trump administration's own numbers after 16 months of total Republican control in Washington.

They control the House. They control the Senate. They control the White House. They passed tax breaks for those who are well-off and well-connected, billionaires and millionaires. At the same time, they cut SNAP by \$200 billion. I hope they are proud of themselves.

They imposed tariffs. They started the war that is driving up food and gas prices. The price of fertilizer is going through the roof.

All they do is blame Biden, blame Democrats, and blame anyone, while they fail to find any solutions. They promised lower costs. What a crock. Their own USDA says that families are paying more because of their disastrous economic policies.

□ 1350

We are going to continue talking about things that my Republican friends think are extraneous because

these are real issues. These are real issues that everyday families are struggling with right now.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN), another great E15 leader.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. FISCHBACH for her leadership on this.

Here is the reality. Republicans and Democrats should all be wanting to help drive down costs for Americans right now: supply chain costs, costs for the home, and costs at the pump. Right now we have got a viable solution, 50 cents off per gallon with year-round nationwide E15. Whether you are filling up a truck or a tractor-trailer, a motor home or a minivan, this has a direct impact on families, and it is something we have been asking for in this Chamber for a long time on both sides of the aisle. Why hasn't this come to the floor for a vote?

I was just back in Iowa a couple weeks ago at a farmers roundtable in Atlantic, Iowa, and I heard the same question that I have heard from hundreds of roundtables in listening sessions across Iowa's 21 counties: How are we going to get year-round, nationwide E15 across the finish line? And when is Congress going to make sure that they are fighting for a waiver so that every spring our growers, our planters, and our farmers aren't asking this question?

Today, we have a chance to answer both those questions. This bill that we are about to vote on fixes the outdated regulations that have been holding E15 back for years and replaces it with a nationwide, permanent solution that is voluntary.

Importantly, throughout this fight, we have been able to focus on things that matter: American energy independence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have flown more combat missions in the Persian Gulf than I care to remember in my time with the U.S. Air Force all to be able to provide foreign energy sources to places like today in China where they consume 80 percent of the oil coming out of the Middle East. We should be focused on a domestic-based energy source, one that pairs up our traditional fuels with our biofuels, and this bill has that privilege of doing it.

Now, there is a lot of misinformation out there. There is insider lobbying going on, and there have been backroom deals on this very floor between people who are putting Iowa farmers and American consumers last.

I stood up. I was not going to let that happen. I am proud that we have been able to stand together in this. We have been able to negotiate and do what Congress should do: stand firm. They tried to kill it by making sure it never reached the floor, and foreign companies flooded this building with lobbying dollars. We have stood to reject that,

and I think we have been able to bring forward a strong path to make E15 year-round.

Just weeks ago, President Trump came to Iowa and said he would sign an E15 bill into law. The Vice President was just in my district on Tuesday and said that they would sign this into law.

This is an opportunity for American-made energy independence to start right here, not just in what we grow in our cornfields but what we produce in America. Every dollar saved at the pump is a dollar back in America's pocket.

I want to make sure that Iowa producers who support this industry receive the certainty that Congress will stop treating year-round access like a favor instead of recognizing it as a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, again, the gentleman makes a strong case for his position. I don't know if he read the rule or not, but what he is doing with this rule is making it less likely that this will ever become law.

The reason why this was going to be attached to the farm bill is because I think my Republican colleagues understood that that may be a vehicle that was moving but that the Senate would not consider this legislation on its own.

Why is that? Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, this measure would cost \$2.27 billion, billion with a b, and none of this is offset. If this were a program to help feed hungry people or if it were to help people get healthcare, my Republican friends would be quoting CBO left and right, but not in this case.

Some Republicans have a problem with the fact that this is \$2.7 billion added to the debt. My friends know that just sent over on its own, it is going nowhere in the Senate.

What we are doing today is Republicans are reversing their position. Again, Republicans insisted and fought to get this so that it would be attached to the farm bill, and now we have a rule that will unattach it to the farm bill. I don't know when the Speaker will bring this up for a vote, but I think everybody is pretty certain that the Senate isn't going to take it up, certainly not adding \$2.7 billion to the debt.

I don't understand the way my friends who claim to be champions for the farms in the Midwest—I don't understand why you flip-flopped on this issue, but you can explain that to your farmers.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, like most everybody here in the Chamber, I spend a lot of time at

home in my district. I am there every single weekend, and what you really hear related to energy is you hear three things:

First off, of course, people want lower prices at the pump. That is a no-brainer.

Secondly, of course, they want American energy dominance. They don't want to be reliant on others.

Then number three, they don't understand the role of outdated regulations. They would like more freedom to make their own decisions.

Well, boy, do I have a deal for them, and do I have a deal for us. Year-round E15 addresses all of those concerns.

Let's go to affordability first. We know that E15 is 40 or 50 cents a gallon cheaper than standard gasoline, and that will have a big impact on American families.

Secondly, when it comes to American energy dominance, I think most South Dakotans would rather our energy future be driven by what is going on in South Dakota cornfields rather than in Iranian oilfields. This is an incredible opportunity to make sure that we are able to buy more homegrown American fuel.

Now, number three, when we get to the freedom and rolling back outdated regulations, let's be really clear what this does. This just gives people more options at the pump. Nobody will be required to buy E15 at the pump. Nobody will be required to sell E15 at the pump. This is going to be the market at work.

What we know is that a 1970s-era EPA rule just tells Americans that, no, you can't—even if somebody wants to sell you E15 in the summer months—you can't buy it. What we know for those people who are concerned about environmental impacts is that E15 has a lower Reid vapor pressure than E10, so any smog concerns are not applicable. E15 is better for the environment in that way.

So, Mr. Speaker, almost no matter how you come down, whether you are concerned about affordability, whether you are concerned about geopolitics, whether you are concerned about over-regulation, E15 gives us the tools we need to move in the right direction.

I would close by saying this: I know the wheels of progress don't always turn quickly, but they are turning today, and when we vote off this House floor year-round E15, the winner will be the American people.

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

The gentleman just said the wheels of progress don't always turn quickly. Well, you guys are turning them backwards.

Nobody has explained to me why my Republican friends are leading the charge to undo what they demanded be done in the first place. So this doesn't smell right.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say on another issue that electric bills are up. Gas bills and prices are up. Grocery

prices are still too high. Inflation is at the highest rate it has been in 3 years.

And what is the President focused on? He is focused on a ballroom—get this—a ballroom, a billion-dollar security request tied to his White House makeover. Even some Senate Republicans are saying they need more details. Good. I hope they actually mean what they say. They should because the American people deserve the details, too. They deserve to know why Republicans can always find money for Donald Trump's wide range of vanity projects around D.C. but somehow can't find money to lower the costs for average working families.

Last year, Trump had his big birthday military parades. Tanks were in the streets. Troops were marching through Washington. It was a taxpayer-funded spectacle that the Army said cost tens of millions of dollars for a parade that just happened to fall on Donald Trump's birthday.

□ 1400

Now he has a laundry list of renovation requests. He wants to repaint the Eisenhower Executive Office Building. Meanwhile, preservationists are warning it could permanently damage a historic landmark.

He wants to turn the Lincoln Memorial Reflecting Pool bright blue like a swimming pool in Florida. A Federal contract for that project has been reported in the millions, and preservation groups are suing because they say the administration skipped required historic review.

He wants a UFC fight on the White House lawn with a 4,500-seat arena built on the grounds of the White House. He wants race cars roaring down the streets of Washington in August. He wants a giant triumphal arch near Arlington National Cemetery, a 250-foot monument that veterans and historians are already fighting in court.

He wants to turn humble, public golf courses in D.C. into championship-level resorts while also using some areas as a dumping ground for remnants of his historic East Wing.

Mr. Speaker, none of this is serious or necessary. This is a rich guy decorating national buildings and monuments like they are one of his hotels and sticking taxpayers with the bill: enough money for the parade; enough money for the ballroom; enough for the blue reflecting pool, the UFC cage fight, race cars, the arch, and the golf courses.

I say to my Republican colleagues: Stop funding the vanity tour, and let's get back to work to actually helping hardworking people in this country.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close on E15, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest why we are here. Republican leadership made promises they could not keep, and they are now back here asking the rest of us to help clean up their mess. That is the whole story.

The longer this goes on, the more the American people lose faith not just in this Republican majority—I think they have lost faith in the Republican majority in this Congress—but in the basic idea that Congress can actually solve real problems.

Again, nobody can explain to me why, after defending this program, we are here with the rule to basically make it more likely that this will never materialize. This will go nowhere in the Senate.

Two-thirds of the American people say this country is headed in the wrong direction. And what do House Republicans do?

They gutted healthcare so that billionaires can get another tax giveaway.

They supported Trump's unpopular war, which has killed American servicemembers and driven up costs for everyday families.

Know why gas prices are going up? Look no further than the illegal, risky and reckless war that this President has launched.

Here is what is really frustrating: The majority in this Congress can't even bring itself to have a serious debate and vote on whether or not to authorize the use of military force in Iran. They step away. They don't want to get involved in that debate.

On Trump's ballroom, Republicans want to spend a billion dollars, billion with a b, on his tacky, stupid, vanity ballroom. That is what they would rather do than lower your costs and fight inflation. It is insane, and it is outrageous.

To my midwestern colleagues, again, who care about E15, I hope you got more than a handshake from your leadership, because once this gets separated from the farm bill, lots of luck.

Then what do you say to your farmers? What do you say to the people who you promised that you would fix this?

The bottom line is, we all know what is going on here. Again, the Senate is not going to take up an independent E15 bill. I stand corrected. Earlier I said that it costs \$2.2 billion. It is actually \$2.27 billion that it adds to the deficit and the debt.

This place is no longer a serious place to get stuff done, to solve problems. The American people are hurting. They are suffering.

I just did a townhall in Massachusetts, and all people wanted to talk about was how everything was more expensive. They were saying: What are you doing about the affordability crisis?

To be honest, the legislation being brought to the floor today by the previous rule and even now is not going to do anything to help lower costs for

anybody. That is sad because people are depending on us to help make their lives a little bit better, to help make their lives easier and more manageable.

People are hurting, and my Republican friends are just doing nothing. Legislation that amounts to press releases are now, you know, making it more difficult to pass legislation that my Republican friends say will help their farmers.

This is not the way government should be running.

I close by urging my colleagues to get their act together. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, vote "no" on the rule, and let's get back to doing the actual work of the American people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be honest. We are here to move the E15 legislation forward. That is what we are here to do today.

It is interesting that the good gentleman from Massachusetts used his time to talk about almost everything except E15. I was happy to yield time to my colleagues to talk about E15 and the benefits and the advantages and what it could do for our farmers and energy independence.

I rise today to close this debate because the choice before us is clear. Do we continue with the status quo of emergency waivers, or do we finally provide permanent certainty that American families and farmers deserve?

We have spent decades hiding behind outdated regulations that do nothing but hike summertime fuel prices. Every single year, this country is forced to hit a pause button on American-grown energy. It makes no sense and, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am tired of it.

H.R. 1346 is about two things: lower costs and market stability. When families pull up to the pump, they should not be forced to pay more just because of what month it is on the calendar.

This is about providing real, permanent relief for hardworking Americans who are tired of seeing their pocketbooks take the fall for outdated red tape. This vote represents a choice between foreign oil and American energy independence. It is a vote for our corn growers across the country who are ready to fuel this country.

There is zero reason to rely on foreign countries for our energy needs when we can support American workers and strengthen our national security.

We are done with the era of temporary fixes that only create market instability. Our refiners, our retailers, and our rural communities deserve certainty.

E15 is cleaner. It is cheaper, and it is grown right here at home. Let's stop the games. It is time to pass a perma-

nent, nationwide solution that provides for our growers, puts American families first, and reinforces our commitment to American-made energy.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. That is the issue in front of us, to move E15 year-round forward.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1274 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8698) to protect consumers from gasoline and fuel price gouging, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX and clause 8 of rule XX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8698.

SEC. 4. The Clerk shall transmit to the Senate a message that the House has passed H.R. 8698 no later than three calendar days after passage.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1445

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YAKYM) at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1275;

Adoption of House Resolution 1275, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1274;

Adoption of House Resolution 1274, if ordered; and

The motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 1252.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5625, CASHLESS BAIL REPORTING ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6260, KEEPING VIOLENT OFFENDERS OFF OUR STREETS ACT OF 2025; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8365, MONITOR ACCOUNTABILITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 96, EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 8469, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2027

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. 1275) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5625) to direct the Attorney General to make publicly available a list of each State and unit of local government that permits cashless bail, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6260) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit fraud in connection with posting bail; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8365) to provide for conditions on the appointment of monitors by courts, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) expressing support for law enforcement officers; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 8469) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2027, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 208, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

YEAS—211

Aderholt	Bacon	Bean (FL)
Alford	Baird	Begich
Allen	Balderson	Bentz
Amodei (NV)	Barr	Bergman
Arrington	Barrett	Bice
Babin	Baumgartner	Biggs (AZ)

Biggs (SC)	Haridopolos	Murphy	Keating	Mrvan	Sherman
Bilirakis	Harrigan	Nehls	Kelly (IL)	Mullin	Simon
Boebert	Harris (MD)	Newhouse	Kennedy (NY)	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Bost	Harris (NC)	Norman	Khanna	Neal	Sorensen
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Nunn (IA)	Krishnamoorthi	Neguse	Soto
Bresnahan	Hern (OK)	Obernolte	Landsman	Norcross	Stansbury
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Ogles	Larsen (WA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Stanton
Burchett	Hill (AR)	Onder	Larson (CT)	Olzewski	Stevens
Burlison	Hinson	Owens	Latimer	Omar	Strickland
Calvert	Houchin	Palmer	Lee (NV)	Pallone	Subramanyam
Cammack	Hudson	Patronis	Lee (PA)	Panetta	Suozi
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Perry	Levin	Pappas	Sykes
Carter (TX)	Hunt	Pfluger	Liccardo	Pelosi	Takano
Ciscomani	Hurd (CO)	Reschenthaler	Lieu	Perez	Thanedar
Cline	Issa	Rogers (AL)	Lofgren	Peters	Thompson (CA)
Cloud	Jack	Rogers (KY)	Lynch	Pettersen	Thompson (MS)
Clyde	Jackson (TX)	Rose	Magaziner	Pingree	Titus
Cole	James	Rouzer	Mannion	Pocan	Tlaib
Collins	Johnson (LA)	Roy	Matsui	Pou	Tokuda
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Rulli	McBath	Pressley	Tonko
Crane	Jordan	Rutherford	McBride	Quigley	Torres (CA)
Crank	Joyce (OH)	Salazar	McClellan	Ramirez	Torres (NY)
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Scalise	McCollum	Randall	Trahan
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Schmidt	McDonald Rivet	Raskin	Tran
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert	McGarvey	Riley (NY)	Underwood
De La Cruz	Kennedy (UT)	Scott, Austin	McGovern	Rivas	Vargas
DesJarlais	Kiggans (VA)	Self	McIver	Ross	Vasquez
Diaz-Balart	Kiley (CA)	Sessions	Meeks	Ruiz	Veasey
Donalds	Kim	Shreve	Mejia	Ryan	Velázquez
Downing	Knott	Simpson	Menefee	Salinas	Vindman
Edwards	Kustoff	Smith (MO)	Menendez	Sánchez	Walkinshaw
Ellzey	LaHood	Smith (NE)	Meng	Scanlon	Wasserman
Emmer	Langworthy	Smith (NJ)	Mfume	Schakowsky	Schultz
Estes	Latta	Smucker	Min	Schneider	Waters
Evans (CO)	Lawler	Spartz	Moore (WI)	Scholten	Watson Coleman
Ezell	Lee (FL)	Staubert	Morelle	Schrier	Whitesides
Fallon	Loudermilk	Steil	Morrison	Scott (VA)	Williams (GA)
Fedorchak	Lucas	Steube	Moskowitz	Sewell	
Feenstra	Luna	Strong			
Fine	Luttrell	Stutzman	Carey		
Finstad	Mace	Taylor	Dunn (FL)		
Fischbach	Mackenzie	Tenney	Kean		
Fitzgerald	Malliotakis	Thompson (PA)	LaLota		
Fitzpatrick	Maloy	Tiffany			
Fleischmann	Mann	Timmons			
Flood	Massie	Turner (OH)			
Fong	Mast	Valadao			
Fox	McCauley	Van Drew			
Franklin, Scott	McClain	Van Dwyne			
Fry	McClintock	Van Epps			
Fulcher	McCormick	Van Orden			
Fuller	McDowell	Wagner			
Garbarino	McGuire	Walberg			
Gill (TX)	Messmer	Weber (TX)			
Gimenez	Miller (IL)	Webster (FL)			
Goldman (TX)	Miller (OH)	Westerman			
Gooden	Miller (WV)	Wied			
Gosar	Miller-Meeks	Williams (TX)			
Graves	Mills	Wilson (SC)			
Griffith	Moolenaar	Wittman			
Grothman	Moore (AL)	Womack			
Guest	Moore (NC)	Yakym			
Guthrie	Moore (UT)	Zinke			
Hageman	Moore (WV)				
Hamadeh (AZ)	Moran				

NAYS—208

Adams	Cohen	Frost
Aguilar	Conaway	Garamendi
Amo	Correa	Garcia (CA)
Ansari	Costa	Garcia (IL)
Auchincloss	Courtney	Garcia (TX)
Balint	Craig	Gillen
Barragán	Crockett	Golden (ME)
Beatty	Crow	Goldman (NY)
Bell	Cuellar	Gomez
Bera	Davids (KS)	Gonzalez, V.
Beyer	Davis (IL)	Goodlander
Bishop	Davis (NC)	Gottheimer
Bonamici	Dean (PA)	Gray
Boyle (PA)	DeGette	Green, Al (TX)
Brown	DeLauro	Grijalva
Brownley	DerBene	Harder (CA)
Budzinski	Deluzio	Hayes
Bynum	DeSaulnier	Himes
Carbajal	Dexter	Horsford
Carson	Dingell	Houlahan
Carter (LA)	Doggett	Hoyer
Casas	Elfreth	Hoyle (OR)
Case	Escobar	Huffman
Casten	Espallat	Ivey
Castor (FL)	Evans (PA)	Jackson (IL)
Castro (TX)	Fields	Jacobs
Chu	Figures	Jayapal
Cisneros	Fletcher	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Foster	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Foushee	Johnson (TX)
Cleaver	Frankel, Lois	Kamlager-Dove
Clyburn	Friedman	Kaptur

Mrvan	Sherman
Mullin	Simon
Nadler	Smith (WA)
Neal	Sorensen
Neguse	Soto
Norcross	Stansbury
Ocasio-Cortez	Stanton
Olzewski	Stevens
Omar	Strickland
Pallone	Subramanyam
Panetta	Suozi
Pappas	Sykes
Pelosi	Takano
Perez	Thanedar
Peters	Thompson (CA)
Pettersen	Thompson (MS)
Pingree	Titus
Pocan	Tlaib
Pou	Tokuda
Pressley	Tonko
Quigley	Torres (CA)
Ramirez	Torres (NY)
Randall	Trahan
Raskin	Tran
Riley (NY)	Underwood
Rivas	Vargas
Ross	Vasquez
Ruiz	Veasey
Ryan	Velázquez
Salinas	Vindman
Sánchez	Walkinshaw
Scanlon	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Schultz
Schneider	Waters
Scholten	Watson Coleman
Schrier	Whitesides
Scott (VA)	Williams (GA)
Sewell	

NOT VOTING—11

□ 1520

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Messrs. SCOTT of Virginia, LANDSMAN, and BELL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BAUMGARTNER 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 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—214

Aderholt	Boebert	Crank
Alford	Bost	Crawford
Allen	Brecheen	Crenshaw
Amodei (NV)	Bresnahan	Davidson
Arrington	Buchanan	De La Cruz
Babin	Burchett	DesJarlais
Bacon	Burlison	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Calvert	Donalds
Balderson	Cammack	Downing
Barr	Carey	Edwards
Barrett	Carter (GA)	Ellzey
Baumgartner	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Bean (FL)	Ciscomani	Estes
Begich	Cline	Evans (CO)
Bentz	Cloud	Ezell
Bergman	Clyde	Fallon
Bice	Cole	Fedorchak
Biggs (AZ)	Collins	Feenstra
Biggs (SC)	Comer	Fine
Bilirakis	Crane	Finstad

Fischbach	Kim	Reschenthaler	Mullin	Ross	Thanedar	Harris (NC)	Massie	Scalise
Fitzgerald	Knott	Rogers (AL)	Nadler	Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Harshbarger	Mast	Schmidt
Fitzpatrick	Kustoff	Rogers (KY)	Neal	Ryan	Thompson (MS)	Hern (OK)	McCauley	Schweikert
Fleischmann	LaHood	Rose	Neguse	Salinas	Titus	Higgins (LA)	McClain	Scott, Austin
Flood	LaLota	Rouzer	Norcoss	Sánchez	Tlaib	Hill (AR)	McClintock	Self
Fong	Langworthy	Roy	Ocasio-Cortez	Scanlon	Tokuda	Hinson	McCormick	Sessions
Fox	Latta	Rulli	Olzewski	Schakowsky	Tonko	Houchin	McDowell	Shreve
Franklin, Scott	Lawler	Rutherford	Omar	Schneider	Torres (CA)	Hudson	McGuire	Simpson
Fry	Lee (FL)	Salazar	Pallone	Scholten	Torres (NY)	Huizenga	Messmer	Smith (MO)
Fulcher	Loudermilk	Scalise	Panetta	Schrier	Trahan	Hunt	Meuser	Smith (NE)
Fuller	Lucas	Schmidt	Pappas	Scott (VA)	Tran	Hurd (CO)	Miller (IL)	Smith (NJ)
Garbarino	Luna	Schweikert	Pelosi	Sewell	Underwood	Issa	Miller (OH)	Smucker
Gill (TX)	Luttrell	Scott, Austin	Perez	Sherman	Vargas	Jack	Miller (WV)	Spartz
Jimenez	Mace	Self	Peters	Simon	Vasquez	Jackson (TX)	Miller-Meeks	Staubert
Goldman (TX)	Mackenzie	Sessions	Pettersen	Smith (WA)	Veasey	James	Mills	Steil
Gooden	Malliotakis	Shreve	Pingree	Sorensen	Velázquez	Johnson (LA)	Moolenaar	Steube
Gosar	Maloy	Simpson	Pocan	Stansbury	Vindman	Johnson (SD)	Moore (AL)	Strong
Graves	Mann	Smith (MO)	Pou	Stanton	Walkinshaw	Jordan	Moore (NC)	Stutzman
Griffith	Massie	Smith (NE)	Pressley	Stevens	Wasserman	Joyce (OH)	Moore (UT)	Taylor
Grothman	Mast	Smith (NJ)	Quigley	Strickland	Schultz	Joyce (PA)	Moore (WV)	Tennet
Guest	McCauley	Smucker	Ramirez	Subramanyam	Waters	Kelly (MS)	Moran	Tenney
Guthrie	McClain	Spartz	Randall	Suozi	Watson Coleman	Kelly (PA)	Murphy	Thompson (PA)
Hageman	McClintock	Staubert	Raskin	Riley (NY)	Whitesides	Kennedy (UT)	Nehls	Tiffany
Hamadeh (AZ)	McCormick	Steil	Riley (NY)	Rivas	Williams (GA)	Kiggans (VA)	Newhouse	Timmons
Haridopolos	McDowell	Steube	Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Stefanik	Kiley (CA)	Norman	Turner (OH)
Harrigan	McGuire	Strong	Kean	McClain Delaney	Wilson (FL)	Kim	Nunn (IA)	Valadao
Harris (MD)	Messmer	Stutzman	Leger Fernandez	Moulton		Knott	Oberholte	Van Drew
Harris (NC)	Meuser	Taylor				Kustoff	Ogles	Van Dwyne
Harshbarger	Miller (IL)	Tennet				LaHood	Onder	Van Epps
Hern (OK)	Miller (OH)	Thompson (PA)				LaLota	Owens	Van Orden
Higgins (LA)	Miller (WV)	Tiffany				Langworthy	Palmer	Wagner
Hill (AR)	Miller-Meeks	Timmons				Latta	Patronis	Walberg
Hinson	Mills	Turner (OH)				Lawler	Perry	Weber (TX)
Houchin	Moolenaar	Valadao				Lee (FL)	Pfluger	Webster (FL)
Hudson	Moore (AL)	Van Drew				Loudermilk	Reschenthaler	Westerman
Huizenga	Moore (NC)	Van Dwyne				Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Wied
Hunt	Moore (UT)	Van Epps				Luna	Rogers (KY)	Williams (TX)
Hurd (CO)	Moore (WV)	Van Orden				Luttrell	Rose	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Moran	Wagner				Mace	Rouzer	Wittman
Jack	Murphy	Walberg				Mackenzie	Roy	Womack
Jackson (TX)	Nehls	Weber (TX)				Malliotakis	Rulli	Yakym
James	Newhouse	Webster (FL)				Maloy	Rutherford	Zinke
Johnson (LA)	Norman	Wied				Mann	Salazar	
Johnson (SD)	Nunn (IA)	Williams (TX)						
Jordan	Oberholte	Wilson (SC)						
Joyce (OH)	Ogles	Wittman						
Joyce (PA)	Onder	Womack						
Kelly (MS)	Owens	Yakym						
Kelly (PA)	Palmer	Zinke						
Kennedy (UT)	Patronis							
Kiggans (VA)	Perry							
Kiley (CA)	Pfluger							

NOES—208

Adams	DeGette	Jayapal
Aguilar	DeLauro	Jeffries
Amo	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Ansari	Deluzio	Johnson (TX)
Auchincloss	DeSaulnier	Kamlager-Dove
Balint	Dexter	Kaptur
Barragán	Dingell	Keating
Beatty	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Bell	Elfreh	Kennedy (NY)
Bera	Escobar	Khanna
Beyer	Españat	Krishnamoorthi
Bishop	Evans (PA)	Landsman
Bonamici	Fields	Larsen (WA)
Boyle (PA)	Figures	Larson (CT)
Brown	Fletcher	Latimer
Brownley	Foster	Lee (NV)
Budzinski	Foushee	Lee (PA)
Bynum	Frankel, Lois	Levin
Carbajal	Friedman	Liccardo
Carson	Frost	Lieu
Carter (LA)	Garamendi	Lofgren
Casar	Garcia (CA)	Lynch
Case	Garcia (IL)	Magaziner
Casten	Garcia (TX)	Mannion
Castor (FL)	Gillen	Matsui
Castro (TX)	Golden (ME)	McBath
Chu	Goldman (NY)	McBride
Cisneros	Gomez	McClellan
Clark (MA)	Gonzalez, V.	McCollum
Clarke (NY)	Goodlander	McDonald Rivet
Cleaver	Gottheimer	McGarvey
Clyburn	Gray	McGovern
Cohen	Green, Al (TX)	McIver
Conaway	Grijalva	Meeks
Correa	Harder (CA)	Mejia
Costa	Hayes	Menefee
Courtney	Himes	Menendez
Craig	Horsford	Meng
Crockett	Houlahan	Mfume
Crow	Hoyer	Min
Cuellar	Hoyle (OR)	Moore (WI)
Davids (KS)	Huffman	Morelle
Davis (IL)	Ivey	Morrison
Davis (NC)	Jackson (IL)	Moskowitz
Dean (PA)	Jacobs	Mrvan

NOT VOTING—8

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.

□ 1527

PROVIDING THAT SECTION 11 OF
HOUSE RESOLUTION 1224 SHALL
HAVE NO FORCE OR EFFECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution (H. Res. 1274) providing that section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 206, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—211

Aderholt	Cammack	Fine
Alford	Carey	Finstad
Allen	Carter (GA)	Fischbach
Amodei (NV)	Carter (TX)	Fitzgerald
Arrington	Ciscomani	Fitzpatrick
Babin	Cline	Fleischmann
Bacon	Cloud	Flood
Baird	Clyde	Fong
Balderson	Cole	Fox
Barr	Collins	Franklin, Scott
Barrett	Comer	Fry
Baumgartner	Crane	Fulcher
Bean (FL)	Crank	Fuller
Begich	Crawford	Gill (TX)
Bentz	Davidson	Gimenez
Bergman	De La Cruz	Goldman (TX)
Bice	DesJarlais	Gooden
Biggs (AZ)	Diaz-Balart	Gosar
Biggs (SC)	Donalds	Graves
Bilirakis	Downing	Griffith
Boebert	Edwards	Grothman
Bost	Ellzey	Guest
Brecheen	Emmer	Guthrie
Bresnahan	Estes	Hageman
Buchanan	Evans (CO)	Hamadeh (AZ)
Burchett	Ezell	Haridopolos
Burlison	Fallon	Harrigan
Calvert	Feenstra	Harris (MD)
Adams	Aguilar	Amo
Ansari	Auchincloss	Balint
Barragán	Beatty	Bell
Bera	Beyer	Bishop
Bonamici	Boyle (PA)	Brown
Brown	Brownley	Budzinski
Bynum	Carbajal	Carson
Carbajal	Carter (LA)	Casar
Carson	Case	Casten
Carter (LA)	Castor (FL)	Castro (TX)
Casar	Chu	Cisneros
Case	Clark (MA)	Clarke (NY)
Casten	Cleaver	Clyburn
Castor (FL)	Cohen	Conaway
Castro (TX)	Correa	Costa
Chu	Courtney	Craig
Cisneros	Crockett	Crow
Clark (MA)	Cuellar	Davids (KS)
Clarke (NY)	Davis (IL)	Davis (NC)
Cleaver	Dean (PA)	DeGette
Clyburn	DeLauro	DelBene
Cohen	Deluzio	DeSaulnier
Conaway	Dexter	Dingell
Correa	Doggett	Elfrith
Costa	Escobar	Españat
Courtney	Evans (PA)	Fields
Craig	Figures	Fletcher
Crockett	Foster	Foushee
Crow	Frankel, Lois	McClellan
Cuellar	Friedman	McCormick
Davids (KS)	Garcia (CA)	McCollum
Davis (IL)	Garcia (IL)	McDonald Rivet
Davis (NC)	Garcia (TX)	McGarvey
Dean (PA)	Gillen	McGovern
	Golden (ME)	McIver
	Goldman (NY)	Meeks
	Gomez	Mejia
	Gonzalez, V.	Menefee
	Goodlander	Menendez
	Gottheimer	Meng
	Gray	Mfume
	Green, Al (TX)	Min
	Grijalva	Moore (WI)
	Harder (CA)	Morrison
	Hayes	Moskowitz
	Himes	Mrvan
	Horsford	Mullin
	Houlahan	Nadler
	Hoyer	Neal
	Hoyle (OR)	Neguse
	Huffman	Norcoss
	Ivey	Ocasio-Cortez
	Jackson (IL)	Olzewski
	Jacobs	Omar
	Jayapal	Pallone
	Jeffries	Panetta
	Johnson (GA)	Pappas
	Johnson (TX)	Pelosi
	Kamlager-Dove	Perez
	Kaptur	Peters
	Keating	Pettersen
	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
	Kennedy (NY)	Pocan
	Khanna	Pou
	Krishnamoorthi	Pressley
	Landsman	Quigley
	Larsen (WA)	Ramirez
	Larson (CT)	Randall
	Latimer	Raskin
	Lee (NV)	Riley (NY)
	Lee (PA)	Rivas
	Levin	Ross
		Ruiz
		Ryan

Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton

Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
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)

NOT VOTING—13

Crenshaw
Dunn (FL)
Fedorchak
Garbarino
Kean

Leger Fernandez
Letlow
McBath
McClain Delaney
Moulton

Sewell
Stefanik
Wilson (FL)

□ 1534

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 de-
mand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This
will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 213, noes 208,
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—213

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Davidson
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards

Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flood
Fong
Foord
Franklin, Scott
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Garbarino
Gill (TX)
Gimenez
Goldman (TX)
Gooden
Gosar
Graves
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagaman
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)
Kiley (CA)
Kim
Knott
Kustoff
LaHood
LaLota
Langworthy
Latta
Lawler
Lee (FL)
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
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)
Oberholte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Patronis
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy

Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
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

NOES—208

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bishop
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carr
Carter (LA)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Español
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gillen

Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Goodlander
Gottheimer
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kamla-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latimer
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClellan
McCollum
McDonald Rivet
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Moskowitz
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
Salinas
Sánchez
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Sewell
Sherman
Simon
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Subramanyam
Suozzi
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velázquez
Walkinshaw
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Whitesides
Williams (GA)

NOT VOTING—9

Leger Fernandez
Letlow
McClain Delaney
Moulton
Stefanik
Wilson (FL)

□ 1541

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.

MEMORIALIZING LAW ENFORCE-
MENT OFFICERS KILLED IN THE
LINE OF DUTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
ant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfin-
ished business is the vote on the mo-
tion to suspend the rules and agree to
the resolution (H. Res. 1252) resolution
memorializing law enforcement offi-
cers killed in the line of duty, on which
the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolu-
tion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
question is on the motion offered by
the gentleman from North Carolina
(Mr. KNOTT) that the House suspend
the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 418, nays 2,
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—418

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Alford
Allen
Amo
Amodei (NV)
Ansari
Arrington
Auchincloss
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Balint
Barr
Barragán
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Beatty
Begich
Bell
Bentz
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boebert
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Brown
Brownley
Buchanan
Budzinski
Burchett
Burlison
Bynum
Calvert
Cammack
Carbajal
Carey
Carson
Carter (GA)
Carter (LA)
Carter (TX)
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciscomani
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleave
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Conaway
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dexter
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Elfreth
Ellzey
Emmer
Escobar
Español
Estes
Evans (CO)
Evans (PA)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Fields

Figures
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Fong
Foster
Foushee
Foord
Frankel, Lois
Franklin, Scott
Friedman
Frost
Fry
Fulcher
Fuller
Garamendi
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gill (TX)
Gillen
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Goldman (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez, V.
Gooden
Goodlander
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Gray
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagaman
Hamadeh (AZ)
Haridopolos
Harrigan
Harris (MD)
Harris (NC)
Harshbarger
Hayes
Hern (OK)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)

Himes	McDowell	Schakowsky
Hinson	McGarvey	Schmidt
Horsford	McGovern	Schneider
Houchin	McGuire	Scholten
Houlahan	McIver	Schrier
Hoyer	Meeks	Schweikert
Hoyle (OR)	Mejia	Scott (VA)
Hudson	Menefee	Scott, Austin
Huffman	Menendez	Self
Huizenga	Meng	Sessions
Hunt	Messmer	Sewell
Hurd (CO)	Meuser	Sherman
Issa	Mfume	Shreve
Ivey	Miller (IL)	Simon
Jack	Miller (OH)	Simpson
Jackson (IL)	Miller (WV)	Smith (MO)
Jackson (TX)	Miller-Meeks	Smith (NE)
Jacobs	Mills	Smith (NJ)
James	Min	Smith (WA)
Jayapal	Moolenaar	Smucker
Jeffries	Moore (AL)	Sorensen
Johnson (GA)	Moore (NC)	Soto
Johnson (LA)	Moore (UT)	Spartz
Johnson (SD)	Moore (WI)	Stansbury
Johnson (TX)	Moore (WV)	Stanton
Jordan	Moran	Stauber
Joyce (OH)	Morelle	Steil
Joyce (PA)	Morrison	Steube
Kamlager-Dove	Moskowitz	Stevens
Kaptur	Mrvan	Strickland
Keating	Mullin	Strong
Kelly (IL)	Murphy	Stutzman
Kelly (MS)	Nadler	Subramanyam
Kelly (PA)	Neal	Suozi
Kennedy (NY)	Neguse	Sykes
Kennedy (UT)	Nehls	Takano
Khanna	Newhouse	Taylor
Kiggans (VA)	Norcross	Tenney
Kiley (CA)	Norman	Thanedar
Kim	Nunn (IA)	Thompson (CA)
Knott	Oberholte	Thompson (MS)
Krishnamoorthi	Ocasio-Cortez	Thompson (PA)
Kustoff	Ogles	Tiffany
LaHood	Olszewski	Timmons
LaLota	Omar	Titus
Landsman	Onder	Tokuda
Langworthy	Owens	Tonko
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Torres (CA)
Larson (CT)	Palmer	Torres (NY)
Latimer	Panetta	Trahan
Latta	Pappas	Tran
Lawler	Patronis	Turner (OH)
Lee (FL)	Pelosi	Underwood
Lee (NV)	Perez	Valadao
Lee (PA)	Perry	Van Drew
Levin	Peters	Van Dyne
Liccardo	Pettersen	Van Epps
Lieu	Pfleger	Van Orden
Lofgren	Pingree	Vargas
Loudermilk	Pocan	Vasquez
Lucas	Pou	Veasey
Luna	Pressley	Velázquez
Luttrell	Quigley	Vindman
Lynch	Randall	Wagner
Mace	Raskin	Walberg
Mackenzie	Reschenthaler	Walkinshaw
Magaziner	Riley (NY)	Wasserman
Malliotakis	Rivas	Schultz
Maloy	Rogers (AL)	Waters
Mann	Rogers (KY)	Watson Coleman
Mannion	Rose	Weber (TX)
Massie	Ross	Webster (FL)
Mast	Rouzer	Westerman
Matsui	Roy	Whitesides
McBath	Ruiz	Wied
McBride	Rulli	Williams (GA)
McCaul	Rutherford	Williams (TX)
McClain	Ryan	Wilson (SC)
McClellan	Salazar	Wittman
McClintock	Salinas	Womack
McCollum	Sánchez	Yakym
McCormick	Scalise	Zinke
McDonald Rivet	Scanlon	

NAYS—2

Ramirez

Tlaib

NOT VOTING—10

Crenshaw
Dunn (FL)
Feenstra
Kean

Leger Fernandez
Letlow
McClain Delaney
Moulton

Stefanik
Wilson (FL)

□ 1556

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONWIDE CONSUMER AND FUEL RETAILER CHOICE ACT OF 2025

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1224, I call up the bill H.R. 1346, to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid Vapor Pressure under that Act, 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 (Mr. VAN DREW). Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1346

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

SECTION 1. YEAR-ROUND E15 AND RFS REFORM.

(a) ETHANOL WAIVER.—

(1) EXISTING WAIVERS.—Section 211(f)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(f)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(4) The Administrator, upon” and inserting the following:

“(4) WAIVERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, on”;

(B) in subparagraph (A) (as so designated)—

(i) in the first sentence—

(I) by striking “of this subsection” each place it appears; and

(II) by striking “if he determines” and inserting “if the Administrator determines”; and

(ii) in the second sentence, by striking “The Administrator” and inserting the following:

“(B) FINAL ACTION.—The Administrator”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) REID VAPOR PRESSURE.—A fuel or fuel additive may be introduced into commerce if—

“(i)(I) the Administrator determines that the fuel or fuel additive is substantially similar to a fuel or fuel additive utilized in the certification of any model year vehicle pursuant to paragraph (1)(A); or

“(II) the fuel or fuel additive has been granted a waiver under subparagraph (A) and meets all of the conditions of that waiver other than any limitation of the waiver with respect to the Reid Vapor Pressure of the fuel or fuel additive; and

“(ii) the fuel or fuel additive meets all other applicable Reid Vapor Pressure requirements under subsection (h).”.

(2) REID VAPOR PRESSURE LIMITATION.—Section 211(h) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(h)) is amended—

(A) by striking “vapor pressure” each place it appears and inserting “Vapor Pressure”;

(B) in paragraph (4), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “10 percent” and inserting “10 to 15 percent”; and

(C) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(i) by striking “Upon notification, accompanied by” and inserting “On receipt of a notification that is submitted after the date of enactment of the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2026, and is accompanied by appropriate”;

(ii) by striking “10 percent” and inserting “10 to 15 percent”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following: “Upon the enactment of the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2026, any State for which the notification from the Governor of a State was submitted after January 1, 2022, and before the date of enactment of the Farm, Food, and National Security Act of 2026 and to which

the Administrator applied the Reid Vapor Pressure limitation established by paragraph (1) shall instead have the Reid Vapor Pressure limitation established by paragraph (4) apply to all fuel blends containing gasoline and 10 to 15 percent denatured anhydrous ethanol that are sold, offered for sale, dispensed, supplied, offered for supply, transported, or introduced into commerce in the area during the high ozone season.”.

(b) DEFINITION OF SMALL REFINING COMPANY.—Section 211(o)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (L) as subparagraph (M); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (K) the following:

“(L) SMALL REFINING COMPANY.—The term ‘small refining company’ means a company, entity, or group of affiliated entities, including through subsidiaries, parent companies, joint ventures, holding companies, spin-offs, or other associated corporate or legal structures, the daily average aggregate production of obligated fuels of which for calendar year 2025 did not exceed 75,000 barrels per day across all of the facilities of the company, entity, or group of affiliated entities that produced transportation fuel subject to the requirements of paragraph (2).”.

(c) TERMINATION OF PETITIONS; ADJUSTED SMALL REFINING COMPANY OBLIGATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 211(o)(9) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(9)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “A small” and inserting “Subject to clause (iv), a small”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) TERMINATION OF EXEMPTION AND PETITIONS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in calendar year 2028, the Administrator may not apply or enforce any extension of an exemption granted pursuant to a petition under this subparagraph or otherwise continue to enforce the exemption under subparagraph (A) with respect to any small refinery.

“(II) LIMITATION ON PETITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(aa) no small refinery may petition for an extension under this subparagraph with respect to any calendar year after calendar year 2027;

“(bb) the Administrator may not consider any petition for an extension under this subparagraph, with respect to any calendar year, that is submitted after July 1, 2028; and

“(cc) to the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall, not later than October 1, 2028, act on all outstanding petitions.”;

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (C) and (D) as subparagraphs (D) and (E), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) ADJUSTED COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS FOR SMALL REFINING COMPANIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in calendar year 2028, the Administrator shall, subject to clause (ii), reduce the compliance requirements of each small refining company under paragraph (2) by 75 percent.

“(ii) NO SUBSEQUENT REDESIGNATION.—If the average aggregate daily production of obligated fuels of a small refining company exceeds the limit described in paragraph (1)(L) in calendar year 2026 or any subsequent calendar year, the small refining company shall no longer be eligible for the adjusted compliance requirements under clause (i) during that calendar year or any subsequent calendar year, regardless of whether the average aggregate daily production of obligated fuels of the small refining company drops below that limit again.”.

(2) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act affects any remedy available to a small refinery (as defined in paragraph (1) of section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o))) with respect to petitions for extensions of exemptions under paragraph (9) of that section and, for purposes of

the application of such extensions and the review of the denial of such petitions, section 211(o)(9) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(9)) shall be applied as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) GENERATION OF CREDITS BY SMALL REFINERIES UNDER THE RENEWABLE FUEL PROGRAM.—Section 211(o)(9) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(9)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) CREDITS GENERATED FOR 2016–2018 COMPLIANCE YEARS.—

“(i) RULE.—For any small refinery described in clause (ii) or (iii), the credits described in the respective clause shall be—

“(I) returned to the small refinery and, notwithstanding paragraph (5)(C), deemed eligible for future compliance years; or

“(II) applied as a credit in the EPA Moderated Transaction System (EMTS) account of the small refinery.

“(ii) COMPLIANCE YEARS 2016 AND 2017.—Clause (i) applies with respect to any small refinery that—

“(I) retired credits generated for compliance years 2016 or 2017; and

“(II) submitted a petition under subparagraph (B)(i) for that compliance year that remained outstanding as of December 1, 2022.

“(iii) COMPLIANCE YEAR 2018.—In addition to small refineries described in clause (ii), clause (i) applies with respect to any small refinery—

“(I) that submitted a petition under subparagraph (B)(i) for compliance year 2018 by September 1, 2019;

“(II) that retired credits generated for compliance year 2018 as part of the compliance demonstration of the small refinery for compliance year 2018 by March 31, 2019; and

“(III) for which—

“(aa) the petition remained outstanding as of December 1, 2022; or

“(bb) the Administrator denied the petition as of July 1, 2022, and has not returned the retired credits as of December 1, 2022.”

(e) PROHIBITION ON REALLOCATION OF OBLIGATED VOLUMES.—Section 211(o)(9) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(9)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) PROHIBITION ON REALLOCATION.—For the purpose of making the determinations in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), for calendar year 2028 and each calendar year thereafter, the Administrator may not reallocate to other persons any renewable fuel obligation applicable to a small refining company the compliance requirements of which were reduced pursuant to subparagraph (C).”

(f) FUEL INFRASTRUCTURE RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, after a period of notice and public comment, finalize a rule modifying the regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) and the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) (commonly known as the “Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976”) relating to the sale and distribution of gasoline-ethanol blends that contain greater than 10 volume percent ethanol and less than or equal to 15 volume percent ethanol.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—In finalizing the rule required under paragraph (1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall modify the E15 fuel dispenser labeling requirements and the underground storage tank regulations of the Environmental Protection Agency with respect to compatibility with gasoline-ethanol blends.

(g) EXEMPTION FOR AT-RISK QUALIFYING SMALL REFINERIES.—Section 211(o)(9) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(o)(9)) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) EXEMPTION FOR AT-RISK QUALIFYING SMALL REFINERIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in calendar year 2028, not later than December 31 of a calendar

year, a qualifying small refinery may petition the Administrator for an exemption from compliance with the requirements of paragraph (2) for such calendar year for the reason of the imminent risk of closure, permanent idling, or conversion to a renewable fuel production facility.

“(ii) MATTERS INCLUDED IN PETITIONS.—In submitting a petition for an exemption under clause (i), a qualifying small refinery shall include in such petition the following:

“(I) Information demonstrating that—

“(aa) the qualifying small refinery is at imminent risk of closure, permanent idling, or conversion to a renewable fuel production facility;

“(bb) such risk is solely caused by the cost of compliance with the requirements of paragraph (2); and

“(cc) the ownership of the qualifying small refinery has not changed after the date of enactment of this paragraph.

“(II) An attestation, executed by a senior corporate officer (or any equivalent position) with direct responsibility for the applicable operations of the qualifying small refinery, certifying that the information included under subclause (I) is correct.

“(iii) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—Any petition submitted under this subparagraph, including any information, attestation, or other supporting documentation included in such a petition—

“(I) shall not be eligible for treatment as confidential business information for purposes of section 114(c) or any other provision of law; and

“(II) shall be made publicly available by the Administrator not later than 30 days after the date of such submission.

“(iv) DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON PETITIONS.—The Administrator shall act on any petition submitted by a qualifying small refinery for an exemption under this subparagraph not later than 90 days after the date of receipt of the petition.

“(v) ADMINISTRATOR DETERMINATION.—The Administrator may grant an exemption under this subparagraph only upon a determination by the Administrator that the petition submitted for the exemption adequately demonstrates the matters specified in items (aa) through (cc) of clause (ii)(I) and includes the attestation described in clause (ii)(II).

“(vi) SCOPE AND DURATION.—An exemption granted for a qualifying small refinery under this subparagraph—

“(I) may exempt the qualifying small refinery from compliance with the requirements of paragraph (2) in whole or in part;

“(II) may only exempt the qualifying small refinery from compliance with the requirements of paragraph (2) to the extent necessary to prevent the closure, permanent idling, or conversion described in clause (i); and

“(III) shall only apply with respect to the calendar year for which the petition for the exemption is submitted.

“(vii) EXEMPTED VOLUMES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—In acting on petitions submitted by qualifying small refineries for exemptions under this subparagraph, the Administrator may not exempt, in total, renewable fuel obligations for qualifying small refineries such that the total volume of renewable fuel so exempted exceeds the relevant volume cap for the applicable calendar year described in subclause (II).

“(II) VOLUME CAP.—The volume cap described in this subclause is—

“(aa) for calendar year 2028, the volume of all renewable fuel, including advanced biofuel, cellulosic biofuel, biomass-based diesel, and conventional biofuel, that the Administrator determines has, in total, an energy content equal to the energy content of 150 million gallons of conventional biofuel; and

“(bb) for each calendar year after calendar year 2028, the volume of renewable fuel determined under item (aa), as adjusted by the Administrator in direct proportion to any changes to the applicable volume of renewable fuel established for the calendar year under paragraph

(2)(B)(ii) as compared to the applicable volume of renewable fuel established for calendar year 2028.

“(viii) QUALIFYING SMALL REFINERY DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘qualifying small refinery’ means a small refinery—

“(I) that received an extension of an exemption under paragraph (9); or

“(II)(aa) for which the average aggregate daily crude oil throughput for a calendar year (as determined by dividing the aggregate throughput for the calendar year by the number of days in the calendar year) does not exceed 10,000 barrels; and

“(bb) that began production on or after January 1, 2007, and before January 1, 2026.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 119-28 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The bill, as amended, shall be debated for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or their respective designees.

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

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1346.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act of 2025. The bill before us today, specifically the substitute text, was developed by some members of the Rural Domestic Energy Council established by the House in January to work with the stakeholders to identify potential reforms to the RFS program.

The underlying bill will allow for year-round sale of 15 percent ethanol and gasoline, which farmers say is needed to provide an additional market for their crops without impacting air quality.

□ 1600

Some Members have noted that the proposal would make it more difficult for small refineries, which already face economic and regulatory hardship, to continue to qualify for existing exemptions of RFS obligations and risk their closure as a result.

Consideration of this bill today does not mean the work to modernize the RFS program is finished and that other reforms shouldn't be considered.

Mr. Speaker, 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 support of H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act. I am a supporter of the Renewable Fuel Standard, including allowing the voluntary year-round sale of gasoline with 15 percent ethanol, known as E15, because it lowers prices for American drivers, supports our farmers, and fosters investment in cleaner transportation fuels.

That is why we are here today, to preserve and expand the availability of a cheaper and cleaner fuel option for the driving public. Blending more biofuels, like ethanol, into gasoline displaces demand for petroleum, helping to bring down gas prices for consumers.

That is particularly important when Trump's reckless war of choice in Iran is driving up prices at the pump for Americans. Just yesterday, new inflation data showed that, overall, energy prices are up nearly 18 percent over the last year, and Americans cannot afford Trump's price spikes.

Issues concerning the Renewable Fuel Standard have a long bipartisan history. For example, at the end of 2024, Democrats and Republicans from the Energy and Commerce Committee worked to secure meaningful provisions in a bipartisan, bicameral, end-of-the-year government funding package.

That agreement included similar year-round E15 language that would have lowered costs and made a meaningful difference in the lives of hard-working Americans. Allowing year-round E15 would have ensured that Americans have access to homegrown biofuels that save drivers money at the pump and help insulate people from dramatic global price fluctuations.

Congress had a chance to address the year-round E15 issue then, but Speaker JOHNSON backed out of that bipartisan, bicameral deal because Elon Musk, of all people, voiced his opposition to it. This problem of Republicans' own making has persisted with no resolution for more than 2 years now.

Earlier this year, Speaker JOHNSON set up an E15 Rural Domestic Energy Council of only Republican Members to bring a new E15 deal to the House floor. This council operated without transparency, abandoned bipartisan cooperation, and ignored longstanding and clear Energy and Commerce Committee jurisdiction on legislation amending the Clean Air Act and the Renewable Fuel Standard.

Next, they tried to slip this deal into the farm bill but were blocked by Republican opposition and a score from the Congressional Budget Office.

The net effect of the deal brokered by the Republican-only E15 Rural Domestic Energy Council would be a \$2.3 billion increase in the deficit over a 10-year window.

The Republican majority scratched the amendment because it costs money, and here we are, debating a standalone version to allow them to get around their budget requirements.

Republicans like to give the impression that they are fiscal hawks, but that is a joke. It is just another example of how they can't get their act together and actually govern.

Republicans are going to turn the other way on supposed fiscal discipline to try to pass this bill, but they refuse to address so many other priorities to help Americans.

Families across the country are dealing with an affordability crisis, thanks to high prices for healthcare, energy bills, and groceries, but House Republicans won't lift a finger to help us on any of these issues.

These are the games the Republican majority plays daily. They are a mess. They are incapable of governing, and the American people are paying the price.

Mr. Speaker, to be clear, I am not opposed to this bill, but I have serious concerns with the Republican majority's artificially rushed, partisan, and secretive process. This is not a bill that I would have proposed if I or any Democrats were given a seat at the negotiating table.

However, it is a compromise, and despite my reservations, I am voting "yes" because year-round E15 can offer some relief at the pump as prices soar across the board due to Trump's reckless war in Iran and the disastrous Republican energy agenda.

Despite my serious concerns with the process by which this bill was brought to the floor today, the bill is a step in the right direction, as President Trump and congressional Republicans carelessly undermine renewable fuels and push policies that hurt our farmers.

Today, drivers are saving, on average, about 30 cents per gallon to fill up their tanks with E15. This fuel provides significant savings for families during the summer driving season, so let's ensure it continues to be available at gas stations across the country all year with certainty, which is what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill but not the methods used to get here. In any case, I do support the bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), a valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee for allowing me time. I am proud to stand here—I know, I really am standing—in strong support of H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act.

Every single year since 2011, the EPA has issued an emergency waiver to allow E15 to be sold during the summer months. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), a valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chair of the Energy and

Commerce Committee for allowing me time. I am proud to stand here—I know, I really am standing—in strong support of H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act.

Every single year since 2011, the EPA has issued an emergency waiver to allow E15 to be sold during the summer months. That means Washington already recognizes that this policy makes sense.

What we are doing today is removing an outdated prohibition and finally providing certainty for farmers, producers, retailers, and consumers year-round.

E15 is an American-made, domestic fuel that is homegrown, lowers gas prices, strengthens our energy independence, and supports rural communities across Iowa and our country.

Nationwide E15 adoption would save drivers nearly \$27 billion annually, but this debate is about much more than fuel. Agriculture is hurting right now. Input costs remained high through the Biden administration. Commodity prices are down. Farm bankruptcies are rising.

I have looked farmers in the eye as they have told me that their family farms, their legacies, are at risk, along with their community bank and their community implement dealer. That is not because they are failing, but because Washington keeps moving the goalpost.

Year-round E15 provides the certainty that farmers have been asking for. It would increase corn demand by 2.4 billion bushels, strengthen domestic energy production, support more than 128,000 American jobs, inject billions of dollars into rural economies, and save Americans money.

Let's clear up some misinformation being pushed about this bill. The legislation doesn't mandate E15. It simply gives retailers the option to sell it year-round. Again, it is removing an outdated prohibition.

The fear-mongering and falsehoods being spread about this bill are coming at the expense of America's farmers, rural communities, and the American people. Farmers do not need more uncertainty. They need Congress to finally act and get out of the way. It is time to deliver permanent year-round E15.

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have concerns about how this bill is being considered today.

The Environment Subcommittee has not held a single hearing on the Renewable Fuel Standard in the 119th session of Congress. CBO has said that this bill will have a significant impact on our budget. Yet, there has not been any legislative record, independent analysis, or technical assistance from EPA

that could help us better understand its consequences.

We know that this bill will affect USDA programs, the highway trust fund, and vehicle fuel economy to some extent. We also know that it will have consequences for the RFS RIN market. Reducing demand for RINs by not reallocating small refiners' gallons will affect RIN prices, and it seems likely that producers and retailers of advanced biofuels will be the ones who suffer the most.

Mr. Speaker, this might just be assumptions on my part, but that is all we have to go on because this bill failed to have any legislative process to help us best understand these complex issues. I hope our counterparts in the Senate will take the time to do a proper review of this proposal.

I also hope that EPA does not interpret this bill as having any sort of congressional intent that would lead to increasing the annual volumes of conventional biofuels beyond its historic 15 billion gallons per year.

Despite my serious concerns with this bill's process, I will acknowledge that administrations have been granting year-round E15 waivers for years. If that is going to continue to be the case, it simply makes sense to codify. I also acknowledge that the RFS' small refinery exemptions have been a source of uncertainty and litigation, and that process should be reformed.

While I have reluctantly supported this bill, it is such a huge missed opportunity. For one, it does nothing to recognize a significant and growing segment of the fuel pool, that being electricity. We should be providing certainty for e-RIN pathways. There is no good reason to keep electricity produced from qualified feedstocks out of the program. Frankly, that is not even enough.

As long as we continue to have a volumetric approach to our national fuel program, it will be filled with uncertainty, unnecessary litigation, and worse outcomes for both consumers and, yes, for our environment. We should embrace a performance-based clean fuel standard that rewards fuels of all types for their pollution reduction.

While this bill is a missed opportunity, I can at least recognize that E15 is about 30 cents per gallon cheaper, and we know that Americans are feeling a lot of pain at the pump due to President Trump and his disastrous, illegal war with Iran.

□ 1610

Today, the average gas price is \$4.51 per gallon. Compare that to under \$3 a gallon before the war started. The \$200 billion that the administration has previously said was necessary for this war could have been better used to incentivize more than 26 million people to buy an American-made electric vehicle.

Instead, Republicans have repealed the tax credit that was allowing people

to take back some control and end their dependence on volatile oil markets.

While I support this bill today, I hope that Republicans will get serious about what it is going to take to lower energy prices for Americans and enact a sensible, long-term fuels policy for our country.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Dakota (Mrs. FEDORCHAK), another valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. FEDORCHAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of North Dakota farmers and rural communities to support this step forward on year-round E15.

For those of us who talk to farmers on a daily basis, we know that agriculture is hurting. Across the country, input costs are up. Interest costs are up. Fuel costs are up.

Many of our producers are also dealing with uncertainty in domestic and foreign markets, and this is exactly why year-round E15 matters.

This is the top priority for farmers in my State and across our Nation. I hear about it in every conversation in every townhall and every radio show: When will we get year-round E15? It is what they are asking for. They want markets, not disaster payments. They want an increase in the demand right here in America for their products, and this is what E15 creates.

E15 is homegrown American energy. Most importantly, eliminating the artificial prohibition on summer sales of E15 is an important step toward creating the consistent demand that will allow this industry to grow and stand on its own without RFS one day.

We have to get this done first. It will add \$25.3 billion to U.S. GDP and support more than 128,000 full-time jobs. In North Dakota, the ethanol industry contributes \$1.7 billion annually to my State's economy.

Congress has a chance right now to find a lasting solution for year-round E15 with today's consideration of the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, legislation I was so proud to cosponsor.

President Trump and Secretary Rollins support this effort, and rural America is counting on us to deliver. Let's get it done.

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 Mr. PALLONE for yielding. I am a newer Member of Congress, so this one was crazy to me: this idea that we didn't allow farmers to produce this biofuel all year-round; that we didn't allow consumers to have this option; that there was a law that said that only when we say so can E15 biofuels be produced.

The question with this bill is: Do we want to allow farmers to produce more ethanol, to produce E15 all year-round

whenever they want? Do we want our consumers to be able to buy lower-priced gas all year-round?

Unfortunately, the answer isn't obviously yes for everyone. There are some folks who don't agree that in the land of the free somehow our farmers can only produce this ethanol and bring it to market sometimes, that consumers can only get this lower-priced gas sometimes, and they will vote against this bill.

Hopefully, a majority of us will get this thing done. It will pass the Senate, and this country will finally have a policy where E15 biofuels can be sold all year-round. Our farmers can produce this all year-round, and consumers can buy it all year-round. Those are families and small businesses.

Permanentizing E15 sales obviously grows domestic demand for ethanol. It is nearly 7 billion gallons every year. That will make a huge difference for our farmers who are struggling with higher costs associated with these tariffs. This will save drivers in the United States more than \$150 million just this summer—\$150 million just this summer. For every single driver and every driver in Ohio, that is a 30-cent savings with every gallon. That is how much more affordable this option is.

Any car that was made from 2001 on, which is 96 percent of cars, can take E15. So that is the vast majority of Americans get 30 cents off per gallon when we pass this.

Why did this take so long? It took so long because oil refineries and Big Oil, these big companies and folks who have a lot of money, they spent that money or some of that money convincing Members of Congress not to bring this to the floor even though it is better for farmers and better for consumers.

I am a farmers first guy. There are a lot of farmers first Members of Congress here on the Republican side and on the Democratic side, and we banded together. We got this thing on the floor, and, hopefully, it will pass and provide meaningful support for our farmers who desperately need it and meaningful relief at the pump for consumers and for our families.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to move toward American energy independence and pass my bill, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act.

With global tensions, volatile fuel prices, and persistent uncertainty in the energy sector, energy independence is no longer a theoretical goal but a vital part of America's national security and economic survival.

Fortunately, E15 is a winning solution. It is a reliable, clean, and affordable homegrown fuel that strengthens every link in our domestic energy supply chain.

Nationwide, year-round E15 would provide immediate relief to consumers, lowering costs at the pump at different levels, but in my district you can see up to 52 cents per gallon at a time when families need it most.

It would increase demand for corn, as you have been hearing, by over 2 million bushels a year, delivering the certainty, opportunity, and market development America's farmers have unequivocally called for.

E15 compatibility is here and can be delivered through existing infrastructure, as the past 5 years of summer-time waivers have already demonstrated.

The question is no longer whether E15 makes sense. We know it does. The question is whether Congress will allow consumers to have this viable option.

To my colleagues in Congress, I urge you to stand with America's consumers, America's farmers, and America's energy future by making nationwide, year-round E15 a reality.

Together, we can finally deliver the certainty, affordability, and energy independence the American people deserve.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee. She used to be on our committee, but we lost her as she moved to the top Democrat on the Agriculture Committee.

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member PALLONE for yielding.

As co-chair of the bipartisan Biofuels Caucus, this has been a longtime coming. Getting year-round E15 across the finish line has been a priority of mine since the day I came into Congress. In fact, I led the charge for Democrats when we were in control of the House in 2022, the only other time that year-round E15 has passed the House of Representatives.

□ 1620

Back then, the farm economy wasn't great, but now it is downright terrible. Farm bankruptcies in the Midwest are up 70 percent year over year. Our family farmers are hurting, and so are our working families in this country.

Tariffs and trade wars have shut corn and soybean farmers out of their largest markets, and the war in Iran is hitting every single person I know in the pocketbook when it comes to gas prices.

We have the opportunity today to expand market opportunities for farmers who badly need them while at the same time lowering costs at the pump.

Make no mistake about it: It is going to lower costs to allow for year-round E15 if the adoption rate goes up as retailers put in more infrastructure at the pump so that people will have broader access to year-round E15.

But the dynamics of the policies in this country are not changing today. As we think about the administration, the tariffs, the war in Iran, the Strait of Hormuz and the problems we have

there, fertilizer costs, diesel costs—we can stand here all day long and say this is a good bipartisan bill, and I believe it is. In 2022, we passed a bipartisan bill. But until this administration changes its actual policies that impact family farmers, there is going to be pain throughout farm country.

As we think about E15 and biofuels in our country, E15 is homegrown, renewable, and available. All we are asking to put into law is that we not arbitrarily limit this cheaper option for consumers to a few months out of the year. In fact, what we are putting in place today, should this pass, is a status quo because we are seeing waivers every single year anyway.

Let's make it available to any American anytime they want to choose it. Year-round E15 is a win for consumers, and it is a win for farmers who desperately need these domestic markets because of so many bad policies on the part of this current administration.

I urge my colleagues to support this package, to support our family farmers and working people across this country.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, we support our farmers, but we also support our consumers. I appreciate my friends on both sides of the aisle for this position, but these two positions of being for farmers and being for consumers are not mutually exclusive.

They are right that we should all have a choice of whether we buy E15 or not, but the problem is that we don't have a choice about the Renewable Fuel Standard, which requires us to produce more ethanol than we ever use.

As a matter of fact, these folks up in the gallery here are paying about \$750 a gallon to produce ethanol, about 2 to 4 gallons of water for every gallon of ethanol. Thirty cents of every gallon you currently buy of ethanol, after you pay the subsidy, is added to your gallon of gas price. This is going to raise prices.

By the way, you already have the chance to do this. Twenty-two States already have the option to sell E15 year-round. Less than 14 percent of fueling stations in Iowa, where they grow a heck of a lot of corn, sell E15 because the consumer doesn't want it. You get less miles per gallon. First of all, you pay more, subsidize it, and then get less miles per gallon when you put it in your tank.

This is craziness. As the price of fuel goes up because of Iran—not because of President Trump, but because of Iran—we are actually going to increase prices in this House if this bill is voted in favor of.

Delta purchased the Monroe facility in Pennsylvania for \$150 million plus \$30 million from Pennsylvania, but they spent \$2.3 billion on renewable fuel compliance. That is 20 times the purchase price.

Where do you think the price goes, ladies and gentlemen? It goes in your

wallet. You are paying for all of this stuff.

I absolutely urge a “no” vote on this. Let's not raise everybody's gas prices.

By the way, it doesn't help the environment, either. I have all of those numbers, too, but I am out of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VAN ORDEN). Members are reminded not to refer to persons in the gallery.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. DAVIDS).

Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this bill allowing for the year-round sale of E15.

For years, I have worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, farmers, fuel producers, and through multiple administrations to push for year-round E15 because this is one of the clearest bipartisan ways we can help lower costs for families while supporting American agriculture and energy production.

Back home in Kansas, families are making tough choices every single day, whether it is filling up their gas tank, paying rent, buying groceries, or covering the cost of childcare. You name it, they are making tough choices. Right now, with gas prices averaging more than \$4 a gallon in Kansas, people are feeling the pressure everywhere they go.

Just the other day, I was at a gas station in Kansas where the fuel with E15 was 15 cents cheaper than regular unleaded. I don't know about y'all, but my mom will drive across town for a 6-cent difference. That makes a huge difference, 15 cents a gallon. It might not sound like much to some folks out here in Washington, but for folks who are at home, driving to work, taking kids to school, those savings can add up really quickly.

We already know that E15 works. We have had summer E15 for years, and it has consistently helped lower prices at the pump.

Families shouldn't lose access to cheaper fuel options just because the calendar changes. We need year-round E15. It matters not just for consumers of gasoline but also for Kansas agriculture.

I really want to give a shout-out to the folks at East Kansas Agri-Energy in Garnett. They are an ethanol producer in my district. They are helping turn Kansas-grown corn into fuel that powers our country.

Right now, the farm economy is the toughest it has been in years. Producers are dealing with rising costs and shrinking margins, and uncertainty is coming at them from every single direction. Frankly, this administration's chaotic economic policies and reckless approach to tariffs are making things worse and harder.

Kansas has lost 700 farms this year. Think about that. These are folks who are working hard, doing everything right, and still wondering whether they are going to be able to keep going another year.

Expanding year-round E15 creates a stronger and more reliable market for what our farmers grow. At a time of global instability and conflict around the world, that really matters because E15 is made with homegrown ingredients produced by American farmers, not imported from other countries overseas. That strengthens our energy independence and our national security while helping lower costs for everyday Americans here at home. This should not be controversial.

Instead of getting this done quickly, though, we have seen unnecessary delays from Republican leadership, and this is all happening while families continue to pay higher prices.

People back home don't care about political games. They care about whether they can afford to fill up their tank and get to work. This is common sense and bipartisan. We are talking about a solution that is going to help drivers, farmers, rural communities, and consumers alike.

I thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle—Representatives NIKKI BUDZINSKI, ANGIE CRAIG, DUSTY JOHNSON, MARIANETTE MILLER-MEEKS, and ADRIAN SMITH—for joining in this bipartisan effort.

Let's stop stalling. Let's lower costs now. Let's support our farmers, strengthen American energy, and deliver real relief for the people we represent.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1346. This bill is disastrous for Wyoming refiners and independent petroleum producers, leading to a direct loss of at least 750 jobs in my home State.

Just to correct the record, it isn't the farmers who produce ethanol or E15. It is the refiners, and this bill threatens to put them out of business.

In fact, it is interesting that anyone who supports this bill has not yet mentioned the fact that it is the refiners that will be forced, mandated, to meet the E15 requirement.

The refineries that are at risk of closure because of this bill across the country employ more than 5,800 workers. We could lose upward of 266,000 indirect jobs that depend on small refineries.

□ 1630

The EPA's own Regulatory Impact Analysis of the 2026–2027 biofuel mandate says the RFS will cost American families about \$20 billion a year.

This bill would create a \$3 billion or more annual cost increase for small refineries because of the blending and compliance costs.

This bill will increase the cost of gasoline by an average of over 35 cents per gallon, with some States seeing an increase of well over \$1 per gallon.

At a time when the American consumer and small businesses are already

struggling to make ends meet, we should not be adopting policies that make it even harder.

This bill is not in line with the values we support as Republicans such as free and fair markets. This bill is nothing short of a new tax being imposed by Washington, D.C., and it is wrong.

If higher ethanol blends were truly competitive on their own merits, they would not require Federal blending mandates, compliance credit schemes, subsidies, and special regulatory carve-outs to survive in the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BUDZINSKI).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1346, the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act, as amended.

As a lead Democrat on this bill, I have been proud to work with Congressman ADRIAN SMITH on this issue. We both understand, like many other Members, that year-round E15 is bigger than politics. This is about American farmers. It is about American consumers, and it is about American energy.

E15 is truly one of those rare issues where everyone wins. Here is why: American farmers win because it creates strong and stable markets for homegrown corn. American consumers win because E15 helps to lower prices at the pump. Our economy wins because E15 supports jobs and investment in rural America.

I represent one of the leading corn producing regions in the United States. I have sat down with growers, producers, and small business owners across central and southern Illinois who all understand the same thing: Year-round E15 works.

Yet despite years of support, years of advocacy, and years of evidence proving its benefits, we are still relying on temporary waivers and short-term fixes to keep E15 available during the summer months. Those waivers may get us through another season, but they do not provide certainty that our farmers need and deserve. Farmers cannot plan their future around temporary decisions. Producers cannot invest with confidence when policy changes year to year. Consumers should not lose access to a cheaper fuel option simply because Washington refuses to finish the job.

We have been close before. In fact, it feels like every year we get right to the goal line, and every year politics, delay, or dysfunction gets in our way.

Today we are here to say: Enough. Enough excuses. Enough kicking the can down the road. The time for bipartisan, permanent, nationwide, and year-round E15 is now.

Family farmers are heading toward a crisis, facing rising costs, shrinking margins, and growing unpredictability

not because they are failing, but because the system is failing them.

While our producers are struggling, American families are being squeezed, and that is especially at the gas pump. Right now, the average price of gas nationwide is around \$4.50 per gallon. Families need relief, and year-round E15 is the solution. That is why today I am calling on my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to come together and let's finally pass this bill.

Let's deliver certainty for our growers, lower costs for consumers, and let's strengthen American energy independence.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON).

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act to allow permanent, nationwide, year-round access to E15.

Mr. Speaker, if you ate today, thank a farmer; if you got dressed today, thank a farmer; and if you put gas in your car today, thank a farmer.

This is a challenging time for our ag economy, and we should be using every tool available to us to support our farmers and our rural communities. This bill does just that, driving new demand for American agriculture products and boosting our farm income by \$13.8 billion.

Year-round E15 would lower costs across the board for working families across the country, saving drivers up to 30 cents per gallon and reducing those prices along the supply chain. That is a savings of about \$200 a year in fuel costs for the average family. Iowans, just for a stat here, have saved \$126 million in the last decade by choosing E15 over E10. That is real savings.

Full E15 adoption would also help to support 128,000 full-time jobs.

After years of uncertainty, it is time for Congress to step up and provide a permanent solution. This is something I have been pushing for years. This is not a mandate. This is commonsense regulation fixes focused right on the consumer.

This is not a mandate. It is a market. It is a win-win-win supporting homegrown energy, reducing reliance on foreign oil and continuing to support America's producers who do the best thing which is feeding and fueling the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FONG). The gentleman from New Jersey has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to offer my strong, unwavering

support for the Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act introduced by my fellow Nebraskan, ADRIAN SMITH, as well as Senator FISCHER over in the Senate from Nebraska.

I support ethanol. Why?

Because it is cheaper, it is cleaner, it is homegrown, and it is a fuel that has been an economic game changer for Nebraska.

I grew up in the 1980s. I watched the farm bankruptcies. I saw what was happening in middle America, and then I saw what happened with the renaissance ushered into middle America by ethanol. I recognize that not everyone, including some of my colleagues in this Chamber, do not have the same feelings about ethanol. While I may disagree with that perspective, the beautiful thing about this bill is that it offers consumers a choice. You can choose E15, Mr. Speaker, you can choose E10, and you can choose E-zero. It is up to each and every person when they fill up at the pump.

This bill allows people to choose or not choose E15 based on their values. They may want cheaper gas, they may not. They may want higher octane, they may not. They may want to support America's farmers, or they may not. It gives everyone the choice.

That is why we need a vote on the clean E15 vote today.

This bill fixes an outdated regulatory barrier that prevents 15 percent ethanol blends. We have come a long way in fuel science, emissions data and vehicle technology in the last 40 years. The decades-old rules no longer fit current conditions.

This wasn't a proposal put together overnight. Lawmakers worked with the liquid fuels industry and farmers to come together to find a solution. Everyone wants regulatory certainty.

Nebraska has enjoyed year-round E15 due to emergency waivers. While we are thankful it has been granted for our State, we can't rely on the Federal Government every year to issue ad hoc relief.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill, and I urge its adoption.

□ 1640

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS), my good friend and a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the bill before us. Let me be clear: If this was just year-round E15, I would be a "yes," but it is not just year-round E15. It makes significant changes to definitions under the Renewable Fuel Standard that impact 80 percent of small refineries.

My district is home to the last two oil refineries in Colorado. Both of them are small refineries. Under this bill, their definition would change. They would no longer be small refineries, which means they would no longer be able to obtain relief from the RFS

compliance costs. My two refineries alone would face an impact of over \$100 million a year.

To be clear, this is a disproportionate impact on small refineries and is something that the GAO has found in a 2022 study. After years of attacks and over-regulation from ruling Democrats in Denver, we can't afford to lose essential energy infrastructure, like the two refineries in my district.

Beyond just energy security, this is a matter of affordability for Coloradans. In fact, the last time my two refineries had to temporarily shut down, gas prices spiked by \$1.40 a gallon for my constituents in Colorado.

If my refineries have to eat a \$100-plus million annual increase in their compliance costs and/or they potentially shut down, that \$1.40 a gallon becomes permanent for my constituents in Colorado. That is something that they cannot afford in perpetuity.

While I would support a clean year-round E15 authorization, that is not what this does. It has other definitions in it. I urge my colleagues to join me in "no."

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FINSTAD).

Mr. FINSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman GUTHRIE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1346, delivering on year-round, nationwide sales of E15.

As a fourth-generation corn and soybean farmer from southern Minnesota raising that fifth generation and representing 21 counties in southern Minnesota, a very strong egg-producing district, I have had many conversations with my neighbor farmers. I know by hearing what they are telling me and firsthand in my own experience as a farmer that we are facing uncertainty in our input costs and uncertainty in the global markets. We need a new domestic opportunity for our corn. E15 delivers on that.

Throughout the past several years, farm country has been forced to rely on D.C. bureaucrats granting emergency waivers to sell E15 during summer driving season.

E15 is a commonsense, win-win solution to strengthen demand for farmers, support rural economies, and provide consumers with more affordable fuel options.

Food and fuel security is also critical to our national security. I will choose reliance on my neighbors in southern Minnesota over our foreign adversaries to produce our domestic fuel supply every day of the week.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time for Congress to act. It is high time that Congress provides much-needed certainty to our fuel supply chain. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY).

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his time.

I appreciate my colleagues on both sides of this debate and where they are coming from. I understand my friends who come from States that want support for farming. We all want to make sure that we are figuring that out. We worked through the farm bill. I just think we ought to be going about this a different way.

If we need to do something to support farmers, let's have a direct conversation about it. Expanding E15 is just the wrong direction to go. It is going to harm refiners. It is going to drive up the cost of gas. I think it is going to drive up the price of energy, generally. It is, in fact, a mandate. It is an expansion of the mandate. That is what the practical effects of it will be.

Truthfully, I have no problem if you want to pull back on the Clean Air Act in terms of what it does with respect to the E15 requirement in the summer, but then let's modify the Renewable Fuel Standard.

We have created this botched system. We are making it massively difficult for refining capacity to grow in the United States. We are not actually solving the problem here. What we are doing instead is trying to put a Band-Aid on it, which expands the mandate. It doesn't fix the Renewable Fuel Standard, which is the core of the problem. It is trying to backdoor into farm subsidies while doing it on the back of our energy and gas policy.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should go to committee. This bill should be amended and debated. We shouldn't be putting it on the floor right now. It is not ready for prime time. I am going to oppose the legislation, and I hope my colleagues will, too.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. VAN ORDEN).

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Mr. Speaker, the only committee I asked to be on when I got elected to Congress was the Agriculture Committee. I came here to fight for my farmers, and that is exactly what we are doing here today.

For the last 5 years in a row, the EPA issued an emergency waiver for E15 year-round. I would argue that if you do the exact same thing 5 years in a row, it is no longer an emergency.

For the people who claim to be all-of-the-above for energy, well, guess what. E15 is a source of energy. It is domestically produced. For the people who bemoan the accountability, it is rightfully so. This is a way to save up to 30 cents a gallon of gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, this is critically important for farmers. It is critically important for consumers. I stand in very strong support of this legislation.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSMER), my good friend.

Mr. MESSMER. Mr. Speaker, we all know that farmers are facing high input costs and that commodity prices are too low. Today, I stand here in support of a policy that will bring about a sustainable solution.

The Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act is not an agriculture assistance package. It is not a mandate. Retailers have a choice. It is not an emergency payment.

This bill delivers cost savings at the pump for U.S. consumers with a promise of stability for small refiners and guaranteed profitability for the next generation of American farmers.

Don't just take it from me. Consider the appeal from hundreds of companies, manufacturers, and producer cooperatives that are pleading for this program.

The hardworking American farmer deserves certainty, and this bill delivers just that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in investing in America's farm families, in agricultural businesses, and in our beloved rural communities by supporting this important legislation.

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

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN).

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, today, we have the opportunity to save every American at the pump up to 50 cents per gallon. We know because we have proved it right in my home State of Iowa. The value of yearlong, nationwide E15 is real money in the pockets of families, communities, and our supply chain nationwide.

Today, we get to choose if we save every American family those dollars and put it back in their pockets to reinvest in their families when they fill up, or if we are going to continue to allow energy prices to strain families' budgets.

Today, we get to choose between a fuel that is grown literally right here in the United States for energy independence, or if we continue to be reliant on foreign powers and adversaries, subsidizing their ability to get fuel to the rest of the world while America does the heavy lifting.

Today, we get the chance to deliver for producers, family farmers like the 87,000 small family farmers that are building that next generation of not only feeding our country but also fueling it.

Our farmers work hard for our families. Today, we get to work hard for both families and farmers by putting this bill on the floor, the first time E15 has ever been voted on.

We defeated backroom deals in D.C. to secure this vote that will bring down costs for American families. Now, we have the chance today to finish that job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle—this is an opportunity for affordability for families,

certainty for producers, and American energy that grows right here in America. I ask for their support.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate my support for the Renewable Fuel Standard, including allowing the voluntary year-round sale of gasoline with 15 percent ethanol, known as E15, because it lowers prices for American drivers, supports farmers, and fosters investment in cleaner transportation fuel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to support this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1650

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1346, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1224, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1346) to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. PERRY. 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.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1275, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) expressing support for law enforcement officers, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1275, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 96

Whereas the brave men and women in law enforcement work tirelessly and relentlessly to safeguard the communities they are sworn to protect, serving as the backbone of public safety across our Nation;

Whereas law enforcement officers bear the critical responsibility of upholding the rule of law and maintaining the safety, stability, and public order upon which our communities depend;

Whereas law enforcement officers routinely and selflessly risk their own lives and safety to combat crime, remove dangerous and lethal drugs from our streets, and stand in defense of the most vulnerable among us;

Whereas law enforcement officers strengthen our communities through outreach, mentorship, crisis response, and countless daily acts of service that frequently go unrecognized;

Whereas, from resolving neighborhood disputes to checking in on elderly residents and guiding youth programs, officers provide a quiet and steady presence that extends far beyond traditional law enforcement duties;

Whereas rhetoric and policies from leftist activists and progressive politicians seek to defund or dismantle local police departments undermine public safety and place both officers and the communities they serve at greater risk;

Whereas sanctuary city policies that restrict cooperation with Federal immigration authorities can compel local law enforcement agencies to divert already limited resources and actively encourage resentment toward local law enforcement;

Whereas the Trump administration's focus on restoring law and order has contributed to a notable decline in homicide rates, with levels reaching among the lowest recorded in over a century;

Whereas drug overdose deaths in the United States have declined significantly, reaching their lowest levels since 2019;

Whereas violent crime rates have declined significantly in major cities across the United States; and

Whereas law enforcement officers deserve our deepest respect, unwavering support, and profound gratitude: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) appreciates and values the indispensable contributions that law enforcement provides to our communities and our country each and every day;

(2) recognizes the extraordinary sacrifice that law enforcement officers make to protect and serve their communities and their country; and

(3) expresses its profound and wholehearted support for the men and women of law enforcement.

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

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 96.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a great deal of gratitude to the men and women in law enforcement who make sacrifices every day. They miss dinners, holidays, parent-teacher conferences, sports games, performances, and celebrations with their families so that the rest of us can live safely. These brave officers are the thin blue line that stand between our communities and chaos.

For years, radical Democrats championed the defund the police movement, slashed police budgets, and demonized entire police departments while crimes skyrocketed. Murders, carjackings, and retail thefts surged. We also saw leftist rogue prosecutors utterly fail to enforce the laws and uphold their oath of office. They refused to prosecute entire categories of crime, implemented cashless bail, released violent offenders back into society, and the list goes on and on.

We have seen Democrats support sanctuary city policies and openly side with illegal immigrants over American citizens. Sanctuary jurisdictions proudly shield criminal aliens from Federal immigration authorities, regardless of the cost to the residents. Officials from these jurisdictions tie the hands of their very own police departments. We have seen time and again how these jurisdictions refuse to honor an ICE detainee, release a criminal alien back onto the streets, and then that alien commits another heinous crime. Almost one-third of the country lives in a sanctuary jurisdiction. That is roughly 100 million Americans.

Where these failed policies took hold, chaos followed. Thankfully, the Trump administration has restored law and order. Because of President Trump, the border is secure.

Because of President Trump, the homicide rate has declined an average of 21 percent in 35 major U.S. cities, reaching the lowest level recorded in over a century.

Because of President Trump, we have seen the lowest number of drug overdoses since 2019.

These historic results prove that when we enforce the law and prioritize prosecuting violent crime, American communities become safer for everyone. When law enforcement officers are empowered to do their jobs, American communities become safer for everyone. When politicians support the police instead of siding with radical activists, American communities become safer for everyone.

To every police officer watching today, America sees you. We thank you. We stand with you.

I urge my colleagues to support our brave men and women in law enforcement, reject policies that make Americans less safe, and support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose and to deplore this partisan resolution. As you just heard, H. Con. Res. 96 is another tiresome and loathsome exercise in partisan MAGA polemics.

Unlike H. Res. 1252, which was honestly written to honor law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty, and which received an overwhelming bipartisan vote in the House just a few hours ago, this nonbinding rhetorical resolution desecrates the solemnity and abandons the nonpartisanship of Police Week by scrawling a bunch of false and inflammatory anti-Democratic and pro-Trump graffiti on what has always been, until now, a simple nonpartisan resolution expressing the national consensus supporting law enforcement.

It is not difficult to write these resolutions in a way that garners widespread bipartisan support. Last year, Congress passed H. Con. Res. 30, a bipartisan resolution expressing our mutual common support for local law enforcement. The year before that, together we passed H. Res. 1213, condemning calls to defund the police and violence against law enforcement officers.

We have always strived for bipartisanship in these resolutions on Police Week to show that the whole community is together. But just as 21 Republicans voted against the Congressional Gold Medal for officers who defended this Capitol and this Chamber against rioters and insurrectionists on January 6, 2021, now, the Republicans bring forward a resolution designed not to unify but to divide.

The resolution before us invites us to endorse a tired, false, cliché-ridden partisan claim about defunding the police when, in fact, it is Democrats who have repeatedly promoted robust funding for law enforcement, while congressional Republicans, the Trump administration, and Elon Musk have cut funding for law enforcement and public safety programs that actually work as they slashed \$500 million from State and local crime-fighting and victim assistance grants and programs under the DOGE and Elon Musk's crusade against the Federal Government.

The resolution also invites us to sign on to the demonstrably false claim that the Trump administration's focus on restoring law and order has contributed to a notable decline in homicide rates. The significant decline in violent crime in major cities over the past couple of years has nothing to do with the Trump Presidency as the resolution asserts and everything to do with the

Democrats they denounce and the Biden Presidency's investment in State and local law enforcement.

In fact, homicides skyrocketed during the first Trump administration, and the historic nationwide decrease in violent crime began during the Biden administration and was the result of Democratic-led investments in public safety through both the American Rescue Plan, which House Republicans unanimously opposed, and the historic Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

Thanks to these sweeping investments in public safety and our common security, cities leveraged Federal funds and innovation to pursue a variety of effective programs to combat violent crime, with some cities recording the lowest murder rate since the 1960s, or even before that.

□ 1700

Madam Speaker, instead of restoring law and order, as the resolution claims, the current administration has systematically undermined law enforcement and jeopardized public safety without any objections from the party that claims to back the blue. The administration canceled millions in critical grant funding that supported State and local law enforcement. It reassigned more than 25,000 Federal agents tasked with fighting organized crime, terrorism, and human trafficking away from their missions in order to do immigration roundups.

The administration invaded American cities with a lawless paramilitary force, unleashing chaos and deadly violence on U.S. citizens, like Renee Good and Alex Pretti, under the pretense of fighting the worst of the worst. The administration stopped enforcing the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, announced that in its first week in office.

It fired dozens of experienced Justice Department lawyers and FBI agents just because they participated in the largest criminal investigation and prosecution in American history against the people who attacked this Chamber and the Capitol and the Congress and the Vice President on January 6, 2021.

This administration has also pardoned dozens of white-collar criminals and fraudsters, including the former President of Honduras, Juan Orlando Hernandez, an international narcotrafficker who brought 800,000 pounds of cocaine into America, saying he would shove it up the noses of the gringos, and he was going off to jail for decades when President Trump decided to pardon him for reasons unknown.

He has released people from prison from January 6 who went on to commit serious new crimes against our people, such as Mr. Johnson who got out because of his Trump pardon and went on and sexually assaulted two 12-year-old children and now has been sentenced to life in prison because of that. Those kids' lives have been irrevocably altered by the mass pardon of all of these people that included armed robbers,

violent felons, domestic abusers, you name it, and a lot of them are back at it right now.

Madam Speaker, the administration has repeatedly threatened to cut off funding for State and local law enforcement in numerous jurisdictions and attempted to commandeer State and local police officers and resources to do the Federal Government's job at State and local expense. All of this compromises public safety and is an insult to the officers who work to keep us safe.

Republicans in Congress have done nothing to put the brakes on Donald Trump's weak-on-crime agenda, and we were going to give him a chance. The fact that he has 34 Federal criminal counts that he is convicted of himself doesn't mean he had to be soft on crime, but he is soft on crime, and we are not going to help the Republicans pull the wool over America's eyes. We are not going to do that to salvage their leader who is sinking like a stone in public opinion polls for his illegal tariffs, his unconstitutional war, his soaring inflation, and runaway corruption throughout the government.

Donald Trump has a staph infection, and America can see it every day. House Republican appropriators recently rejected the Trump administration's proposal to increase ATF's budget by 4 percent and agent head count from 2,400 to 3,000 agents in the coming fiscal year. Instead, they want to cut ATF's budget by \$285 million, which would leave ATF with even fewer resources to support State and local police as they work to prevent and investigate and prosecute gun crimes.

Meaningless polemics against leftist activists and progressive politicians have no place in a resolution purportedly meant to honor law enforcement. This is the first time that any majority has fallen into the political trap, but they can't help themselves because they are so desperate because of the plummeting poll numbers of Donald Trump and his administration.

Now that you raise it, it is worth noting that Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee have actually voted to defund the police in the 119th Congress. H.R. 7640, the Shut Down Sanctuary Policies Act of 2026, would strip Federal funding from jurisdictions that have laws placing any limits on State and local law enforcement officers' involvement in Federal immigration matters despite the fact that immigration enforcement is the job of the Federal Government and not an unfunded mandate that can be put on the States and cities and localities.

All of this undermines public safety. I cannot support this resolution, which lies about Republicans and this administration's real record on crime and public safety. The observance of National Police Week and Peace Officers Memorial Day marks a time of solemn remembrance when our Nation should come together to honor the courage, sacrifice, and dedication of our law en-

forcement officers and personnel, and promote awareness of their service to our communities.

Let's stand united and reject this shameful effort to inject divisive partisan politics into this resolution and this week.

If you want something that can bring us together, please support the bill that I introduced today to create a fund to compensate the law enforcement officers who defended the Republic, this Capitol, the Congress, the Vice President against that violent attack on January 6, 2021. They continue to suffer the physical, medical, psychological effects of that atrocious attack.

The Trump administration wrote a check for nearly \$5 million to the family of Ashli Babbitt despite the fact that there were two different investigations which determined that the police had acted reasonably, lawfully, and honorably. Yet, they just gave them a check for \$5 million.

What do the families of the officers who defended our lives get? So far they have done nothing. We are introducing legislation to make that happen, and I hope everybody in this body who really believes that law enforcement should be stood by and should be defended in their work will get with us on this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, you know, when I hear the term "national consensus," what seems to be national consensus is that the Democrats were the ones that promoted defund the police. I have here a list of cities who cut a total of \$1.71 billion to promote police. They did that because they wanted to defund the police.

I hear that there is a consensus bill. The Democrats couldn't even get a unanimous vote on the bill we just voted on just an hour or so ago. I mean, it is just hokum. It is just flat out hokum.

Well, the national consensus is that Democrats are well-known to have supported the defund the police movement.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUNN), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. NUNN of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman BIGGS for helping us bring this resolution forward.

Today, I rise for National Police Week where thousands of officers and their families are in Washington, D.C., right now for memorial services, honoring the men and women who have given everything in the line of duty.

I will start by honoring one of those Iowans, our own, who lost his life while serving in my community. Officer Phoukham Tran was with the Des Moines Police Department, and he lost

his life when he was hit while serving in the line of duty by a drunk driver outside of the Iowa State Fair. He served for more than three decades with the Des Moines Police Department. And while he succumbed to his injuries, his legacy of service for our community made us all recognize how much safer we are based on what he did for all of us.

He is only 1 of 198 officers honored at the Iowa Peace Officers Memorial in downtown Des Moines, sacrificing their lives for a safer community, and this week we honor all of those losses, and we remember each of those families, and our communities are better because of what they did for us.

These are the heroes that we recognize this week. This is their resolution, and that is what this is about. The officers who sacrificed their lives in the line of duty are the loved ones who have served, as well as the loved ones who are left behind, and the officers who continue serving our communities every day despite the loss of a friend, a comrade, and a wingman.

Unfortunately, there is a reality, as Mr. BIGGS has stated, that some elected officials, including some here in Congress and across this country, have refused to honor or even recognize their sacrifice and service by standing with our law enforcement.

Whether it is the radical idea of defunding the police or the self-described sanctuary cities, these policies are a choice, a choice that undermines the very communities they are serving, a choice that puts officer safety at risk every single day.

□ 1710

I am proud to say that my State of Iowa has resoundingly rejected these policies. In Iowa, we led the Back the Blue Act that increased penalties for violent crimes, particularly those against officers, and increased law enforcement pay. That is truly how you stand with law enforcement.

We also banned sanctuary policies back in 2018.

Just last year, Iowa increased penalties for assaulting a law enforcement officer, including a mandatory minimum for a violent offense.

These policies in Iowa have led to a historic decline in crime. As noted, we now have the lowest homicide rate in over 125 years. Fewer murders are good for every American.

Iowa has made its position clear, and now Congress has the opportunity to do the same. The good work being done on the Judiciary Committee is executing on exactly that.

Last year alone, sanctuary city jurisdictions declined almost 18,000 ICE detainer requests, many against violent offenders and habitual offenders who were turned back onto the streets. Nearly 18,000 times, local officials chose not to allow the police to cooperate with Federal law enforcement and released these individuals back into the communities, making not only

local officers' jobs harder but those at the Federal level, as well.

I know this much is true: When we support local law enforcement, it works, and we have proven it. Homicide rates are the lowest in over a century. Drug overdose deaths are at their lowest in over a decade. Federal law enforcement is working alongside departments in States like Iowa and so many others to remove real public safety threats.

That happens when we stand with law enforcement. That is what this week is about: honoring those who have fallen, those who continue to serve, and the communities that stand with our men and women on that thin blue line.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH), who is the ranking member of the Crime and Federal Government Surveillance Subcommittee.

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for giving me time to speak on the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 96, which does a disservice to our law enforcement officers by using them simply in a political ploy.

This resolution takes cheap shots and spreads misinformation while not doing a single thing to help law enforcement or improve public safety, which should be our goal this and every National Police Week.

I will not repeat the misleading statements and half-truths in this resolution, but I will actually present some facts today.

It is a fact that it was the first Trump administration when our country experienced the largest increase in homicides ever recorded in a single year.

It is a fact that violent crimes, especially homicides, have been declining for nearly 4 years, beginning under the Biden administration, long before this administration took office.

It is a fact that this historic, yearslong effort to decrease crime began under a Democratic President and Democratic control of Congress, which allowed us to pass unprecedented investments in law enforcement and public safety through the American Rescue Plan Act and the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

It is a fact that cities and States across the country, many of them led by Democratic mayors and Democratic Governors, used that funding to strengthen their approach to public safety by investing in their local law enforcement, but also in education, community centers, community violence intervention, social workers, mental health and substance abuse services, and more.

It is a fact that these efforts to improve public safety have allowed many

cities to achieve the fewest murders since the 1960s or even earlier.

It is a fact that the Trump administration has repeatedly eliminated funding for public safety programs that we know work, including clawing back \$500 million in public safety grants that were already awarded.

On top of that, the Trump administration has diverted more than 25,000 law enforcement officers to immigration enforcement and away from their jobs of investigating gun violence, drug trafficking, sex crimes, and other major offenses, leading criminal prosecutions to fall to their lowest points in decades.

This resolution does not invest a single dollar in effective policing. It does not equip police with modern technology to help them simply solve a crime. It does not invest in innovative, collaborative approaches to public safety. It does not provide assistance to help law enforcement agencies address the continuing crisis that they are facing in the recruitment and retention of law enforcement officers. It does not do anything to make our police officers safer on the job and more likely to return home to their families safe and sound at the end of their shifts.

That is what we should be doing here in the House during National Police Week. When Democrats controlled the House, that is exactly what we did. We passed bipartisan bills that were signed into law and are still improving law enforcement officer safety and wellness, and strengthening public safety. These bills include the Protecting America's First Responders Act, the Public Safety Officer Support Act, the COPS Counseling Act, and the Law Enforcement De-Escalation Training Act.

Make no mistake, my opposition to this resolution is not opposition to the statements in this resolution that we can all agree on, such as that our law enforcement officers work tirelessly to protect our communities. Indeed, I was proud to vote in favor of the bipartisan resolution that we actually passed today in support of law enforcement and honoring those who died while serving their communities, including my own.

Yet, I must oppose this legislation that seeks to score political points instead of investing in law enforcement and in our communities.

Madam Speaker, as the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Crime and Federal Government Surveillance, I urge my colleagues to stand with me in opposing this resolution and to instead work with me on bills that will actually support law enforcement and improve public safety.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it is interesting to think back on 2020 as being the measuring line that you are coming from because, when you remember, that is

the year of George Floyd. That is the year of CHAZ, CHOP, and rioting, wholesale violence, the Portland courthouse under siege, and the defund police movement, even by some across the aisle in Congress.

What has happened since President Trump has come in? Violent crime rates have declined significantly in major cities across the United States. That is what this resolution says at one point. Let's get here.

Do they deny the drop? No, they don't deny the drop. They just don't like the fact that Donald Trump gets some credit for it. The TDS has been on display.

The numbers are clear. Why does falling crime under renewed law and order priorities threaten the worldview of Democrats? It shouldn't.

In Chicago, for instance, in 2025, homicides plunged 29 percent after Donald Trump was elected, from 587 in 2024 to 417 last year.

In Columbus, Ohio, in the same period, rapes dropped 39 percent, from 1,116 down to 678.

In Houston, ag assaults fell 17 percent, from 18,590 to 15,378.

Robberies in L.A. dropped 15.3 percent, from 8,593 to 7,278.

New York City recorded the fewest shooting victims and shooting incidents in its entire recorded history in 2025.

Democrats spent years telling us that backing the police, enforcing laws, and rejecting soft-on-crime nonsense wouldn't work, that it was racist, outdated, or somehow made things worse. Yet, the American people can see the results with their own eyes—safer streets, fewer victims. That is what is specifically stated in this resolution.

What don't they like about it? It mentions Donald J. Trump. It is that simple. They should be coming along with us.

Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1720

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

The worst Congress in modern American history cannot even write a resolution praising law enforcement that maintains bipartisan support—something that every other Congress, Democratic or Republican, has been able to do—because they are so desperate to cover up their miserable record.

The Trump administration has done nothing more to improve public safety than it has done to lower the ruinous inflation they unleashed on us with their illegal tariffs or to open up the Strait of Hormuz, which was closed only because of the illegal war Trump has already spent \$29 billion of our money on.

Well, our colleagues have some very fine rhetoric about how much they love public safety. So why don't we look at their fiscal year 2027 budget proposal. They won't fess up to the fact that

they just slashed \$500 million out of local and State crime fighting and victim assistance grants, but let's talk about the future.

Well, what does their fiscal year 2027 budget proposal say? It proposes significant funding cuts for grant programs under the Office on Violence Against Women, including a \$14 million cut to transitional housing grants and a \$15 million cut to legal assistance grants to help survivors and their children.

They want to cut 62.1 percent, nearly a half a billion dollars from the discretionary budget request for COPS, which would translate into complete elimination of the anti-methamphetamine task forces, the anti-heroin task forces, the Community Policing Development Project, de-escalation training, and the dramatic reduction in STOP School Violence, and other crime-fighting projects.

So you are talking about defunding the police and defunding criminal justice. That is what their proposal is for next year.

They want to cut millions of dollars from successful programs to fund the Office on Violence Against Women, of course. For example, they want to cut millions from the Financial Assistance to Victims Program. They want to cut from consolidated youth-oriented programming, access to sexual assault nurse exams \$12 million and on and on.

That is their budget.

They want to cut \$538 million from the Byrne Discretionary Community Project Grants in the Department of Justice budget. They want to eliminate the Community Based Violence Intervention and Prevention Initiative whose great successes they want to take credit for. They want to cut \$50 million from that.

They want to cut \$17 million in grants from the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes community policing program. And it goes on and on. You don't have to go and make up a bunch of mirages and ghosts about defunding the police. That is in their budget for next year. They want to dismantle one criminal justice program after another.

But of course, they want to increase the military budget to \$1.5 trillion, which they all leapt up to support even before hearing about what specific military projects and arms projects were contained in it. They want \$1.5 trillion for that budget as they continue to drive our budget deficit up to the heavens. They have added already more than \$3.5 trillion to the debt. So it is fiscally irresponsible, and it is irresponsible from the standpoint of public safety.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I said last time I was prepared to close. I assumed that was his closing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman reserve?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reserved the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. Is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I am prepared to keep going. I am not afraid to keep the debate going. Whatever the gentleman pleases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona reserve?

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

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

The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, which they propose to slash and essentially dismantle, is responsible for advancing the practice of community policing at the State, local, territorial, and Tribal levels. The COPS Office awards grants to hire community policing professionals, that is something that they propose to gut.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close. He seems to be in a hurry.

Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 11 minutes remaining.

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

Look, it is unfortunate that we have reached this place, Madam Speaker. Every prior Congress has been able to honor the police on Law Enforcement Week. Yet, they insisted on scribbling polemical, partisan graffiti, attacking Democrats and Progressives and so on, using a nonbinding ceremonial resolution to try to pick a political fight, which is not very wise given their miserable record in terms of crime fighting.

One of the first things they did was they said they were no longer going to enforce the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Then they gutted anti-terrorism and counterintelligence programs in the Department of Justice. They pardoned 1,600 or 1,500 Proud Boys, Oath Keepers, Klan members, violent rioters, and insurrectionists from January 6. Even his own Vice President urged him—or said he supposed the President was not going to pardon those who had committed violence, but he pardoned everybody.

Prior to Donald Trump, you know, the way the Presidents did it was there was a pardon office in the Department of Justice, and they would look at very specific requests and applications that came in for a pardon, and they would try to judge whether the person was truly reformed, truly rehabilitated.

Every President up until Trump insisted that they actually pay off their

finances and pay restitution to their victims. But no, not President Trump. He said: I am going to take all of them together. I am going to pardon them en masse, 1,600 of them. Some of them were armed robbers, domestic felons, violent assaulters. Some maybe it was a first offense, but they were all mixed in together, and then they got their pardon, and they were forgiven for all of their fines and all of the restitution that they owed to their victims.

Then the President continued that rampage with all of the white-collar criminals and fraudsters and drug dealers he pardoned. Some of them owed tens of millions or hundreds of millions of dollars. It was all forgiven. That money was, therefore, transferred from the victims of these crimes right back to the criminals. This is the person that they want to praise as being tough on crime and such a great law-and-order President.

We were willing to look—aside from the fact that he had 34 criminal convictions of his own and was an adjudicated sexual assailant under the civil law of New York—and say maybe he will actually invest in fighting crime. But no, it has been quite the opposite. He has been doing everything in his power to undermine criminal law enforcement. Now they want to take credit for what the mayors and Governors have been doing for several years now, which is causing a dramatic decrease in crime by investing in all of the programs that they have pulled the plug on.

They just slashed more than \$500 million from Department of Justice grants going out to the States and the cities. You want to look for weak on crime? You want to look for defunding the police? Look no further. You found it in the Trump administration. Elon Musk and DOGE came right over to the Department of Justice and slashed \$500 million from program moneys that were appropriated by Congress and programmed by the Department of Justice, and they said: Stop the delivery of this money. We are going to cut off these grants.

The reason they don't say anything about it is because they know it is true. We heard all about it in the Judiciary Committee. That is the real track record.

Now we see in their budget request for next year they want to continue to ravage the crime-fighting budget of the country.

Why did President Trump pardon the former President of Honduras who brought 400 tons of cocaine into America? Why? He brought in 800,000 pounds of cocaine. He said: We are going to shove it up the nostrils of the gringos. That is what he said. And Donald Trump pardoned him, saving him from decades in Federal prison.

□ 1730

How come they are not talking about that?

We wouldn't have brought any of it up if they had just come forward with

the same consensus, bipartisan resolution that we have always had. But no, they wanted to pick a partisan fight.

Well, they picked the wrong people, because we know what has actually been happening. We know who is standing strong for law and order and who is bringing us down into the mud of lawlessness and authoritarianism in the country.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to my colleague for a moment if he wants to respond about the pardon of the former President of Honduras, whether that is something that our colleagues on that side of the aisle support or not. I don't know if he is interested in responding to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland yields.

Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I was just offering to yield if he wanted to respond to that question, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I reclaim my time.

We consider the safety of the people to be the highest law that there is, along with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Unfortunately, this administration has been trampling all of it. We saw what happened in Minneapolis where we had U.S. citizens shot down at pointblank range in broad daylight for exercising their First Amendment rights, the rights contained in the First Amendment of our Constitution, shot down in cold blood.

Then we saw their then-Attorney General, Ms. Bondi, come out and say that these people were engaged in acts of terror and had been threatening people, which was a lie, and she refused the opportunity to apologize for what she had done.

There will be a real investigation. There will be a real investigation of those homicides. There were only, up to that point, three homicides, three murders that took place in Minneapolis, in Minnesota, up until that point of the year, and two of them were committed by Federal agents, two of the three. Well, that is a pretty powerful statement about the law-and-order administration that they want to praise in this completely partisan resolution that they want to push through the House of Representatives today.

So the Constitution is under attack, right? They promulgate executive orders telling thousands of lawyers at different law firms they cannot enter Federal buildings, including Federal courthouses, which makes it difficult to practice law.

They have used their power of the Federal Communications Commission

to force them to settle completely bogus, frivolous lawsuits that the President has brought against media companies. Then they have installed their minders, their little spies, into TV networks, like something out of Putin's Russia or Orban's Hungary.

They have been systematically undermining the free press in the country. They are attacking the Constitution, and they are attacking the Bill of Rights.

It is so bad that even their stacked-and-packed, gerrymandered Supreme Court has had to strike them down for things like their illegal, unconstitutional tariffs, their global trade war against the world, which has been ruinous for our economy, compounded only by his illegal, constitutional war on Iran where he usurped the power of Congress to declare war.

James Madison said it had to be the Representatives of the people to declare war, not a President, not a Vice President, not Tulsi Gabbard or their leaky chat group. No, it has got to be the Representatives of the people, because the kings were constantly plunging their people into wars of conceit and vanity and imperial plunder.

They have created lawlessness from the highest levels of the government all the way down to the streets, where they are pulling the plug on Federal grants to help State and local governments fight crime, while they pardon narcotrafickers, white-collar fraudsters, people scamming American citizens.

So we are going to have to try to restore real law and order in the country, and that begins at the top. That begins with the Presidency, and it begins with everybody who is in government.

I wish that we could just go ahead and honor law enforcement without all of the partisan graffiti they have scrawled all over the resolution. We would show just as before, you have an overwhelming vote when you do it the right way, and we honor the people who have served us.

I invite our friends to join us in honoring and standing by the men and women who defended us on January 6. One hundred fifty of them were wounded, injured, hospitalized, disfigured, and disabled. Some of them were disabled and forced out of police work because of the injuries inflicted by the mob that came here.

They have given nearly \$5 million to Ashley Babbitt's family, despite the fact that two different investigations showed that the police had acted reasonably and lawfully in what they did.

How about millions of dollars to the families of the police officers who lost their lives as a result of that violence? Let's show for real that we are committed to law enforcement by standing by the police officers who defend us every single day.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remain-

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). The gentleman from Arizona has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We heard a lot about pardons. It is not mentioned at all in this resolution.

But it is real fun, you know, when you think about pardons, and I have got article after article here. There is a whole stack of them right here of the more than 3,000 people that President Biden pardoned, some massive fraudsters who never paid their restitution. Odd, isn't it?

Quite frankly, Joe Biden was going on a pardon-issuing spree to such an extent he even pardoned a few Members of Congress. How about that. That is pretty interesting to me.

Let's see. If you didn't know what was in this resolution, as most Americans don't and anybody watching, you would think this is all about how heinous of an individual Donald J. Trump, our President, is. You saw that TDS on display.

But I am going to do a favor for everybody. I am going to go over the 11 clauses in this resolution that honor police officers.

By the way, Democrats couldn't even get a unanimous vote when the resolution we just voted on listed fallen officers. They think we are creating partisanship with this. That is not the case.

Facts are stubborn things. They don't want to honor police. They were the party of defund the police.

Let's take a look at the clauses.

Number one: "Whereas the brave men and women in law enforcement work tirelessly and relentlessly to safeguard the communities they are sworn to protect, serving as the backbone of public safety across our Nation."

What do my colleagues on the other side find controversial here? What is it? Do they deny that officers work tirelessly? Do they deny that communities depend on them? Because if you can't even affirm this, your problem isn't with the resolution. It is with reality.

Number two: "Whereas law enforcement officers bear the critical responsibility of upholding the rule of law and maintaining the safety, stability, and public order upon which our communities depend."

What offends them, the rule of law part or the idea that safety and stability actually matter? They never touched on this.

Number three: "Whereas law enforcement officers routinely and selflessly risk their own lives and safety to combat crime, remove dangerous and lethal drugs from our streets, and stand in defense of the most vulnerable among us."

What is their objection? What is their objection? Do they think law enforcement don't risk their lives, that drugs aren't lethal or that the vulnerable don't deserve that shield? They

should tell the widows and orphans of fallen officers why this fact bothers them.

Number four: "Whereas law enforcement officers strengthen our communities through outreach, mentorship, crisis response, and countless daily acts of service that frequently go unrecognized."

Which of these acts of service do they reject? The mentorship? The crisis intervention?

Number five: "Whereas from resolving neighborhood disputes to checking in on elderly residents and guiding youth programs, officers provide a quiet and steady presence that extends far beyond traditional law enforcement duties."

Is it the neighborhood dispute resolution that you oppose or the very idea of a steady, positive police presence?

□ 1740

What is it that you oppose?

Number six: "Whereas rhetoric and policies from leftist activists and progressive politicians seek to defund or dismantle local police departments, undermine public safety, and place both officers and the communities they serve at greater risk."

I thought this was your goal. For years many of you and your allies championed it in the streets. You posted on official social media accounts. You introduced legislation and redirected budgets away from law enforcement. The defund the police movement wasn't some fever dream. It was your rallying cry.

Do you deny now that that rhetoric ever existed?

Do you deny that progressive politicians and leftist activists aggressively pushed these policies in cities across the country?

Do you deny the explosion in violent crime?

You can't spend years trying to kneecap, starve, and demonize the police and then act outraged when a resolution dares to call it what it was: a dangerous failure that hurt people.

Number seven: "Whereas sanctuary city policies that restrict cooperation with Federal immigration authorities can compel local law enforcement agencies to divert already limited resources and actively encourage resentment toward local law enforcement."

Again, I thought this was your goal. We have heard it loud and clear from dozens of your own politicians from Minnesota to Boston, California and beyond, people proudly declaring they will not cooperate with Federal immigration enforcement. They will shield the illegal aliens, even the worst of the worst: murderers, rapists, and gang members. They will keep them out on the streets rather than let ICE do its job.

Do they deny these sanctuary policies exist and deliberately restrict cooperation with Federal authorities?

Almost one-third of Americans live in sanctuary jurisdictions. You can't

champion policies that protect criminals over cops and then act shocked when the resolution says sanctuary policies sabotage law enforcement at every level.

"Whereas the Trump administration's focus on restoring law and order has contributed to a notable decline in homicide rates, with levels reaching among the lowest recorded in over a century."

Data is data, and facts are facts. A report by the Council on Criminal Justice says this: Homicides in 35 major cities declined by 21 percent from 2024 to 2025. Just in Washington, D.C., President Trump is protecting our citizens from failed progressive governance. We have seen incredible drops in violence. Homicides are down 52 percent. Sex abuse is down 48 percent, robbery is down 23 percent, and vehicle theft is down 56 percent. All crime overall is down 25 percent, and Washington, D.C., is on pace for roughly 42 murders this year, the lowest rates since at least 1930. Compare that to the 274 murders in 2023.

Number nine: "Whereas drug overdose deaths in the United States have declined significantly, reaching their lowest levels since 2019."

Which part of that is fake news to you? The decline? The significance? Or is it the timing as enforcement and border focus tighten?

Under Biden administration's catastrophic open-border policies, fentanyl poured across the southern border like never before, over 100,000 deaths, killing tens of thousands. That wasn't an accident. It was a predictable deadly result in prioritizing illegal immigration over American lives.

Now with the Trump administration's renewed focus on securing the border, cracking down on traffickers and backing law enforcement, the body count is falling. Lives are being saved. We are reversing that damage.

They should own their failure or at least get out of the way while we clean it up.

Number 11: "Whereas law enforcement officers deserve our deepest respect, unwavering support, and profound gratitude."

Let me ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: If you vote against this resolution, are you voting against gratitude for these men and women who deserve our grateful attitudes and thankfulness?

Explain it.

Mr. Speaker, he is out of order. He knows he is getting whipped, and that is why he is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is out of order. The gentleman from Maryland has not been recognized.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. BIGGS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, that is a perfect example of what happens when the Democrats cannot answer for their policies that have wrecked cities and demeaned police of-

ficers. They have to be rude and interrupt. They can't sit silent because they know that they are profoundly responsible for the results of their policies.

I want them to explain to every officer watching right now, explain to their families, and explain to their spouses who lost a partner and the parentless children and tell them why basic appreciation for the people who risk their lives is somehow too much to ask.

Tell them why they don't deserve respect. Tell them why they don't deserve support.

After everything, after your defund movement, you cheered. After the sanctuary policies you defended and you continue to defend, after the crime waves your ideology unleashed, and after watching this country bleed for years under your failed experiments of policies, you can't bring yourself to say a simple thank you.

Enough. The American people are done with your excuses. They are done watching you demonize the only people standing between them and anarchy.

We support our police. We will back the blue, and we will pass this resolution to send one unmistakable message: In America, law enforcement officers have friends, they have allies, and they have the unwavering gratitude of a grateful nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to vote to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 1275, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution and the preamble.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. RASKIN. 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.

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:

The motion to recommit H.R. 1346;
Passage of H.R. 1346, if ordered;
Adoption of H. Con. Res. 96; and
Motions to suspend the rules and agree to:

H. Res. 1251; and

H. Res. 1259.

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

NATIONWIDE CONSUMER AND FUEL RETAILER CHOICE ACT OF 2025

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 1346) to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid Vapor Pressure under that Act, and for other purposes, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 112, nays 309, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

YEAS—112

Ansari	Fulcher	Nadler
Balint	Garamendi	Neguse
Beyer	Garcia (CA)	Nehls
Biggs (AZ)	Golden (ME)	Norcross
Biggs (SC)	Goldman (NY)	Norman
Boebert	Gosar	Ocasio-Cortez
Brecheen	Green, Al (TX)	Ogles
Burchett	Grijalva	Olzewski
Burlison	Hageman	Pallone
Cammack	Harder (CA)	Palmer
Casar	Harris (MD)	Perez
Castro (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Cisneros	Himes	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Hoyle (OR)	Pingree
Cline	Huffman	Pou
Cloud	Jackson (IL)	Pressley
Clyde	Jayapal	Raskin
Conaway	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Courtney	Kamlager-Dove	Roy
Crane	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
Crow	Latimer	Schrier
DeGette	Lee (PA)	Self
DeLauro	Liccardo	Sewell
Deluzio	Luna	Simon
DeSaulnier	Mace	Steube
Dexter	Massie	Subramanyam
Dingell	Matsui	Sykes
Doggett	McBride	Tiffany
Donalds	McGovern	Tlaib
Downing	Menefee	Torres (NY)
Elfreth	Menendez	Van Dwyne
Espallat	Meng	Vargas
Fields	Mfume	Vasey
Fine	Mills	Velázquez
Fletcher	Min	Walkinshaw
Friedman	Morelle	Wasserman
Frost	Moskowitz	Schultz
Fry	Mullin	

NAYS—309

Adams	Bonamici	Comer
Aderholt	Bost	Correa
Aguiar	Boyle (PA)	Costa
Alford	Bresnahan	Craig
Allen	Brown	Crank
Amo	Brownley	Crawford
Amodei (NV)	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Arrington	Budzinski	Cuellar
Auchincloss	Bynum	Daids (KS)
Babin	Calvert	Davidson
Bacon	Carbajal	Davis (IL)
Baird	Carey	Davis (NC)
Balderson	Carson	De La Cruz
Barr	Carter (GA)	Dean (PA)
Barragán	Carter (LA)	DelBene
Barrett	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais
Baumgartner	Case	Diaz-Balart
Bean (FL)	Casten	Edwards
Beatty	Castor (FL)	Ellzey
Begich	Chu	Emmer
Bell	Ciscomani	Escobar
Bentz	Clark (MA)	Estes
Bera	Cleaver	Evans (CO)
Bergman	Clyburn	Evans (PA)
Bice	Cohen	Ezell
Bilirakis	Cole	Fallon
Bishop	Collins	Fedorchak

Feenstra	LaHood	Rose
Figures	LaLota	Rouzer
Finstad	Landsman	Ruiz
Fischbach	Langworthy	Rulli
Fitzgerald	Larson (CT)	Rutherford
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Ryan
Fleischmann	Lawler	Salazar
Flood	Lee (FL)	Salinas
Fong	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
Foster	Levin	Scalise
Foushee	Lieu	Schakowsky
Fox	Lofgren	Schmidt
Frankel, Lois	Loudermilk	Schneider
Franklin, Scott	Lucas	Scholten
Fuller	Luttrell	Schweikert
Garbarino	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Garcia (IL)	Mackenzie	Scott, Austin
Garcia (TX)	Magaziner	Sessions
Gill (TX)	Malliotakis	Sherman
Gillen	Maloy	Shreve
Gimenez	Mann	Simpson
Goldman (TX)	Mannion	Smith (MO)
Gonzalez, V.	Mast	Smith (NE)
Gooden	McBath	Smith (NJ)
Goodlander	McCaul	Smith (WA)
Gottheimer	McClain	Smucker
Graves	McClain Delaney	Sorensen
Gray	McClellan	Soto
Griffith	McClintock	Spartz
Grothman	McCollum	Stansbury
Guest	McCormick	Stanton
Guthrie	McDonald Rivet	Stauber
Hamadeh (AZ)	McDowell	Steil
Haridopolos	McGarvey	Stevens
Harrigan	McGuire	Strickland
Harris (NC)	McIver	Strong
Harshbarger	Meeks	Stutzman
Hayes	Mejia	Suozzi
Hern (OK)	Messmer	Takano
Hill (AR)	Meuser	Taylor
Hinson	Miller (IL)	Tenney
Horsford	Miller (OH)	Thanedar
Houchin	Miller (WV)	Thompson (CA)
Houlahan	Miller-Meeks	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Moolenaar	Thompson (PA)
Hudson	Moore (AL)	Timmons
Huizenga	Moore (NC)	Titus
Hurd (CO)	Moore (UT)	Tokuda
Issa	Moore (WI)	Tonko
Ivey	Moore (WV)	Torres (CA)
Moran	Moran	Trahan
Morrison	Morrison	Tran
Mrvan	Mrvan	Turner (OH)
Murphy	Murphy	Underwood
Neal	Neal	Valadao
Newhouse	Newhouse	Van Drew
Nunn (IA)	Nunn (IA)	Van Epps
Obernolte	Obernolte	Van Orden
Omar	Omar	Vasquez
Onder	Onder	Vindman
Owens	Owens	Wagner
Panetta	Panetta	Walberg
Pappas	Pappas	Waters
Patronis	Patronis	Watson Coleman
Pelosi	Pelosi	Weber (TX)
Pettersen	Pettersen	Webster (FL)
Pfizer	Pfizer	Westerman
Pocan	Pocan	Whitesides
Quigley	Quigley	Wied
Ramirez	Ramirez	Williams (GA)
Randall	Randall	Williams (TX)
Reschenthaler	Reschenthaler	Wilson (SC)
Riley (NY)	Riley (NY)	Wittman
Rivas	Rivas	Womack
Rogers (AL)	Rogers (AL)	Yakym
Rogers (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Crockett	Kean	Moulton
Dunn (FL)	Leger Fernandez	Stefanik
Gomez	Letlow	Wilson (FL)

□ 1818

Messrs. JEFFRIES, AMO, Ms. GILLEN, Messrs. BAUMGARTNER, CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. McIVER, Ms. SALAZAR, Mmes. RAMIREZ, HAYES, Messrs. BENTZ, FIGURES, WITTMAN, WIED, SMITH of Washington, Ms. PETTERSEN, Messrs. JAMES, PANETTA, Mses. LOFGREN, GOODLANDER, Messrs. RILEY of New York, McCLINTOCK, Ms. SCHOLTEN, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Messrs. CROW, STEUBE, MASSIE, Mrs. LUNA, Mses. SIMON, CLARKE of New York, Messrs. MULLIN, CISNEROS, MILLS, Ms. MATSUI, Messrs. GOSAR, and WALKINSHAW changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 203, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 164]

YEAS—218

Aguiar	Garcia (TX)	Messmer
Alford	Gillen	Meuser
Allen	Gimenez	Miller (IL)
Amodei (NV)	Gonzalez, V.	Miller (OH)
Auchincloss	Gooden	Miller (WV)
Bacon	Goodlander	Miller-Meeks
Baird	Gottheimer	Moolenaar
Balderson	Graves	Moore (NC)
Barr	Grothman	Moore (WI)
Barragán	Guest	Moore (WV)
Barrett	Guthrie	Morrison
Baumgartner	Haridopolos	Mrvan
Beatty	Harris (NC)	Murphy
Begich	Hayes	Newhouse
Bell	Hinson	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Horsford	Obernolte
Bergman	Houchin	Omar
Bice	Hoyer	Owens
Biggs (SC)	Hudson	Pallone
Bilirakis	Huizenga	Panetta
Bishop	Jack	Pappas
Boebert	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Bost	James	Pfizer
Boyle (PA)	Jeffries	Pocan
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Quigley
Buchanan	Johnson (TX)	Ramirez
Budzinski	Jordan	Reschenthaler
Bynum	Joyce (OH)	Riley (NY)
Carbajal	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Carey	Kaptur	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Kelly (IL)	Rose
Carter (LA)	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Casten	Kelly (PA)	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kennedy (NY)	Ryan
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Salazar
Cleaver	Kiggans (VA)	Salinas
Clyburn	Kiley (CA)	Schakowsky
Collins	Krishnamoorthi	Schmidt
Comer	LaHood	Schneider
Correa	LaLota	Scholten
Craig	Landsman	Scott (VA)
Crenshaw	Langworthy	Scott, Austin
Cuellar	Latta	Sessions
Daids (KS)	Lawler	Sewell
Davidson	Lee (FL)	Shreve
Davis (IL)	Lee (NV)	Smith (MO)
Davis (NC)	Levin	Smith (NE)
De La Cruz	Lieu	Smucker
Edwards	Lucas	Sorensen
Ellzey	Mackenzie	Soto
Emmer	Magaziner	Spartz
Estes	Malliotakis	Stanton
Ezell	Mann	Stauber
Fallon	Mannion	Steil
Fedorchak	Massie	Stevens
Feenstra	Mast	Strong
Figures	McBath	Stutzman
Finstad	McClain	Suozzi
Fischbach	McClain Delaney	Sykes
Fletcher	McClellan	Taylor
Flood	McCollum	Tenney
Foster	McDonald Rivet	Thanedar
Franklin, Scott	McDowell	Thompson (CA)
Garbarino	McGarvey	Thompson (MS)
Garcia (IL)	Meeks	Thompson (PA)

Tiffany
Timmons
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Tran
Turner (OH)

Underwood
Van Epps
Van Orden
Vasquez
Veasey
Vindman
Wagner
Walberg

Weber (TX)
Wied
Williams (GA)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Yakym

NAYS—203

Adams
Aderholt
Amo
Ansari
Arrington
Babin
Balint
Bean (FL)
Bera
Beyer
Biggs (AZ)
Bonamici
Brecheen
Bresnahan
Brownley
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carson
Carter (TX)
Casar
Case
Castro (TX)
Chu
Ciscomani
Cisneros
Clarke (NY)
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Courtney
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crockett
Crow
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Dexter
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Downing
Elfreth
Escobar
Espallat
Evans (CO)
Evans (PA)
Fields
Fine
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fong
Foushee
Foxx
Frankel, Lois

NOT VOTING—9

Dunn (FL)
Gomez
Hunt

Kean
Leger Fernandez
Letlow

Moulton
Stefanik
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1826

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 96) expressing support for law enforcement officers, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 173, answered “present” 3, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—243

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei (NV)
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Barrett
Baumgartner
Bean (FL)
Begich
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs (AZ)
Biggs (SC)
Bilirakis
Gray
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hageman
Buchanan
Burchett
Burlison
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Castor (FL)
Ciscomani
Cline
Cloud
Clyburn
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Collins
Comer
Crane
Crank
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis (NC)
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Downing
Edwards
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Evans (CO)
Ezell
Fallon
Fedorchak
Feenstra
Fine
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Lucas

Fleischmann
Luna
Luttrell
Mace
Mackenzie
Malliotakis
Maloy
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
McDonald Rivet
McDowell
Gooden
Gosar
Gottheimer
Graves
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills
Moolenaar
Moore (AL)
Moore (NC)
Moore (UT)
Moore (WV)
Moran
Moskowitz
Mrvan
Murphy
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunn (IA)
Oberholte
Ogles
Onder
Owens
Palmer
Pappas
Patronis
Perez
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Riley (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Roy
Rulli
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schmidt
Schneider
Scholten
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Self
Sessions
Shreve
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Soto

Spartz
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Strong
Stutzman
Suozi
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

NAYS—173

Adams
Aguilar
Amo
Ansari
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bell
Bera
Beyer
Bonamici
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bynum
Carbajal
Carson
Carter (LA)
Casar
Casten
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleave
Conaway
Correa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davis (IL)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dexter
Dingell
Doggett
Elfreth
Escobar
Espallat
Evans (PA)
Fields
Figures
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Friedman
Frost
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)

Garcia (TX)
Goldman (NY)
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (TX)
Kamlager-Dove
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy (NY)
Khanna
Krishnamoorthi
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (PA)
Levin
Liccardo
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Mannion
Matsui
McBath
McBride
McClain Delaney
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McIver
Meeks
Mejia
Menefee
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Min
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Morrison
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—3

Goodlander
Houlahan
Olszewski

NOT VOTING—11

Boyle (PA)
Costa
Dunn (FL)
Gomez

Kean
Leger Fernandez
Letlow
Magaziner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1833

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING ON ELECTED OFFICIALS AND CIVIL SOCIETY LEADERS TO COUNTER ANTISEMITISM AND EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ON THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE JEWISH- AMERICAN COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1251) calling on elected officials and civil society leaders to counter antisemitism and educate the public on the contributions of the Jewish-American community on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. KNOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 166]

YEAS—419

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Fletcher
Aderholt	Cleaver	Flood
Aguilar	Cline	Fong
Alford	Cloud	Foster
Allen	Clyburn	Foushee
Amo	Clyde	Fox
Amodei (NV)	Cohen	Frankel, Lois
Ansari	Cole	Franklin, Scott
Arrington	Collins	Friedman
Auchincloss	Comer	Frost
Babin	Conaway	Fry
Bacon	Correa	Fulcher
Baird	Costa	Fuller
Balderson	Courtney	Garamendi
Balint	Craig	Garcia (CA)
Barr	Crane	Garcia (IL)
Barragán	Crank	Garcia (TX)
Barrett	Crawford	Gill (TX)
Baumgartner	Crenshaw	Gillen
Bean (FL)	Crockett	Jimenez
Beatty	Crow	Golden (ME)
Begich	Cuellar	Goldman (NY)
Bell	Davidson	Goldman (TX)
Bentz	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez, V.
Bera	Davis (NC)	Gooden
Bergman	De La Cruz	Goodlander
Beyer	Dean (PA)	Gosar
Bice	DeGette	Gottheimer
Biggs (AZ)	DeLauro	Graves
Biggs (SC)	DelBene	Gray
Bilirakis	Deluzio	Green, Al (TX)
Bishop	DeSaulnier	Griffith
Boebert	DesJarlais	Grijalva
Bonamici	Dexter	Grothman
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Guest
Brecheen	Dingell	Guthrie
Bresnahan	Doggett	Hagaman
Brown	Donalds	Hamadeh (AZ)
Brownley	Downing	Harder (CA)
Buchanan	Edwards	Haridopolos
Budzinski	Ellfrith	Harrigan
Burchett	Ellzey	Harris (MD)
Burlison	Emmer	Harris (NC)
Bynum	Calvert	Harshbarger
Cammack	Españillat	Hayes
Carbajal	Estes	Hern (OK)
Carey	Evans (CO)	Higgins (LA)
Carson	Evans (PA)	Hill (AR)
Carter (GA)	Ezell	Himes
Carter (LA)	Fallon	Hinson
Carter (TX)	Fedorchak	Horsford
Casar	Feenstra	Houchin
Case	Fields	Houlahan
Casten	Figures	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Fine	Hoyle (OR)
Castro (TX)	Finstad	Hudson
Chu	Fischbach	Huffman
Ciscomani	Fitzgerald	Huizenga
Cisneros	Fitzpatrick	Hunt
Clark (MA)	Fleischmann	Hurd (CO)
		Issa

Ivey	Menendez	Scholten
Jack	Meng	Schrier
Jackson (IL)	Messmer	Schweikert
Jackson (TX)	Meuser	Scott (VA)
Jacobs	Mfume	Scott, Austin
James	Miller (IL)	Self
Jayapal	Miller (OH)	Sessions
Jeffries	Miller (WV)	Sewell
Johnson (GA)	Miller-Meeks	Sherman
Johnson (LA)	Mills	Shreve
Johnson (SD)	Min	Simon
Johnson (TX)	Moolenaar	Simpson
Jordan	Moore (AL)	Smith (MO)
Joyce (OH)	Moore (NC)	Smith (NE)
Joyce (PA)	Moore (UT)	Smith (NJ)
Kamlager-Dove	Moore (WI)	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Moore (WV)	Smucker
Keating	Moran	Sorensen
Kelly (IL)	Morelle	Soto
Kelly (MS)	Morrison	Spartz
Kelly (PA)	Moskowitz	Stansbury
Kennedy (NY)	Mrvan	Stanton
Kennedy (UT)	Mullin	Staubert
Khanna	Murphy	Steil
Kiggans (VA)	Nadler	Steube
Kiley (CA)	Neal	Stevens
Kim	Neguse	Strickland
Knott	Nehls	Strong
Krishnamoorthi	Newhouse	Stutzman
Kustoff	Norcross	Subramanyam
LaHood	Norman	Suozzi
LaLota	Nunn (IA)	Sykes
Landsman	Obernolte	Takano
Langworthy	Ocasio-Cortez	Takano
Larsen (WA)	Ogles	Taylor
Larson (CT)	Olshewski	Tenney
Latimer	Omar	Thandekar
Latta	Onder	Thompson (CA)
Lawler	Owens	Thompson (MS)
Lee (FL)	Pallone	Thompson (PA)
Lee (NV)	Palmer	Tiffany
Lee (PA)	Panetta	Timmons
Levin	Pappas	Titus
Liccardo	Patronis	Tlaib
Lieu	Pelosi	Tokuda
Lofgren	Perez	Tonko
Loudermilk	Perry	Torres (CA)
Lucas	Peters	Torres (NY)
Luna	Pettersen	Trahan
Luttrell	Pfluger	Tran
Lynch	Pingree	Turner (OH)
Mace	Pocan	Underwood
Mackenzie	Pou	Valadao
Magaziner	Pressley	Van Drew
Malliotakis	Quigley	Van Duyne
Maloy	Ramirez	Van Epps
Mann	Randall	Vargas
Mannion	Raskin	Vasquez
Massie	Reschenthaler	Veasey
Mast	Riley (NY)	Velázquez
Matsui	Rivas	Vindman
McBath	Rogers (AL)	Wagner
McBride	Rogers (KY)	Walberg
McCaul	Rose	Walkinshaw
McClain	Ross	Wasserman
McClain Delaney	Rouzer	Schultz
McClellan	Roy	Waters
McClintock	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
McCollum	Rulli	Weber (TX)
McCormick	Rutherford	Webster (FL)
McDonald Rivet	Ryan	Westernman
McDowell	Salazar	Whitesides
McGarvey	Salinas	Wied
McGovern	Sánchez	Williams (GA)
McGuire	Scallie	Williams (TX)
McIver	Scanlon	Wilson (SC)
Meeks	Schakowsky	Wittman
Mejia	Schmidt	Womack
Menefee	Schneider	Yakym
		Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

Boyle (PA)	Kean	Stefanik
Dunn (FL)	Leger Fernandez	Van Orden
Garbarino	Letlow	Wilson (FL)
Gomez	Moulton	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1840

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD PRIORITIZE SECURING THE RE- LEASE OF PASTOR JIN MINGRI, PASTOR GAO QUANFU AND HIS WIFE PANG YU, DR. GULSHAN ABBAS, AND JIMMY LAI DE- TAINED BY THE PEOPLE'S RE- PUBLIC OF CHINA DURING FU- TURE ENGAGEMENTS WITH CHI- NESE PRESIDENT XI JINPING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1259) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should prioritize securing the release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, and Jimmy Lai detained by the People's Republic of China during future engagements with Chinese President Xi Jinping, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—414

Adams	Burlison	Davis (IL)
Aderholt	Bynum	Davis (NC)
Aguilar	Calvert	De La Cruz
Alford	Cammack	Dean (PA)
Allen	Carbajal	DeGette
Amo	Carey	DeLauro
Amodei (NV)	Carson	DelBene
Ansari	Carter (GA)	Deluzio
Arrington	Carter (LA)	DeSaulnier
Auchincloss	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais
Babin	Casar	Dexter
Bacon	Case	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Castor (FL)	Dingell
Balderson	Castro (TX)	Doggett
Balint	Chu	Donalds
Barr	Ciscomani	Downing
Barragán	Cisneros	Edwards
Barrett	Clark (MA)	Ellfrith
Baumgartner	Clarke (NY)	Ellzey
Bean (FL)	Cleaver	Emmer
Beatty	Cline	Escobar
Begich	Cloud	Españillat
Bell	Clyburn	Estes
Bentz	Clyde	Evans (CO)
Bera	Cohen	Evans (PA)
Bergman	Cole	Ezell
Beyer	Collins	Fallon
Bice	Comer	Fedorchak
Biggs (AZ)	Conaway	Feenstra
Biggs (SC)	Correa	Fields
Bilirakis	Costa	Figures
Bishop	Courtney	Fine
Boebert	Craig	Finstad
Bonamici	Crane	Fischbach
Bost	Crank	Fitzgerald
Brecheen	Crawford	Fitzpatrick
Bresnahan	Crenshaw	Fleischmann
Brown	Crockett	Fletcher
Brownley	Crow	Flood
Buchanan	Cuellar	Fong
Budzinski	Davidson	Foster
Burchett		Foushee

Foxx	Levin	Rogers (KY)
Frankel, Lois	Liccardo	Rose
Franklin, Scott	Lieu	Ross
Friedman	Lofgren	Rouzer
Frost	Loudermilk	Roy
Fry	Lucas	Ruiz
Fulcher	Luna	Rulli
Fuller	Luttrell	Rutherford
Garamendi	Lynch	Ryan
Garcia (CA)	Mace	Salazar
Garcia (IL)	Mackenzie	Salinas
Garcia (TX)	Magaziner	Sánchez
Gill (TX)	Malliotakis	Scalise
Gillen	Maloy	Scanlon
Jimenez	Mann	Schakowsky
Golden (ME)	Mannion	Schmidt
Goldman (NY)	Massie	Schneider
Goldman (TX)	Mast	Scholten
Gonzalez, V.	Matsui	Schrier
Gooden	McBath	Schweikert
Goodlander	McBride	Scott (VA)
Gosar	McCaul	Scott, Austin
Gottheimer	McClain	Self
Graves	McClain Delaney	Sessions
Gray	McClellan	Sewell
Green, Al (TX)	McClintock	Sherman
Griffith	McCollum	Shreve
Grijalva	McCormick	Simon
Grothman	McDonald Rivet	Simpson
Guest	McDowell	Smith (MO)
Guthrie	McGarvey	Smith (NE)
Hageman	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
Hamadeh (AZ)	McGuire	Smith (WA)
Harder (CA)	McIver	Smucker
Haridopolos	Meeks	Sorensen
Harrigan	Mejia	Soto
Harris (MD)	Menefee	Spartz
Harris (NC)	Menendez	Stansbury
Harshbarger	Meng	Stanton
Hayes	Messmer	Stauber
Hern (OK)	Meuser	Steil
Higgins (LA)	Mfume	Steube
Hill (AR)	Miller (IL)	Stevens
Himes	Miller (OH)	Strickland
Hinson	Miller (WV)	Strong
Horsford	Miller-Meeks	Stutzman
Houchin	Mills	Subramanyam
Houlahan	Min	Suozi
Hoyer	Moolenaar	Sykes
Hoyle (OR)	Moore (AL)	Takano
Hudson	Moore (NC)	Taylor
Huffman	Moore (UT)	Tenney
Huizenga	Moore (WI)	Thanedar
Hunt	Moore (WV)	Moran
Hurd (CO)	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Issa	Morrison	Thompson (MS)
Ivey	Moskowitz	Thompson (PA)
Jack	Mrvan	Timmons
Jackson (IL)	Mullin	Titus
Jackson (TX)	Murphy	Tlaib
Jacobs	Nadler	Tokuda
James	Neal	Tonko
Jayapal	Neguse	Torres (CA)
Jeffries	Nehls	Torres (NY)
Johnson (GA)	Newhouse	Trahan
Johnson (LA)	Norcross	Tran
Johnson (SD)	Norman	Turner (OH)
Johnson (TX)	Obornolte	Underwood
Jordan	Ocasio-Cortez	Valadao
Joyce (OH)	Olszewski	Van Drew
Joyce (PA)	Omar	Van Duyn
Kamlager-Dove	Onder	Van Epps
Kaptur	Owens	Vargas
Keating	Pallone	Vasquez
Kelly (IL)	Palmer	Veasey
Kelly (MS)	Panetta	Velázquez
Kelly (PA)	Pappas	Vindman
Kennedy (NY)	Patronis	Wagner
Kennedy (UT)	Khanna	Walberg
Khanna	Perez	Walkinshaw
Kiggans (VA)	Perry	Wasserman
Kim	Peters	Schultz
Knott	Pettersen	Waters
Krishnamoorthi	Pfuger	Watson Coleman
Kustoff	Pingree	Weber (TX)
LaHood	Pocan	Webster (FL)
LaLota	Pou	Westerman
Landsman	Pressley	Whitesides
Langworthy	Quigley	Wied
Larsen (WA)	Ramirez	Williams (GA)
Larson (CT)	Randall	Williams (TX)
Latimer	Raskin	Wilson (SC)
Latta	Reschenthaler	Wittman
Lawler	Riley (NY)	Womack
Lee (FL)	Rivas	Yakym
Lee (NV)	Rogers (AL)	Zinke
Lee (PA)		

NOT VOTING—16

Boyle (PA)	Kiley (CA)	Stefanik
Casten	Leger Fernandez	Tiffany
Dunn (FL)	Letlow	Van Orden
Garbarino	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Gomez	Nunn (IA)	
Kean	Ogles	

□ 1846

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING FORMER REPRESENTATIVE BILL POSEY

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, our State, our country, and this institution lost a dedicated public servant, a friend of all of us, and a former colleague, Congressman Bill Posey.

Congressman Posey served for 16 years first in the Florida Legislature. He did so honorably and with passion. Then he served here in the people's House for 16 years as well, representing both the 15th and the Eighth Congressional Districts of Florida. He served on various committees, including Financial Services and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. Posey had a deep, unwavering love and passion for our great country. He had a strong commitment to his beliefs, but he always was respectful to his colleagues. Again, his deep passion and love for the United States was evident to all of us who knew him, or who dealt with him. We respected him. He was a devoted public servant.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. I learned so much from him just having lunch with him, because he was also somebody who was a fountain of knowledge, of wisdom, and of experience, but always with humility, with passion, with joy, and with love.

Our condolences to his devoted, wonderful life partner, his wife, Katie; his daughters, Cathi and Pam, and the entire Posey family.

It is with deep sorrow that we are here recognizing this great friend and colleague who we have lost.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I really want to note what a decent human being and individual, with the wryest of senses of humor, that Bill Posey was.

I had the privilege of knowing Congressman Posey for my entire career. We were elected together in the class of 1992 in the Florida House of Representatives, and just like my friend, Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART, I, too,

served with Bill in the Florida House of Representatives and Florida Senate, along with here in the United States House of Representatives.

Bill Posey and I entered the Florida House together, and the passion he had to serve his constituents on the Treasure Coast and the Space Coast was the same all the way through to his final day serving in this body.

During his time in Tallahassee and Washington, D.C., Congressman Posey was dedicated to fighting for funding for NASA. He was NASA's champion and securing Florida's role as the leader in space launches and operations.

He fought for robust funding to protect our irreplaceable environment in the State of Florida, including his yearslong work to reauthorize and prioritize funding to clean up our Nation's estuaries.

There was no issue too big or small, and Bill was never afraid to stand up for what he believed in, even if his own party wasn't going in the same direction.

We worked together to pass drowning prevention legislation, to prevent children in Florida from drowning in residential swimming pools when his party went the other way on that, passing the first swimming pool safety legislation in the State of Florida together. He worked with me to try and make condo buildings safer following the horrific collapse and tragedy of Champlain Towers South in Surfside, Florida, which I represented at the time.

My heart goes out to Katie, his life partner. There were no spouses that I remember more than Bill and Katie, who were inseparable.

To their family, may the memory of Bill Posey be for a blessing. I appreciate the opportunity to mourn his passing.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, Mr. HARIDOPOLOS was President of the Florida Senate and served with Bill Posey in the State legislature and then again as the person who succeeded our wonderful friend, Bill Posey.

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

Mr. HARIDOPOLOS. Mr. Speaker, our country lost a true patriot on Saturday night. He loved this country like no other and taught all of us here so much about our country and about what love is all about.

His wife, Katie, his high school sweetheart, was always there by his side. He loved his daughters, Pam and Cathi.

He was just a remarkable guy who really never "went Washington." His heart was always in Brevard County. As Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ said as well, he had a passion for the space industry.

Before he was ever elected, he served at Kennedy Space Center. He was a part of those amazing rockets that led us during the Cold War.

He served his community with honor. He was always the guy showing up at every meeting. After the 2000 election,

was the one who fixed our election system in the State of Florida and became a national model.

But I knew Bill best as a friend. He was a person who always took the time with all of us who wanted to understand the intricacies of how legislation was passed and how to really get things done.

If you had a problem to solve back in the State Legislature, you went to Bill. Here in Congress, he served so ably for 16 years.

Most importantly, as I mentioned before, his heart was always in Brevard County. But his heart was closest with his wife, Katie. As was said so well, and I want to say it again, they were inseparable.

It was such a thrill to always see them because they were on a mission to make sure that the values and principles that founded this Nation were always pushed forward.

Mr. Speaker, I request a moment of silence to remember our good friend and an American patriot, former Congressman Bill Posey.

□ 1850

HONORING FORMER SENATOR DON RIEGLE

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

Ms. McDONALD RIVET. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues to honor a true champion for the city of Flint and the great State of Michigan: former Congressman and former Senator Don Riegle.

For 28 years, under seven Presidents, Don Riegle stood tall as a principled leader, always fighting to give families a fair shot.

He led efforts to make it easier for working people to buy a home, bring more investments to the communities that needed them the most, stand up for Gulf war veterans exposed to toxic chemicals, and rally against bad trade deals like NAFTA.

He made Washington a better place, and he always put our constituents first.

There are many in this Chamber today who were lucky enough to consider Don not just a colleague but a mentor and a friend. I got to know Don better in recent years, and I will never forget the lessons he shared with me about what it means to be a true servant leader for the communities we both love.

Our hearts go up to Lori, his wife of 48 years; as well as his children; grandchildren; and all his family and friends.

Our country joins them in mourning one of the greatest public servants Michigan has ever known: Don Riegle.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague to join me in a moment of silence.

DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(C) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, TO REMOVE THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of April 27, 2026, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 75) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOORE of Utah). Pursuant to the order of the House of April 27, 2026, the concurrent resolution is considered as read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 75

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Islamic Republic of Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and an adversary of the United States.

(2) The Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to pose a threat to the United States, its Armed Forces, and allies through its ballistic missile program, its sponsorship of terrorist proxy forces, and pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

(3) The Islamic Republic of Iran engages in a range of destabilizing activities across the Middle East and the world which have resulted in scores of American deaths since 1979.

(4) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

(5) Congress has not declared war with respect to, or provided any specific statutory authorization for, hostilities involving United States Armed Forces against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(6) United States Armed Forces were introduced into hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran on February 28, 2026.

(7) The President is mandated to brief Congress on the deployment of United States forces, included their estimated scope and duration of their continued use, under the War Powers Resolution.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF USE OF FORCE.

(a) TERMINATION.—Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress hereby directs the President to remove the use of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, including potential ground forces in a combat role or used for occupation, by not later than the date that is 30 days after the date described in section 1(6), unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force against Iran.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to—

(1) prevent the United States from defending itself, its Armed Forces, its diplomatic facilities, or allied states from imminent attack;

(2) prevent the United States Armed Forces from maintaining a troop presence in the region for defensive purposes; or

(3) force the removal of United States Armed Forces in the region who are not engaged in hostilities against Iran.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO INTELLIGENCE SHARING.

Nothing in this resolution may be construed to influence or disrupt any intelligence, counterintelligence, or investigative activities relating to threats in or emanating from Iran or surrounding countries conducted by, or in conjunction with, the United States Government involving—

(1) the collection of intelligence;

(2) the analysis of intelligence; or

(3) the sharing of intelligence between the United States and any coalition partner, if the President determines such sharing is appropriate and in the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 4. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO NONAUTHORIZATION OF THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE.

Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), nothing in this concurrent resolution may be construed as authorizing the use of military force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by Representative MAST of Florida and Representative MEEKS of New York, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAST) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 75. I thank Mr. GOTTHEIMER for this resolution.

We are here for a third time—a third time—because congressional inaction has cost Americans paying a lot and suffering a lot.

Most Americans oppose this war. Now, this is not my opinion. It is a fact. It is not unpatriotic to say so. It is honest, which is what Americans want and what Americans deserve from their government.

The opposition to this war has just continued to grow. As we stand here today, CBS News found 60 percent of Americans oppose the war. RMG Research, a Republican-leaning firm, has the most recent survey on RealClear Politics. It finds the war is opposed by 59 percent of Americans with only roughly one-third in support.

□ 1900

A recent PBS News poll shows that 81 percent of Americans are feeling the

strain of increased gas prices on their families.

My colleagues across the aisle are defending a war that their own voters really oppose. They can and will, I am sure, deflect, but you cannot escape the facts.

The American people are tired of costly misadventures in the Middle East, and they are right to be tired. They are tired of wars. They thought this President said he would not get them into a war, but, as he wanted to change the Defense Department, he basically said he was going to get into wars because they want to call it the Department of War.

Let's look at the full cost of this war, not cherry-picked facts that some prefer.

The Israelis did strike and kill Supreme Leader Khamenei. We still have a Supreme Leader Khamenei. This new Supreme Leader is 30 years younger and widely considered more extreme, less practical, and more hostile to the United States than his father. We removed a devil we knew and replaced him with one that we don't.

It is a fact that U.S. strikes against Iran have depleted Iran's stock of missiles and drones. The New York Times reported just yesterday that Iran has regained access to most of its missile sites, and there is evidence Iran has restored operational access to 30 of the 33 missile sites it maintains along the Strait of Hormuz.

Iran still has a significant drone capacity. Shahed drone manufacturing is low cost, quick to produce, and easier to conceal than missile production.

Here is what my colleagues do not want to talk about. Per public reporting—this is in the public sphere—we have used 20 percent of our long-range joint air-to-surface missiles and 30 percent of our Tomahawks. We have expended 45 percent of our Precision Strike Missiles, half of our THAAD interceptors, and 50 percent of our Patriot missile interceptors.

These are incredible military capabilities. We are burning through them at an unsustainable rate in a theater that is not our most urgent strategic priority.

Our allies are seeing yearslong delays on the purchases of U.S. arms into the 2030s, undermining their own strategic posture.

My colleagues on the other side who profess to be China hawks should be sounding the alarm right now about the impacts of this war on our Indo-Pacific readiness.

Before the first strike, there was no serious diplomatic off-ramp used. This was and this is a war of choice. It was from the start, and it is now. The American people are paying the price.

This war has also demonstrated to Iran the effectiveness of weaponizing the Strait of Hormuz. Oil prices have skyrocketed. Americans are paying more to take their kids to school and to drive to work. It seems as though, unless you are Secretary Duffy, family

vacations are out of reach because of skyrocketing fuel prices. Rising fertilizer and gasoline costs are making it more difficult to put food on the table.

Just recently, President Trump, when asked by a reporter—I believe it was yesterday—if he is considering America's financial situation when it comes to making a deal to end his war of choice, what was his response? Was he considerate? What did he say? "Not even a little bit." He went on to say: "I don't think about Americans' financial situation." Maybe he is telling the truth, I guess, but the American people need to know that he doesn't think about it. He says: "I don't think about anybody." I think that sentiment couldn't be clearer.

We still don't have the exact figures on the cost of this war. The Trump administration's latest estimate is \$29 billion, which is an enormous figure for an unnecessary and failing war and is far below other reasonable estimates, which suggest the war costs more than a billion dollars a day.

Of course, the highest costs to our country have been to the more than 400 soldiers who have been wounded in the conflict and the 14 who have made the ultimate sacrifice. We honor them. The best way to honor them is to end a war that was never in America's national interests.

The record speaks for itself. Most Americans—yes, most Americans, and that is Democrats, Republicans, liberals, conservatives, and Independents—oppose this war.

Iranian leadership remains a deadly and motivated enemy. They have weaponized the Strait of Hormuz against the world. Our stock of crucial weapon systems has been depleted to shocking levels.

This war is reaching right into the wallets of hardworking Americans every single day, every single hour, and every single minute that it continues.

This debate, for me, isn't about politics. This debate isn't about theatrics. This debate is about reality. The reality is that this war of choice was never in America's national interests.

To my colleagues who believe the administration's claims that Iran posed an imminent threat, a claim that, actually, they have never been able to support with any evidence, the War Powers Act is clear. We are well past 60 days now into this war.

Without congressional approval and without an Authorization for Use of Military Force, the administration must begin to draw down forces to end hostilities. That is not something that I am saying; that is what the law says.

Nothing in the statute says anything about a cease-fire, which is what they are trying to come up with. Even if we were in one, U.S. strikes on Iranian targets continue, as does the U.S. blockade itself, an act of war.

Let's not pretend that renaming the operation weeks later makes this a new conflict. The American people are smarter than that. They can see

through that. It is clear that the administration is concerned about the legality of this war, and it should be. This is a war of choice.

Congress must make clear to the Trump administration that it cannot continue, not without an AUMF passed by this Congress.

□ 1910

We are representatives of the people. We have a responsibility, and the President has a responsibility, and at this moment his responsibility is to come back to Congress, not SCOTUS, not to make up some reason not to come to get an AUMF or this War Powers Act.

I am going to urge the Republican majority not to join Democrats to support the Gottheimer resolution—and I know that is what it is—but really to join the American people.

Join the American people. I gave you the numbers. Join them to send a message that this time of which we are in is the time to end the war and for us to return to a more sane and sustainable path.

Join the American people to secure our interests in the Middle East, yes, and to ensure Americans are safe and prosperous in the process.

Join the American people. They want the executive branch to come to the people. It is clear this is the time. This is the third time that we have been here. We may have to come back, I know, again and again, and there have been all kinds of things to prevent folks from having the vote, but join the American people. It is time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a smile on my face. I am laughing because in the whole 10 minutes that I just listened to my colleague speak, there was not one mention of what this bill actually does or says. It is probably really convenient to not reference anything that this bill says.

I will tell you why it is really convenient for my colleague across the aisle. He said: We could never show any evidence that Iran posed an imminent threat. He said it numerous times and said it other days that we were going through the same song and dance. So why does he not want to mention the bill? It is because him voting for this bill that he is going to vote for—he is going to vote "yes" on this bill—what does the bill say right in its text? It outlines the imminent threat that Iran is. Thank you to the author of this bill for the bill that you are going to vote for. Let me quote the bill since maybe you didn't read it. "The Islamic Republic of Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and an adversary of the United States." That is one of many.

"The Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to pose a threat to the United States, its Armed Forces, and allies through its ballistic missile program, its sponsorship of terrorist proxy forces, and

pursuit of a nuclear weapon." There are many more whereas clauses in this.

It literally states the imminent threat that they are. So I look forward to you voting "yes" on the imminent threat that Iran is, my colleagues over there, and just proving to yourselves and proving to everybody just how wrong you are, how you probably didn't read this bill, and how you have no interest in actually speaking the truth about what it says.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY of Utah). Members are reminded to direct their comments to the Chair.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs for the time. I appreciate his leadership on highlighting the error of removing the United States Armed Forces from an action that will bring an end to a 47-year conflict.

Mr. Speaker, introducing this provision at this point in time reeks of political gamesmanship when President Trump and his administration are actively engaged in negotiations to bring the tyrannical reign of Iran, the largest state sponsor of terrorism, which the text indicates is the case, to an end.

Placing restrictions on the President both undercuts the ongoing U.S. negotiations and supports the Iranian regime in their 47-year journey to hold the world hostage with a nuclear weapon and approves of the reprehensible slaughter of reportedly more than 30,000 Iranians. To make matters worse, Iran is attempting to use their illegal attempt to close an international strait as leverage in the negotiations.

I am not sure if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle missed the media reporting, but the United States is not engaged in military operations in Iran right now. President Trump's position is consistent with past practices of both Republican and Democratic administrations.

In 1993, a Democrat administration's position was that the War Powers Act clock actually stops when hostilities ceased.

Due to the great success of Operation Epic Fury, the U.S. is currently positioned with the upper hand, and this resolution would completely turn the power over to the tyrannical Iranian regime.

The Iranian regime is the most weakened it has been in the past half-decade. This is a historic opportunity. Their air force has been dismantled. Their navy is currently at the bottom of the ocean. Their command and control structure no longer exists, and their weapons supplies are depleted. They are out of options. They have

come to the end of their rope. This is evident by Iran's continued posturing.

Congress should be on the side of the United States in a conflict with the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. It baffles me why our Democratic colleagues would be so determined to weaken the United States' negotiating position.

President Trump has been very clear on the goals of this mission: to ensure that Iran cannot obtain a nuclear weapon.

I, for one, am very appreciative of President Trump's courage and willingness to do what numerous leaders before him were unable to accomplish for 47 years.

This resolution will hinder efforts to bring a threat of a possible Iranian nuclear weapon to an end and support the illegal Iranian claim over the Strait of Hormuz.

This politically-charged resolution divides the U.S. in a way that will have Iranian leadership cheering in favor of its passage. Bringing this resolution to the floor undercuts the primary American objective to eliminate the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran and supports Iran's illegal claims on an international strait that is directly affecting Americans' daily lives. Is this what is intended by the sponsors? I hope not.

It seems that our Democrat colleagues only ever come to the table to push a political point versus bringing real solutions that advance American interests.

Diplomacy must be backed by strength, and considering this resolution signals that some congressional Members lack the political resolve to do the right thing. We should support measures that ensure that all tools of national power are available to be used to end the Iranian terror regime. Democrats have overwhelmingly agreed Iran is an existential threat to the United States and its allies. Supporting the President at this point in time will help to achieve America's strategic objectives and ensure the U.S. and our allies are operating with the full support of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman MAST for his partnership and his leadership.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I don't know about the gentleman, but I encourage him to read the resolution again because the words "imminent threat" to the United States of America are not in there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), who is also the Democratic whip.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have been at war with Iran for 2½ months. What do we have to show for it? There is no victory. There is no strategy. We still don't have an objective. In fact, the President keeps saying this war is over, but we have 50,000 troops deployed to the region. The strait is still

closed. Shipping is still blockaded, and negotiations that should be about making sure Iran never gets a nuclear weapon are completely stalled out.

Meanwhile, every single day, working Americans are paying the price. Gas prices have spiked. They have skyrocketed through the roof. Utility bills are going up. Because of increased shipping costs, we are seeing further increases in the price of food, clothes, toys, car parts, everything that you can imagine a family needs.

There is still no end in sight, and there won't be an end in sight unless Republicans decide to work for the American people and do their job.

The single fastest way to bring down costs is to end this war. Once again, Republicans are going to have an opportunity to do just that.

Once again, they have a chance to bring our servicemembers home and end this chaos.

Once again, they have a chance to side with working families and our troops.

The American people deserve better than they are getting from the GOP. Vote "yes." Show the American people you are on their side.

□ 1920

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER), my friend and the sponsor of this important resolution.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be standing here today introducing this resolution, but I feel, Mr. President, you have left me no choice. It has been 74 days since the start of the conflict in Iran, and Congress still hasn't been formally briefed on the objectives, our progress, or what success looks like.

Our Nation's Founders were very clear about this. Congress has a constitutional responsibility under Article I to provide oversight. Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress exclusive power to declare war, raise and support armies, maintain a navy, and make rules for the military.

We may have one commander in chief at a time, which I agree with, but the United States Congress has a specific constitutional responsibility. The American people sent us to Washington to be their voice, their eyes, and to hold the government accountable. That is not a partisan position. That is our job, our job as Democrats and Republicans.

The War Powers Act of 1973 only affirms that responsibility, clearly laying out, in furtherance of the Constitution, that the President has 60 days after formally informing the Congress to either come to Congress for declaration of war or an Authorization For Use of Military Force. Unfortunately, the President has done neither.

That is what this resolution means to me. It is a call to action to the President of the United States to do what the Constitution requires and to brief the Congress and the country on the state of the conflict, the objectives, the progress we have made, and what lies ahead.

Let me be very clear on what this resolution doesn't mean to me. I believe the Iranian regime must be crushed. They are the world's leading state sponsor of terror, a tyrannical government that chants "The great Satan" and "death to America," bankrolls Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and the Houthis who have attacked our bases and have killed scores of Americans.

The ayatollah has killed tens of thousands of their own citizens in Iran, brutally so, just for seeking freedom. They are an enemy of the United States of America and work closely with our other adversaries, including Russia, North Korea, and China.

Unlike some of my colleagues who oppose taking on this regime, I believe—no, I actually know, that the world is a safer and more secure place if the Iranian regime were destroyed. They have attacked Americans and done everything to undermine our freedom and our democracy since the 1970s.

I support the administration crushing the Iranian regime. I want to ensure we destroy their nuclear programs, their ballistic missile program, their drone programs, and their terrorist proxy programs. But that said, you cannot leave the United States Congress in the dark any longer. You can't leave the American people in the dark, and that is what this resolution means to me.

Oversight is a key constitutional responsibility of Congress, and moments like this are exactly why the Founders crafted a government with separation of powers. In other words, it wasn't by accident. In *The Federalist Papers*, Hamilton and Madison made the Founders' intentions unmistakable. Papers 23, 41, 69, and 74 deliberately entrust Congress the power to provide for the common defense.

Hamilton said: "The declaring of war would appertain to the legislature," and yet here we are with no formal briefings, no formal hearings, no plans presented on the conflict.

The Founders weren't naive. They anticipated this very moment. That is why we, ultimately, had the War Powers Act of 1973, so the President couldn't go it alone. Article I says he must come here to authorize or declare war. Under the War Powers Act, he is prohibited from keeping armed forces engaged in a conflict for more than 60 days without congressional approval.

But this administration has not given real briefings on the Iran conflict to the Intelligence Committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee, formal briefings related to this conflict.

Unfortunately, it is often that I have gotten more information, like a lot of

my colleagues have, from papers like *The New York Times*. That is absurd. Yesterday alone, I learned from *The New York Times* that Iran maintained 70 percent of its pre-war missile stockpile despite our military actions. I learned or read, at least, in *The New York Times* that Iran has restored operational access to 30 of 33 missile sites it maintains along the Strait of Hormuz.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if any of that is true or false, but Congress isn't getting briefed, so I wouldn't know if that is true or false. That is not acceptable to me. That is not how this is supposed to work.

It stands in direct contrast to our constitutional obligations and to the precedent for how other administrations have treated Congress during a military campaign of this size and duration. And if some haven't, then, by the way, we shouldn't have accepted that either.

Previous administrations, some, have come to Congress within 60 days to make the case for their actions. After strikes against Iranian-backed militia groups in Iraq and Syria in 2021, the Biden administration notified Congress and sent a formal letter explaining their legal justifications under an existing Congressional authority.

In 2003, the Bush administration conducted extensive briefings to Congress and was granted congressional authorization months before the invasion. After Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, George H.W. Bush's administration regularly briefed Congress. Before U.S. combat began, the administration consulted Congress extensively and sought authorization to use military force.

Again, I didn't want to have to bring this resolution to the floor. I had hoped the administration would have changed their course after I introduced it and properly briefed the Congress and the country.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, people have lots of questions about the goals, about the Strait of Hormuz, about \$5 gas, about what a win looks like for America. Make no mistake, my resolution explicitly grants us the ability to maintain a presence in the region, to respond to any Iranian aggression that places Americans or our allies in danger, and to safely remove our troops. If the President comes to seek authorization with a proper briefing, I would do my job and consider it, like we all should.

This vote isn't whether or not we should crush the Iranian regime. It is a

message to the President and his administration to brief the Congress and the country. The people elected us to do this job, Mr. President. Come to us. Make your case. Lay out your plan. Let us do our job as a co-equal branch of government.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. My ask, Mr. President, is brief the appropriate committees and do so regularly. Lay out the plan. Let us do our job as a co-equal branch of the government. This is too important not to.

Again, as I said, I believe the Iranian regime should be crushed. It is not a question of that. It is a question about making sure we can do what we must do as elected officials of this branch of government.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for the purpose of a colloquy to tell us if Iran is an imminent threat.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if they are able to develop a nuclear program and they continue to have their ballistic missile program and their drone program, then I am deeply concerned about the threat they present to the United States and our allies in the region.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) more time.

Is that an imminent threat?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. It depends how you define that.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) again for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I am just saying, Mr. MAST, that if they, right now, are able to—and these are kind of questions I have that I am not getting briefed on. These are the questions I have in terms of where they are in some of their program capabilities to be able to right now threaten our country. That is part of the question that I have. But I think you and I are in agreement, sir, that they are clearly a threat to the United States of America.

Mr. MAST. Absolutely. I am happy to let you continue the dialogue if you want. I am not going to cut you off.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. No, thank you. I thank the gentleman for the colloquy.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman say that because Iran is an imminent threat against us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Representative GOTTHEIMER dialoguing with me for a moment. I will give another quote that he offered. "Iran's sole objective is to wreak havoc, create violence, cause instability, and cowardly murder U.S. servicemen and -women protecting our way of life." That is a quote from my colleague over there. I agree with everything that he said.

That is an outline of an imminent threat, as well as the "whereas" things that were added into this bill. It is an outline, an indictment of an imminent threat. Iran is an imminent threat against us. Iran is an imminent threat.

The imminent threat that has been going on against us, I will outline some more of it. And this relates to the Strait of Hormuz, not because of the combat actions that have taken place, but just because Iran is an imminent threat in what they have been doing. They captured sailors and two boats. Four patrol boats from Iran's IRGC attacked the USS *Nitze*, and the USNS *Invincible* was forced to change course because IRGC fast-attack crafts tried to run into it.

□ 1930

These are all separate incidents.

IRGC vessel attacks USS *Thunderbolt* in Persian Gulf.

Unarmed Iranian drone flies to USS *Nimitz* as fighter jets landing at night.

IRGC naval personnel place and detonate limpet mines on two Saudi, one UAE, one Norwegian-registered ship, all harbored in UAE. These are going back years.

IRGC naval personnel place and detonate limpet mines on Japanese ship and Norwegian-owned ships transiting the Gulf of Oman. This is, again, just going back in history.

IRGC personnel deploy surface-to-air missiles to shoot down U.S. unmanned aircraft operating over international waters.

IRGC Navy seize British-flagged and Swedish-owned *Stena Impero* tanker while it was transiting the Strait of Hormuz.

Iran attempts to stop British tanker *British Heritage*, and six U.S. Navy ships attacked by Iranian ships.

IRGC Navy forcibly board and detain Hong Kong-flagged *SC Taipei*, an oil tanker, in international waters.

Eleven IRGC Navy small boats attack five U.S. Navy vessels conducting routine exercises.

I have pages of these—I can go on—year after year after year.

I have at least one colleague over here who is willing to acknowledge the imminent threat that they are, what it is that they have been doing, longstanding, with the Strait of Hormuz.

Did the gentleman want to continue the conversation?

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Sure.

Mr. MAST. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. By the way, I completely agree with your outline of the threats that Iran poses, and I want to be very clear about that. I think they present a clear and present danger to our country, their regime there, which is why they need to be crushed.

My broader point and the question, I guess, I would have for you is: Do you believe that we, Congress, are being appropriately briefed and kept up to speed? That is really, fundamentally,

my challenge right now, that I don't feel like we are getting the information.

I am on the Intelligence Committee. I don't think we are getting the information that we should be getting as a coequal branch to make sure that we can do our jobs.

Mr. MAST. I am glad you asked.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Thanks.

Mr. MAST. My opinion is that, yes, both by the content of what it is that the administration has told me in whether it is full House classified briefings with the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, General Caine, and CIA Director John Ratcliffe; whether it is in expanded Gang of Eight meetings that Ranking Member MEEKS and myself have been a part of, numerous of those; or other briefings that we have had.

I don't know how many briefings it is that you have had as a part of the Intelligence Committee, but I am tracking at least 30 separate briefings, and absolutely, I am satisfied with the content of which I am given.

On any given day, would I love to have more information that they have within a tactical operations center—a TOC, as we call it in the military—of what is going on? I would love to still be an operator inside of a TOC, watching ISR footage of exactly everything that is going on, but that is not the latitude that we have, to sit inside of those TOCs and observe everything that is going on, but I am satisfied.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. No, listen, I am glad that you are briefed, because I think you have—

Mr. MAST. We all are, 30—at least 30 separate briefs.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. If the gentleman will yield, I think you have incredible experience, and I am grateful for your service to our country.

Mr. MAST. Thank you.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I am glad you are getting those briefings. The challenge is, at least from my colleagues' perspective and me, who sits on the committee, we have not been getting those sort of briefings that you have been getting. That is part of what we are raising a flag about.

I would ask Chairman MEEKS the same question, but that has been, just so you understand, the real frustration, because I am with you that we should crush Iran.

Mr. MAST. I heard you say it.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. I am with you, and I just want to make sure—I want to understand where we are in that process and actually get appropriate updates on what is going on so that I can do my job. That is really what this is about for me.

Mr. MAST. I appreciate the colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the ranking member is ready to close.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MENEFE).

Mr. MENEFE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution to bring an end to the President's war in Iran.

This administration started a war that the American people never asked for. A majority of Americans oppose it, and every single day, Americans are paying for it.

Before this war started, gas in Houston cost about \$3 a gallon. Today, it costs over \$4 a gallon. That is the largest 2-month gas price spike in the recorded history of Houston, which is the energy capital of the world.

The average Houston family is paying \$100 more every single month just to fill their tanks. This administration told us that they would put America first. Instead, they have put Americans, our servicepersons, and our wallets last.

This administration has blown up the global markets. People are paying more for groceries. Businesses are paying more for supplies. People are struggling to get by that much more because of this President's actions. The experts say prices will fall slower than they rose, even if this war ends today.

The American people did not ask for this war. It was forced upon them, and Congress must force it to end. I urge my colleagues to support this War Powers Resolution.

We have heard a lot of conversation about imminence here tonight, but that is not the question before us. The question before us is: Who has the power to declare war? That is the United States Congress.

We have seen this President haphazardly bring us into a dispute overseas, resulting in the deaths of 13 U.S. servicepersons, while at the same time conducting foreign policy over Truth Social, saying that he is going to annihilate an entire civilization.

I don't care what your feelings are about any nation. This country operates by a Constitution, and the President must follow it the same way as anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this War Powers Resolution.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, first, based upon the argument, I heard the President say just a few months prior that he obliterated all of Iran's nuclear capabilities. That is what he said, so come back to the United States Congress to tell us that you did not, and here are the reasons why they still have what they have, and it is imminent, from my definition of "imminent," that they will utilize it against us soon.

From all the evidence that I have seen, they have not done so.

I don't know what 30 meetings or classified hearings the chairman has had. I have had two—two, one with the full Congress, and one with the gang of 16 or 18, or whatever we are called.

I do know that it is clear by today's debate that my Republican colleagues

simply cannot defend this costly and massively unpopular war. I have not heard one time anyone talk about how much this war is costing us, how much it is costing the American people.

What I have heard—and we do know what the President thinks because we heard him. The President says that he doesn't care. He doesn't even think a little bit about what it costs Americans. He said that he doesn't think about Americans' financial situation and that he doesn't think about anybody. That is probably including Congress. We are somebody, too. He doesn't think about us.

My colleagues have not been able to make a case that Americans are better off now than we were before this reckless war. We are worse off now. The Strait of Hormuz is closed. We are losing allies.

My colleagues cannot demonstrate that this war has neutralized Iran's most significant threats. Clearly, that is what they are saying. That is what I am hearing. Nor have they put us in a position to guarantee a better nuclear deal than we had before, which Donald J. Trump ripped up.

That is because this is an unauthorized war, and this war has, instead, ushered in a new, younger, and more extreme Ayatollah. That is a fact.

□ 1940

It has weaponized the Strait of Hormuz, severely damaging the global economy as well as everyday American checkbooks. That is a fact. If you deny that, say that to the American people. Ask them when you go home.

As this war grinds on at the cost of \$1 billion a day, the United States must face numerous global challenges with significantly depleted munition stockpiles and setbacks to our military readiness.

The fact is, this war has been a mistake from the start.

The American people ended one forever war in the Middle East. They don't want another. In fact, many of President Trump's MAGA friends, the reason why they voted for him was because he said he would not get into another war. That is why you hear that some of his friends and many Republicans are now angry with him.

What do the American people want? Do you know what they want? They want the affordability crisis addressed. They want good jobs. They want good healthcare. Instead, this administration has started a war that has skyrocketed everything from gasoline to groceries with little to show for it.

So to my colleagues across the aisle, it is past time that we do our job. That is all Mr. GOTTHEIMER was saying: Do our job. We declare war, not the executive branch. It is time for the President to come to us, and it is time for us, I believe, to end this war.

Everyone is asking me: How is it going to end? We are going to have to negotiate our way out of this because clearly we are not going to be able to

bomb our way out of this. It is not going to make us safe as we see what is taking place right now.

It is time for Members of Congress, Republicans, Democrats, and those who are Independent, to say, okay, Mr. President, if you have proof of something, come to us.

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

Mr. MEEKS. Come to us, and we will then decide. That is what the Constitution allows.

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

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

I am going to respond to the trove of ridiculous things that I have heard said on this floor.

Speaking generally about life, I know that there are people out there that when they get hit, they curl up, they cry, and they don't deal with the situation. That is how some people deal with conflict.

I can't personally say that I have known people that get hit, and they deny that it happened at all. That is literally what we have going on here.

As my colleague says over and over, there is no imminent threat that is going on. The author of this bill acknowledged the imminent threat, wrote word after word, paragraph after paragraph in the very thing that my colleagues over there will vote "yes" on to outline specifically the imminent threat that Iran is. He wanted it to be known the imminent threat that Iran is, but my colleagues are denying the imminent threat. They are denying that we have got hit.

They say we started this war. To quote my colleague right now, Ranking Member MEEKS, he said we started this war. That is a denial of every single time the United States of America has been hit. It is a denial of the times that they fired at us at Tower 22 and killed three Americans. It is a denial of the times that they fired at us in Iraq and Syria. It is a denial of the times that they fired at our ships that were passing through the straits and other places causing some of our jets to fall off the decks of our carriers. It is a denial to say we started this war, not all of those things that Iran did started this war.

I literally just read off a laundry list of things that Iran has done to us and to our allies over the years, attack after attack after attack, but according to my colleague, we started this war. Again, it is like getting hit in the face, and it is like no, no, that didn't happen, nobody hit me in the face. Black eye? No black eye. It didn't happen to me. I ran into a wall. That is like what we are living through right now.

I am going to give you some more of the things that they have done, and it is important because my colleague for the first time I have heard him define what "imminent" actually means to him. He said this is what imminent

means to me, that they will utilize against us soon, was what was said—utilize against us soon.

So I just listed off a whole bunch of things, a whole bunch of attacks that were done to us immediately preceding our combat operations in Iran. That to me equals imminent. If they just did it, that means they would continue to do it soon.

But if we go back even further than that, we will list some more. MV *Asphalt Princess*, another ship, a tanker traveling from UAE to Oman, was attacked by Iran. They are our allies. An Iranian-flagged tanker seized two Greek tankers, *Delta Poseidon* and *Prudent Warrior*, in the Persian Gulf. The tanker *Pacific Zircon* was hit by an Iranian drone off the coast. Iran's navy captured a Marshall Islands-flagged tanker, *Advantage Sweet*. Iran's IRGC seized the Panamanian-flagged *Niovi* oil tanker.

The list goes on and on just year after year. I can list off dozens of these imminent what they have been doing in the Strait of Hormuz going on year after year, imminent. But, again my colleagues across the aisle, it is like they are getting hit in the face, and they are saying: No, nobody hit me. They are saying that because they want to talk a big game, but they are too scared to actually deal with somebody hitting them in the face. That is true about life.

Some people don't have the stomach to be soldiers. Some people have the stomach, but they are just not capable of doing it. Not everybody is built to do the same things.

I want to cover some of the other things that were said. My colleague, Ranking Member MEEKS, said numerous times that the new leader of Iran is more extreme. That is certainly an acknowledgment of the extremist nature of the previous leader of Iran. Very extreme.

Having done all of those things that I just listed off to our allies and to the United States of America, that is how extreme the previous leader was, now the new one is more extreme. The previous one was absolutely an imminent threat, absolutely making this a legal military operation, though they continue to say it wasn't some legal operation, that it was a war of choice.

My colleague said it was a war of choice—I counted at least three times—in his remarks. Absolutely, it is a choice. If somebody hits me in the face like my colleagues are denying is happening to America, it is a choice whether we hit them back. My colleagues over there would prefer to choose that, when somebody hits America in the face, we say: No, nothing happened. I walked into a wall. Nothing to see here—and not hit them back.

That is not the United States of America.

It is a choice whether we hit back. Strong people choose to hit back. Strong countries choose to hit back.

Weak people, weak countries, they don't hit back.

Let's go over some of the other things that were said. They regained access to missile sites. It was reported that Iran regained access to missile sites. Absolutely. You know what, they regained access probably 10 minutes after those sites were hit. That doesn't mean that they are operational. That doesn't mean that they can go into a cache where they held weapons and pull the weapons out of that cache and start using them. It doesn't mean that they can take a mobile platform that they could access before we hit it and then go access it again 10 minutes later and utilize it. Sure, they have access to it. That doesn't mean that it is something that can be used.

□ 1950

Our colleagues want you to believe that they had this access and nothing is being done. That is absolutely irresponsible.

I went over how my colleagues talked about how this war caused the closure of the Strait of Hormuz. No, Iran has been closing the Strait of Hormuz year after year, decade after decade, and I have far more pages of what I could go over of all the attacks that they have been conducting through the strait and other places.

It was said numerous times—again, I counted at least three times—“never in America's national interest.” That is the colleague of Ranking Member MEEKS over there, “never in America's national interest.”

If it was never in America's national interest, why did my colleague literally vote to say the United States of America should “use any and all means”—that is a quote, direct quote, from the bill—to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon? That is what President Trump is doing, using any and all means to make sure that that doesn't happen.

In this breath, he says it was never in America's national interest, but before, I guess it was. I am not sure how before it was okay, but now it is never. It doesn't quite add up to me.

He said it is not about theatrics. If you voted previously to say use any and all means necessary against Iran, but now you say it is never in America's national interest, it is 100 percent about theatrics. That is what it is.

That is what this whole show is about for my colleagues over there. It is theatrics because you can't say it was never in America's national interest and just before that say, yes, I voted to say use any and all means necessary. They don't add up. One thing doesn't equal the other. It is all about theatrics.

On the words “imminent threat,” he said the words “imminent threat” are not in there. Yes, the words “imminent threat” are not directly in there. That is correct, but again, my colleague did state the ways that Iran is an imminent threat, my colleague who au-

thored the legislation that they intend to vote “yes” on. They intend to vote “yes” outlining the ways that Iran was an imminent threat, even though they say it is not in our interests and all of these other things.

My colleague over there said that the sole objective of Iran is to wreak havoc—that equals imminent threat; create violence—equals imminent threat to me; cause instability; and cowardly murder U.S. servicemen and -women protecting our way of life. That sounds like a pretty damn big imminent threat to me.

It went on to say in the legislation: “The Islamic Republic of Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and an adversary of the United States.” That sounds like an imminent threat. I know he didn't use the exact words, but sometimes you have to read between the lines, read between those lines.

“The Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to pose a threat to the United States, its Armed Forces, and allies through its ballistic missile program, its sponsorship of terrorist proxy forces, and continued pursuit of a nuclear weapon.” That is an imminent threat.

Again, I would say read between the lines. If you can't read between those lines, you probably don't have business working in the national security sphere.

Let's go over some other quotes that were said here.

They said that we have troops there. We have troops there, so the war is not over. The combat is not over.

Guess what, Ms. CLARK. We have troops in Germany, but I can tell you that World War II—not World War 11, according to Ms. OMAR—World War II is over, but we still have troops in Germany and still have troops in Europe. We had, previous to these operations against Iran, troops throughout the Middle East.

Just because we have troops there doesn't mean that this hasn't ended. It has ended since April 7, and I applaud President Trump for the cease-fire that he has negotiated and the peace that he continues to work toward.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAST. Mr. Speaker, I have more to talk about and go over more quotes here.

Ms. CLARK said there is no strategy. I will tell you, she has been briefed numerous times, probably about 30 times, if she chose to attend all the classified briefings or was invited to all of them. I don't know which ones she was entirely invited to.

To say that there is no strategy is absolutely a direct insult to our United States Armed Forces, all of our generals, all of our colonels, all of our majors, all of our leaders working in tactical operations centers, the Pentagon, crunching data day in and day out, doing everything that they do to plan

every single part of these operations: every time an aircraft takes off of a carrier; the targets that they are looking at; everything that they are looking to hit, when and in what order; what they have to hit before they go hit something further in the interior of Iran.

It is an insult to our military to say that there is no strategy. It takes away from every bit of strategy that is going on.

Let's keep going on.

My colleague Mr. GOTTHEIMER, to quote him, said: I believe that we—that they must be “crushed.” I agree with my colleague that they must be crushed. They have to be crushed. He wrote this legislation because of the imminent threat that Iran is. My colleague agreed with that.

Though my colleague, the ranking member over there, said that nobody could agree that it was an imminent threat, that Republicans couldn't prove it, there is at least one Democrat who agrees and was willing to see that through.

It is theatrics. It is theatrics that hurt our servicemembers.

There is probably only one thank-you that should be given, and that would be a thank-you from the IRGC to my colleagues over there for giving them hope. Without my colleagues over there, the IRGC would have zero hope.

Because they keep bringing forward ridiculous pieces of legislation like this, where they are unwilling to acknowledge the imminent threat that Iran is, all the attacks that have taken place against the United States of America, against our servicemembers, against our tankers, against our Navy vessels, against those of all of our allies, it continues to be theatrics because they won't see this. They are going to get hit in the face and deny that they ever got touched.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield the balance of my time in just one moment and simply say I urge a “no” vote on this because it is ridiculous and dangerous to say, especially in the midst of this cease-fire, of the negotiations for long-term peace, to prevent Iran from seeking a nuclear weapon in the future or seeking to continue their ballistic missile program or their drone program or their terror proxy programs or what they have been doing in the strait, that we even whisper the idea of pulling our servicemembers out of that area. It could not be more irresponsible of my colleagues to suggest that that take place.

They say they want negotiations. Those are taking place, but they want negotiations without the United States military protecting ships, knocking ordnance out of the sky, and being the very credible threat that the United States military is? That makes absolutely no sense.

Again, people that assess that way I do not want in the United States of America's national security decision-making tree.

I will say that I look forward to seeing that my colleagues over there vote “yes,” even though I recommend a “no” vote. Why? Because their “yes” vote literally shows just how much they agree that Iran is an imminent threat, even though they keep saying they are not, which directly leads to the legal justification for every operation that is taking place or has taken place against Iran.

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

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of April 27, 2026, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. MEEKS. 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.

RECOGNIZING MARTIN COUNTY WRIGHT FLIGHT FLY DAY

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, dreams are taking flight in Martin County, North Carolina.

The Wright Flight Fly Day rewards sixth graders from across the county for academic success, leadership, and positive choices by giving them an opportunity to see their home community in an airplane from the skies above.

Through a powerful partnership between the local schools, sheriff's office, and airport commission, students are connected to real-world opportunities in aviation, engineering, science, technology, and public service.

We are working to keep the American Dream within reach.

Wright Flight reminds young people across eastern North Carolina that their hopes and dreams are achievable and their future can soar even higher.

□ 2000

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. MOORE of Utah was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be joined by my colleagues for this Police Week Special Order.

Law enforcement across this country is putting their lives on the line every day to protect our communities, and 1 week per year honoring them will never be enough. I want to respect the time of our colleagues so I will turn the time over to them before I give my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Mrs. BIGGS).

Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during National Police Week, we honor the brave men and women in law enforcement who put on the badge each day, knowing the risks that come with serving others.

Today, I rise to remember Greenwood Police Officer Don “DJ” Keller who passed away earlier this week while faithfully serving his community.

Officer Keller was only 31 years old. He was a fellow National Guardsman, a husband, and a father. He represented the very best of law enforcement.

The Greenwood community, the Third District, and the entire State of South Carolina mourn his loss. We also lift up his family, his fellow officers, and all who knew and loved him.

Scripture tells us in Matthew 5:9, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.”

Officer Keller lived as a peacemaker. His service, sacrifice, and example will not be forgotten. May God bless Officer Keller, his family, and every law enforcement officer serving our communities.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from South Carolina for her great message, and I appreciate her attending this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this week, during National Police Week, we honor the brave men and women in law enforcement who put on the badge every single day and run toward danger while others are running away.

These officers respond to violent crimes, overdoses, domestic disputes, natural disasters, and unimaginable tragedies. They carry burdens that most Americans will never fully understand. As the wife of a first responder, I have seen firsthand the mental and emotional toll, as well as the physical toll, that this job can take on not just the individual wearing the uniform but all their families, as well. The stress, the trauma, and the weight of responsibility do not disappear when a shift ends.

Too often, when our first responders need help themselves, the system is not prepared to answer their call. That is why I have introduced the Answering

the Call Act of 2026, legislation to strengthen the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline and ensure it effectively serves first responders. That is because I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't.

Our law enforcement officers, firefighters, EMTs corrections officers, and public safety telecommunicators face disproportionately high rates of depression, PTSD, substance abuse, and suicide because of the traumatic situations they encounter on the job. Yet many do not seek help because of the stigma or concerns about confidentiality. In fact, over the last 5 years, over 850 law enforcement officers have taken their own lives, and we know that number is underreported.

This bill will take practical steps to address this crisis. It promotes targeted outreach to first responders, improves trauma-informed training for 988 counselors, strengthens accountability and establishes a pilot program to improve support services nationwide for our LEOs.

First responders answer the call at our most critical moments. That is why this legislation will ensure that when they need help, the system is ready to answer theirs.

To every law enforcement officer serving across Florida's Third District, across the Sunshine State, and across this country, I thank them for their courage, their sacrifice, and their service.

May God bless our law enforcement officers and their families who stand beside them every single day.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her inspiring message. It is so personal as well, and I appreciate her willingness to share.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, National Police Week serves as an important reminder of the brave law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line every day to protect our communities.

During this week, we honor the officers who answer the call knowing that they may face dangerous and unpredictable situations in service to our community. Their courage, sacrifice, and dedication deserve not only our gratitude, but our continued support.

This week, two Wisconsin officers are being honored during National Police Week and will have their names added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

The first is Racine County Deputy Joshua LaForge. Deputy LaForge knew from an early age that he wanted to serve others through law enforcement. That commitment guided his life and career.

He served both with the Racine Police Department for 18 years and then joined the Racine County Sheriff's Department. Throughout his career, he took on many responsibilities within

the department, participated in charitable efforts throughout the community, and dedicated himself to helping those around him.

Tragically, Deputy LaForge passed away on July 4, 2023.

The second is Milwaukee Police Officer Kendall Corder. Officer Corder served with the Milwaukee Police Department for more than 6 years. On June 26, 2025, Officer Corder and his partner responded to a domestic violence call involving an armed suspect. While en route, the call was upgraded to shots fired. When they arrived on the scene, Officer Corder and his partner were ambushed by a suspect hiding in nearby bushes. Officer Corder later succumbed to his injuries on June 29, 2025.

Their service and sacrifice serve as a powerful reminder of the risks law enforcement officers face every day and of the countless families and communities forever changed by their loss.

As we remember those who make the ultimate sacrifice, I would also like to make specific mention from Wisconsin's Sixth District, State Trooper Trevor Casper. Back home, he is remembered as a shining example of service, courage, and selflessness.

Trevor's dream was to become a Wisconsin State trooper, and in December of 2014, he graduated from the State Patrol Academy and was stationed in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin.

□ 2010

Tragically, just months later, on March 24, 2015, during his first solo assignment, Trevor Casper was shot while apprehending a bank robbery and murder suspect.

Though mortally wounded, Trevor returned fire and stopped the suspect, protecting innocent lives and preventing further harm to the community.

Just think about that. You have been shot and are in the process of dying, but still you return fire, stop the suspect, and save members of the community.

He was just 21 years old—so tragic. Trooper Casper's bravery in the face of danger and his commitment to protecting others will never be forgotten.

Trevor is also a reminder that there are countless law enforcement officers across this country who quietly make extraordinary sacrifices in service of their communities. Many have given their lives in the line of duty, and each one deserves our respect, gratitude, and remembrance.

During National Police Week and throughout the year, we must continue standing with law enforcement officers and honor the memory of those who gave their lives in service.

I would suggest to those in the Chamber who are hearing our remarks, I think one of the things that you can really do that will drive home to any individual here what a great job our law enforcement officers are doing is to do a drive-along with them. I try to do

one of these at least once every 2 years. It really brings home the situations that our law enforcement officers face, the possibility of harm. Nevertheless, again and again and again, they go out, go into unknown circumstances, risking huge physical harm to themselves, to apprehend dangerous members of our community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Utah for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for his message, and I appreciate him for sharing the two incredible, brave individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SCHMIDT).

Mr. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today during National Police Week to honor the brave men and women in law enforcement who put on the badge every day and stand between safety and danger.

Across Kansas and across our Nation, law enforcement officers answer the calls most of us hope we will never have to make. They run toward danger when others are running away. They work long nights, miss holidays, and experience difficult moments that often go unseen or unrecognized.

Their service demands courage, sacrifice, and an unwavering commitment to protecting their communities.

This week, we especially remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. Sadly, last year, we lost four heroes from the State of Kansas.

We honor Officer Scott Heimann of the Hays Police Department in Hays, Kansas. Officer Heimann was a devoted public servant who faithfully protected his community with professionalism and integrity.

We remember Officer Hunter Simoncic of the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department. Officer Simoncic dedicated his life to serving others, and his courage and commitment will not be forgotten.

We recognize Deputy Brandon Gaede of the Phillips County Sheriff's Office. Deputy Gaede answered the call to serve rural Kansans with dedication and selflessness, and we remain grateful for his service and sacrifice.

We remember Deputy Elijah Ming of the Wyandotte County Sheriff's Office. Deputy Ming's commitment to duty and to protecting others reflected the very best of Kansas law enforcement.

These officers were sons, friends, colleagues, neighbors, and public servants. Behind every badge is a human being who chose a life of sacrifice. Behind every fallen officer is a family whose sacrifice continues long after the headlines have faded.

During National Police Week, we honor not only those we have lost but also every officer who continues to serve. We thank them for their courage, their professionalism, and their steadfast commitment to keeping our communities safe.

To the families of our fallen officers, your loved ones will not be forgotten. Their legacy lives on in the communities they protected, in the officers they served with, and in the grateful hearts of the people of Kansas and of our great country.

May God bless the memory of these fallen heroes and protect all who wear the badge, and may He continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his heartwarming and thoughtful remarks on a very important week. I know that the families of those officers will appreciate the focus, attention, and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their comments. National Police Week is about brave, sacrificial people. It is about families. It is about heroes, Mr. Speaker, like Sergeant Lee Sorensen and Officer Eric Estrada, whose service and dedication to public safety left a lasting impact on northern Utah.

Sergeant Sorensen and Officer Estrada faithfully served their communities for many years before tragically being killed in the line of duty. While there are no words to ease the pain of their passing, it has been incredible to see the Tremonton, Garland, and greater Utah communities rally in support and appreciation for their families and our first responders.

This National Police Week, we are backing the blue and standing up for those who risk their lives to protect us.

I am proud to see Sergeant Sorensen and Officer Estrada's names being added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial wall here in D.C. Of course, we wish that were not the case, but it is an honor to be able to see them listed among the brave. Their service, like that of many others who have died on the job, is simply not forgotten.

This National Police Week is dedicated to the brave men and women of law enforcement who make it so we can leave with peace of mind and so we can feel confident that our families are safe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of my colleagues who joined me tonight. I yield back the balance of my time.

HIGHLIGHTING WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Ms. MORRISON of Minnesota was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

SUPPORTING UKRAINE

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the courtesy. Today, I rise sincerely to thank 218 House bipartisan colleagues for signing Discharge Petition No. 8 in order to force a vote here on the floor for a long-overdue vote on the Ukraine Support Act.

Liberty for Ukraine and for NATO hangs in the balance. For 12 years, Ukraine's people have valiantly endured Russia's savage war to eradicate Ukraine, its children, and Ukraine's very identity.

As today's forces continue liberating stolen territory, our bipartisan petition represents strong support for Ukraine's defense of liberty.

Vladimir Putin must stop and end his horrific invasion of a free nation. I am confident that this bill will pass this House.

Let me thank especially Congressmen STENY HOYER, DON BACON, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, KEVIN KILEY, MIKE QUIGLEY, and all those in the Ukraine Caucus who have fought so long and hard in our bipartisan support for Ukraine that transcends party lines.

All 218 signatories have the gratitude of the American people, the whole of the Ukrainian nation, and freedom lovers around the world. Let us now pass this bill with dispatch before the end of next week.

Mr. Speaker, I include a summary of H.R. 2913.

H.R. 2913—UKRAINE SUPPORT ACT

SUMMARY

This bipartisan legislation enhances security assistance to Ukraine while placing long overdue sanctions on Russia to force Vladimir Putin to end the war on Ukraine.

UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE

Extends Lend-Lease authority through 2028.

Authorizes up to \$8 Billion in Foreign Military Financing loans.

Extends Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative.

Supports Baltic Allies.

Establishes new mechanisms to support Ukraine's recovery.

Supports intelligence cooperation.

RUSSIA SANCTIONS AND EXPORT CONTROLS

If Russia continues waging war against Ukraine or refusing to negotiate a peace agreement in good faith, requires the President to sanction:

Russian financial institutions;

Russia's energy industry;

Constructors and maintainers of the Kerch Strait Bridge;

Russia's Shadow Fleet;

Facilitators of North Korea's participation in the invasion of Ukraine;

All foreign persons involved in the kidnapping of Ukrainian children;

Imposes export licensing requirements on foreign-produced items known to be destined for Russian military or industrial activities, and to prevent US-origin drone technology from being shared with Iran.

500 percent tariffs on Russia.

Vote yes on the Ukraine Support Act to pressure Russia to end its invasion of Ukraine.

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, millions celebrated the work, love, and support mothers give

to their children and families across the country.

There are so many ways, seen and unseen, that mothers show up for their families and care for their communities.

I know that I am incredibly grateful to my beloved mother and for the privilege of getting to be the mother to my three wonderful children.

Appropriately, Mother's Day also marked the beginning of National Women's Health Week. This provides the opportunity to highlight women's health, reflect on the progress we have made and the ongoing research we need, and to commit to the continued advancement of access, quality, and affordability in women's healthcare.

□ 2020

Advancing women's health and delivering the best possible care requires a strong collaboration between the many caregivers and entities that have built and continue the work of advancing women's healthcare.

One organization that has been an indispensable partner to all obstetrician/gynecologists in their quest to provide the best evidence-based care to their patients over the past 75 years is the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Over its 75-year legacy, ACOG has never wavered from its foundational mission of advancing the quality and consistency of care for women through guidance, education, and professional collaboration.

In the early years of its existence, ACOG set out to create evidence-based standards and develop opportunities for clinicians to continue their education.

Growing scientific progress and an expanding focus on women's health opened doors for the organization to serve as a leading voice as the Nation experienced historic advances, like the FDA's approval of the birth control pill and the Griswold v. Connecticut decision that established the right to privacy and, therefore, the right to use contraception, which had been illegal in Connecticut and many other States prior to this decision in 1965.

As these events established the policy landscape for women's health, ACOG continued its work standardizing prenatal and cancer screenings, introducing its own academic journal, and establishing the requirements to achieve high honors in the field of obstetrics and gynecology.

The landmark Roe v. Wade decision, as well as the establishment of the Title X program, which was the first Federal grant program in the United States dedicated to providing family planning and other preventive health services to low-income families, both elevated women's health further and supported ACOG's efforts to expand access to reproductive healthcare to all Americans, regardless of their ability to pay. They also amplified the importance of understanding the causes of maternal mortality and working to decrease it.

During this time, ACOG was at the forefront of building reliable, trusted programs that helped standardize evidence-based medicine, integrate cultural competency, and strengthen policy partnerships.

ACOG's role in women's health was also extended to helping protect the patient-physician relationship.

From the critical influence of the Doe v. Bolton decision, which was the companion case to Roe v. Wade in which the Supreme Court struck down burdensome procedural requirements that effectively made abortion completely inaccessible in Georgia, even if the patient's life or health were threatened, to the mobilization needed in the aftermath of the Dobbs decision in 2022, which overturned Roe.

ACOG serves as a trusted source for evidence-based guidance for care across the lifespan for patients and providers alike. Both turn to ACOG for information about critical topics, ranging from contraception, cancer screening, STI screening and treatment, obstetric care, best surgical practices and advances, nutrition, abortion care, vaccines, menopause care, and everything in between.

In its continued pursuit of advancing women's healthcare, ACOG has championed work to understand and address the systemic issues vulnerable women and populations face.

Through pioneering initiatives like the Committee on Healthcare for Underserved Women and the recognition that health is deeply impacted by factors beyond biology and clinical care, ACOG was an early leader in establishing opportunities for communities' lived experiences to be heard and incorporated into our understanding of disparities and how to address them.

As ACOG expanded its focus on reviewing and understanding the impact of systemic inequities and disproportionate burdens of maternal mortality in minority communities, ACOG continued its work of building robust and responsive clinical guidance and programming that centers respectful care and quality improvements.

During times of transformational advancements like the development and approval of the HPV vaccine, the Affordable Care Act, and historic investments in maternal death prevention efforts, ACOG has led and helped expand key collaborations and partnerships.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. PETTERSEN).

Ms. PETTERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Women's Health Week and the catastrophic impact Trump and Republicans have had on women's health in this country.

This week, the Trump administration launched moms.gov, another performative political stunt pretending to support moms, but the health and well-being of women and families has never been under greater threat than under this administration.

Our access to healthcare is being decimated with cuts to Medicaid and

the ACA, while women are also dealing with the ongoing consequences of the Dobbs decision across this country and, somehow, it might even get worse.

Republicans are working on a backend national abortion ban by trying to eliminate access to mifepristone, an abortion pill that is utilized for 63 percent of abortions in the United States. This move will disproportionately impact women in poverty and women in rural communities who face significant barriers to being able to see a doctor.

Despite their lies, we know that mifepristone is a safe, effective medication, but access to this lifesaving drug now hangs in the balance before the Supreme Court. Any restrictions of this medication for miscarriages and abortions will be another devastating attack on our ability to make our own decisions about our health, our bodies, and our futures.

Let's be clear that this has nothing to do with science. It is about controlling women and taking away our access to reproductive healthcare and our ability to make our own decisions.

During Women's Health Week, let's remember that Donald Trump has consistently put us last. As a woman, as a mom, and as an American, I am horrified. We cannot stand on the sidelines.

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague (Ms. MORRISON) for coordinating this Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, better known as ACOG.

For three-quarters of a century, ACOG has been at the forefront of improving the health and well-being of women, mothers, and families across the United States.

Since its founding in 1951, ACOG has helped to shape the standard of care in obstetrics and gynecology, advancing research, physician education, and evidence-based medicine.

Every day, OB/GYNs across our country provide compassionate care through every stage of life—from birth to infancy, then to adolescence and adulthood, from pregnancy to menopause, and beyond.

As a physician myself, I know firsthand the critical role that trusted medical professionals play in keeping our communities healthy and informed. That role is certainly critical today as we see from this administration so many attacks, I would say, on the ability of families to have the information and to gain the information that they need to protect their health, the health of their families and communities at large.

We have moved away from science as the foundation for decisionmaking in healthcare, and that terrible trend, that tragic trend needs to end.

ACOG has consistently worked to ensure that physicians have the tools,

training, and guidance necessary to deliver the highest quality care to patients. Their work has helped to reduce maternal and infant mortality, improve prenatal care, expand access to preventive screenings, and advance women's health outcomes nationwide.

At a time when maternal health disparities continue to impact far too many families, particularly Black mothers and their children and others who live in underserved communities, organizations like ACOG remain essential partners in the effort to build a healthier and more equitable future.

Now, I mentioned I am a practicing physician. I have had to call on members of ACOG to help me provide help to women. Certainly, as a legislator at the State level for 26 years, I worked closely with ACOG on everything from medical malpractice reform to obviously dealing with the tragedy of the disparities in Black infant mortality and for Black mothers who are pregnant and delivering children.

Their work to provide standards of care, to guide decisionmakers, not only in the healthcare arena, but in the legislative arena, to improve outcomes for all people, and particularly those who suffer from disparities in our healthcare system, we owe to ACOG a tremendous debt of gratitude.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, we owe a gratitude to the doctors, the nurses, the researchers, the educators, and advocates who have dedicated themselves to this mission for the past 75 years. I will stand and commend ACOG for its decades of leadership, service, and advocacy on behalf of patients and physicians alike.

Congratulations to the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists on this important milestone, and I wish the organization continued success in the years ahead.

Ms. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the last few years have brought unprecedented challenges and rapid change. During the COVID-19 pandemic and in the wake of the Dobbs decision, ACOG held strong to the foundational mission that has driven its work for decades, strengthening equitable, accessible obstetric and gynecologic care.

ACOG's presence and leadership during these pivotal moments for women's health and the profession they have represented over the last 75 years has helped translate the lifesaving scientific advances and give evidence-based guidance and stability to a profession that has, is, and will continue to be monumentally consequential to families across the country and in every congressional district.

Reflecting on the incredible progress of the last 75 years also brings to the forefront the importance of the work still left to build and expand.

Despite the incredible advances in women's health, challenges and obstacles to fully achieving the mission of equitable, accessible care remain.

An estimated 36 percent of counties in the United States are maternity care deserts, meaning they do not have a hospital or birth center offering obstetric care or any obstetric providers.

Two-thirds of these maternity care deserts are in rural areas that are also the most vulnerable to disruptions in services and hospital closures. Approximately 1.2 million women live in counties with only one OB/GYN.

By 2035, the estimates are that 44 U.S. States are projected to not have enough OB/GYNs to meet those States' needs with the most severe shortages being in rural areas.

Women in many communities are already traveling long distances to access prenatal care or to deliver safely in a hospital.

In the wealthiest country in the world, in a country built on the principles of human dignity and freedom, these alarming statistics can and should lead to a unified bipartisan effort to address them.

We have seen how the work and legacy of ACOG and its members have helped support historic achievements while upholding the core goals of access and quality of care.

Facing and overcoming persistent challenges demands a commitment to science and evidence-based practices for setting the standards for OB/GYN care, for advocating for policies that advance the field, and empowering physicians to provide patients with the care they need all while building on each of these areas to inform continuing education opportunities, refine clinical guidelines, and continue the evolution of the field of obstetrics and gynecology.

Beyond navigating increasing administrative burdens, burnout, and workforce instability, OB/GYNs are having to deal with health and medical misinformation jeopardizing their work and their patients' well-being.

Patients are increasingly exposed to misinformation about contraception, fertility, pregnancy care, menopause, vaccines, and reproductive health.

This creates fear and confusion, undermines trust, delays treatment, imposes real risks to patients and families. That is why trusted scientific leadership matters.

ACOG and generations of physician-researchers have helped translate rigorous science into evidence-based care that improves outcomes for women across the lifespan. Throughout my career in medicine and public service, I have worked to support evidence-based approaches that deliver for families.

From championing expanding Medicaid coverage to 12-months postpartum in Minnesota to advocating for the reauthorization of the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act in Congress, I have advocated for advancing early intervention and prevention to save lives.

Healthy mothers, healthy babies, and healthy families strengthen communities, reduce long-term healthcare expenditures, and improve the long-term resilience of our Nation.

I had the privilege of caring for patients as an OB/GYN for more than 20 years, so I have seen firsthand the challenges patients face to afford and get the care they need.

I have seen the impacts of some of the medical breakthroughs and improvements to care that have occurred over the decades, and I have seen how social determinants of health make it so difficult for many Americans to have good health.

As an OB/GYN, I have seen my patients directly benefit from practices that were built on decades of research, clinical trials, and the dedicated work of multiple generations of my fellow OB/GYNs.

These advances were the result of hard-fought advocacy and awareness campaigns, committed work from researchers and physicians, and patient voices being centered and truly heard.

One of the great privileges of my years in practice was caring for my patients across different stages of their life. OB/GYNs see patients from adolescence through adulthood to end of life.

I have cared for patients that I delivered through to their own pregnancies, and I have cared for many through early adulthood, through midlife, through perimenopause and menopause, and beyond.

ACOG has been there every step of the way to provide evidence-based recommendations to help guide my and my patients' decisionmaking.

In the decades I have spent in this remarkable profession, it has been my sincere honor and privilege to provide the care my patients needed, from prenatal care through labor and delivery, to contraception, to hormone replacement therapy, from the exam room to the operating room, helping patients through important life stage transitions, creating care plans through shared decisionmaking, always working to meet patients where they are to meet their unique needs. ACOG has been a critical partner throughout my career and the careers of many thousands of OB/GYNs across the country.

In a rapidly changing world that is marked by advances in technology and access to an avalanche of information, not all of which is accurate, it is difficult for many of us to fully understand how drastically circumstances have changed for women and how transformational historic moments were to women's health and safety.

Younger generations of Americans and even some older Americans may not be able to recall a United States without protected access to birth control or an HPV vaccine.

My career as an obstetrician-gynecologist began at a time when foundational concepts in public health and clinical practice were better defined and elements critical to progress, like the right to privacy and the ability of women to make their own independent healthcare decisions, were protected.

In the last decade as women's health rights and protections have been

threatened and eroded, I am thinking of my patients and of people across our country.

I am remembering my patients who disclosed, in some cases for the first time in their life, their traumatic experiences prior to the protections of *Roe v. Wade*.

I am thinking of my younger patients who worried about the possibility of losing protected access to abortion care as the Supreme Court ruled on the *Dobbs* case.

I am thinking about the babies I delivered protected by vaccines from preventable, life-threatening conditions and the mothers spared from complications because of comprehensive, evidence-based clinical guidelines and access to comprehensive care.

I would be remiss if I didn't take the opportunity to remind everyone in this moment when access to mifepristone is threatened, the research on mifepristone has not changed. It has been an FDA approved medicine for a quarter of a century. It has been used safely and effectively by millions of women around the globe.

For my entire 20-year-plus career as an OB/GYN, mifepristone has been used to help women manage miscarriages and safely end pregnancy. Its safety record surpasses most over-the-counter medicines.

What has changed is the people in power. People with no medical training who want to undermine access to healthcare, control women's bodies, and ignore evidence-based science because of their own personal ideology.

Putting their desire to control and restrict women, women whose lives they know nothing about and who they will never meet, over facts and research and safety.

It sets a very dangerous precedent for us all.

□ 2040

As we celebrate the milestones of the last 75 years of ACOG, we also have a responsibility to face future challenges head-on, mindful of all that we have gained and conscious of what is being lost, unwaveringly committed to improving the lives of all people seeking care, their families, and their communities.

I offer a heartfelt thank-you to ACOG for 75 years of always standing with patients and physicians and for its ongoing work to improve healthcare and the health of our patients. Onward to the next 75.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3497. An act to establish a medal of service for law enforcement officers and first responders.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Kevin F. McCumber, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 12, 2026, the following bills were presented to the President of the United States for approval:

H.R. 2815. To provide equitable treatment for the people of the Village Corporation established for the Native Village of Saxman, Alaska, and for other purposes.

H.R. 972. To amend the Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area Act to adjust the boundary of the Sloan Canyon National Conservation Area, and for other purposes.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 14, 2026, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE A COMMITTEE

MAY 13, 2026.

To the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XV, I, Gregory W. Meeks, move to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution, H. Res. 518 entitled, a resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2913) to authorize support for Ukraine, and for other purposes, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Gregory W. Meeks. | 20. Salud O. Carbajal. | 38. Herbert C. Conaway. |
| 2. Sara Jacobs. | 21. Sanford D. Bishop. | 39. Kristen McDonald |
| 3. Bonnie Watson Coleman. | 22. Steven Horsford. | Rivet. |
| 4. Gabe Arno. | 23. Ilhan Omar. | 40. Danny K. Davis. |
| 5. LaMonica McIver. | 24. Greg Stanton. | 41. Gilbert Ray Cisneros. |
| 6. Dina Titus. | 25. Delia C. Ramirez. | 42. Dwight Evans. |
| 7. Raja Krishnamoorthi. | 26. Suzanne Bonamici. | 43. Nanette Diaz Barragan. |
| 8. Paul Tonko. | 27. Jasmine Crockett. | 44. Robin L. Kelly. |
| 9. Sean Casten. | 28. Joseph D. Morelle. | 45. Robert C. "Bobby" Scott. |
| 10. Valerie P. Foushee. | 29. Julie Johnson. | 46. Nancy Pelosi. |
| 11. Troy A. Carter. | 30. Marilyn Strickland. | 47. Daniel S. Goldman. |
| 12. Deborah K. Ross. | 31. Lucy McBath. | 48. John B. Larson. |
| 13. Chrissy Houlahan. | 32. Joe Neguse. | 49. William R. Keating. |
| 14. Robert Menendez. | 33. Brittany Pettersen. | 50. Juan Vargas. |
| 15. Teresa Leger Fernandez. | 34. Seth Magaziner. | 51. Mark DeSaulnier. |
| 16. April McClain Delaney. | 35. Maggie Goodlander. | 52. George Latimer. |
| 17. Ami Bera. | 36. Sam T. Liccardo. | 53. Yvette D. Clarke. |
| 18. Steny H. Hoyer. | 37. Sydney Kamlager-Dove. | 54. Grace Meng. |
| 19. Henry C. "Hank" Johnson. | | 55. Al Green. |

56. Greg Landsman.
57. J. Luis Correa.
58. Mike Thompson.
59. Sylvia R. Garcia.
60. Steve Cohen.
61. Eugene Simon.
62. Madeleine Dean.
63. Bennie G. Thompson.
64. James E. Clyburn.
65. Frank Pallone.
66. Betty McCollum.
67. Terri A. Sewell.
68. Nikema Williams.
69. Bill Foster.
70. Jamie Raskin.
71. Joyce Beatty.
72. Johnny Olszewski.
73. Glenn Ivey.
74. Josh Gottheimer.
75. Maxine Waters.
76. Yassamin Ansari.
77. Doris O. Matsui.
78. Jennifer L. McClellan.
79. Sheila Cherfilus-McCormick.
80. George Whitesides.
81. Val T. Hoyle.
82. Shomari Figures.
83. Jonathan L. Jackson.
84. Bradley Scott Schneider.
85. Veronica Escobar.
86. Sarah McBride.
87. Debbie Wasserman Schultz.
88. Frederica S. Wilson.
89. Jahana Hayes.
90. Shontel M. Brown.
91. Seth Moulton.
92. Hakeem S. Jeffries.
93. Lois Frankel.
94. Marcy Kaptur.
95. Kweisi Mfume.
96. James A. Himes.
97. Suhas Subramanyam.
98. Rick Larsen.
99. Jake Auchincloss.
100. Alma S. Adams.
101. Wesley Bell.
102. Luz M. Rivas.
103. Joe Courtney.
104. Raul Ruiz.
105. Ted Lieu.
106. Gwen Moore.
107. Linda T. Sánchez.
108. Jim Costa.
109. Dave Min.
110. Kathy Castor.
111. Scott H. Peters.
112. Zoe Lofgren.
113. Darren Soto.
114. Brad Sherman.
115. Nellie Pou.
116. Alexandria Simon.
117. Maxwell Frost.
118. Timothy M. Kennedy.
119. James P. McGovern.
120. Katherine M. Clark.
121. Mike Levin.
122. Lloyd Doggett.
123. Mark Takano.
124. Josh Riley.
125. Derek Tran.
126. Maxine Dexter.
127. Stephen F. Lynch.
128. David Scott.
129. Mike Quigley.
130. Henry Cuellar.
131. Christopher R. Deluzio.
132. Emily Randall.
133. Brendan F. Boyle.
134. Susie Lee.
135. Norma J. Torres.
136. Rosa L. DeLauro.
137. Cleo Fields.
138. André Carson.
139. Jimmy Gomez.
140. Nikki Budzinski.
141. Ed Case.
142. Jill N. Tokuda.
143. Pramila Jayapal.
144. Ro Khanna.
145. Judy Chu.
146. Janelle S. Bynum.
147. Emanuel Cleaver.
148. Mark Pocan.
149. Adam Gray.
150. Julia Brownley.
151. Thomas R. Suozzi.
152. Jerrold Nadler.
153. John Garamendi.
154. Chris Pappas.
155. Lauren Underwood.
156. Andrea Salinas.
157. Janice D. Schakowsky.
158. Lizzie Fletcher.
159. Diana DeGette.
160. Frank J. Mrvan.
161. Jared Huffman.
162. Pete Aguilar.
163. Robert Garcia.
164. Ayanna Pressley.
165. Morgan McGarvey.
166. Nydia M. Velázquez.
167. Becca Balint.
168. Kelly Morrison.
169. Donald S. Beyer.
170. Jared F. Golden.
171. Marie Gluesenkamp Perez.
172. Jesus G. “Chuy” Garcia.
173. Suzan K. DelBene.
174. Sarah Elfreth.
175. Kim Schrier.
176. Laura Friedman.
177. Adriano Espaillat.
178. Shri Thanedar.
179. Debbie Dingell.
180. Greg Casar.
181. Melanie A. Stansbury.
182. Richard E. Neal.
183. Kevin Mullin.
184. Jimmy Panetta.
185. Mary Gay Scanlon.
186. Jason Crow.
187. Lori Trahan.
188. Haley M. Stevens.
189. Laura Gillen.
190. Jared Moskowitz.
191. Donald G. Davis.
192. Adam Smith.
193. Josh Harder.
194. Hillary J. Scholten.
195. Joaquin Castro.
196. Sharice Davis.
197. Chellie Pingree.
198. Eric Sorensen.
199. Donald Norcross.
200. Gabe Vasquez.
201. John W. Mannion.
202. Angie Craig.
203. Marc A. Veasey.
204. Ritchie Torres.
205. Emilia Strong Sykes.
206. Patrick Ryan.
207. Vicente Gonzalez.
208. Lateefah Simon.
209. Eric Swalwell.
210. James R. Walkinshaw.
211. Don Bacon.
212. Summer L. Lee.
213. Adelita S. Grijalva.
214. Rashida Tlaib.
215. Brian K. Fitzpatrick.
216. Christian D. Menefee.
217. Analilia Mejia.
218. Kevin Kiley.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

EC-3513. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office of Child Care, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Restoring Flexibility in the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) (RIN: 0970-AD20) received May 12, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC-3514. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Reimagining and Improving Student Education--Federal Student Loan Program Final Regulations [Docket ID: ED-2025-OPE-0944] (RIN: 1840-AD98) received May 12, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

EC-3515. A letter from the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Promoting Fair and Open Competitive Bidding in the E-Rate Program [WC Docket No.: 21-455] Schools and Libraries Universal Service Support Mechanism [CC Docket No.: 02-6] received May 12, 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-3516. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a summary of actions taken by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in response to recommendations contained in various U.S. Government Accountability Office reports related to NRC activities for FY 2025; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3517. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Space Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Modernizing Spectrum Sharing for Satellite Broadband [SB Docket No.: 25-157] received May 13, 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-3518. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report titled “Cuban Compliance with the Migration Accords” Department Report Number: 007137, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, Sec. 2245; (112 Stat. 2681-824); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3519. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report titled “Voting Practices of UN Members, Department Report Number: 007111; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3520. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report titled “Resolution of the Cyprus Dispute” Department Report Number: 007018; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3521. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report titled “Annual Report to Congress on the Interdiction of Aircraft Engaged in Illicit Drug Trafficking” Department Report Number: 007031, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2291-4(c)(1); Public Law 103-337, Sec. 1012 (as amended by Public Law 107-108, Sec. 503); (115 Stat. 1405); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3522. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Report Titled “PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989, as amended” Department Report Number: 007123; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3523. A letter from the Biologist, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys in the Gulf of America [Docket No.: 260414-0101] (RIN: 0648-BO19) received May 12, 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-3524. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major interim final rule — Extension of Compliance Dates for Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability; Accessibility of Web Content and Mobile Applications of Recipients of Departmental Financial Assistance [Docket No.: HHS-OCR-2026-0133] (RIN: 0945-AA30) received May 12, 2026, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT: Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 2026 Economic Report of the President (Rept. 119-649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union Union.

Mr. COMER: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3766. A bill to prohibit the District of Columbia from requiring tribunals in court or administrative proceedings in the District of Columbia to defer to the Mayor of the District of Columbia's interpretation of statutes and regulations, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 119-650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALBERG: Committee on Education and Workforce. H.R. 7082. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide for greater flexibility in the Federal programs supporting the planning and implementation of charter schools, with an amendment (Rept. 119-651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

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

H.R. 8776. A bill to require a report by the Attorney General on effective strategies and best practices to reduce stigma related to mental health among law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 8777. A bill to restore certain guidance and rules of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 8778. A bill to require the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board to finalize a proposed rule relating to accessibility of electric vehicle charging stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. HARSHBARGER (for herself, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. NEHLS, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 8779. A bill to prohibit pharmacy benefit managers and pharmacies from being under common ownership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE of Utah (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CAREY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. BEAN of Florida):

H.R. 8780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve the advanced manufacturing production tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BOST, Ms. TENNEY, Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. RULLI, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. MOORE of West Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MCDOWELL, Ms. FEDORCHAK, and Mr. MANN):

H.R. 8781. A bill to clarify that for purposes of Federal nondiscrimination requirements applicable to education programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance, discrimination prohibited under title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 is based on the biological reality of sex; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. BERGMAN (for himself, Mr. WIED, and Mr. STAUBER):

H.R. 8782. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to include dedicated-use municipal snow removal vehicles and machinery as examples of an emergency vehicle in the definition of covered fleet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

H.R. 8783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income charitable distributions from certain employer-sponsored retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 8784. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals and freestanding birth centers to notify each mother of a miscarried fetus of her rights with respect to such fetus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

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

H.R. 8785. A bill to amend section 5336 of title 49, United States Code, to provide for certain apportionments to medium-sized transit intensive cities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Ms. CROCKETT):

H.R. 8786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide the work opportunity tax credit with respect to the hiring of veterans in the field of renewable energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE (for himself, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SELF, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

H.R. 8787. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from contracting with retailers who use covered payment processing equipment, systems, or services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DELUZIO (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 8788. A bill to prohibit vulture investors from investing in youth sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 8789. A bill to expand eligibility for certain housing programs for qualified volunteer first responders; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HARRIGAN (for himself and Ms. SALINAS):

H.R. 8790. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to direct research, development, demonstration, and commercial application activities in support of next-generation geothermal and closed-loop geothermal systems in various conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. FIGURES):

H.R. 8791. A bill to provide for the long-term improvement of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. HOULAHAN (for herself, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. LUNA, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio):

H.R. 8792. A bill to require the collection of information on multigenerational caregiving in at least one major Federal population survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HUIZENGA (for himself, Mr. CORREA, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LAWLER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 8793. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a list of covered providers that complete annual training on the prevention of suicide among veterans and to make such list available to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Ms. MCBRIDE):

H.R. 8794. A bill to provide for increased research and initiatives related to bleeding disorders in underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LUNA:

H.R. 8795. A bill to provide a fuel tax holiday; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS (for herself, Mr. EZELL, and Mr. MCGUIRE):

H.R. 8796. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a safety buffer zone to protect certain Federal law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 8797. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize cooperative partnerships for mineral extraction activities at Army organic industrial base facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. OMAR (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. AMO, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. BALINT, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BELL, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. BUDZINSKI, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CHU, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. DEXTER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS of Pennsylvania, Ms. FRIEDMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACOBS, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MAGAZINER, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGARVEY, Mrs. MCIVER, Mr. MENEFEE, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PETTERSEN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SIMON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. STANSBURY, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. THANEDAR, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 8798. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to make breakfasts and lunches free for all children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PEREZ (for herself and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 8799. A bill to establish certain requirements for any communications by a private entity regarding United States Department of Transportation numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 8800. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2027 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 8801. A bill to prohibit a congestion toll in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RASKIN (for himself, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CHU, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SIMON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. WALKINSHAW, Ms. PETERSEN, Mr. CORREA, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NEAL, Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MANNION, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. SUBRAMANYAM, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. CARSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. RANDALL, Mr. MORELLE, Mrs. MCCLAIN DELANEY, Ms. SALINAS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. CROCKETT, Mr. THANEDAR, Mr. LIEU, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROSS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. FIGURES, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. BALINT, Mr. OLSZEWSKI, and Ms. ESCOBAR):

H.R. 8802. A bill to provide compensation to law enforcement officers who defended the United States Capitol during the events that occurred at or near the United States Capitol on January 6, 2021, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 8803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits excise tax on crude oil and to rebate the tax collected back to individual taxpayers until the President declares that all hostilities with Iran have ceased, the Strait of Hormuz is fully reopened, and the price of oil drops below \$75 per barrel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8804. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into contracts with recovery audit contractors to perform prepayment reviews under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 8805. A bill to provide supplemental payments to Federal personnel performing immigration enforcement operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. VALADAO (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MOORE of Utah, and Mrs. DINGELL):

H.R. 8806. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the newborn tax credit and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.J. Res. 184. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; File Disclosure"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.J. Res. 185. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8

of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024-03: Unlawful and Unenforceable Contract Terms and Conditions"; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. FOUSHEE:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities with Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. MACKENZIE):

H. Res. 1279. A resolution supporting the designation of the month of May as "Lyme and Tick-borne Disease Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BERA (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. KIM, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WALKINSHAW):

H. Res. 1280. A resolution supporting the designation the week of May 10 through May 16, 2026, as "Taiwanese American Heritage Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

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

H. Res. 1281. A resolution recognizing the 175th anniversary of the founding of Alpha Delta Pi sorority; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Ms. MORRISON (for herself, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. SIMON, Ms. ANSARI, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. ELFRETH, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. RANDALL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ROSS, Ms. SALINAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. BERA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. MCIVER, and Ms. SCHOLTEN):

H. Res. 1282. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and its critical role in advancing the practice of obstetrics and gynecology and the health and well-being of patients through excellence in clinical practice, education, advocacy, and research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 1283. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2026 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

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

By Ms. GILLEN:

H.R. 8776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 8777.

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

Article I, Section 8, cl. 1, To pay debts and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8 cl. 3, To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, Among the Several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, cl. 18, To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 8778.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. HARSHBARGER:

H.R. 8779.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MOORE of Utah:

H.R. 8780.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.R. 8781.

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

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

By Mr. BERGMAN:

H.R. 8782.

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

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

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8783.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 8784.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. CARBAJAL:

H.R. 8785.

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

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 8786.

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

Title I, Section 8

By Mr. CLINE:

H.R. 8787.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DELUZZIO:

H.R. 8788.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 8789.

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

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HARRIGAN:

H.R. 8790.

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

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

By Mr. HILL of Arkansas:

H.R. 8791.

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

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. HOULAHAN:
H.R. 8792.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUIZENGA:
H.R. 8793.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:
H.R. 8794.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Necessary and Proper Clause—Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. LUNA:
H.R. 8795.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
By Ms. MALLIOTAKIS:

H.R. 8796.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MORAN:
H.R. 8797.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Ms. OMAR:
H.R. 8798.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PEREZ:
H.R. 8799.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:
H.R. 8800.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 12, clause 13, and clause 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PERRY:
H.R. 8801.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution
By Mr. RASKIN:

H.R. 8802.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SHERMAN:
H.R. 8803.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the US Constitution
By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 8804.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section VIII
By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 8805.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8
By Mr. VALADAO:

H.R. 8806.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. LYNCH:

H.J. Res. 184
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.
By Mr. VARGAS:
H.J. Res. 185.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, cl. 1, To pay debts and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States.

Article I, Section 8 cl. 3, To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, Among the Several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, cl. 18, To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the powers enumerated under section 8 and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. CRANK.
H.R. 220: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 255: Mr. MENEFEE.
H.R. 378: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 516: Mr. McDOWELL.
H.R. 588: Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 642: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 685: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 925: Mrs. CAMMACK.
H.R. 942: Mr. MOSKOWITZ.
H.R. 959: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 1027: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 1046: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1109: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 1189: Ms. OMAR.
H.R. 1227: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 1241: Mr. McDOWELL.
H.R. 1288: Mr. VINDMAN.
H.R. 1548: Mr. FIGURES.
H.R. 1551: Mr. GRAY.
H.R. 1742: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1810: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1987: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1993: Mr. AUCHINCLOSS.
H.R. 2028: Mr. SCHMIDT and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 2048: Mr. KEAN.
H.R. 2089: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 2094: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THANEDAR, and Mr. GRAY.
H.R. 2095: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 2120: Ms. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 2242: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2314: Mr. BEAN of Florida.
H.R. 2352: Ms. RANDALL and Ms. ANSARI.
H.R. 2355: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2359: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2512: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2540: Mr. RILEY of New York and Mr. LALOTA.
H.R. 2662: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 2671: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2692: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2757: Ms. CHU.
H.R. 2767: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2829: Mr. THANEDAR.
H.R. 2878: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2913: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2978: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 3045: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 3140: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3178: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 3243: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3248: Ms. MCBRIDE.
H.R. 3327: Mr. MACKENZIE.
H.R. 3469: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. SUBRAMANYAM.
H.R. 3513: Mr. MRVAN and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 3514: Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 3527: Mrs. FLETCHER, Ms. CHU, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3544: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. TORRES of New York.
H.R. 3597: Mr. MOYLAN.

H.R. 3747: Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania and Ms. GOODLANDER.

H.R. 3931: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 4077: Mr. DOWNING and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 4093: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4109: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 4253: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 4311: Mr. FRY.
H.R. 4332: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 4398: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 4464: Mr. ONDER.
H.R. 4664: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 4718: Mr. BERGMAN and Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 4744: Ms. CRAIG.
H.R. 4763: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4783: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. FRY.
H.R. 4797: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 4966: Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 4972: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 5120: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 5123: Mr. STANTON.
H.R. 5168: Ms. TLAIIB.
H.R. 5258: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 5282: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 5298: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5309: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 5355: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 5390: Mr. GRAY.
H.R. 5408: Mr. CASAR and Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5437: Mr. VAN EPPS.
H.R. 5448: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 5449: Mr. WALKINSHAW.
H.R. 5490: Mr. LATIMER and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 5506: Ms. ANSARI and Mr. GARCÍA of California.

H.R. 5509: Mr. CRANK, Mrs. GRIJALVA, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 5563: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 5621: Mr. SORENSEN and Mrs. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 6056: Mr. MIN.
H.R. 6086: Ms. ANSARI and Mr. FITZGERALD.
H.R. 6128: Mr. MAGAZINER.
H.R. 6130: Ms. GOODLANDER and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 6137: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6149: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 6152: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 6213: Mr. McDOWELL.
H.R. 6231: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina and Mrs. BICE.

H.R. 6283: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 6289: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 6425: Mr. LATIMER.
H.R. 6468: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 6527: Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona.
H.R. 6682: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 6806: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 6809: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
H.R. 6832: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. RULLI.

H.R. 6856: Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. FOUSHEE, and Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 6875: Mr. DUNN of Florida.
H.R. 6895: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 6960: Mr. SHREVE.
H.R. 7026: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 7037: Mr. HARRIGAN.
H.R. 7086: Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona, Mr. HILL of Arkansas, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 7096: Ms. BYNUM.
H.R. 7212: Mr. JAMES.
H.R. 7223: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 7227: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 7281: Ms. SIMON.
H.R. 7335: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
H.R. 7417: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 7441: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 7520: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CORREA, Mr. BEAN of Florida, and Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.

H.R. 7540: Ms. VAN DUYN.
H.R. 7548: Ms. STANSBURY and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 7587: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
H.R. 7598: Mr. CORREA and Mr. HAMADEH of Arizona.

H.R. 7608: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 7622: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
 H.R. 7769: Ms. SALAZAR and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 7779: Ms. MCCLELLAN.
 H.R. 7798: Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H.R. 7808: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 7826: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 7919: Mr. LANDSMAN.
 H.R. 7957: Ms. RANDALL, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. MIN.
 H.R. 7961: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 7965: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
 H.R. 7970: Mr. McDOWELL.
 H.R. 7974: Mr. McDOWELL.
 H.R. 7977: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 8019: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 8028: Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 8041: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 8076: Mrs. BICE and Mr. BERA.
 H.R. 8092: Mr. TIMMONS.
 H.R. 8101: Ms. VAN DUYN.
 H.R. 8163: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 8183: Mr. MOORE of Utah.
 H.R. 8205: Mrs. BICE and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 8327: Mr. LATIMER.
 H.R. 8332: Mr. KENNEDY of Utah.
 H.R. 8414: Mr. FITZGERALD.
 H.R. 8421: Mr. LATIMER, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. MCIVER, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 8429: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 8430: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. SCHKOWSKY.
 H.R. 8437: Ms. MALOY.

H.R. 8465: Ms. TLAIB and Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 8474: Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 8540: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 8541: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 8563: Mr. GOLDMAN of New York.
 H.R. 8582: Mr. NADLER and Ms. ROSS.
 H.R. 8586: Mr. FULLER.
 H.R. 8592: Ms. TOKUDA, Mr. HERNÁNDEZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 8596: Mr. MANN and Mr. MCGUIRE.
 H.R. 8603: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.
 H.R. 8611: Mr. HUNT.
 H.R. 8612: Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 8620: Mrs. HAYES.
 H.R. 8630: Mr. LUTTRELL.
 H.R. 8632: Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE.
 H.R. 8648: Mrs. KIM and Mr. HARRIGAN.
 H.R. 8654: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 8661: Mrs. KIM.
 H.R. 8666: Mr. LATIMER, Mrs. HAYES, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.
 H.R. 8667: Ms. BUDZINSKI and Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 8679: Mr. HARRIGAN.
 H.R. 8680: Mr. EVANS of Colorado.
 H.R. 8690: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. TITUS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. MENEFEE, and Mrs. SYKES.
 H.R. 8699: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 8716: Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 8730: Mr. LATTI, Ms. BOEBERT, and Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 8736: Mr. FITZGERALD.
 H.R. 8737: Mr. MANN and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 8743: Mr. HARIDOPOLOS.
 H.R. 8756: Mr. NORMAN.

H.J. Res. 122: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.J. Res. 152: Mr. BACON.
 H.J. Res. 154: Mrs. GRIJALVA.
 H.J. Res. 155: Ms. OMAR.
 H. Con. Res. 41: Mrs. KIM and Mr. RILEY of New York.
 H. Con. Res. 96: Mr. BALDERSON, Ms. MALOY, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. RULLI, and Mr. BAIRD.
 H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. SHREVE and Mr. OWENS.
 H. Res. 70: Mr. ALFORD.
 H. Res. 948: Mr. CASE.
 H. Res. 1035: Mr. LATIMER.
 H. Res. 1164: Mrs. HINSON.
 H. Res. 1179: Ms. OMAR and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 1209: Ms. SCHOLTEN and Mr. LEVIN.
 H. Res. 1248: Mrs. TORRES of California and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H. Res. 1251: Ms. STANSBURY.
 H. Res. 1252: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. FIGURES, and Mr. FALLON.
 H. Res. 1253: Mr. CISNEROS.
 H. Res. 1268: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. HAYES, and Mrs. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 1273: Mrs. BIGGS of South Carolina.

OFFERED BY MR. ALFORD

The amendment to be offered by Representative Alford, or a designee, to H.R. 8469, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2027, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 13, 2026

No. 81

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Gracious God, thank You for the gift of Yourself and for teaching us how to live and serve. Lord, forgive us when we take Your grace for granted. Forgive us also when we fail to treat others as we ourselves desire to be treated.

Lord, transform our lawmakers into instruments of Your glory, enabling them to strengthen our Nation and world. Remind them that fierce winds bring no anxiety to those who keep their eyes on You. Imbue our Senators with Your wisdom, that they may know the road to take. Sustain them in all of their endeavors, keeping them from stumbling and slipping.

And, Lord, bring peace to our Nation and world.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. 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.

USMCA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor many times recently to explain how important the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement is to the economies of the three countries—particularly the United States and particularly agriculture in the United States—and that we need to soon make a decision to continue the USMCA. It is up for review, and that review ought to be conducted very quickly because of the economic importance that I have kind of tried to demonstrate on the floor of the U.S. Senate—how it has expanded trade between our countries and business between our countries and how it has been so beneficial to the economic growth of all three countries but particularly the United States. So I have said the renewal is really a no-brainer.

So I continue my review today of this USMCA, but there is one part of that agreement that does not show up in the text of the agreement or is easily calculated in dollars, as I have tried to explain the value of the USMCA in dollar terms. In other words, it is hard to give any statistics to this aspect of the USMCA and its value.

It is the invaluable effect of countering China on the global stage because of what has developed as a result of the USMCA. That is through alignment on agricultural, environmental, intellectual property rules and regulations, and by aligning rules of origin, strengthening nearshore supply chains, and countless other provisions. The USMCA protects our domestic workers, our companies, and our products from being replaced by Chinese competition.

The alignment of the North American economy, because of the USMCA, to U.S. standards—that all sends a very strong signal to the rest of the world. That signal is this: If you align with the United States, you and your economy will prosper.

As more and more countries are finding out, aligning in the opposite direction—with China—means intellectual property theft, continuously moving goalposts, and regulatory uncertainty. Because of the USMCA and the North American economy being aligned—because of the USMCA—I think it shows the importance of counteracting China.

So I urge the Trump administration to quickly advance trilateral conversations on renewing USMCA, and I say this especially with Canada because I see we are dragging our feet in regard to sitting down with Canada. We should not be pushing Canada to the back burner in the USMCA negotiations. The United States and Canada economically are so integrated that it is important to keep this moving.

The Canadians showed their willingness to expand trade with China, to our detriment. They did this in January—including in electric vehicles. This administration must move quickly to ensure Canada remains focused on strengthening trade between our two countries, and we do that by sitting down with Canada very quickly.

I yield the floor.

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. 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 4344

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2249

motion with respect to S. 4344 be withdrawn.

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

The cloture motion was withdrawn.

NOMINATION OF KEVIN WARSH

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, later today, the Senate will finish considering the nomination of Kevin Warsh to be the 17th Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

Leading the Federal Reserve System is an enormous task. The decisions the Fed makes affect Wall Street and Main Street and kitchen tables all across the country. So it is critical that we have people who understand not only the macro—the global economy and the markets—but who appreciate the microeconomy, and that is the hard-working Americans, their jobs, and their livelihoods.

Kevin Warsh is just such a person.

He credits his knowledge of the real economy to growing up in Upstate New York where his dad ran a children's clothing store and manufacturing company. From Shaker High School, he went on to Stanford University and then Harvard Law School.

He then started a career on Wall Street, but he shifted to public service and joined the Bush administration's economic policy team in 2002. Four years later, President Bush nominated him to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. At age 35, Kevin Warsh was unanimously—unanimously—confirmed here in the Senate and became the youngest Governor in the history of the Federal Reserve. Being the youngest person to take a seat in the Federal Reserve's boardroom is impressive enough, but Kevin Warsh didn't just take his seat—he was a key player during the time he was on the Board.

Kevin Warsh seems to have just the profile of a Federal Reserve Chairman; yet Democrats oppose his nomination. That is right. For the first time in its history, the Banking Committee reported out a nominee for Fed Chairman on a party line vote because every single Democrat opposed Mr. Warsh's nomination—and, actually, only one Democrat was even present for the vote. The other 10 Democrats on the Banking Committee didn't even bother to show up for it.

And, yesterday on the floor, all but one Democrat opposed the first of Mr. Warsh's two nominations: his nomination to be on the Board of Governors. He has already had that job, and a number of Democrats actually supported his nomination the last time; but those same Democrats voted yesterday against appointing him to the Board, and I suspect they will do the same when it comes time to vote on his other nomination to be the Chairman later today.

I wish I could say I am surprised, but this is just how bad Trump derangement syndrome has gotten on the other side of the aisle. Democrats won't say

so, but that is what it is. I expect we are going to hear Democrats attempt to justify their opposition by suggesting that a Chairman Warsh would somehow threaten the Fed's independence. I have to say that is a pretty serious claim and one that doesn't really have any basis in reality.

To begin with, Mr. Warsh's testimony before the Banking Committee should have put any concerns about his independence to rest, but if the depth of his commitment to Fed independence were at all unclear, I recommend my colleagues review a speech he gave in 2010, entitled "An Ode to Independence," in which he said:

Central bank independence is precious . . . Ensuring Fed independence—as the cornerstone of institutional credibility—is our charge to keep. It is central to what the Federal Reserve represents, and to how policy is conducted.

Or they could ask Randall Kroszner, who served with Warsh on the Fed Board, who said:

He's not an ideologue. Since I've known him, he was someone who tried to get things done.

Or maybe—maybe—they could just ask the Democrat leader, who introduced Kevin Warsh at his 2006 confirmation hearing. He said then of Warsh:

He knows unequivocally that the Fed must be independent, nonideological, and nonpartisan, and for this reason, I am proud to support his nomination.

That was the Democrat leader's comments, who is now leading the charge in opposing Warsh's nomination.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. THUNE. It doesn't seem to matter who President Trump nominates—the Democrats blindly oppose them. Democrats aren't interested in a person's qualifications. All they care about is opposing President Trump, and it has been that way since he took office last January. President Trump is the only President on record who has not had a single—single—civilian nominee approved by voice vote or by unanimous consent here in the U.S. Senate—the only President in history. Democrats have dragged out the process on every single one of his nominations.

The fact that two Democrats voted for our former colleague Markwayne Mullin to be Secretary of DHS, in this day and age here, appears to be an act of courage in today's Democrat Party—even though it was a vote that traditionally would have been widely bipartisan, if not unanimous, but not when Democrats are in the throes of Trump derangement syndrome.

It is shameful—it really is—but Republicans aren't letting it stop us.

In September, we took steps to restore Senate precedent on largely noncontroversial Presidential nominees to ensure that no other President has to face the kind of petty—and I mean petty—partisanship that President

Trump is encountering. Very soon, we will vote on a fourth nominations package containing 49 Trump nominees who have had their hearings and mark-ups and are ready for confirmation, and we will keep moving forward.

I know that Democrats aren't happy that Donald Trump is the President, but that doesn't mean that nominations should be held up for purely political reasons.

As the Democrat leader said just a few years ago:

That doesn't mean we don't disagree. But it does mean when nominees are held up, opposed, or blocked—it's for a legitimate purpose, not for leverage in partisan games . . .

Well, unfortunately, Democrats have made it pretty clear that they are only—only—interested in partisan games since President Trump took office, but we have got a country to run, and Republicans are doing our job.

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

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

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. MERKLEY. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote on a simple question: Will Congress embrace and exercise its constitutional responsibility to decide 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. [The Constitution] has accordingly with studied care, vested the question of war in the [legislative branch].

With studied care.

The Founders said that no one person, not even the President, should be able to take this Nation to war.

They would observe that throughout history, Executives were inclined to commit troops and treasure to battles that made no sense in a government by and for the people in a democratic republic. So they stipulated there had to be a debate and a vote here in the legislative branch, an act of Congress, a declaration of war, or an authorization by legislation for war. Yet we have had neither. We have had neither.

In the 1973 War Powers Act, there is a third option. It is a condition in which the United States has been attacked or is under imminent threat of an attack.

Some colleagues have said that imminent threat was real, and therefore the President has 60 days to conduct a war before he is in violation of the Constitution.

Now, I disagree. Many of us and many experts believe nothing close to an imminent threat existed that justified that third option—the President having 60 days to respond without action by Congress. But many colleagues across the aisle have said: We will give the benefit of the doubt to the President's contention that there was an imminent threat, but we will reconsider our position when the 60 days has expired.

Well, my friends, the 60 days expired on May 1. We are way past that deadline.

Now the President has a new excuse. He says: Well, we are no longer conducting acts of war. We are in a ceasefire.

But what matters are the facts on the ground. Are we, in fact—have we, in fact, suspended all the acts of war? No, we have not. We are still engaged on a daily basis. The United States is still blockading Iranian ports. That is an act of war. We are still firing on Iranian warships. That is an act of war. We are still firing on Iranian vessels. That is an act of war. Iran is still blockading the Strait of Hormuz. That is an act of war. They are still firing on U.S. Naval vessels. That is an act of war. They are still attacking U.S.-flagged tankers. That is an act of war.

Both sides are engaged in a daily war as defined by international law. Is it at a somewhat lower level than the bombing campaign? Yes, I will grant you that. But it is a war by every definition. It has not ended. Our troops have not been withdrawn.

So here we are. Are we going to honor that oath to the Constitution? Each and every one of you took that oath. The Constitution is very clear: War can be conducted by the United States only with congressional authorization. We are now past that 60 days, so that excuse, that reason, is gone.

How seriously do you take the Constitution? If you don't take it seriously, maybe you shouldn't be serving in this Chamber.

It is clear how important that debate is in this Chamber when you look at the catastrophe that has unfolded with this war of choice. Catastrophe. Undermined the reformers. Massively strengthened the hard line—massively. Enriched Russia extensively. We lifted the sanctions on Russia. They are able to sell their oil at a world price—a world price that is double what it was before. We have lost men and women in uniform. We have hundreds that are injured. We are spending \$1 to \$2 billion a day.

Here at home, there are massive increased costs for the American family. People keep saying it is \$4 for gas now—\$1.50 higher than it was. Well, in Oregon, it is over \$5. Diesel is over \$6. The cost to a family in the course of a

year at this point is about \$2,700 additional cash out of hand, posttax dollars—gone.

When energy goes up, everything goes up. Our agricultural community is looking at the increased cost for fertilizer on top of the chaos of the tariffs affecting their inputs and their outputs. The inflation index is way up—3.8 percent last month, which is the highest year-over-year in 3 years, and more is coming.

We have undermined our alliances. We said to the Europeans: We don't need you.

President Trump said: We do not need you. Then he said: Please, please come and help.

They said: This war you have embarked on is unwise. You did not ask us for help. You did not consult with us beforehand. This is your choice. It is a big mistake. And, no, we are not going to partner in this massive catastrophe.

The enriched uranium is still buried deep underground. There is a path on the uranium question. The path will look something like this: Iran will agree not to enrich for 5 years or so. That would be face-saving for the United States of America. But then they will be free to enrich to a low level, protecting and defending their sovereignty, with international inspections. The enriched uranium—60 percent—they will be in agreement that will be moved to Russia or somewhere else.

Those three features—all part of the JCPOA, the agreement that was reached through diplomacy rather than war, the agreement that President Trump tore up in his first administration and created an expanded pathway to more enriched uranium in Iran because he tore up the agreement.

So costs at home, deaths of servicemembers, cost to the Treasury, undermining alliances, enriching Russia, failing to retrieve uranium—mistake after mistake after mistake. That is why the Founders said that a President by himself should not be able to go to war and wrote a Constitution that we each have pledged ourselves to. We are a democratic republic, not an authoritarian power—authoritarian power, the President or the Chief Executive, the dictator, whatever you want to call him.

But we have a responsibility, and today, we will test whether or not we honor that oath to the Constitution. Will we?

Option 1, have we done a declaration of war? We have not.

Option 2, have we passed an authorization for the use of military force? We have not.

Option 3, the President has 60 days when there is an imminent threat. So colleagues who have asserted that is a legitimate option, I disagree, but those who have asserted it, 60 days is up.

So will you or will you not honor your constitutional responsibility? That is the question that will be in the vote today.

Mr. President, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1546(a) 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. 163.

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. 163, 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor having just heard the Senator from Oregon is proposing a resolution, a War Powers Act today, heard him say this was about protecting the Constitution.

What they are doing—the Democrats are doing is not about protecting the Constitution; it is about obstructing the President of the United States. That is what is happening here today. That is exactly what Democrats are trying to do.

Going back to 1973, there have been a total of 17 War Powers Act votes in Congress. That is when the War Powers became law—1973. There have been 17 votes in 53 years, and 14 of the 17 votes were from Democrats aimed specifically at President Trump—53 years; 17; 14 of 17 by the Democrats actively going after President Trump.

Democrats—here they are saying they are protecting the Constitution. They introduce absolutely zero War Powers Resolutions under President Obama, and that was despite his strikes in Libya. Democrats introduced absolutely zero War Powers Resolutions under President Biden despite his actions in Syria. So we have Libya, Syria, and they say nothing.

This is the eighth vote on Iran this very Congress. We have also had War Powers Resolutions and votes regarding Cuba and Venezuela.

Well, let's talk about Iran. For nearly 50 years, Iran has waged war against our Nation. Iran is the world's largest, leading sponsor of terrorism. They regularly chant "Death to America." Iran has murdered thousands of Americans, tens of thousands of Iranians, and has tried to build nuclear weapons.

For decades, American Presidents have pledged that Iran would not get a nuclear weapon. Only President Trump had the courage and the strength to keep his word. Earlier this year, President Trump responded with military precision. Now we are deploying economic pressure as well and diplomatic pressure.

Under President Trump, America continues to restore peace through strength around the world. Today, Iran is losing \$500 million a day in revenue. They are going to lose that much today, yesterday, and they will again tomorrow.

That is the impact of what the President is doing to Iran right now. Iran's cash cow of oil exports has collapsed.

By contrast, America is pumping out record amounts of oil and natural gas.

Iran's economy is on life support. Its leadership has been eliminated.

Thirteen days ago, President Trump sent a letter to Congress about the conflict in Iran. The President made it very clear—clear that the major fighting is halted; clear that the American cease-fire has held for more than a month, and our Naval blockade is working.

This week, President Trump is meeting with China overseas. Democrats right here in the Senate want to pull the rug out from under him.

Let's be clear: President Trump has complied with the law. Enforcing a blockade is not the same as active hostilities under the War Powers Act. That is the established and binding precedent that governs the U.S. Senate.

Democrats don't seem to care. Senator TIM Kaine of Virginia said in January that their goal—the Democrat goal, he said, is to “flood the Senate calendar.” So they want to run out the clock on the Republican majority.

The Senate has now rejected each and every one of these Democrat delays. We need to reject this one as well. We should reject it because it is partisan. We should reject it because it is written by Democrats to weaken our Commander in Chief. And we should reject it because it encourages Iran to doubt the resolve of our Nation.

Iran is going to be watching this vote today. China will be watching this vote. America must continue to show strength and resolve.

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 Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, Donald Trump told a reporter: “I don't think about Americans' financial situations.” I don't think of any-one.

I repeat: Donald Trump actually said this. He said:

“I don't think about Americans' financial situations.”

Can you believe it? You wouldn't believe it coming from any other Presi-

dent. But, sadly, from this President, it smacks of reality. He says almost anything, and he doesn't care.

Clearly, Donald Trump doesn't care about Americans' financial situations, considering that, just this morning, we saw wholesale inflation skyrocket to 6 percent, the highest it has been since December of 2022—wholesale inflation, 6 percent. As those costs trickle down to Americans, Americans are going to be paying more and more and more, and they hate it.

Now, what is Donald Trump thinking about instead? Himself, especially his new ballroom, at a time when 77 percent—that is 77 percent—of Americans say that Donald Trump's policies have increased their cost of living.

Trump and the Senate GOP try to force through a bill that would spend \$1 billion taxpayer dollars on a gilded ballroom and not one penny on bringing down American costs. Trump may be trying to build a ballroom, but, clearly, he is living in the theater of the absurd.

Really? Do Americans want a ballroom when wholesale inflation just hit 6 percent—the highest level in 4 years? Do Americans want a ballroom when food prices just went up more in April than in any month in nearly 40 years? Do Americans want a ballroom when the cost of a gallon of gas has increased a dollar and a half since March?

Of course not.

I would say Trump has completely lost touch with the American people, but that would assume that Trump was ever in touch with the American people to begin with. And on this issue, he sure as heck isn't.

IRAN

Mr. President, on Iran, Trump was talking about his disastrous Iran war when he said:

I don't think about Americans' financial situations.

Trump launched this war without a plan, without a clear objective, and without any thought to how it might affect the American people.

When Hegseth and other Pentagon officials came to testify, at the end of April, they said this war cost American taxpayers \$25 billion. Well, yesterday, they revised that figure to \$29 billion. Trump has forced American taxpayers to sink at least \$29 billion into a war that still has no end game.

And \$29 billion is just the sticker price and doesn't include the hundreds of additional dollars American families will have to pay this year just to fill up their tanks. Americans are paying over \$4½ a gallon at the pump—more than a dollar and a half above what it was when Trump started this war.

If Senate Republicans care about Americans' financial situations, which they should, they need to vote for our War Powers Resolution today to limit Trump's ability to continue this war without authorization. Senator MERKLEY will be introducing that War Powers Resolution, which I am proud to cosponsor, in a little while.

Today's vote will be the Republicans' seventh—seventh—opportunity to support our resolution to withdraw our troops from hostilities with Iran and stop the economic fallout from this historic blunder.

Americans' financial situation is dire, and Republicans don't think about anyone other than Donald Trump.

CHINA

Mr. President, on China, Donald Trump may have no interest in helping the American people get ahead, but he certainly seems willing to give China a leg up. We all ought to fear what Donald Trump may concede to China just so he can claim a headline. Trump has fantasized about \$1 trillion in Chinese investments in America that would give the Chinese a stranglehold on our economy, threaten our supply chains, our economic independence, and our national security.

This is Trump empowering Xi's “Made in China” ambitions—selling out American manufacturers and workers, giving CCP businesses an edge in undermining America building the industries of the future here at home.

He is opening the door. He is saying: China, you come here. Use all American innovation and technology and everything else; and then send it back to China, and let China take the lead over America on industry over industry.

What a disgrace. The American people—American businesses—aren't going to fall for this bunk.

And then there are many other things we all worry about that Trump would or could do to weaken American workers, families, and businesses when he gets outnegotiated by Xi. And that has happened time and time again.

Here are some of the things that Donald Trump could do that we all worry about—American workers, American families, American people, American companies worry about.

Donald Trump could sell out American autoworkers by allowing Chinese EVs to flood our markets and crowd out domestic manufacturing.

Donald Trump could sell out America on chips and AI, allowing the sale of our AI chips and semiconductor equipment to China so they can catch up in the technology race that will define the global economy for the next decade. This is a clear and present threat, not just to American jobs but to our national security.

Donald Trump could sell out on fentanyl, failing to use American leverage to extract real and meaningful concessions from the Chinese Communist Party to prevent the deadly flow of fentanyl poisoning our communities. This is an issue I brought up directly with Xi years ago. We were making some progress. Will Donald Trump sell it out? We all worry about it.

Donald Trump could sell out Taiwan, whose people want to continue living in freedom, instead of under the jackboot of the Chinese Communist Party. Any threat Trump allows Xi Jinping to

make against the Taiwanese is a threat to the global democracy. It is also a threat to the global economy, given how many semiconductor chips are made in Taiwan.

So in all of these things, forget the “Art of the Deal.” Trump is practicing the “art of the duped.”

Forget the “art of the deal.” Donald Trump is practicing the “art of the duped.”

NOMINATION OF KEVIN WARSH

Mr. President, on Mr. Warsh, Donald Trump has made it clear he will stop at nothing—nothing—to undermine the independence of the Federal Reserve at the expense of the American economy and the American people. As the Senate prepares to vote on Kevin Warsh’s confirmation as Fed chair, Donald Trump has shown no sign he intends to stop his crusade against an independent Fed.

Trump undermined the central bank with his attempt to oust Lisa Cook and his sham investigation against Chairman Powell. Those attacks on the Fed ought to concern everyone who is worried about the cost of living and interest rates going up.

The more Donald Trump interferes with an independent Fed, the more chaos he injects into the markets. And the more chaos he injects into the markets, the more the interest rates go up.

Markets like certainty. Donald Trump doesn’t offer that.

With this administration’s disastrous war and failed economic agenda driving up costs, Donald Trump will only seek to exert more pressure on the Fed to manipulate interest rates to his own political advantage. Appointing a new Fed Chair amid this chaos and coercion could further undermine the independence of the Fed.

I urge Senate Republicans to join Democrats in protecting the Fed and restoring some stability to our economy.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. President, on CRAs, later today, the Senate will have a series of votes on the Trump administration’s undermining of key protections for the American consumer against predatory corporate practices that raise costs and limit opportunity.

The CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, has played a critical role on the side of people to help them avoid junk fees, predatory medical debt, and payday lenders who take advantage of people in need, including military servicemembers.

The Trump administration has chosen to prioritize undermining these critical protections, and, today, Senate Democrats stand up and say “enough.”

As someone who helped authorize the CFPB, years ago, I feel strongly that we cannot let Trump undermine and constrain this vital Agency. So I thank Senator WARREN and so many of my Democratic colleagues for leading these joint resolutions of disapproval to fight on behalf of the American people, of the American consumer.

The joint resolution of disapproval that I am leading is against the Trump administration’s decision to reverse CFPB protections on mortgage lending called “contract for deed” transactions, that without the proper guardrails can be predatory to people trying to live the American dream in purchasing a home.

For millions of Americans who can’t access a traditional mortgage, a contract for deed can seem like a lifeline, but all too often these arrangements are traps. The buyer takes on every obligation of home ownership immediately—taxes, repairs, risk—but doesn’t receive the deed until they have paid every last dollar. You miss a single payment, and you can lose everything—no equity, no recourse, evicted like a tenant.

Over 200,000 New Yorkers are in these arrangements right now.

The CFPB has heard reports of many unfair, deceptive, and abusive practices in “contract for deed” transactions and took action in 2024 to crack down on these practices by applying the same lending protections to these loans as other consumer and mortgage loans.

What does Trump want to do? Of course, he wants to give a green light to the bad actors, that they are free to exploit American potential homeowners in this way by eliminating the protections of CFPB.

Apparently, Trump wasn’t paying attention during the 2008 financial crisis. Giving these predatory lenders free rein only hurts the American people and the American economy.

I call on all of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to join me in protecting Americans who just want a fair shot at the American dream.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled rollcall vote: Senator CORNYN for up to 10 minutes and Senator KENNEDY for up to 10 minutes.

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

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, like many families across America, mine was touched by the disease of cancer when I was a young man. At the age of 14, my father died of lung cancer. I was 14; he was 53. Seeing my dad struggle changed my life. I made it a priority during my time in Congress to try to spare others from the suffering. We have made significant progress in reducing smoking over the last several decades. After I passed legislation banning smoking on airplanes, it turned out to be a tipping point. And, increasingly, we have seen tobacco and cigarettes disappear from public spaces.

But Big Tobacco did not dissipate like a cloud of smoke. They rebranded with flashy new products: vaping and e-

cigarettes. And they followed the same playbook they used to sell Marlboro cigarettes and so many others: They targeted our children in America.

Tobacco companies have donated generously to Donald Trump’s election, his inauguration, and his “Great Gatsby” ballroom with the expectation of favorable treatment, and President Trump’s administration has delivered for tobacco. Last week, the Food and Drug Administration did something it had never done before. After pressure from President Trump, the FDA authorized the first ever flavored e-cigarettes.

Why is that important? That is what lures the children into this deadly habit. Scientists, doctors, and parents—even the FDA’s own studies—all acknowledge sweet and fruity flavored e-cigarettes are responsible for addicting our children. Health experts I have spoken to believe the true number of high school kids vaping is at least 40 percent—40 percent of our kids vaping—a percentage that teachers, principals, and students acknowledge. These are not kids vaping to quit cigarette smoking. These are kids who first became addicted to nicotine because of flavored vaping.

Why would an administration supposedly committed to making America healthy again unleash this new wave of addiction on our children? Formaldehyde, chromium, and heavy metals like nickel and lead all are present in e-cigarettes. A recent study found that vaping is likely to cause cancer.

We should not trust Big Tobacco when they promise they won’t market to kids. We know better.

Then, on Friday, the Food and Drug Administration granted a free pass to scores of illegal vapes, permitting them to stay on the market without having met the law’s requirement that they first prove to the FDA that their product is “appropriate for the protection of public health.” They didn’t try to do it because they can’t do that; they can’t prove it.

But even that gift to vaping and cigarette titans like Altria and R. J. Reynolds was not enough to spare the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration. Yesterday, President Trump canned him, forced his resignation. Dr. Makary is gone for his resistance to this expansion of vaping in the high schools of America.

What a disgraceful display in Washington. The President wants yes-men no matter the consequences, even if it harms our children.

While I did not agree on everything that Dr. Makary did, I appreciated his commitment and focus on protecting kids from Big Tobacco.

Whether it is for drugs, medical devices, or tobacco products, it is never a good idea for the President and the White House to pressure regulators to approve applications. That is a recipe for deadly consequences.

As the President’s whims have created dangerous vacancies now at the

Food and Drug Administration and the Centers for Disease Control, my Republican colleagues should have the nerve and fortitude to call out this alarming, unacceptable, and dangerous behavior and treatment of our children.

AMERICAN CURES ACT

Mr. President, on a separate topic, every family, like my own, has wrestled with a dangerous medical condition. When you or a loved one receive a diagnosis, there is only one question on your mind: Is there a cure? Is there a treatment? Often, thank God, the answer is yes.

America's world-class medical researchers and institutions have pushed the boundaries of science and achieved so many important and lifesaving breakthroughs. Medical researchers have turned terminal illness into treatable conditions in many instances—from HIV and AIDS, to heart disease, to many types of cancer—and they have developed treatments that have given patients what they desire the most: more time with their loved ones.

This work is primarily supported by the National Institutes of Health, or NIH. It is not only the Nation's premier medical research agency; it is the world's premier medical research agency.

Today, the budget of the National Institutes of Health is nearly \$50 billion. The vast majority of their research is competitively awarded to scientists, research institutions, and small businesses in every State across the Nation. Last year, Illinois hospitals and universities received more than \$1.2 billion in NIH funding.

What do we have to show for this investment? Well, thanks to NIH research, cancer deaths have declined by 34 percent between 1991 and 2022, and death from heart disease and stroke fell by 78 percent between 1968 and 2013. Medical research works. Because of NIH funding, we are on the verge of curing—yes, curing—sickle cell disease. Consider this: Between 2010 and 2016, the FDA approved more than 200 new drugs and treatments. Every single one of them benefitted from NIH research funding—money well spent.

Congress has long recognized the importance of NIH, which is why we, on a bipartisan basis, provided NIH with \$19 billion in additional funding over the past decade, a 60-percent increase. I was part of that effort, and I am proud to announce that it was bipartisan from the start. Senator Roy Blunt, a Republican from Missouri, was chairman of the key Appropriations subcommittee. Senator PATTY MURRAY, who is the ranking Democrat on the Appropriations Committee, was a leader in this field. Senator SUSAN COLLINS did remarkable work in the same area. It has been bipartisan from the start. And working together as a team, we have achieved an amazing investment in medical research.

However, thousands of chronic diseases still need treatments, causing millions of families to suffer. These

families are depending on us to support NIH in groundbreaking research today. So, this week, I have reintroduced the American Cures Act, which would provide our top medical research agencies with 5 percent real funding growth every year. My bill would ensure that the United States remains at the forefront of new treatments and would provide researchers with the strong, stable funding they need to continue their lifesaving work.

This legislation is more important than ever since we currently have a new administration that seems hell-bent on dismantling America's medical research infrastructure. No nation has ever made such a significant investment in science as the United States. No nation's scientists have ever done more to improve the quality of life on Earth. Through government support for scientific research, we have split the atom, defeated polio, and mapped the human genome.

American leadership comes with the responsibility to continue to move forward, to never be satisfied when there are those suffering with sickness, and to push the boundaries of what is possible. Let's pass the American Cures Act on a bipartisan basis and give families facing terrible illnesses today the hope of treatment and cures tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526.

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

WATER ASSURANCE AND TREATY ENFORCEMENT FOR THE RIO GRANDE FARMERS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, eight decades ago, the United States and Mexico signed an agreement now known as the 1944 Water Treaty to govern the sharing of waters in the Colorado River and the Rio Grande. According to this treaty, the United States is required to deliver 1.5 million acre-feet, or just under 500,000 gallons, of water from the Colorado River to Mexico each year. Similarly, Mexico is obligated to deliver 1.75 million acre-feet to the United States from the Rio Grande River every 5 years.

And while the United States has dutifully held up its end of the bargain, Mexico has been delinquent on repeated occasions. Now, Mexico is hundreds of thousands of acre-feet behind in their required water deliveries. In the most recent cycle, which ended in October of last year, Mexico had delivered less than half of the water it was obligated to deliver under the terms of the treaty. Furthermore, Mexico has not been consistent in their water delivery, sometimes waiting until the very end of the 5-year period to deliver a substantial amount of water in an attempt, ostensibly, to catch up.

This uncertainty in and of itself has made life difficult, you can imagine,

for the more than 400,000 farmers and ranchers who call Texas home. Imagine trying to grow crops not knowing whether you are going to have any water for as long as 4 years, only to receive a huge lump sum at the end of year 5. It just doesn't work out. But this is a very real dilemma faced by many of my constituents in South Texas.

Water deliveries from Mexico are vital to irrigation farming and municipal use in the Rio Grande Valley, helping generate billions in economic productivity for the region. Water shortages created by Mexico's failure to follow this treaty have wreaked havoc on the ability of farmers and ranchers to plan and to tend their crops, which has, in turn, had a terrible economic cost on our entire State. In 2024, the Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, which ran the only sugarcane mill in Texas, announced they were forced to close operations after more than 51 years because of these water shortages. Five hundred American jobs were lost as a result.

If Mexico continues to fail to live up to the treaty, more and more farmers and ranchers and other producers will face the same fate. Many growers will potentially default on their financing, and they will be unable to secure any additional financing for future crops without the ability to plan on future water deliveries. Imagine running a bank that offers credit to farmers in the community. If you know the farmer will not be able to access the water they need in order to grow their crops and have a profitable business, obviously that makes it a much riskier bet to offer them a line of credit or a loan.

Further delay of water deliveries could result in bankruptcies, land auctions, more lost jobs, supply chain disruptions, and higher prices at the grocery store for Americans around the country.

I am grateful to Secretary Rubio—the Secretary of State—and Secretary Rollins of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for their leadership on this issue and for their willingness to engage with Mexico and indeed put pressure on them to hold up their end of the bargain.

But South Texas farmers cannot wait. They have already suffered too much from the draught caused by Mexico's failure to live up to its obligations.

The "carrot" approach is clearly not working, so now it is time to bring out the "sticks." For this reason, I am introducing legislation called the Water Assurance and Treaty Enforcement for Rio Grande Farmers—or WATER for Farmers—Act, which will impose penalties in the form of tariffs on Mexico if they continue in their delinquency.

This bill will establish annual benchmarks that Mexico must meet in order to be considered compliant with the 1944 Water Treaty. These annual benchmarks will help ensure that water deliveries are predictable for the farmers

in South Texas. Waiting until the end of a 5-year treaty period to deliver water is neither realistic nor acceptable and certainly what anybody contemplated when this treaty was enacted.

This bill would also direct the Secretary of State, in consultation with the U.S. Commissioner of the International Boundary and Water Commission and the Secretary of Agriculture, to determine each year if Mexico has met the requirements of these benchmarks. If Mexico does not, this legislation directs the U.S. Trade Representative to impose tariffs on the shortfalls accumulated at the end of each year.

While this may seem like an extraordinary measure, Mexico has had ample time to make things right. As I said, we have tried "carrots." Those don't work, so now it is time for the "sticks."

By imposing severe tariffs on Mexico, I hope they will pick up the pace and begin delivering the water they are already committed to delivering so that South Texas farmers and ranchers will have the predictability they need.

South Texans and the agricultural community there are counting on us to ensure that Mexico complies with this treaty that they agreed to way back in 1944.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this legislation, and I will not give up on this matter until the farmers in Texas are made whole.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

S. RES. 526

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we are going to be voting on S. Res. 526, and I wanted to spend a few moments explaining what my resolution would do.

First, it is a resolution; it is not a bill. This resolution will only affect the U.S. Senate. It will not affect the U.S. House of Representatives.

Very simply, this is what my resolution would do. When we shut down the government—and by that, I mean, of course, when Congress, House and Senate, refuses to provide funding for an Agency in government and in some cases, all of government, and those Agencies or all of government, as the case may be, have to shut down, that means that Federal employees for the most part aren't being paid.

My resolution would require—or stipulate, rather, that Senators wouldn't be paid either. It is called shared sacrifice.

Now, I want to be clear so my colleagues understand exactly what this resolution would do because I have worked hard to get the votes to pass this, and I have had to make a few accommodations.

First, a Senator would not lose his or her salary. The money would be escrowed. The Senator's salary just would not be available to that Senator while we are in a shutdown, but once the shutdown is over, you will get your money.

No. 2, again, to repeat, this bill will not apply to the House of Representatives. It will only apply to the U.S. Senate. The House can take care of its own business.

Because of the 27th Amendment and in order for my resolution to be constitutional, the resolution will not take effect until the day after the midterm elections. The 27th Amendment provides pretty clearly that our compensation as Members of the Senate—and the House, for that matter, although this resolution doesn't apply to the House—can't be changed until after an election, and the soonest election, of course, is midterms.

If I could, if I were King for a day—I am not. I don't aspire to be. But if I were, I would make this resolution effective immediately because I am very concerned—I hope I am wrong. If I am wrong, I will apologize. I am very concerned that my Senate colleagues on the Democratic side are going to try to shut down the government yet again right before the election to try to create chaos to affect the midterm elections. If I am wrong in that prediction, I will come here and apologize to every Senator by name. So if I could, I would make this resolution apply immediately.

Frankly, if I were also King for a day and I wanted to stop government shutdowns, I would do more than this. I would do two things. I would say that if government shuts down, a Senator loses his pay. It is not escrowed and you get it back later; you just don't get your pay. I would also say that you can't leave Washington; you can't go home.

If you make people forfeit their pay and tell them they can't leave Washington, we won't have any more shutdowns, and everybody in this body knows that. But I can't pass that. I would if I could, but I can't.

So to repeat one more time, all my resolution would do would say: If we choose to shut down government, you are not going to be paid. You will get your money later, but while we are in a shutdown, you are not going to be paid.

This is about shared sacrifice. I mean, what we have done this year in terms of keeping government open—last October—I looked it up before I came to the floor—last October, we shut down government for 43 days. That is the longest shutdown in history. We had FBI agents, national park rangers, CDC scientists, our staff here in Congress—nobody was getting paid. Then 3 months later, after we finally got out of that 43-day shutdown, we shut down the Department of Homeland Security. It was shut down for 76 days. This is all in 1 year.

We ought to hide our heads in a bag. It has to stop. Shutting down government should not be a default solution to our refusal to work out our issues and our differences.

So that is what my Senate resolution will do. Vote how you want to. I am

not saying this is going to stop all shutdowns. As I say, if I were King for a day, I know what to pass that will stop them, but maybe this will help.

So vote for it if you want to. Don't vote for it if you don't want to. Follow your heart. Be sure and take your brain with you, because this is about shared sacrifice. This is about putting our money where our mouths are.

I yield the floor. Thank you for your time and attention.

My work here is done, and I can show myself out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask that our vote scheduled for 11:30 begin immediately.

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

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 163.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS).

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—1

Ricketts

The motion was rejected.

(Mr. BANKS assumed the Chair.)

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526, a resolution withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs.

John Thune, John Kennedy, Pete Ricketts, Marsha Blackburn, Thom Tillis, Bill Hagerty, Rick Scott of Florida, John Cornyn, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Joni Ernst, David McCormick, Steve Daines, Ashley Moody, Jon Husted, Roger Marshall, John Hoeven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526, a resolution withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska Mr. RICKETTS.

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Nebraska Mr. RICKETTS would have voted "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alsobrooks	Graham	Murray
Armstrong	Grassley	Ossoff
Baldwin	Hagerty	Padilla
Banks	Hassan	Paul
Barrasso	Hawley	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Risch
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt Rochester	Hoeven	Rounds
Booker	Husted	Sanders
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Britt	Johnson	Schiff
Budd	Justice	Schmitt
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kim	Shaheen
Coons	King	Sheehy
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Smith
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Luján	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Markey	Tuberville
Curtis	Marshall	Van Hollen
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	McCormick	Warnock
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Ernst	Moody	Welch
Fetterman	Moran	Whitehouse
Fischer	Moreno	Wicker
Galleo	Murkowski	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murphy	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Ricketts

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). On this vote, the yeas are 99, the nays are 0.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING THE PAY OF SENATORS IF A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN OCCURS—Motion To Proceed The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 296, S. Res. 526, a resolution withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, here in DC this week is Police Week, and we are reflecting on the brave men and women who serve us in Tennessee and also across this country, where they are serving our communities every day with courage, with integrity, and with honor. We so appreciate their service. Every day, they put their lives on the line to protect their families, their friends, their neighbors. They enforce the law, and they keep the peace; and for that, they deserve every American's enduring gratitude.

Few places better capture the magnitude of their sacrifices than the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial that is here in our Nation's Capital. Engraved on that memorial are the names of every fallen officer in our country going back to the year 1850. This memorial contains 24,775 names. This week, 363 heroes are being added, including 3 from Tennessee: Hugh Carlen of Putnam County, whose watch ended February 24, 1912; James Hood of Jonesborough, who fell in the line of duty August 26, 1928; and Deputy Sheriff Justin Bradford Mowery, of Blount County, whom we tragically lost on December 28.

This week's candlelight vigil will provide a powerful moment to reflect on their sacrifices and their stories and those made by the thousands of other officers on the Roll Call of Heroes.

There is a reason our officers are called the thin blue line: They are the only force separating us from chaos, disorder, and anarchy. They take pride in their responsibility, but to do their jobs, they need the support of their communities, their States, their country. They need the support of this Chamber, and for too long, they have lacked that support from Democrat leadership. Instead of funding the police, the Democrats have worked to defund the police and, indeed, all law enforcement. But, under President Trump, the Federal Government is backing the blue from one side of this country to another.

In Tennessee, we have seen this much needed support in Memphis. For years, Memphis, which is an iconic American city, has struggled with rampant crime. In 2024, it had the highest crime rate per capita of any city in the country. Memphians truly suffered. Indeed, all West Tennesseans suffered. Many could not walk outside of their homes without fear of being robbed, assaulted, or murdered in Memphis.

Under the President's leadership, those days are coming to an end. Since

launching the Memphis Safe Task Force last year, crime in Memphis has plummeted. In the first quarter of this year, overall crime was down more than 40 percent compared to 2025. Indeed, since the task force began 7 months ago, the crime rate has been cut 50 percent.

The way this happened was in coordination with local, State, and Federal resources. The task force has done a great job in getting criminals off the street and behind bars. In total, authorities have made more than 9,000 arrests, including 996 for narcotics, 838 for firearms offenses, 105 for sex offenses, and 67 for homicide. They have also seized 1,500 illegal firearms, and they have located 150 missing children. Every single American—indeed, every Member of this Chamber—should applaud this success.

In the Senate, Republicans are working to support the administration's effort. My Restoring Law and Order Act would increase funding for law enforcement and help keep violent criminals behind bars.

The Protecting Law Enforcement Officers from Doxxing Act would make it illegal to dox Federal law enforcement officials and put them in harm's way.

The Safer Prisons Act would double the maximum term of imprisonment for assaulting a Federal Bureau of Prisons correctional officer.

While Republicans work to support our brave officers, unfortunately, many of our Democratic colleagues are trying to do everything in their power to undermine law enforcement.

For 76 days, they shut down the Department of Homeland Security, left the Secret Service, Coast Guard, TSA, FEMA, and other critical Agencies without funding, and they jeopardized our Nation's security at a time of heightened threats from the world's largest sponsor of terrorism, Iran.

And the reason? Well, they had a petty reason. They used our Federal law enforcement and the Department of Homeland Security as a trading chip. What they were trying to do was to abolish ICE, end the enforcement of our immigration laws, and defund Federal law enforcement.

Thank goodness they were not successful. They got nothing for their little fit. President Trump brought this charade to an end late last month by signing into law legislation that reopened DHS and restored its vital operations.

Now Republicans are moving forward with a public security bill that will fund ICE and Customs and Border Protection for years to come. We are accomplishing this through the reconciliation process, and that is the same process we used to pass the Working Families Tax Cut last year. We are going to make certain we can fund these vital Agencies.

Our colleagues across the aisle can continue to oppose the rule of law, and they can side with criminals over law enforcement. They can continue to side

with illegal aliens rather than citizens, and they can continue to champion the same radical policies that unleashed chaos at the border and across the country during the Biden administration, but that will not stop Republicans from saluting our men and women in uniform, from backing the blue, from standing with the thin blue line, and making certain that law enforcement has what they need to provide safety for American citizens in communities coast to coast.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

NOMINATION OF KEVIN WARSH

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote no on Donald Trump's attempt to take over America's central bank.

Trump's economy is in big trouble, and everybody knows it, including Donald Trump. Consumer sentiment is at an alltime low. Families are paying more for groceries, more for housing, more for healthcare—all thanks to Trump's chaotic tariffs and his One Big Beautiful Bill, and now his foolish and illegal war with Iran is further driving up the cost of gas and the cost of nearly everything else here at home.

So it is no wonder that Donald Trump is desperate to salvage the economy before November's midterm elections. Now, he can do that. Instead of taking action to lower prices, which he could do, he has cooked up a ridiculous scheme: Install sock puppets at the Federal Reserve Board who are willing to artificially juice the economy. Of course, it will be American families who pay the price when this scheme backfires and raises prices and the cost of borrowing even more.

Donald Trump has not been subtle about this takeover attempt. First, he opened a bogus criminal investigation into Fed Governor Lisa Cook, and he illegally tried to fire her. Then he opened another bogus criminal investigation into Fed Chair Jay Powell—all in a ploy to push him out.

Trump then proclaimed:

Anybody that disagrees with me will never be the Fed Chairman.

And, about a month later, he nominated Kevin Warsh to be his sock puppet on the Fed.

Consideration of Mr. Warsh's nomination was rightfully delayed by some of my Republican colleagues when they joined Democrats in refusing to move forward amid the Department of Justice's phony inquiry into Chair Powell, but the second that the administration pretended to close the investigation, Republicans folded and advanced Mr. Warsh's nomination. No one here is fooled. The investigation is still open.

But don't take it from me. Take it from President Trump, who said the investigation is "not dropped."

Take it from the President's spokeswoman, who said "The investigation still continues."

Take it from U.S. attorney Pirro, who said that she "will not hesitate to restart a criminal investigation." She

went on to promise that her office would "continue to litigate the issue."

And no one should forget that President Trump is still trying to fire Fed Governor Cook, taking it all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, and the Justice Department's reported criminal probe against her is ongoing.

So it is clear that Donald Trump is still using bogus criminal investigations as a way to take over the Fed—to push out the people who have been confirmed so that he can install his own people who will do exactly what he wants.

So let me turn to Mr. Warsh, the nominee. At this unprecedented moment in the Fed's history, he is uniquely unqualified to lead the Agency, and that is why every single Democrat on the Banking Committee voted against his nomination—the first party-line vote ever for a Fed Chair, ever in history.

First, Mr. Warsh has proven to be a sock puppet for President Trump. During his confirmation hearing, Warsh couldn't even say that Trump lost the 2020 election. We need a Fed Chair who evaluates economic data and sets monetary policy in the real world, not in Trump's delusional alternative reality.

Second, Mr. Warsh has refused to disclose the sources of more than \$100 million worthwhile of assets. If confirmed, he will be the wealthiest Fed Chair in history, but he refuses to provide transparency to the American people about who he is entangled with. During his hearing, Mr. Warsh refused to say if he is invested in companies affiliated with President Trump or his family, companies that have facilitated money laundering, Chinese-controlled companies, or financing vehicles established by Jeffrey Epstein.

We have no idea if Mr. Warsh owns stock in any banks, which will be in direct violation of the Federal Reserve Act upon his swearing in later this week.

We also have no idea how and to whom Mr. Warsh will divest those secret assets. Based on the information we pieced together, it is possible that Stanley Druckenmiller, who makes a living betting on what the Fed will do next, may cut Mr. Warsh a huge check to cash him out. The American people would be right to question who Mr. Warsh will serve if a billionaire gives him a sweetheart deal just as Mr. Warsh takes office.

Third, Warsh says that he has "no regrets" from his catastrophic tenure as a Fed Governor before, during, and after the 2008 financial crash. The Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, which Congress set up to investigate the causes of the financial crisis, found that Governor Warsh attended multiple meetings in 2006 in which participants rung the alarm about subprime mortgages and rising mortgages and rising foreclosures and implored the Fed to use its authority to address these risks. Not only did Mr. Warsh ignore these warnings, he pushed back against them. In fact, in 2007, he said:

Subprime mortgages have gotten a bad name in this environment, and in some cases, that's not just.

He also said later that he doesn't "see any immediate systemic risk issues" among the big banks. Remember, this is shortly before the crash of 2008.

Then, for good measure, Mr. Warsh also praised risky financial instruments like credit default swaps that helped trigger the 2008 crash, and he said: No, these are innovations that make the financial system safer.

So that is what he did before the crisis. During the crisis, Warsh served as Wall Street's personal liaison on the Fed Board as 8 million workers lost their jobs, 10 million people were being thrown out of their homes, and many more saw their life savings vanish. Mr. Warsh's No. 1 priority? Not those families. Not those workers. Mr. Warsh's No. 1 priority was the big banks that crashed our economy. He worked tirelessly to orchestrate multibillion-dollar Wall Street bailouts. But Mr. Warsh says today he has "no regrets."

After the crash, most people on the Fed saw the economic devastation and said: Now might be a good time to lower interest rates to revive the economy and help get people back to work.

Not Mr. Warsh. Nope. He wanted to keep interest rates high—"no regrets"—and he kept pushing for higher interest rates for more than a decade even as our economy struggled.

When the job of Fed Chair became available during Trump's first term as President, Donald Trump passed him by. Now, Mr. Warsh chalked this up to his refusal to "put [his] ambitions ahead of [his] principles." Well, Mr. Warsh decided not to make that mistake the second time around. As soon as Donald Trump became President a second time, Mr. Warsh began shouting from the rooftops that the Fed should cut interest rates. In exchange for abandoning his principles, the President offered Mr. Warsh his dream job.

Look, red lights are flashing all across our economy. American families are struggling. Republicans will come to regret their decision to aid and abet President Trump's Fed takeover by installing Mr. Warsh as Chair.

I urge a "no" vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose Kevin Warsh's nomination to serve as Chairman of the Federal Reserve. I am not persuaded, based on his record and his testimony at his hearing before the Senate Banking Committee, that he has demonstrated the independence or the judgment this position requires.

The Federal Reserve has a statutory dual mandate: maximum employment to support jobs and price stability to avoid excessive inflation. To carry out that mandate effectively, markets need confidence that monetary policy decisions are being made on the basis of

economic evidence, not on the basis of political pressure or convenience.

That is especially important now as prices are rising too fast and President Trump is still demanding a big cut in interest rates. In fact, just yesterday, a Washington Post headline read "Iran war pushed inflation to highest rate in nearly three years."

We know our constituents are feeling these rapid price increases around the country—at the gas pump, at the kitchen table, farmers across the country with higher input costs. So there is no doubt that the illegal Iran war is driving prices up, and that comes on top of the continued upward inflationary pressure from the President's failed tariff tax policies, which continue to work their way through the system and put upward pressure on prices.

So illegal tariff taxes and the illegal war in Iran and other policies the President is pursuing are making life simply unaffordable for our fellow Americans. Yet, when he was faced with the prospect of carrying out that dual mandate free of political interference from the White House, Mr. Warsh's record and his responses to questions raised very serious concerns.

When he served as a Federal Reserve Governor during the financial crisis and its aftermath, he was a consistent inflation hawk, supporting higher interest rates. He did that even as unemployment then approached 10 percent and the country was in the middle of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. Despite that loss of jobs and high unemployment, Mr. Warsh repeatedly focused instead on inflation risks.

At a 2009 meeting of the Federal Open Market Committee—that is the committee that sets interest rates—Mr. Warsh said he was "more concerned about upside risks to inflation than downside risks"—again, at a time of very high unemployment.

He also argued publicly against quantitative easing—the policy that Chairman Bernanke put in place to lower long-term borrowing costs and support economic recovery.

So just to step back here, at a time when unemployment was near 10 percent, as Americans faced the great recession, Mr. Warsh was a hawk, pushing for higher interest rates over more near-term relief for American families. That was his position when the economy was weakest, weaker than it had been in generations, when millions of Americans were out of work.

But these days—these days—Mr. Warsh has had a complete conversion, a 180-degree flip. He is now a super dove on interest rates even as unemployment has recovered from the depths of the great recession, and, in fact, today, prices are too high. That is a situation where textbook economics would say that the big rate cuts demanded by President Trump will make inflation worse; they will make life even more unaffordable for the American people. Prices will keep going up.

Now Mr. Warsh says that rapid productivity gains, particularly from artificial intelligence, could justify easier monetary policy without reigniting inflation. Economists across the spectrum are overwhelmingly skeptical of this theory, especially when you look at the near- and midterms—certainly not something that would happen by the end of this year, and it is the end of this year where President Trump is demanding big interest rates. In fact, President Trump has repeatedly and publicly demanded sharply lower rates. We have seen him harangue the Federal Reserve over and over and over. And Mr. Warsh's views have conveniently moved in exactly that direction.

That doesn't automatically disqualify him, but it does create a very legitimate question: Is this a genuine change in economic judgment or is it a shift that reflects the preferences of the President who nominated him—specifically, a President who has been abusing his power to influence monetary policy and to strip the Fed of its independence; a President who has launched an unprecedented assault on the Fed, trying to fire Governor Lisa Cook, trying to concoct charges against Chairman Powell to push him out of the Federal Reserve. President Trump is doing all of this to try to get lower interest rates and much lower interest rates now.

It wasn't a secret that Donald Trump was looking for a Chair who would implement his preferences, who would lower interest rates significantly in the short term. And all of a sudden—all of a sudden—on his nomination-day conversion or just preceding that as he was auditioning, Mr. Warsh now seems to think that is appropriate despite his clear prior views.

That question became even more concerning during the Banking and Housing Committee hearing. I asked Mr. Warsh a straightforward question about monetary policy.

President Trump has called for a massive rate cut—below 1 percent—by the end of this year, so I asked Mr. Warsh whether a rate cut of that scale in an economy with steady growth and inflation already above target—whether that would likely put upward pressure on prices. Right? This is a simple, basic economics question, and he would not answer the question directly.

As I said, the basic framework is clear: Lower rates stimulate demand. If demand rises faster than supply, inflationary pressures increase, costs for families go up. That is Economics 101. If a nominee for Fed Chair will not directly acknowledge that basic relationship in a public hearing before this body, it is reasonable to ask whether he is avoiding an answer because it conflicts with the policy direction favored by the White House, favored by President Trump.

Now, colleagues, our economy works best when the Chairman of the Federal Reserve implements monetary policy based on their reading of the data, not

on the reading of politics. And I am concerned about whether Mr. Warsh meets that standard because we have seen these questions of independence raised even more dramatically under this administration than any before.

And against that backdrop, members of the committee asked Mr. Warsh direct questions. We asked: Would he step down if pressured by the President over monetary policy?

We asked: Would he resist efforts to manipulate the composition or decisions of the Federal Open Market Committee?

We asked: Would he clearly reject political pressure on reserve bank leadership?

And over and over, Mr. Warsh refused to give direct answers.

I believe Americans deserve clarity about whether Mr. Warsh is committed to standing up for the Fed at a time of unprecedented attacks and political pressure from the White House.

And based on his record and his flip-flops and his answers to the Senate Banking Committee, I remain unconvinced. I hope, if confirmed, he proves my concerns wrong. I hope he does act independently, and I hope he makes decisions based on facts and evidence, even when those decisions conflict with the President's preferences.

But on the record before us today, I cannot support this nomination.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

WHISTLEBLOWERS

MR. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I am here in the Senate about the Democrat Judiciary Committee minority in the House of Representatives.

They wrote a letter on May 12 of this year that I found to be more than troubling. That letter made disgraceful and wrongful accusations regarding this Senator's helping many FBI whistleblowers.

For the entirety of this Congress, I have been open and very public about my efforts to help whistleblowers. Accordingly, the timing of this letter, so late after settlements occurred in August of 2025, is suspect. If concerns existed, why were they not raised last year?

I have seen a lot, in my time serving the people of Iowa, but this attack on this Senator and my office and whistleblowers is beyond the pale.

Now, you have often heard me say on the Senate floor, over many years, that I feel like honest whistleblowers are treated like a skunk at a picnic. Oftentimes, their only crime is telling the truth. And for telling the truth, they often lose their job. They are hurt professionally, and it discourages other people who want to tell the truth about wrongdoing in government from coming forth. That is why whistleblowers deserve the protection that I and other Senators give them.

So getting back to that letter, this letter from the minority calls my office's efforts to obtain a fix for whistleblowers who faced years of retaliation

and financial ruin—that letter called it a “shakedown scheme.”

The Democrats are dead wrong about what they said, and if they had a sliver of integrity, they would retract that letter. This isn’t the way to handle disagreements.

But what is there to disagree with? Patriotic whistleblowers had wrongs against them righted, and I helped make their case right.

This should be a bipartisan celebration, especially since some of these whistleblowers weren’t pro-President Trump.

The letter also notes that some of the whistleblowers were properly disciplined, as if suffering retaliation is OK.

The letter further notes:

The record definitively shows that the agents weren’t disciplined for making protected disclosures to Congress or for the imaginary offense of being a Republican.

Now, even publications in this town—and I am going to quote POLITICO.

POLITICO noted in their article:

Judiciary Democrats did not provide supporting documentation for the sources of some of their claims.

As an example of how far off base the letter is, one FBI official who was wrongly accused of being a part of a January siege was cleared by the inspector general. His clearance was restored. He got his job back. The FBI Security Division had ignored photo and video evidence supporting that whistleblower’s claim.

Indeed, the whistleblower’s lawyers have publicly defended their client, noting:

No classified leaks. No criminal conduct.

But the records happen to exist, just not the ones that the Democrats want to talk about.

The lawyers for the whistleblowers rightly said the following, publicly:

It’s common practice for Federal Agencies to settle legal or administrative complaints against them, which virtually all the whistleblowers had against the FBI at the time of settlements.

Those lawyers also noted that they published hundreds of pages “documenting the flaws in FBI actions against employees”:

In fact, two of our clients who received settlements were FBI Security Division employees retaliated against for exposing the FBI’s use of the security clearance process for reprisal also against other Empower Oversight clients—a wrong even the Biden-era FBI recognized when it reinstated Marcus Allen’s security clearance.

President Trump’s Justice Department and the FBI should get credit for righting the wrongs against these additional whistleblowers.

And what the Democrats did with this letter may cause tremendous damage to whistleblower reputations for getting the facts wrong.

At my direction, my staff did what many in this town don’t understand. When whistleblowers step up to the plate, you have to fight for them. So that is exactly what my office did, and

I am not going to back down one bit and let brave individuals suffer more years of ruin. And I am certainly not going to apologize for fighting and winning for whistleblowers.

That doesn’t always mean that every whistleblower is going to get the satisfaction and settlement that he or she deserves. But that effort to get them justice must be made, and I make it clear to all of my staff that they must do what they can to get the job done of protecting whistleblowers—in other words, give the effort of protecting whistleblowers the “old college try.” That is what the taxpayers expect, and that is my reputation as a whistleblower defender.

I have made a career out of protecting and defending whistleblowers; and never in my time have I, my staff, or my whistleblowers received more attacks for doing that job than in this Congress.

I encourage all whistleblower groups in this town to stand up to what is happening here, just as I stood up for whistleblowers throughout the decades—no matter who they blow the whistle on, Republican or Democrat administrations—whether that is disagreeing with this administration about Mr. Reuveni being a real whistleblower or defending the Ukraine whistleblower, years ago.

In conclusion, I will note that the Democrat letter said:

The treasury isn’t a personal checkbook for ideological payouts, and the misuse of millions of dollars in taxpayer resources for personal or political benefit is a felony.

Did the Democrats forget about FBI Agent Peter Strzok reportedly receiving \$1.2 million or Lisa Page receiving \$800,000 from the Biden Department of Justice after the damage that they did to this country? Or were they covering up again for a disastrous Biden-Harris administration?

For God and country, this Senator will never stop fighting for whistleblowers.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF KEVIN WARSH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the President of the United States, there are few decisions more important than nominating leaders of integrity and good judgment to hold trusted positions in office. And few of those trusted positions are more important than the Chair of the Federal Reserve. Those words were uttered by President Trump during his first term when he announced Jerome Powell as his nominee to Chair the Fed. How times have changed.

During his tenure, Chair Powell served with competency and dignity as he navigated the economic problems of our time, from the COVID-19 pandemic to rapidly rising inflation. Yet he also faced a challenge unlike any other Chair in history: a sham legal battle waged by the very President who nominated him. To President Trump, it seems that exercising good judgment does not mean reliance on the economic facts and data, but instead obedience to his every demand.

Because of Chair Powell’s refusal to kowtow, Donald Trump has weaponized the Department of Justice to pressure, belittle, and threaten him. I want to commend Chair Powell for standing firm in the face of the President’s tirades. It is not easy to face Trump’s vengeful wrath, and it is indefensible that DOJ has kept open the possibility of pursuing these baseless, politicized charges in the future.

But Mr. Powell’s term as Chair expires on Friday, and President Trump seems determined to nominate a Chair who will do his bidding, instead of one who is independently minded. Earlier this year, President Trump nominated Kevin Warsh to lead the Fed after Powell’s departure. Mr. Warsh previously served as member of the Board of Governors from 2006 through 2011 as a Bush appointee.

Warsh’s actions during that time raise cause for concern: Mr. Warsh played a central role in arranging numerous multibillion-dollar bank bailouts, while warning against interest rate cuts even as unemployment soared. He has expressed no regrets about these bailouts and continues to support Trump’s Wall Street deregulatory agenda. We already have seen the damage across our government, from the Department of Justice to Health and Human Services, that Trump loyalists can wreck. We cannot allow that chaos in our central bank.

America’s economy is trusted by the world because of the belief that our economic policies are determined by facts not politics. Warsh threatens to undermine that.

When President Trump asks him to juice the economy by lowering interest rates, even if it raises inflation, will Warsh have the courage to say no? When one of the President or his allies’ many shady business ventures fail, will Warsh stand strong amid pressure to provide a taxpayer funded bailout? When the chips are down, will Warsh make the decisions that best benefit his country or the President who picked him? Warsh’s record and his answers at his confirmation hearing indicate the answers are no. Americans are struggling more than ever to afford basic goods, from housing, to gas, to groceries. Yesterday, data showed that Trump’s war of choice in Iran has caused inflation to reach 3.8 percent, the highest in 3 years. Working families deserve a central bank that will fight for them, not the President and his billionaire buddies.

I am not convinced that Mr. Warsh has the willingness to do what is best for the American people. For that reason, I will be voting no on his nomination and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for 2 o’clock be called immediately.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination.

The legislative clerk reported the nomination of Kevin Warsh, of Florida, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

VOTE ON WARSH NOMINATION

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 120 Ex.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—1

Gillibrand

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Nevada.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, this week marks National Police Week—a time for our Nation to honor the bravery, sacrifice, and service of the men and women in law enforcement, who work every single day to keep our communities safe. These heroes put their lives on the line to protect our communities.

I want to give a special thanks to law enforcement officers across Nevada, who serve every day with honor and integrity. Every day, they put on the uniform. They kiss their loved ones goodbye and head into situations that most of us hope we never ever have to face. Whether it is a major emergency or a domestic dispute or a routine traffic stop, they face danger every single day. They do it because they believe in service and because they believe in protecting others.

National Police Week is also about honoring the fallen, those heroes who left behind family, friends, colleagues, and the communities they served and helped to protect—heroes like Officer Jason Roscow, who served for 17 years, proudly, with the North Las Vegas Police Department and was tragically killed in the line of duty last year. Officer Roscow devoted his life to serving his fellow Americans—first in uniform for the U.S. Air Force and then for nearly two decades in law enforcement in Southern Nevada.

Today, I am thinking about his family—the two sons he left behind—his fellow officers, and the entire North Las Vegas community that continues to mourn this tremendous loss.

Unfortunately, Officer Roscow is not alone. In Nevada and across the country, far too many officers have made the ultimate sacrifice to their communities. This week, every week, and every day, we honor their memory. We also honor the work that our officers do.

I want to let Nevada's law enforcement know one thing: I have your back. That means making sure law enforcement agencies have the funding, staffing, training, equipment, and mental health resources that you need to do your jobs safely and effectively. I have worked across party lines to deliver exactly that for Nevada.

Earlier this year, I helped to secure millions of dollars in funding to strengthen public safety and support local law enforcement. That funding included \$1 million for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to procure equipment supporting search and rescue operations, to support patrols, and to support large-scale event security.

It included \$3 million for Washoe County to acquire a mobile command intelligence vehicle to improve emergency response capabilities.

The bill also included more than \$1 million for the city of Henderson to implement a domestic violence and sexual assault response program to better support victims and to improve public safety.

These funds are absolutely critical, and it is one of the best uses of our taxpayer dollars. Any time that we invest in fighting crime and keeping people safe, well, we are investing in ourselves, and we are investing in our communities.

These are so much more meaningful, well, than, let's say, a ballroom because, right now, Donald Trump has proposed spending \$1 billion of your taxpayer dollars—taxpayer money—on a new White House ballroom. Imagine that—\$1 billion for one room that no one will go to except the President and his friends. Mr. President, \$1 billion at a time when police departments across America are struggling with staffing shortages, recruitment challenges, retention issues, and the growing demands every day on officers.

Let me tell you, this \$1 billion could do a whole lot to support our local law enforcement. Mr. President, \$1 billion?

Well, it could fund nearly 2 years of full funding for the COPS Hiring Program to help communities hire and train and retain more officers. Not only that, it could fund 2 years of the COPS Hiring Program and fully fund 2 years of the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program. Do you know what the Benefits Program is? It is to help support the families of the fallen officers and the officers who have been permanently disabled in the line of duty. It could fund 2 full years for the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program and, like I said, 2 years for the COPS Hiring Program.

There are a few other things that that \$1 billion could do that is a lot better use than a ballroom for our public safety; \$1 billion could also fund an entire year of the Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants, which help our local law enforcement agencies combat violent crime, invest in crime prevention, support drug treatment programs, and strengthen public safety initiatives. These are actually investments that are keeping all of our communities safe everywhere—that are keeping all of you safe; that are keeping our officers safe.

That is why I am going to be doing a few things. I am going to be filing two amendments to the Republicans' reconciliation package that would redirect the \$1 billion boondoggle of a ballroom. It would take that funding away from the White House ballroom and put it toward the programs that support law enforcement and public safety in our communities.

Remember that. With 2 years here, 2 years here, and another year here for funding for law enforcement safety, for survivors, and benefits, it matters.

If my Republican colleagues truly support law enforcement the way they claim to, then they, too, should support my amendments.

I am doing this because I believe we must do everything we can to give our police the resources that they need to stay safe. They are the ones who put their lives on the line to protect us,

and their safety should be a priority for all of us.

I am going to continue to work with my colleagues here in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, on solutions that support our police departments, the officers who serve, and their families because our first responders, our law enforcement run in when everyone is running out. They take that risk every day. They will never go to the ballroom. They need the help in our communities. It is the least we can do.

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. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, hurricane season is less than 3 weeks away—3 weeks—and we have to act to make flood insurance affordable again before it is too late.

Last year, thankfully, no hurricanes hit my State. Now, no hurricanes hitting my State is good news for everyone in my State but especially for homeowners who do not have flood insurance.

Every year, more and more people have to drop the National Flood Insurance Program coverage because it is too expensive and too unreliable. So this is about making flood insurance affordable again.

Between 2022 and 2024, 70,000 people in Louisiana dropped coverage. And last year, another 52,000 did. Why? They need it. They are trying to be responsible. They are being priced out. And they are being priced out of flood protection by the rising costs of a post-Biden era flood insurance program. Under President Joe Biden, FEMA implemented Risk Rating 2.0 as a new risk assessment program, even though Congress never gave approval.

Now, look at this.

Since 2023, rates have increased, making people's flood insurance premiums so high they cannot afford them. They have got a certain amount of money to pay for their mortgage, their flood insurance premium, and their property and casualty.

Now, these are hard-working families trying to do the right thing, but having to choose between paying their mortgage, the property and casualty, the flood insurance—oh, by the way, buying food and gasoline, health insurance, taking care of their children, as well as any kind of ancillary expenses.

Now, these are some expenses here. And you can see, after the implementation of Risk Rating 2.0 to Calcasieu Parish, which is in the southwest portion of my State, Property 1 would have almost a \$12,000 a year risk of insurance. They would try and decrease

their risk of flooding. That is premitigation, before they decrease their risk of flooding. They get a \$758 increase, and the post-risk Risk Rating 2.0 is here, and that is their percent increase.

On Property No. 2, instead of a 1,183-percent increase, there is an 867-percent increase.

This is unaffordable for a middle-income family trying to make ends meet.

Now, people want to go to sleep at night knowing they are protected and they have taken care of things, in case a terrible event happens which affects them, for example a flood.

In 2016—it is one example—a 46-foot river crest swept the land completely out from underneath a Cypress Point home, even though they had elevated it above the base-flood elevation. That means, if your average flooding is here, they had built their house above that area—I shouldn't say "average"—of maximal flooding. What the worst case could be, they had built their house above that. Despite that, the family doing everything right, a natural disaster still wiped out their home.

This is when you want flood insurance. The family has done everything right, but, nonetheless, through an act of God, they lose it all.

But it is possible this family cannot afford their flood insurance. So if Congress has the power to guarantee reliable flood insurance that people can afford—and we do have that power—why don't we do it?

Instead, nearly one-fifth of the people in my State—almost 100,000—can no longer afford their insurance. And it is not just my State. Millions of Americans across the Nation rely on the National Flood Insurance Program. They are all getting pounded across the Nation by Risk Rating 2.0.

I am leading a group of Republicans who, last year, tried to end the policy, and I recently followed up with FEMA, asking that they would be urgent in addressing the harm Risk Rating 2.0 is doing the National Flood Insurance Program for people in my State and across the Nation.

And President Trump has begun to speak about how we make things more affordable. He understands this. The American people need to be able to afford to live, and right now, the component of their life which is flood insurance is not working.

In 2019, President Trump and I worked together to delay Risk Rating 2.0 for a year. I ask that we do it again, but let's make it permanent. The American people need flood insurance which is affordable and also reliable.

Right now, the NFIP relies on Congress to both fund and authorize the program. Now "to fund" means that if funding is ever withheld by Congress, like the Democrats have done multiple times this Congress, the National Flood Insurance Program cannot operate, and that leaves millions of Americans hanging in uncertainty.

Now, Congress must vote every year to reinstate the National Flood Insur-

ance Program. I have introduced legislation to automatically extend the program to operate during a lapse in authorization. It can still issue policies, renew contracts, pay claims, and access funding. Coverage should be there whether politicians decide to act responsibly or not.

And speaking of acting responsibly, Congress needs to act responsibly now and soon because Federal support is critical.

In President Trump's first administration, he created a program called BRIC, B-R-I-C, short for Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities, which provided costs and lifesaving grants that States across the Nation, including Louisiana, benefited from.

In President Trump's second administration, they assured me they would release more of these funds, and I am pleased to say that a new round has just been released: \$1 billion to help States impacted by natural disasters such as Louisiana.

Now, I have been fighting to get these BRIC grant dollars released. I am pleased that it is done.

And this is a picture of one of those projects, which is helping to mitigate the risk of flooding, building storm and flood protection in the West Shore Lake Pontchartrain or the Morganza to the Gulf, two areas of my State which are at risk of flooding.

But as much as we need recovery assistance, we also know that the best way to lower the cost of flood insurance is by trying to make sure you don't flood in the first place. That is why, through my work negotiating the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, Louisiana has received so far \$3 billion—I am sorry—hundreds of millions of dollars for flood mitigation and hundreds of millions for coastal restoration.

And here we see some of that activity. This is a bargain for the Federal taxpayer. It is easier and cheaper to prevent a flood than to provide recovery afterward.

Right now, if you go from the New Orleans area to Baton Rouge on the I-10, you pass LaPlace, and you will see construction of a huge flood control structure, which I have toured last August. This has received over a billion dollars to build this. It is going to protect flooding, which indeed protects the liability of Federal taxpayers. And this is money which I have helped—a portion of which I helped—to obtain.

And, by the way, if you never flood, the National Flood Insurance Program has less money to pay out. I know that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. In this case, this money for this levee could prevent billions of dollars in recovery.

If you go to Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes, you will go by the Morganza to the Gulf levee project—tremendous local support, the locals putting up hundreds of millions of dollars to build. But I have been able to

get \$615 million through the infrastructure bill and other mechanisms, including a funding package recently signed into law by President Trump.

And as an example of the positive thing that can occur, this being partially completed—not completely, but partially—when Hurricane Ida came, there were 10,000 homes that did not flood that would have flooded if the flood control structure built at that time had not been built. Put differently, it wasn't completed, but enough of it was built that it prevented 10,000 homes from being flooded that would have flooded had it not been started.

This is how you save money for the Federal taxpayer. This is how you preserve communities. A mother will rest more easily knowing that the home in which she lives will stay safe and dry, even if the rains come, the winds blow, even if the hurricane hits the shore. And the funding that I am delivering gives her that peace of mind.

But there is more to come. I tell folks I wake up every morning and think about how to make life better for the people in my State and my country. And I can tell you that reliable, accountable, affordable flood insurance is part of that. That is what I am working toward as I continue taking Federal investment back to my State for flood prevention to help protect the Federal taxpayer from paying excessive dollars in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, today, I rise to oppose the resolutions, these three CRAs.

Under former Director Chopra, the Biden CFPB frequently pushed or ignored the limits of the CFPB's authority. Consistently, they ignored their own limits because power—power—was more important than doing the right thing for small businesses across this great country.

He attempted to assert the CFPB in issues far outside its statutory limits, including healthcare, labor, and technology.

The Biden CFPB's guidance documents we are discussing today were highly prescriptive, established new regulatory requirements, and were all issued without formal rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act's notice and comment process.

This is not speculation. Multiple Biden CFPB policies have been struck down in courts—let me say it differently. Court after court after court struck down nonsense after nonsense after nonsense.

The current administration was right to correct this overreach and refocus the CFPB.

Last year, Congress enacted a Congressional Review Act resolution rejecting the Biden CFPB's last-minute attempt to impose price controls on overdraft fees. These are those junk

fees that you heard President Biden talk about during his State of the Union presentations and speeches. It is utterly ridiculous to lump all these things together.

I can't think of a worse way to govern than the Biden administration's approach to the CFPB and the playbook that they used time and time again, putting onerous pressure on small businesses that merely—my words—confiscated millions of dollars from private businesses without actually ending in a finding. This happened over and over and over again. Weaponizing the Federal Government against private businesses is just wrong.

I can't think of anything more clear than how wrong the CFPB has been consistently.

Agencies should not be conducting supervision or exams without explicit statutory authority to do so.

The Biden administration CFPB's medical debt advisory opinion is another example of Agency overreach. This guidance creates serious privacy concerns. Imagine a debt company being able to peer into your medical records to determine which debt should be and which debt should not be a part of their process. I don't want a debt company looking at medical records—certainly not my medical records—and making a determination on what they can and cannot do. That is just utterly ridiculous but consistent with the Biden administration's approach to the CFPB.

We ought not bring that back. We ought not ever bring that back. That means more third parties would have more patient-level health and financial information, increasing the risk of misuse, overcollection, and data breaches. Don't forget the data breach we saw at the CFPB. We don't want more information in the hands of people who can't handle the information they had before.

This is, as we know, Madam President, something we know in Wyoming and South Carolina. We just call it common sense.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose all these motions to proceed and the underlying resolutions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

IRAN

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, there is a debate right now about the cost of the Iran war. Now, this administration won't or can't give us a straight answer, but Coloradans can.

They are paying \$4.50 a gallon for gas that not too long ago they were getting for 2.50 a gallon. That is \$25 more every time they fill up their tank.

Shoppers are seeing their grocery bills go through the roof. Since January alone, the price of berries—strawberries, blueberries—has doubled. Today, the average family of four spends over \$1,000 a month just on groceries, and that number keeps climbing the longer the war drags on.

Mortgage rates jumped half a point in 2 months, costing most home buyers trying to buy a house over \$100 additional each month.

Just yesterday, President Trump admitted he doesn't "think about Americans' financial situations." He doesn't think about the financial situation of Americans when making the decisions on the war in Iran—well, finally the truth. The American people know this, and they have seen how the policies of this administration are costing lives overseas and exaggerating a cost-of-living emergency here at home.

While the White House has a hard time keeping track of what it is spending on the war—there was no plan at the beginning; it doesn't seem we have a good off-ramp—American families are struggling just to deliver their basic needs. To the administration, these might be just numbers on a spreadsheet, but to the rest of us, these are our family members, these are our neighbors, it is all of you.

Last week, I met an Uber driver named Kareem. It costs him \$68 every day to fill up his tank with gas. Kareem's expenses now exceed his take-home pay. He had to find a second job just to support his first job. He told me he worries every day about having enough money to feed his children.

It is not just the President's war that is increasing costs; this comes on the heels of numerous Republican efforts to gut and eviscerate our healthcare subsidies and our healthcare system and to, in whole terms, slash the social safety net.

Last week in Denver, I met a guy named TJ. He told me his marketplace premium went from 30 bucks a month to \$500 a month. These are real numbers. This happened right at the time when he was diagnosed with a rare blood cancer. TJ couldn't afford his marketplace plan, so he was forced to drop it. He had to move in with his parents just to stay afloat.

I also met with a Denver resident who is living with a rare neurological condition they picked up from COVID. Last year, in the middle of an endless health battle, her husband was diagnosed with cancer. Their marketplace premium doubled. They couldn't afford for both of them to stay on insurance and have healthcare at the same time, so her husband put off his chemotherapy so that she could get a badly needed treatment.

Let me say that again. In the wealthiest Nation on Earth, a man with cancer was forced to go without healthcare to make sure his wife got a fair shot at beating her sickness, just so his wife could get that chance. That is shameful.

Her words are going to stay with me. This woman told me that she has come to terms with death and with the severity of her husband's cancer, but what she can't accept is the daily battle to afford her healthcare when the cost of staying alive might well turn out to be bankruptcy.

These Coloradans aren't outliers. Over 1 million Americans—1 million Americans—had to drop their health insurance plans in January after this Congress—the Republicans—refused to extend the Affordable Care Act tax credits that eliminated a big chunk of those subsidies. So 1 million dropped off. Of the Americans who stayed on with their insurance, over 3 million missed their monthly payment in January. So 1 million dropped off, and 3 million have stopped payment as of January. So we could have up to 4 million people newly uncovered. How long before those 3 million people lose their health insurance? We don't know.

It is not just people in big cities; farmers across America, farmers across Colorado were already being crushed by a cost-of-living emergency. Now soaring food and fertilizer costs are making a grave situation a crucial one.

One sweet corn farmer in Montrose, CO, told me that fuel normally takes up about 15 percent of his operating costs. Now it is 65 percent. He said: If I didn't have a son that was crazy enough to farm, I would probably quit because the unknowns make it impossible to plan.

Let me tell you, if a farmer can't plan, if he can't make a plan for how he is going to make the whole year work, he can't plant. Think about that, because the unknowns make it impossible to plan.

Farmers are now paying 40 percent more for nitrogen-based fertilizer and, as I said, 60 percent more for diesel. With just a few weeks remaining in the planting season, 70 percent of farmers and ranchers in America are saying they can't afford their operating costs.

Add in the tariffs, which are diminishing the futures market for whatever they are selling, and the worsening drought conditions, the climate change-caused drought, it is no wonder that so many Colorado producers are choosing to fallow their land instead of farming as they have always done.

You don't need a crystal ball to see what comes next. Fewer crops are suddenly going to mean higher prices. That will be good for those few farmers who did take the risk—probably an exceptional risk—to go forward with planting with such unknown outcomes.

As one farmer told me, a country that can't feed itself cannot survive.

We are hearing stories like this all the time. It doesn't matter if we are meeting farmers or teachers or restaurant owners, rural or urban, Republican or Democrat, we are hearing the same thing: Costs are too high, and Americans need help.

This cost-of-living emergency didn't start with the war, but the war is making it far worse, and the President's response has just been to spend more—not on you but on this war. The President recently requested \$1.5 trillion—\$1.5 trillion requested to fund the Department of War, what used to be the Department of Defense.

Madam President, \$1.5 trillion—that is money we don't have, money we are

going to have to borrow and add to our ballooning deficit. To put that in perspective, \$1.5 trillion is the equivalent of borrowing roughly \$18,000 for every American family. We are passing \$18,000 per family on to the children of those families.

Now, you ask yourself: Do we really want to take on the cost of that war when we have no clear path to victory? We don't know what the off-ramp looks like?

And that doesn't even cover the full cost of the Iran war. The White House budget director told Congress that a separate funding request is coming. We are being told to expect up to \$200 billion just for operations and to replenish our stockpiles from the war in Iran—\$200 billion. With that money, we could fully fund pre-K for every kid in America; we could have free community college all across this country; we could get much closer to universal healthcare coverage.

I think our Nation's priorities have somehow gotten backward. We have money for ballrooms and bombs and tax breaks for billionaires but very little for hard-working Americans, the people that make this country work. It is just plain wrong.

The MAGA Republicans are giving the White House a blank check while all of you get stuck with the bill.

We need to end this war and stop asking the American people to carry costs they never agreed to bear.

The President sometimes treats billions like a rounding error. Coloradans don't have that luxury. Every dollar counts, and hard-working families are paying the price.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, Senate Democrats are on the floor today to fight back against President Donald Trump's actions to raise the cost of living for American families.

Now, you may remember that Donald Trump promised to lower costs on day one. Instead, he is deliberately raising them. His war in Iran sent gas prices soaring. His chaotic tariffs are jacking up the costs of everything from coffee to housing. And as we will discuss today, his attack on the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau cost families at least \$19 billion in just 1 year alone.

The CFPB is the financial cop on the beat for American consumers. Since 2011, it has been working to catch financial crooks, putting over \$21 billion

right back into the hands of hard-working families that had gotten cheated.

From protecting consumers from predatory medical debt to cracking down on hidden fees and shotty credit reporting practices that raised the cost of loans for families, the CFPB has taken action to shield consumers from getting tricked or trapped by giant banks and big corporations.

But the Trump administration is hell-bent on destroying the Agency. Let me count the ways: They tried to fire the entire staff. They tried to end all funding for the Agency. They told CFPB employees to stop working to protect consumers—literally, to stop working. They turned loose lenders who had been caught cheating Americans. They rolled back commonsense guidelines to protect consumers. And they pretty much have advertised that there is no financial cop on the beat, inviting scammers to do their worst to families that are already struggling to make ends meet in Trump's economy.

Today, we are going to hear from 20 Senators about how the Trump administration has hurt American families by rolling back commonsense CFPB rules, and we are going to hear how Congress can make it right.

We are going to vote to undo 20 different ways that the Trump administration has abandoned consumers and is making life more expensive for them.

I urge my Republican colleagues to listen with open ears and cast their votes on behalf of the consumers that they were elected to represent.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there be up to 2 minutes for debate on each motion.

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

Ms. WARREN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in defending the consumer protections that the Trump administration is working so hard to unravel.

During the financial crisis of 2008, Americans lost trillions because of deceptive and abusive and irresponsible financial practices. And I saw firsthand what this meant in North Minneapolis and in other communities around Minnesota. I saw what happened when families lost their homes, when properties went vacant, when whole blocks went vacant. It has taken years for my communities to recover.

So the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau was created in the aftermath of this crisis to be the strong advocate for consumers. In a financial marketplace that too often is rigged in favor of the big financial institutions with so much power and influence, the CFPB was charged with standing up for the little guy, and it worked. When people got ripped off, when they were faced with consumer fraud, the CFPB was there to enforce the law.

The CFPB has done its job. It has actually worked. It has returned more than \$21 billion stolen from consumers.

But in 2025, when the Trump administration came in, they began undoing all of this good work and dismantling this Agency that was created by Congress, by us, to protect the people.

So, today, I want to talk about just one example of what this means. This is a true story about how these predatory lenders, these predatory land contracts, and contracts for deed have created such a serious problem in my home State of Minnesota.

S.J. Res. 149, which we will be voting on today, would ensure that consumer protections apply to these predatory land contracts.

So here is how this swindle works and how people get taken advantage of. This is a real story about a father. He worked as a long-haul truckdriver, and he rented an apartment in the Twin Cities for years. But it was just too small for his young children, and they were sleeping sometimes three to a room, all together. But he honestly didn't make enough money to qualify for a mortgage.

The father heard how he could move into a home with room for each of his children to grow, how there was this great backyard for them to play in, and he could do so using a contract for deed.

So what he does is he puts together a hefty downpayment, and they move into this home. And even though these contracts can seem like a mortgage, they lack the critical protections in a standard mortgage.

What that means is unscrupulous sellers could take advantage of unsuspecting buyers. For example, with a land contract, a single missed payment—a single missed monthly payment—can mean that a family forfeits all of the money that they have paid in years of payment, and then they face eviction. They have been able to build no equity at all. In actual fact, what happens is that they lose everything.

So here is what happened with this Minnesota truckdriver.

After a few months, the cost of diesel went up, and he had fewer shifts available to work on, and he struggled to make those monthly payments.

In a story that was published in the *Sahan Journal* in Minnesota, he talks about how “his family” then found themselves “at risk of losing not only the house, but about \$100,000” that “they have paid” in, “including” their entire “down payment.” And “he never understood the disadvantages and” the tricks of this “contract for deed.” But, at this point, “it [was] too late to get out of it.”

Now, none of this would have happened if he had the protections of a traditional mortgage. And I want to be clear. I know that the President represents farming interests. I don't know if it is this way in your State, Madam President. But in my State, contracts

for deed can be legitimate tools for financing real estate transactions.

But predatory land contracts can be designed to fail, and that is what happened here. A set of bad actors specifically targeted Minnesota's Muslim families, who, under the tenets of their faith, were limited in paying interest with traditional mortgages.

And families thought they were realizing their dream of homeownership only to be sucked into these contracts that are so-called “interest free,” and they found themselves intentionally in situations designed by the seller where there is no way they can succeed. They lose their homes, and they lose all their money with no recourse.

This is not a rare problem. Over 8 million Americans have used contracts for deed to purchase their home. They deserve the same basic protections as anyone with a mortgage.

I held a subcommittee hearing on this topic a few years ago with my colleague Senator LUMMIS, and we dived into this, and we developed some bipartisan solutions for establishing just even basic reporting requirements around this.

And I want to thank Senator LUMMIS for that partnership.

Here is what happened. In August of 2024, the CFPB took action on these predatory land contracts. I stood alongside the Director in Saint Paul, where they issued an advisory opinion affirming that financial products should be subject to the same consumer protections as traditional mortgages.

But now, the Trump administration is tearing up that work. They are tearing up that advisory opinion. Rather than cracking down on the people who are ripping off families, the President is making it easier for bad actors to get away with predatory practices like this, by stealing money from Americans and from Minnesotans.

Colleagues, we should not be on the side of making it easier for our constituents to get swindled, to make it easier for bad actors to take away people's homes.

We should be on the side of hard-working Americans, making it easier for them to afford their lives and making it harder for these bad actors to rip them off.

That is what this resolution that I offer today would do, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MOODY). The Senator from Rhode Island.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO “EXAMINATIONS FOR RISKS TO ACTIVE-DUTY SERVICEMEMBERS AND THEIR COVERED DEPENDENTS”—Motion to Proceed

Mr. REED. Madam President, I move proceed to Calendar No. 388, S.J. Res. 132.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 388, S.J. Res. 132, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Examinations for Risks to Active-Duty Servicemembers and Their Covered Dependents”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes for debate.

Mr. REED. Madam President, it is not enough that President Trump has injected chaos and inflation into the economy with his illegal tariffs, unauthorized war, and his so-called Big Beautiful Bill. He is also stripping protections for average Americans against being defrauded and scammed out of their money.

Case in point, through Russell Vought, who is moonlighting as the Director of Consumer Financial Protection Bureau or the CFPB, Trump is dismantling the Military Lending Act or MLA. He has fired the CFPB staff responsible for enforcing this law, dismissing active cases against lenders for defrauding and scamming the troops, and refusing to supervise financial companies to make sure they comply with the Military Lending Act.

Back in 2006, the Senate passed the Military Lending Act by unanimous consent. I strongly support this law because as a former military officer, I have seen how servicemembers have had their lives and careers ruined by predatory lending.

And in 2010, the Senate strengthened this law again in a bipartisan fashion—completely bipartisan—by giving the CFPB powerful supervision and enforcement authority.

Since then, the CFPB has returned \$360 million to servicemembers and veterans. They have won major cases for violations of the MLA, and as result, corrected the behavior of many predatory lenders.

But Mr. Vought is unilaterally defanging this Agency—taking it apart. Besides removing staff, he has issued guidance stripping the Agency of its authority to supervise nonbank lenders for compliance with the MLA.

Who are these nonbank lenders? These are the payday lenders who set up shop outside military bases and target young servicemembers with loans

that leave them with huge debts and exorbitant interest payments that can be in some cases in the triple digits.

Mr. Vought wants to give these lenders free rein to go after servicemembers to take away their well-earned compensation, and in many cases—I have seen it personally—to put them in a financial spiral that pushes them out of the service and into a very, very difficult and challenging life.

Today, this Senate can go on record, as it has in the past, in a very strong bipartisan vote to rescind Mr. Vought's guidance and protect our servicemembers.

Now, every one of us goes back home and gets with the veterans groups and says: We owe you more than we can pay you. We respect what you have done.

And those servicemen who are serving today in the Persian Gulf, they have to get the support they need, and frankly, they don't get it.

It is an easy choice: the troops or Russell Vought's attempt to suppress these troops who are serving us.

And I would urge passage of this proposal.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 121 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—52

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). The Senator from Georgia.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES (REGULATION F); DECEPTIVE AND UNFAIR COLLECTION OF MEDICAL DEBT"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 393, S.J. Res. 141.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 393, S.J. Res. 141, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Deceptive and Unfair Collection of Medical Debt".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes of debate on the motion.

Mr. WARNOCK. I rise today in support of my resolution to restore the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rule restricting medical debt collections. This rule protected Americans from paying for medical services they did not receive or paying debt they already paid off.

Medical debt leaves Americans in serious financial jams. It wrecks lives. Folks go to the doctor one day for a bandage or some minor injury and end up leaving with a financial burden the size of a mortgage. It could happen to any one of us.

Georgia ranks among the top 10 States with the highest rates of medical debt, to the tune of \$855 per Georgian, in large part because of the State's refusal to expand Medicaid. In fact, more than a quarter of rural Georgians have medical collections on their credit report—one in four—and that is 10 percentage points higher than the national average.

Americans face more barriers as a result. Their mortgage costs increase. Their access to car loans can be restricted just because they got sick and went into debt for care.

That is why I led 30 of my colleagues in a letter to the Trump administration defending the CFPB's work on protecting families from the consequences of medical debt. But the Trump administration's actions will make it easier for debt collectors to aggressively go after sick or struggling Americans and prey on families already saddled with medical debt. That is just cruel and unnecessary.

I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on this resolution.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. WARNOCK. 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 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 122 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Indiana.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION CIRCULAR 2024-05: IMPROPER OVERDRAFT OPT-IN PRACTICES"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 386, S.J. Res. 130.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 386, S.J. Res. 130, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to withdrawal of the rule relating to "Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024-05: Improper Overdraft Opt-In Practices".

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, colleagues, overdraft fees are among the most abusive junk fees in our financial system. The average overdraft

is only \$26 and is usually repaid within a few days, but many large banks charge \$35 a fee per overdraft. That works out to an annual percentage of about more than 16,000 percent.

So I want you to imagine that you are walking into a 7-Eleven. You are a little short on cash. You want to buy a cup of coffee. You go to the ATM machine. You take out 50 bucks. You buy a \$2.50 cup of coffee, but it costs you about \$40; and you don't even know it because the bank doesn't tell you.

And then the next day you go to buy some groceries. This time you use your debit card, and they charge you another 35 bucks and don't tell you you have overdrawn.

Well, these fees fall hardest on families living paycheck to paycheck. Federal law requires that these banks can charge an overdraft fee on these withdrawals only if consumers opt in—if they opt in. But many financial institutions use deceptive tricks and confusing fine print to get consumers to enter into these programs and then do not inform them of the costs. And banks not that long ago made about \$30 billion in one year from these overdraft fees.

So in 2024, the CFPB issued guidelines requiring banks to show proof that one of our constituents—one of our consumers—actually opted in, and that is what the Trump administration got rid of. They got rid of the enforcement mechanism that prevents our consumers from being gouged.

I know a 35-buck fee is a drop in the bucket for Trump and his billionaire buddies. I know he is focused on his billion-dollar ballroom, but we need to focus on our constituents.

And I will close with this. Just yesterday, President Trump said:

I don't think about Americans' financial situation.

Well, when they got rid of this rule, he proved he did not care about the financial situation of people living paycheck to paycheck. We should care. I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Duckworth	Kaine
Baldwin	Durbin	Kelly
Bennet	Fetterman	Kim
Blumenthal	Gallego	King
Blunt Rochester	Gillibrand	Klobuchar
Booker	Hassan	Lujan
Cantwell	Heinrich	Markey
Coons	Hickenlooper	Merkley
Cortez Masto	Hirono	Murphy

Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed
Rosen
Sanders

Schatz
Schiff
Schumer
Shaheen
Slotkin
Smith
Van Hollen

Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—53

Armstrong
Banks
Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Britt
Budd
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
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
Tillis
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The Senator from Delaware.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING; BACKGROUND SCREENING"—Motion to Proceed

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 389, S.J. Res. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 389, S.J. 133, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; Background Screening".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 2 minutes.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Tariffs, a war, and a golden ballroom. We are in the middle of an economic crisis in America, but instead of working with us to help bring down costs, this administration weakened the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, gutting protections and making it harder for Americans to afford daily life.

The unemployment rate is 4.3 percent and rising. Our housing market is in turmoil. Bottom line: Americans are struggling to get jobs, rent apartments, and secure mortgages. And the last thing they need to deal with is inaccurate background screening reports. This is especially true for those seeking a fresh start. My resolution would address that.

Now, we have all been there where you have submitted your paperwork, you sit for an interview, you provide references, and you are just waiting for the background check. This should be a

breeze, right? Well, for many Americans it is not that easy—especially for our returning citizens.

That is why red States and blue States across the country have recognized the need to address a portion of this problem passing clean-slate legislation to give people a fair shot and a fresh start.

The Biden CFPB issued guidance to crack down on inaccurate background screening reports, but the Trump administration withdrew this guidance stating it was too onerous. You know what is onerous? Jumping through hoops to prove your background check was wrong while hoping to get an apartment that you applied for is still available. Or fighting with the credit bureau to prove you have a clean record to keep your job—that is onerous.

It has been proven that protecting consumers from error-filled background checks can be done. Equifax—one of the big three credit bureaus—recognized the importance and continued to handle customer complaints, despite the Trump administration's rescission of the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. The Federal Government should do the same, and I urge my colleagues to join us because nobody deserves to lose their job or their home because of false or outdated information.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Clearly, the noes have it. The motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING; PERMISSIBLE PURPOSES FOR FURNISHING, USING, AND OBTAINING CONSUMER REPORTS"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 394, S.J. Res. 145.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 394, S.J. Res. 145, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; Permissible Purposes for Furnishing, Using, and Obtaining Consumer Reports".

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a joint resolution of disapproval that would restore critical privacy protections for consumers that the Trump administration did away with.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act is one of our foremost laws aimed at protecting the privacy of the American people. The law requires that a consumer report, like a credit report or a background check, can only be provided if the report's requestor, like a creditor, landlord, or employer, certifies that it has a permissible purpose to obtain a report on a specific person.

Despite these requirements, far too many Americans have been subjected to serious, outrageous breaches of privacy when companies sharing the report for one person include information pertaining to someone else.

In 2022, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—our Nation's consumer watchdog—took action to protect Americans' privacy and crack down by issuing new guidance on the rules that surround crucial credit report privacy.

The advisory opinion did something that ought to be common sense: It made it clear that your sensitive financial information couldn't be shared with landlords, loan sharks, or used car salesmen just because you had a similar name to somebody else.

Once your credit info is in the wrong hands, scammers, criminals, and shady data brokers can easily use your personal information, and then they go rip you off.

This was a huge win for consumer privacy, and Donald Trump gutted it.

I will close with this: My resolution is simple. It would restore this advisory opinion that Trump withdrew as part of this administration's ongoing war against consumers and privacy.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in rolling back Trump's war on consumers by supporting this joint resolution that will once again restore important privacy measures for the American people.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

It appears the noes have it. The motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "TRUTH IN LENDING (REGULATION Z); CONSUMER PROTECTIONS FOR HOME SALES FINANCED UNDER CONTRACTS FOR DEED"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 396, S.J. Res. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 396, S.J. Res. 149, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Protections for Home Sales Financed Under Contracts for Deed".

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—CFPB—has played a critical role on the side of people to help them avoid junk fees, predatory medical debt, payday lenders who take advantage of people in need, including so many of our military servicemembers.

So it should come as no surprise that Donald Trump is no fan of the CFPB—he has always sided with big special interests over average folks—and he has undermined its protections for the American people.

Senate Democrats have made clear time and time again: Donald Trump's policies are one big broken promise in lowering costs to the American people.

Trump undermining consumer protections is just another example of Trump's betrayal—betrayal—of working people.

So today I am defending the CFPB for the same reason I helped authorize it years ago: American consumers need to have someone—someone—in their corner. This is a critical tool to reducing people's everyday costs from healthcare and banking to housing.

So I am heading up this joint resolution of disapproval with many of my colleagues against the Trump administration's decision to reverse CFPB protections on mortgage lending called contract for deed transactions that without the proper guardrails can devolve into predatory practices against Americans trying to buy a home.

For millions of Americans who can't access a traditional mortgage, a contract for deed can seem like a lifeline, but too often, these arrangements are simply traps.

The buyer takes on every obligation of home ownership immediately—the taxes, the repairs, the risks—but doesn't receive the deed until they pay every last dollar.

This is a formula for failure. Miss a single payment, and you can lose everything—no equity, no recourse, evicted like a tenant. Mr. President, 200,000 New Yorkers are in this position. We must stop it, and I urge a yes vote.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it. The motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING; NAME-ONLY MATCHING PROCEDURES"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WARNOCK. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 392, S.J. Res. 140.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 392, S.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 Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; Name-Only Matching Procedures".

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I rise today in support of my resolution to restore CFPB guidance that prevented mistaken identity on credit reports, which can destroy someone's credit through no fault of their own.

Credit and background reports are incredibly important to the lives of Americans. The difference between good credit and bad credit can decide whether someone gets a house, an apartment, or a job. It determines how much money they will spend in order to afford a house.

These reports may include criminal records or eviction records, so they need to be accurate.

If they are inaccurate because of lazy name-matching practices, they can result in you being denied a job or apartment based on the wrong person's criminal or eviction record—a case of mistaken identity. And by the time you figure out what went wrong and jump through all the hoops to fix the problem, it is often too late for that job or apartment.

The CFPB, under the previous administration, tried to fix this problem by saying companies need more than just someone's name to identify someone, but the Trump administration has torn up this guidance and made the lives of ordinary folks harder—harder to get a job, harder to find an apartment. I don't get it.

I encourage my colleagues to vote yes on my resolution to restore this simple guidance to stop credit report mistaken identity by companies and debt collectors.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it. The motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "LIMITED APPLICABILITY OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION ACT'S 'TIME OR SPACE' EXCEPTION WITH RESPECT TO DIGITAL MARKETING PROVIDERS"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S.J. Res. 150.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S.J. Res. 150, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Limited Applicability of Consumer Financial Protection Act's 'Time or Space' Exception With Respect to Digital Marketing Providers".

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in a remarkable gift to Big Tech, President Trump eliminated the digital marketing rule, which means they are not subject to the same kind of consumer protection laws or rules that apply to traditional advertisers and other kinds of interests.

Banks, fintechs, and other financial institutions partner with Big Tech to use consumer data and targeted advertising tools to reach specific consumers online, including financially vulnerable individuals.

This means unchecked exploitation, which creates opportunities for bad actors like scammers. This need for the rule is not just hypothetical or hyperbole. It is real. Big Tech has brought in billions of dollars from scams.

According to internal documents, Meta projected it would earn roughly 10 percent of its total 2024 advertising revenue—that is approximately \$16 billion from ads linked to scams, fraud, and prohibited productions—maybe not accidentally. Some of those Big Tech executives are on President Trump's plane to China.

In response to that revelation, I, along with Senator HAWLEY, led a letter to FTC and the Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate Meta for enabling and profiting from these scams that harm consumers.

President Trump has left consumers at the mercy of Big Tech, using social media to target and exploit consumers. It is clear that this kind of cozying up to Big Tech puts corporate interests above individual consumers, and I urge my colleagues to join my joint resolution of disapproval of the Trump administration's decision to rescind the digital marketing rule.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it. The motion is rejected.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING; FILE DISCLOSURE"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 383, S.J. Res. 127.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 383, S.J. Res. 127, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Credit Reporting; File Disclosure".

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I rise today to defend something rather simple: Americans' right to access their own credit and background reports.

We have a law already on the books—the Federal Credit Reporting Act—to protect this right, but we are seeing companies and others finding creative ways to skirt this responsibility, and working Americans are the ones left paying the price. That is why we must pass this joint resolution of disapproval I filed today and reassert this law's authority.

The Fair Credit Reporting Act gives every consumer the right to obtain a copy of the information in their file, entitling them to one free credit report per year from annualcreditreport.com or from "specialty" reporting companies like tenant screeners or background check companies. When these companies choose to cheat the system, they are able to make a profit, while American consumers are left in the dark about their own credit.

That is why, in January 2024, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, our Nation's consumer watchdog, stepped in to stand up for consumers and hold credit reporting companies, tenant screeners, and others accountable to the law.

Last year, though, the Trump administration threw this work out the window. And while the law is still clear, scrapping CFPB's work was a glaring signal to credit bureaus and background screeners about what they can get away with.

In New Jersey alone, over the past year, there have been over 157,000 com-

plaints with the CFPB about credit reports or other consumer reports—hundreds of them about not being able to get to their credit report or score.

Everyone knows these moments when a credit score matters: applying to rent an apartment, at the car dealership, opening a new credit card. Credit is foundational to people's financial mobility and staying out of financial hardship. Without the transparency consumers deserve, people can go unaware of mistakes in their reports and have no way to get them fixed. Without the accuracy consumers deserve, people's financial stability and mobility are put at risk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KIM. I yield back.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO "FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT; PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 399, S.J. Res. 155.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 399, S.J. Res. 155, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Fair Credit Reporting Act; Preemption of State Laws".

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, as the Trump administration has walked back from protecting American consumers to help all of its creepy billionaires who it loves so much, States have had to step up into the breach and enact commonsense protections for regular consumers. That includes 15 States, like my State of Rhode Island, helping to make sure medical debt does not send consumers, American families, into a financial tailspin, blocking their access to credit.

While the Fair Credit Reporting Act continues to provide some key protections for consumers, this rule is particularly concerning at a time the administration has sidelined the CFPB at every turn. Rhode Island consumers have filed almost 13,000 complaints about credit reporting with the CFPB in the past year.

We need its help again. We need vigorous, empowered State enforcement more than ever as well.

I yield back.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (REGULATION F); TIME-BARRED DEBT"

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 382, S.J. Res. 126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 382, S.J. Res. 126, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (Regulation F); Time-Barred Debt".

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I rise today because the American dream of owning a home is getting further and further out of reach, and as working families get crushed by Trump's economy, Congress needs to take steps to make life more affordable.

I filed this joint resolution of disapproval today to do just that and reinstate commonsense guidance at the CFPB that protects hard-working families from being forced or threatened into paying debts that they don't legally owe.

These time-barred or nonenforceable debts are appropriately named "zombie" debts. Nearly all States have laws that make it illegal to start a lawsuit after a fixed number of years since a legal claim arose. However, that isn't enough to stop debt collectors from trying to extort money from homeowners by threatening legal action that they have no right to take. These "zombie" debts are another example of how American homeowners continue to be plagued from fallout from the 2008 mortgage meltdown.

It doesn't have to be this way. In 2022, CFPB issued guidance to set out clear rules for how to rein in foreclosures on stale mortgage debts. The Trump administration, though, withdrew this commonsense rule, leaving homeowners at risk.

With this vote, we can restore this guidance; we can protect homeowners from zombie debt; we can restore accountability and make sure debt collectors compensate consumers for the

harm inflicted by their unfair, deceptive collections; and we can stand up for millions of Americans that need us to have their backs.

I yield back.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES (REGULATION F); PAY-TO-PAY FEES"—Motion to Proceed

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 381, S.J. Res. 125.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 381, S.J. Res. 125, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Pay-to-Pay Fees".

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Mr. President, I filed a joint resolution of disapproval to restore the CFPB's existing rule against charging consumers a convenience fee to pay their bills a certain way. Adding these surprise pay-to-pay fees to bills are useless and unnecessary in general but especially in a time when American families are struggling with the growing affordability crisis.

During my time here in the Senate, I have worked to lower costs and fought to make everything from housing to groceries more affordable for Maryland. I am also fighting these unfair fees because our residents have also had to contend with these unfair debt collection practices.

Maryland consumers have now filed nearly 24,000 complaints against debt collection with the CFPB. The CFPB has stood on the side of consumers, creating an advisory opinion to clarify debt collectors' obligations under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act and explicitly prohibiting debt collectors from charging pay-to-pay fees.

Unfortunately, this administration has chosen the side of making things harder for American consumers by withdrawing this rule. Although underlying statutes like the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act continue to prohibit abusive debt collection practices, this administration's rescission of this guidance signals to bad actors that

they may have leeway to charge convenience fees without fear of facing any real consequences from the current CFPB.

That is why I filed a joint resolution of disapproval to restore the CFPB's rule, and I urge my colleagues to support it. Senate Democrats and the CFPB have been committed to protecting working families, and fighting these unlawful fees is another step to making life fairer for all of them.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION CIRCULAR 2024-02: DECEPTIVE MARKETING PRACTICES ABOUT THE SPEED OR COST OF SENDING A REMITTANCE TRANSFER"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 387, S.J. Res. 131.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 387, S.J. Res. 131, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024-02: Deceptive Marketing Practices About the Speed or Cost of Sending a Remittance Transfer".

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. President, imagine this: Your kid is studying abroad, and they call to tell you their laptop has been stolen; they can't do coursework—or, worse, that they were in an accident and ended up in the hospital. They need your help financially. So you send them an international money transfer.

Your kid needs help very fast. So you use a company that promises it will get money to them in 24 hours. In reality, however, the transfer takes days. On top of that, you are hit with a hidden junk fee of 8 percent or more. That is a scenario the Trump administration has made a whole lot more likely.

In 2024, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau warned companies against deceptive remittance advertising like claiming that transfers will be delivered within a certain timeframe, even if that is not true, or claiming the transfers are free when, in fact, fees are charged.

The Trump administration withdrew this commonsense guidance, signaling to bad actors that they can engage in deceptive marketing about remittance transfers without fear of facing any real consequences from the current CFPB.

My joint resolution of disapproval, which comes before the Senate today, would restore the previous guidance and make clear that we don't stand for companies that deceive and overcharge Americans.

Right now, hard-working Americans are struggling just to get by. For those who use what little they have left over to help family and loved ones abroad, we shouldn't be making life any harder for them. Consumers deserve clear, honest pricing. That is why I have introduced the One Fair Price Act, to outlaw surveillance pricing, and the Junk Fee Prevention Act, with Senator BLUMENTHAL, to crack down on deceptive, excessive, and hidden fees on everything from hotels to concert tickets.

And that is why I introduced this resolution. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "TRUTH IN LENDING (REGULATION Z); CONSUMER CREDIT OFFERED TO BORROWERS IN ADVANCE OF EXPECTED RECEIPT OF COMPENSATION FOR WORK"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 400, S.J. Res. 156.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 400, S.J. Res. 156, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Credit Offered to Borrowers in Advance of Expected Receipt of Compensation for Work".

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, payday loans are notorious short-term loans, often with interest rates of 100, 300, or 500 percent. They put families into a vortex of debt they often cannot escape. Any way you slice it, at those interest rates, it is loansharking.

Many States, including Oregon, have outlawed these loans and put reasonable sideboards on it—a good thing to do. But now the industry has changed its language. Instead of calling it a payday loan, they call it an earned wage access product. Instead of calling it a loan, they call it an advance. Instead of calling it a fee, they call it a tip.

The CFPB provided some national protection, including what States did separately—basically, Truth in Lending Act fair disclosure.

I offer this joint resolution of disapproval to suggest we restore that basic Truth in Lending Act disclosure and other protections the CFPB had provided—just sideboards to help reduce the most harmful aspects of these predatory products.

So, quite simply, if you are against unregulated loansharking and want to end it, vote aye. If you are for loansharking, vote no.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "EQUAL CREDIT OPPORTUNITY (REGULATION B); REVOCATIONS OR UNFAVORABLE CHANGES TO THE TERMS OF EXISTING CREDIT ARRANGEMENTS"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 398, S.J. Res. 154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 398, S.J. Res. 154, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Revocations or Unfavorable Changes to the Terms of Existing Credit Arrangements".

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, in 1974, Congress passed a landmark piece of legislation, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. The ECOA was put in place to protect people from what was widespread discrimination in getting and using credit. Congress knew how vital credit is to Americans, and they worked to expand that not just to women but also to minorities.

In the five decades since, the ECOA has always protected people not only

when they get a loan but from unfair treatment once they have it—whether they can renew the loan, whether the terms change during the loan, and more.

Now, look, as recently as 2022, a study found that women in America paid an extra \$40.3 million annually in higher premiums for auto loans they received at car dealers compared to men. This is wrong. We have a nation on the principle that all are created equal and deserve equality.

And so, despite these problems, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, our Nation's consumer watchdog, saw that banks and lenders were closing more accounts and doing more unequal things, and they acted—again, because credit discrimination is not just about getting the credit you need; it is about making sure you have fair treatment.

These decisions to deny credit, to revoke credit, to charge unfair prices are wrong, and we all know that. We know that when people have challenges, we should be there to make sure there is equality.

In 2022, the CFPB took action to make sure the laws and the practices that are at the heart of fairness in our country were put into place. Unfortunately, the Trump administration scrapped the ruling that helped to make sure we get to equality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BOOKER. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the restoration of fairness and equality in our country with this.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the yeas have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION CIRCULAR 2024-03: UNLAWFUL AND UNENFORCEABLE CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS"—Motion to Proceed

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S.J. Res. 128.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S.J. Res. 128, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial

Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024-03: Unlawful and Unenforceable Contract Terms and Conditions”.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I am asking my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 128, which is my amendment to restore commonsense protection from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to stop companies from putting illegal terms in their contracts.

Since it opened its doors in 2011, the Consumer Protection Bureau has returned over \$21 billion to more than 200 million American consumers after finding that companies violated the law and took advantage of them. That is why we have the Consumer Bureau to go after those bad actors. When companies use the fine print in their contracts to work in illegal provisions that exploit hard-working Americans, the Consumer Bureau is empowered to prosecute them.

But the restitution the Consumer Bureau has won for consumers is by nature a response. It comes after Americans have lost precious time and money or sometimes after they have signed away their rights.

There needs to be more efforts to proactively discourage companies from abusing the fine print and taking advantage of consumers in the first place. That is what the Consumer Bureau did under the Biden administration. They issued guidance warning companies that creating contracts with unlawful or unenforceable terms is illegal. It doesn't get more common sense than that.

No one should be coerced into signing away their rights, like the right to counsel or the right to pursue your claim in court, just to be able to open a bank account, open a credit card, or get a loan. These predatory practices are exactly what the Consumer Bureau was created to stop.

Unfortunately, this administration has withdrawn this guidance. They are intentionally allowing bad actors to break the law and put illegal provisions in contracts that will hurt Americans. It is just wrong.

That is why I am encouraging my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 128, to restore this protection against fine-print traps. Deception is not a business model, and Americans across the country are paying the price for the Trump administration's anti-consumer policies.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO “THE FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT'S LIMITED PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS”—Motion to Proceed

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 385, S.J. Res. 129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 385, S.J. Res. 129, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “The Fair Credit Reporting Act's Limited Preemption of State Laws”.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I am encouraging my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 129, which is my amendment to restore the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rule that gives States more power to protect their consumers.

In 2022, the Consumer Bureau issued an interpretive rule declaring that the Fair Credit Reporting Act, which is the Federal law that regulates the collection, dissemination, and use of consumer credit information, can mostly be overridden by State law. That means States are allowed to regulate credit reporting without the Federal Government stepping in to say that they can't.

For example, 15 States have laws on the books banning medical debt from counting toward credit reports, and several States have limits on which eviction records are included in credit reports, easing the burden on tenants who are having trouble renting.

Under the Consumer Bureau's 2022 rule, these laws would stand, but now, the Trump administration is trying to replace the Consumer Bureau's rule with one that does the exact opposite. This new rule would make Federal law preempt State law, so States can no longer take action to ensure that consumers get a fair shake when trying to buy a house or get a loan. That is rich coming from an administration that supports States' rights.

So as a former attorney general, I believe strongly that States need the ability to protect Americans from financial exploitation. The Trump administration is working to gut the CFPB Bureau, and that leaves consumers in every State open to abuse. It is just unacceptable.

In the absence of a Federal Government that wants to protect Americans, individual States are stepping up and passing their own laws to support their residents.

If the Trump administration isn't going to support a strong Bureau, then

they should let the States do what they refuse to do, but instead, this administration is trying to stop States from stepping in entirely. That is why I filed this joint resolution of disapproval, and I would ask my colleagues to support it.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO “STATEMENT OF POLICY REGARDING PROHIBITION ON ABUSIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES”—Motion to Proceed

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 395, S.J. Res. 147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 395, S.J. Res. 147, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition on Abusive Acts or Practices”.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was proud in 2008 during the financial crisis facing this country to join a majority of Senators in creating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This Bureau has been a watchdog for consumers ever since.

Congress took steps to strengthen consumer protection laws after this crisis which centered on mortgage lenders profiting on loans doomed to fail. Millions of Americans lost their homes. The unemployment rate was 10 percent.

Shortly after, Congress passed this Consumer Financial Protection Act to address consumer protection failures and to ban abusive financial conduct to ensure fair dealing and protect consumers.

The CFPB issued guidance on what constitutes financial abuse, warning bad actors, and making it easy to enforce the law.

In 2023, the Biden CFPB issued a policy statement that spelled out by legal definition the abusive conduct and provided summaries and explanations as how to analyze the abusers. For example, the CFPB explained that abusive practices include obscuring or withholding information on mortgages in a

way that makes it difficult for consumers to understand them—same thing for credit card agreements, same thing for financial contracts and for student loans. The guidance warned bad actors about engaging in these practices and deterring abusive conduct, making it easier to bring enforcement actions when it occurs. The Trump administration withdrew this guidance and protection, and this JRD seeks to restore it.

Now, I ask those who want to stand up for families that are struggling with their expenses today to vote yes and those who want to approve of low-rent, bottom-feeder, sleazy conduct by cheaters to vote no.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "TRUTH IN LENDING (REGULATION Z); USE OF DIGITAL USER ACCOUNTS TO ACCESS BUY NOW, PAY LATER LOANS"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 134, which would restore the CFPB's rule to ensure that consumers are granted critical protections when they are using "buy now, pay later" loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 390, S.J. Res. 134, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Use of Digital User Accounts To Access Buy Now, Pay Later Loans".

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, there is now widespread and growing use of "buy now, pay later." The reason families are doing that is to buy things like school clothing, not some incidental that is a discretionary expense.

The reason "buy now, pay later" is so much increasing in demand is because people are really broke. They are struggling with the high gas prices, they are struggling with record inflation, and at the end of the month, there are more bills than there is money.

The people using "buy now, pay later" are in every single State of the Union—in West Virginia, in Vermont—

and they are good people that we care about and are concerned that the economy is not working for them, and they are struggling with very severe shortages of income.

These products can be risky. You know, most of us wouldn't recommend "buy now, pay later." It is much better if you have the money to pay cash and you don't get in a risky situation. But the fact is, this is a necessary tool for some families.

Why in the world would we all not want to take the necessary action to protect those vulnerable families from abusive practices? That is what the CFPB did with its rule. I am absolutely mystified—absolutely mystified—that the administration would rescind that because, as I mentioned and as we all know, this is a protection that helps people that each and every one of us represents.

I know there is every bit as much concern on the Republican side of the aisle as there is on the Democratic side of the aisle to protect people from getting ripped off, particularly vulnerable people who work full time but can't pay their bills.

So the Trump CFPB withdrew this rule, and it obviously sends a clear signal to "buy now, pay later" that they can get away with what they want.

Vote with us to rescind this rule.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION RELATING TO THE WITHDRAWAL OF THE RULE RELATING TO "CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION CIRCULAR 2024-04: WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS UNDER CFPA SECTION 1057"—Motion to Proceed

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 391, S.J. Res. 135, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to "Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024-04: Whistleblower Protections Under CFPA Section 1057".

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, the CFPB promulgated a rule to protect whistleblowers.

Whistleblowers have historically revealed information about abusive practices and rip-offs in organizations where they had the ability to see what happened and to stand up to protect the rule of law and to stop rip-offs.

The biggest proponent of whistleblower protection in this Chamber is our President pro tempore Senator GRASSLEY, and I have such admiration for him in his steadfast commitment to whistleblowers.

The corporations that don't like whistleblowers are now forcing them to sign nondisclosure agreements that are overly broad, and it means that a whistleblower has no protections because they are being threatened with lawsuits, and they are being threatened that they are going to be accused of breaking the law or that they are engaged in corporate misconduct if they essentially blow the whistle on bad practices that are hurting the people we represent.

I don't know why the Trump administration rescinded that rule. Whistleblowers, as Senator GRASSLEY has eloquently stated over and over again, protect us, protect the taxpayers, and protect us from abuse of practices.

I believe, as Senator GRASSLEY believes, it is absolutely critical for Congress to act to protect whistleblowers.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO KYLER GOHLKE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Kyler Gohlke, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Kyler is a graduate of Waconia High School in Waconia, MN, and a recent graduate of Concordia College in Moorhead, MN, having earned a degree in finance. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kyler for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO HAYES HANSEN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Hayes Hansen, an intern in

my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Hayes is a graduate of Custer County High School in Miles City, MT, and a recent graduate of Black Hills State University in Spearfish, SD, having earned degrees in political science and international studies. This fall, Hayes plans to attend the University of Nebraska College of Law in Lincoln, NE. Hayes is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Hayes for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

TRIBUTE TO ELIJAH SUWYN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Elijah Suwyn, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Elijah is a recent graduate of Biola University in La Mirada, CA, having earned a degree in political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Elijah for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Please find enclosed the following notification from the Department of State.

Department Notification Number: RSAT 26-0Q.

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(5)(C) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 26-0Q. This notification relates to enhancements or upgrades

from the level of sensitivity of technology or capability described in the Section 36(b)(1) AECA certification 22-14 of April 14, 2022.

Recipients:

Speaker of the House of Representatives
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Sincerely,

PAUL D. GUAGLIANONE,
Senior Bureau Official,
Bureau of Legislative Affairs.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 26-0Q

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(B)(5)(C), AECA)

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Bulgaria.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 22-14; Date: April 4, 2022; Implementing Agency: Air Force.

Funding Source: National Funds.

(iii) Description: On April 4, 2022, Congress was notified by Congressional certification transmittal number 22-14 of the possible sale under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, of four (4) F-16 C Block 70 aircraft; four (4) F-16 D Block 70 aircraft; eleven (11) F100-GE-129D engines (8 installed, 3 spares); eleven (11) Improved Programmable Display Generators (8 installed, 3 spares); eleven (11) AN/APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array Scalable Agile Beam Radars (8 installed, 3 spares); eleven (11) Modular Mission Computers 7000AH (8 installed, 3 spares); eleven (11) LN-260 or equivalent Embedded Global Positioning System Inertial Navigation Systems with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module and Precise Positioning Service (8 installed, 3 spares); nineteen (19) Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) AIM120C-7/C-8 or equivalent missiles; two (2) AMRAAM guidance sections; forty-eight (48) LAU-129A launchers (40 installed, 8 spares); twenty-eight (28) GBU-39/B Small Diameter Bombs (SDBs); two (2) SDB Guided Test Vehicles; eleven (11) M61A1 Vulcan cannons (8 installed, 3 spares); four (4) AN/AAQ-33 Sniper Advanced Targeting Pods; twelve (12) Multifunctional Information Distribution System with Joint Tactical Radio Systems (aircraft terminals and ground station terminals) (10 installed, 2 spares); twenty (20) AIM-9X Block II missiles; eight (8) AIM-9X Block II Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs); four (4) AIM-9X Block II tactical guidance units; four (4) AIM-9X Block II CATM guidance units; twenty-four (24) FMU-139 or FMU-152 fuze systems; twelve (12) KMU-572 Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) tail kits for 500LB GBU-38 or laser JDAM GBU-54; twelve (12) MXU-650 Air Foil Groups for Enhanced Paveway II EGBU-49; twelve (12) MAU-210 Enhanced Computer Control Groups for EPII EGBU-49; twenty-four (24) MK-82 or BLU-111 or equivalent bomb bodies; six (6) MK-82 inert bombs; and two (2) GBU-39 SDB I practice bombs. The following non-MDE items were also included: AN/ARC-238 radios; AN/APX-126 or equivalent Advanced Identification Friend or Foe with Combined Interrogator Transponders; Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System II or Scorpion Hybrid Optical-based Inertial Tacker helmet mounted displays; AN/ALQ-254 Viper Shield or equivalent electronic warfare systems; AN/ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser Systems, KY-58M cryptographic devices, KIV-78 cryptographic devices, and Simple Key Loaders; Joint Mission Planning Systems or equivalent; AIM-120 CATM; PGU-28 High Explosive Incendiary (HEI) ammunition; PGU-27 training rounds (non HEI); ARD-446 impulse cartridges; ARD-863 impulse cartridges; BBU-36/B impulse cartridges; BBU-35/B impulse cartridges; MK-124 smoke flares; MJU-7/B flare cartridges L463 or MJU-53 or equivalent;

Common Munitions Built-in-Test Re-programming Equipment (CMBRE); ADU-890 adapter for CMBRE; ADU-891 adapter for CMBRE; Night Vision Devices (NVD); NVD spare image intensifier tubes; Remote Operated Video Enhanced Receiver (ROVER) 6i units; tactical network ROVER kit; DSU-38 laser sensors for GBU-54; Cartridge Actuated Device/Propellant Actuated Devices; GBU-39 tactical training rounds; BRU-57 bomb racks; BRU-61 bomb racks; MAU-12 bomb racks and TER-9A triple ejection racks; other chaff and flare, ammunition, and pylons; launcher adaptors and weapons interfaces; fuel tanks and attached hardware; travel pods; aircraft and weapons integration, test, and support equipment; electronic warfare database and mission data file development; precision measurement and calibration laboratory equipment; secure communications; cryptographic equipment; precision navigation equipment; aircraft and personnel support and test equipment; spare and repair parts; repair and return services; maps, publications, and technical documentation; studies and surveys; classified/unclassified software and software support; personnel training and training equipment; facilities and facility management, design and/or construction services; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total cost was \$1.673 billion. Major defense equipment (MDE) constituted \$978 billion of this total.

This transmittal notifies the inclusion of the following additional MDE items: one hundred twenty-five (125) AIM-120C-8 AMRAAM; five (5) AIM-120C-8 AMRAAM guidance sections; and four (4) AIM-9X Block II missiles. The following non-major defense equipment items will also be included: missile containers and control section spares; munitions support and support equipment; computer program identification numbers; engine component improvement program support; transportation support; studies and surveys; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistic support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost of the new items is \$957 million. The estimated MDE value will increase by \$452 million to a revised \$1.43 billion. The estimated non-MDE value will increase by \$505 million to a revised \$1.2 billion. The estimated total case value will increase by \$957 million to a revised \$2.63 billion. MDE constitutes \$1.43 billion of this total.

(iv) Significance: This notification accounts for requested additional MDE and non-MDE items not included in the original notification. The inclusion of this MDE and non-MDE represents an increase in capability over what was previously notified. The proposed sale will enhance Bulgaria's capability to meet current and future threats by providing a credible force that is capable of deterring adversaries and participating in NATO operations. The proposed sale will support its goal of improving national and territorial defense as well as interoperability with U.S. and NATO forces.

(v) Justification: This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO Ally that is an important force for political and economic stability in Europe.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology:

The Sensitivity of Technology Statement contained in the original notification applies to items reported here.

The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 11, 2026.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 114, the adoption of S. Res. 690, Authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted nay.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 115, the motion to close further debate on confirmation of the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 728, Kevin Warsh, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2026. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted nay.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 116, the Confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 728, Kevin Warsh, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2026. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted nay.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 117, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 727, Kevin Warsh, of Florida, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted nay.

HONORING NORTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT ON NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I rise during Police Week to honor the brave men and women in North Carolina and across the Nation who serve in law enforcement. Police Week is a solemn and humbling experience, as thousands of officers and their families come to our Nation's Capital and pay tribute to their fellow officers who made the ultimate sacrifice to protect their communities.

Every name that is added to the memorial wall is a monument to that officer's heroism and legacy of courage, selflessness, and ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. This kind of heroism and sacrifice is one far too familiar for North Carolinians who have heard stories of brave officers giving their last full measure of devotion while protecting our State. Today, I wish to list and honor five of these heroes that North Carolina has lost since last year's Police Week in May 2025.

Often, we hear of the dangers law enforcement faces in their profession, but rarely do civilians truly grasp the real risks borne by officers which exist even during "routine" parts of the job, even something as normal as transporting an inmate to a hospital to receive medical care can turn deadly.

Officer Flattes, a detention officer for the Cherokee County Sheriff's Office in western North Carolina, was fatally shot when an inmate who was being transported for medical care

took a detention officer's firearm during a scuffle. Officer Flattes was 56 years old and was shot by the inmate he was seeking to help. This story and others like it are sobering reminders of the true risks facing law enforcement everywhere. Officer Flattes is survived by his wife, who also served with the Cherokee County Sheriff's Office, as well as his 6 children and 15 grandchildren. To them and to Officer Flattes, I rise to say thank you for their sacrifice and his heroism.

We must also remember WakeMed Campus Police Officer Roger Smith, who shares a story far too similar to Officer Flattes. Officer Smith was working in the WakeMed emergency department when a struggle ensued with an armed individual that left Officer Smith shot and wounded. Despite the best efforts of doctors, Officer Smith succumbed to his wounds later that morning. Officer Smith is survived by his two daughters, mother, brother, granddaughter, and long-time partner. Officer Smith previously served 16 years as a Knightdale police officer and as a volunteer firefighter, making his loss one felt throughout his community.

The next person to honor is North Carolina Master Trooper Stien Davis, Jr. Trooper Davis was killed in a single-car crash on NC Highway 130 just after midnight when he lost control of his car before riding off of the road and flipping his vehicle upside down in a swamp. What is especially tragic about this loss is who Trooper Davis leaves behind; his young son, mother, siblings, and fiancée, all of whom have felt and shared a loss that escapes words. This tragic accident resulted in the death of a young trooper who loved his family, his community, and his career in law enforcement.

Sadly, there is another master trooper that I rise to honor today, Master Trooper Steven J. Perry. Trooper Perry was killed when his patrol car was struck in a head-on collision by someone driving the wrong way at 3 in the morning. Trooper Perry was 30 years old and had served the State of North Carolina for almost 7 years when he was killed. He is survived by his then 9-month-old daughter. Because of one person's bad choice, the State of North Carolina has lost one of its finest sons.

Finally, I rise to honor Forsyth County Sheriff's Deputy Kaleb Mitchell. Deputy Mitchell, like the other heroes mentioned before, was killed during what was a routine moment of his day. Deputy Mitchell was killed when he was struck by a driver going over 100 miles per hour in a 55-mph zone, who then crossed a dividing line and hit Deputy Mitchell. Deputy Mitchell was later pronounced dead after being taken to a hospital immediately after the collision. He is survived by his expectant wife, his 2-year-old child, his parents, and his siblings. One of his brothers also serves with the Forsyth County Sheriff's Office. There are no

words to fully express the heartbreak and loss these families have suffered, feelings that are only sharpened by the ordinary nature of what was happening when each officer died.

There is simply no speech, no award, no memorial or honor that we can bestow upon these officers and families that can lessen their sacrifice or ease their pain, but what we must do no matter what is remain thankful for their sacrifice and honor the legacies of these men who died protecting our State and its people.

In my remaining time in the Senate, I will continue to push for the passage of the Protect and Serve Act, legislation that I introduced that makes it a Federal crime to intentionally harm, or attempt to harm, a law enforcement officer. It also gives prosecutors new tools to penalize criminals who target law enforcement.

Officers go to work every day prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice for their communities, and they need our support now more than ever. The Protect and Serve Act is supported by law enforcement groups across the Nation, including the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Police Officers Defense Coalition, the North Carolina Fraternal Order of Police, the National Sheriffs Association, and the Major County Sheriffs Association.

To every officer serving today: Thank you for your unwavering courage; you have earned our unending gratitude. To the families of the fallen: Your loss is shared by a grateful nation. We will never forget your loved one's service, nor their sacrifice. God bless them. God bless law enforcement. And may God bless the United States of America.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, National Police Week serves as a solemn reminder of the courage and sacrifice shown by the men and women in law enforcement who lost their lives in service to others. This week, we set aside time to honor their memory and recognize the families, friends, and fellow officers who continue to carry their loss with strength and grace.

Behind every officer is a family that serves alongside them. They share in the sacrifices, the uncertainty, and the responsibility that comes with a life of public service. These officers are more than public servants. They are parents, neighbors, mentors, coaches, and leaders who play an essential role in the communities they call home. In my home State of Mississippi and across the country, we are so proud of these dedicated individuals who serve with integrity, professionalism, and honor.

This year, we honor the three Mississippi officers whose names have been added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, three heroes who protected our communities and whose legacy will live on.

We remember: Joshua Brashears, a Jackson County Sheriff's deputy who died from injuries after his patrol vehicle struck several horses on a dark road in Stone County on October 17, 2025. He served in law enforcement for more than 21 years and is survived by two children and his parents.

We remember: Martin Shields, Jr., a Hinds County deputy who was shot and killed while responding to a domestic call on February 23, 2025. After serving with the Jackson and Ridgeland Police Departments, he sadly only served with Hinds County Sheriff's Department for 9 months before his death. He is survived by his wife and daughter.

And we remember: Bryan Pippin, a Jackson police officer who passed away from COVID-19 complications. He served with the Jackson Police Department for nearly 20 years, often working parades in the motorcycle unit.

We honor the memory of these fallen officers and stand beside their families with enduring respect.

As we remember those we have lost, we also must continue supporting those who serve today. That means ensuring law enforcement has the tools, resources, and support needed to do their jobs safely and effectively, while also showing appreciation for their sacrifices.

To every officer serving our communities, know that we recognize your service and the sacrifices inherent with ensuring public safety. During National Police Week and every week throughout the year, let us stand together in gratitude for all who protect and serve.

May God bless our fallen officers, the families who miss them, all who wear the badge, and the United States of America.

NATIONAL SALVATION ARMY WEEK

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. I rise today to recognize May 11 to May 17, 2026, as National Salvation Army Week.

Founded in 1865, the Salvation Army has been unfailingly committed to serving those in need without discrimination. For more than 150 years, the Salvation Army has provided essential social services, including disaster relief, food assistance, shelter, rehabilitation programs, and youth development initiatives in local communities across the United States.

The Salvation Army serves more than 27 million Americans annually, offering compassion, hope, and support to the most vulnerable populations, including individuals experiencing homelessness, veterans, seniors, human trafficking survivors, and those recovering from addiction. Across the Nation, the Salvation Army operates shelters, food pantries, job training programs, and emergency disaster relief efforts that strengthen communities and improve lives.

The Salvation Army continues to be a trusted partner at the local, State,

and Federal levels, providing critical services that address poverty, hunger, and natural disasters. Volunteers, donors, and officers of the Salvation Army exemplify the spirit of service, working tirelessly to provide relief and opportunity for those in need—and should be recognized and commended for their commitment to the betterment of others.

I am grateful for the work that the Salvation Army accomplishes every day and applaud its dedication to social service.

NATIONAL SALVATION ARMY WEEK

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize May 11 to May 17, 2026, as National Salvation Army Week. I join the junior Senator from Virginia in expressing my sincere gratitude to the Salvation Army for all they do to support and provide for Americans across the Nation.

For over a century, the Salvation Army has been committed to "Doing the Most Good." This good is carried out in countless ways including feeding the hungry, rebuilding homes, providing addiction recovery services, assisting with disaster relief, and combating human trafficking. For the past 160 years, it has been evident: Where there is need, the Salvation Army steps up.

Today, the Salvation Army humbly serves nearly 28 million Americans annually, offering warm beds, nutritious meals, and financial assistance. I am especially grateful for Alabama's local Salvation Army units for their tireless efforts and impactful work within our communities. After several tornadoes hit our State in 2023, the Salvation Army came to Alabama's aid to provide resources including over 1,800 meals for affected families. Each year, the Salvation Army partners with the University of Alabama at Birmingham to bring gifts and joy to thousands of children during the Christmas season. And in true Alabama fashion, local Salvation Army chapters have mobilized to the frontlines of disaster response across the Nation to lend a helping hand and provide essential supplies to families devastated by natural disasters.

I am extremely proud to celebrate the far-reaching and critical work carried out by the Salvation Army each and every day. Their dedicated volunteers and members step up in communities across our Nation to meet urgent needs with compassion, dignity, and unwavering commitment. This work not only meets immediate challenges, but also restores hope for so many families.

I am honored to recognize National Salvation Army Week and to express my deep appreciation for the Salvation Army's tireless work in uplifting lives, strengthening communities, and "Doing the Most Good" for Americans across our Nation.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:52 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, 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. 2071. An act to require the United States Executive Directors at the international financial institutions to oppose certain projects involving shrimp production.

H.R. 2267. An act to require the Attorney General to submit to the Congress a report that includes demographic data of persons determined to be ineligible to purchase a firearm based on a background check performed by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

H.R. 2853. An act to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods and cargo for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

H.R. 3709. An act to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to establish a Financial Agent Mentor-Protégé Program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4437. An act to reduce the regulatory burden on certain well managed and well capitalized financial institutions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4478. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to permit Federal banking agencies to examine qualifying insured depository institutions with under \$6 billion in total assets not less than once during each 18-month period, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8352. An act to authorize peace officer standards and training agencies to access criminal history records, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:27 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3497. An act to establish a medal of service for law enforcement officers and first responders.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2071. An act to require the United States Executive Directors at the international financial institutions to oppose certain projects involving shrimp production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2267. An act to require the Attorney General to submit to the Congress a report that includes the demographic data of persons determined to be ineligible to purchase a firearm based on a background check performed by the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2853. An act to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods and cargo for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3709. An act to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to establish a Financial

Agent Mentor-Protégé Program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4437. An act to reduce the regulatory burden on certain well managed and well capitalized financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4478. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to permit Federal banking agencies to examine qualifying insured depository institutions with under \$6 billion in total assets not less than once during each 18-month period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 8352. An act to authorize peace officer standards and training agencies to access criminal history records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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-3388. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enrolled Agent Special Enrollment Examination User Fee Update" (RIN1545-BS12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3389. A communication from the Director of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Emergency Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological and Ethnological Material of Afghanistan" (RIN1685-AA43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3390. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B)" (RIN3170-AB54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3391. A communication from the Attorney, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition on the Use of Reputation Risk by Regulators" (RIN1557-AF34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3392. A communication from the Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Bank Non-Interest Charges and Fees" (RIN1557-AF54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3393. A communication from the Counsel, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Order Preempting the Illinois Interchange Fee Prohibition Act" (RIN1557-ZA10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3394. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13067 with respect to Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3395. A communication from the Acting Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Regulations for the Shelter Plus Care and the Supportive Housing Programs" (RIN2506-AC64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3396. A communication from the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report for the period from April 1, 2025 through September 30, 2025; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3397. A communication from the Assistant Director, Bank Advisory Group, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Community Bank Leverage Ratio Framework" (RIN1557-AF33) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3398. A communication from the Treasurer, National Gallery of Art, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Gallery's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2025; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3399. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to nominations, vacancies, designations of service in acting roles, discontinuations of service in acting roles and actions on nominations for positions covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3400. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-302, "Rental Housing Registration Data Integrity Temporary Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3401. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2025 Antideficiency Act Reports Compilation"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-3402. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Small Business Lending Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulations B)" (RIN3170-AB40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2026; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3403. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exceptions from Foreign Ownership, Control, or Domination" (RIN3150-AL32) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April

30, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3404. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Five-Year Review of the Oil Pipeline Index" ((RIN1902-AG33) (Docket No. RM26-6-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 30, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3405. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-303, "Archdiocese of Washington Parish Real Property, Deed Recordation, and Transfer Tax Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3406. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-304, "Full Accountability in Arrest Reporting Temporary Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3407. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-305, "Body-Worn Camera Transparency for Use of Force Temporary Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3408. A communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate for the period from October 1, 2025 through March 31, 2026, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 13, 2026; ordered to lie on the table.

EC-3409. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-315, "First Responder Retention Efforts Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3410. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-312, "Empowering Parents in CFSA Investigations Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3411. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-311, "Strengthening Capacity and Transparency at DYRS Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3412. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-310, "Safe Pregnancy, Delivery, and Postpartum Care for Youth at DYRS Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3413. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-309, "Statutory Neglect Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3414. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-308, "Increasing Support for Grandparent and Close Relative Caregivers Amendment Act of 2026"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3415. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 26-307, “Mu Lambda Foundation, Inc. Real Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2026”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3416. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-301, “Holding Company System Amendment Act of 2026”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3417. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-300, “Child Fatality Review Committee Amendment Act of 2026”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3418. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 26-299, “Promoting Parental Engagement at DYRS Amendment Act of 2026”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3419. A communication from the Acting Branch Chief of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pesticide Tolerances; Implementing Registration Review Decisions for Certain Pesticides (Hydrogen cyanide, et al.)” (RIN2070-ZA16) (FRL No. 12765-02-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3420. A communication from the Regulations Branch Lead, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Land Uses; Special Uses” (RIN0596-AD71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3421. A communication from the Management Analyst, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Changes Related to Insurance Requirements in Multi-Family Housing (MFH) Direct Loan and Grant Programs” (RIN0575-AD29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3422. A communication from the Acting Branch Supervisor of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval of Missouri’s Request for Partial Program Delegation of Clean Air Act 112(r) Prevention of Accidental Release Program” (FRL No. 13206-02-R7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3423. A communication from the Acting Branch Supervisor of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Virginia; Revision to the Regulatory Definition of Volatile Organic Compound” (FRL No. 12836-02-R3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3424. A communication from the Acting Branch Supervisor of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Construction Permits Required” (FRL No. 13099-02-R7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3425. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cost Expenditure Criteria for Research and Development Utilization Facilities” (RIN3150-AL35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3426. A communication from the Director, Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Generic Environmental Impact Statement for Licensing of New Nuclear Reactors” (RIN3150-AK55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2026; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3427. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a nomination for a position covered by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 for the position of Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2026; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3428. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Awards Fiscal Year 2025”; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3429. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2025-2026 Marketing Year” (Docket No. AMS-SC-24-0069) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2026; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3430. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Medicare National Coverage Determinations for Fiscal Year 2025”; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3431. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Section 6435 Payments; Refunds for Previously Taxed Dyed Fuel” (RIN1545-BS04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3432. A communication from the Section Chief, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Treatment of Income from Indian Fishing Rights-Related Activity as Compensation” (RIN1545-BL61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2026; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3433. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Petroleum-Equivalent Fuel Economy Calculation” (RIN1904-AF47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2026; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3434. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Exempt Power Supplies Under the EPS Service Parts Act of 2024” (RIN1904-

AF80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2026; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3435. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation, and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Rescinding the Grant Programs for Schools and Hospitals and Buildings Owned by Units of Local Government and Public Care Institutions Regulations” (RIN1930-AA02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 11, 2026; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3436. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report entitled “2025 Report of Statistics Required by the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3437. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Streamlining the Regulations Related to Concrete Masonry Research, Education, and Promotion” (RIN0605-AA86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3438. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Commerce Acquisition Regulation; Minor Amendments” (RIN0605-AA87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 13, 2026; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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. LUJÁN (for himself and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 4506. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an investment credit for certain water reuse projects; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 4507. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals and freestanding birth centers to notify each mother of a miscarried fetus of her rights with respect to such fetus, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. LEE, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 4508. A bill to prohibit the sharing of certain information about Federal law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 4509. A bill to prohibit pharmacy benefit managers and pharmacies from being under common ownership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4510. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief to the families of public safety officers who died as a result of injuries sustained in the line of duty; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income charitable distributions from certain employer-sponsored retirement plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4512. A bill to provide for appropriate cost-sharing for insulin products covered under private health plans, and to establish a program to support health care providers and pharmacies in providing discounted insulin products to uninsured individuals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIM:

S. 4513. A bill to require the collection of information on multigenerational caregiving in at least one major Federal population survey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 4514. A bill to provide funding to the Bureau of Prisons, States, and localities to carry out mental health screenings and provide referrals to mental health care providers for certain corrections officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4515. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a pilot program to enhance the mapping of urban flooding and associated property damage and the availability of that mapped data to homeowners, businesses, and localities to help understand and mitigate the risk of such flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LUJAN:

S. 4516. A bill to require officers and employees of the Department of Homeland Security to receive training with respect to Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 4517. A bill to require Federal banking agencies to carry out a study on rural depository revitalization; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KIM, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GALLEGOS, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 4518. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to make breakfasts and lunches free for all children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 4519. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to expand the types of devices for which required labeling may be made available solely by electronic means, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 4520. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to include a definition of the term "public interest", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4521. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize cooperative partnerships for mineral extraction activities at

Army organic industrial base facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4522. A bill to prohibit vulture investors from investing in youth sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 4523. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 111 South Tremont Street in Tremonton, Utah, as the "Sorensen-Estrada Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4524. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former Members and elected officers of Congress from lobbying Congress at any time after leaving office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. COONS, Mr. DAINES, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RICKETTS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. Res. 727. A resolution supporting the designation of May 29, 2026, as "Mental Health Awareness in Agriculture Day" to raise awareness around mental health in the agricultural industry and workforce and to continue to reduce stigma associated with mental illness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 728. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should prioritize securing the release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Jimmy Lai, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, and Ekpar Asat detained by the People's Republic of China during future engagements with Chinese President Xi Jinping; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 624

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to achieve parity between the cost-of-living adjustment with respect to an annuity under the Federal Employees Retirement System and an annuity under the Civil Service Retirement System, and for other purposes.

S. 825

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 825, a bill to require the Attor-

ney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCCORMICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy to certain veterans with traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder.

S. 1296

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to strengthen disclosure requirements relating to foreign gifts and contracts, to prohibit contracts between institutions of higher education and certain foreign entities and countries of concern, and for other purposes.

S. 1330

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1330, a bill to advance research to achieve medical breakthroughs in brain tumor treatment and improve awareness and adequacy of specialized cancer and brain tumor care.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to improve protections for employees and retirees in business bankruptcies.

S. 1526

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1526, a bill to establish the American Worker Retirement Plan, improve the financial security of working Americans by facilitating the accumulation of wealth, and for other purposes.

S. 1547

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1547, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to reauthorize the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1782

At the request of Mrs. MOODY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1782, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of mental or physical disability in cases of organ transplants.

S. 1806

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1806, a bill to terminate unused authorities of the Securities and Exchange Commission that were established pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act.

S. 1892

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1892, a bill to clarify that amounts from declarations should be deposited in the Crime Victims Fund and to temporarily provide additional deposits into the Crime Victims Fund.

S. 1919

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1919, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a domestic cotton consumption credit.

S. 2096

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2096, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the Transition Assistance Program and Solid Start Program to address mental health issues, and for other purposes.

S. 2448

At the request of Mr. KELLY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2448, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve dependent coverage under the TRICARE Young Adult Program.

S. 2531

At the request of Ms. ALSOBROOKS, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2531, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to increase early detection of and intervention for uterine fibroids, and for other purposes.

S. 2758

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2758, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to encourage the replacement or modernization of inefficient, outdated freight railcars, and for other purposes.

S. 2858

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2858, a bill to improve research and data collection on stillbirths, and for other purposes.

S. 3023

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Oregon

(Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3023, a bill to limit liability for certain entities storing child sexual abuse material for law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 3041

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3041, a bill to allow the U.S. Marshals Service to assist in certain Tribal criminal matters, and for other purposes.

S. 3138

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3138, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include adaptive prostheses and terminal devices for sports and other recreational activities in the medical services furnished to eligible veterans by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

S. 3697

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3697, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the approval of new abortion drugs, to prohibit investigational use exemptions for abortion drugs, and to impose additional regulatory requirements with respect to previously approved abortion drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 3897

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3897, a bill to revise administrative procedures relating to public safety officers' death benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 3989

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3989, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide community-based training opportunities for medical students in rural areas and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes.

S. 4023

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4023, a bill to establish the America's Living Library Project, and for other purposes.

S. 4051

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4051, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins that are emblematic of the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial and the service and sacrifice of firefighters throughout the history of the United States.

S. 4271

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from California

(Mr. SCHIFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4271, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide rest and recuperation leave for employees engaged in wildland firefighting, and for other purposes.

S. 4335

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4335, a bill to address the challenges of providing child care opportunities for military families, and for other purposes.

S. 4367

At the request of Mr. JUSTICE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4367, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to modify the definition of food.

S. 4404

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4404, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require Congress to approve of the application of certain executive exemptions under that Act, to strike an exemption under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4501

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4501, a bill to bar aliens from admission to the United States to give birth on United States soil or remaining in the United States to undermine the sovereignty of the United States through birth tourism.

S. 4504

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4504, a bill to improve the full-service community school program, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 6, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 677

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 677, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should prioritize securing the release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, and Jimmy Lai detained by the People's Republic of China during future engagements with Chinese President Xi Jinping.

S. RES. 716

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of

S. Res. 716, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding critical elements of the United States policy towards the People's Republic of China.

STATEMENT ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 4514. A bill to provide funding to the Bureau of Prisons, States, and localities to carry out mental health screenings and provide referrals to mental health care providers for certain corrections officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Corrections Officer Blake Schwarz Suicide Prevention Act of 2026. This critical legislation honors the memory of an Illinoisan who should still be with us today by taking action to address a crisis unfolding inside our Federal, State and local correctional facilities in Illinois and across the country.

Blake Schwarz was a corrections officer at the Federal Correctional Institution in Thomson, IL. He was proud of the work he did every day to keep his community and his colleagues safe. In 2023, Blake died by suicide, leaving behind his wife Michelle and never getting the chance to witness the wonderful smile of his soon-to-be-born daughter. I am heartbroken that Michelle and her family must live with the aftermath of a loss that was preventable.

I had the privilege of sitting down with Michelle last year. She did not come to my office looking for sympathy. She came to make sure that Blake was not just a statistic. She came to make sure no other family in this country has to endure what hers has endured. The legislation I am introducing today is the direct result of her advocacy, the advocacy of Blake's colleagues at FCI Thomson, and the advocacy of law enforcement professionals across our country who refuse to let their colleagues feel abandoned to take on the struggles of mental health alone.

We ask our law enforcement officers to do a job that few Americans understand and even fewer are willing to do themselves. The job is extremely difficult and physically and mentally demanding. Corrections officers in this country die by suicide at a rate estimated to be as much as seven times higher than the rate for the general population. More than one in three corrections officers live with post-traumatic stress disorder, and far too often, corrections officers struggle with their mental health alone because of a culture that stigmatizes any perception of weakness and a fear that they will lose their job if they do seek treatment. This fear and stigma keep people silent.

The Corrections Officer Blake Schwarz Suicide Prevention Act gives corrections officers, who risk their lives every day, access to the mental

health care they deserve that aids their critical work and prevents tragedies. With my legislation, corrections officers will have readily accessible mental health care both on and off duty. It also confronts the fear and stigma that keep officers silent by guaranteeing that an officer's badge will never be on the line because that public safety officer sought appropriate care for a mental health issue.

Blake Schwarz is gone, and nothing we do here will bring him back. But it is my honor and privilege to introduce this legislation to ensure that his name is attached not to another statistic but to a law that saves lives. I commend Michelle and all the dedicated men and women of FCI Thomson for their bravery, hard work, and steadfast advocacy. I urge every one of my colleagues to take Blake's story as a painful reminder that we must do better for our corrections officers and prevent future tragedies.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4515. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a pilot program to enhance the mapping of urban flooding and associated property damage and the availability of that mapped data to homeowners, businesses, and localities to help understand and mitigate the risk of such flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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. 4515

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 "Flood Mapping Modernization and Homeowner Empowerment Pilot Program Act of 2026".

SEC. 2. FLOOD MAPPING MODERNIZATION AND HOMEOWNER EMPOWERMENT PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(2) COASTAL.—The term "coastal" means, with respect to a unit of general local government, that the unit borders a body of water that—

(A) is more than 2,000 square miles in size; and

(B) is not a river.

(3) PELAGIC.—The term "pelagic" means, with respect to a unit of general local government, that—

(A) the unit is a coastal unit; and

(B) the body of water that the unit borders is—

(i) an ocean; or

(ii) a large, open body of water, including a bay or a gulf, that empties into an ocean.

(4) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term "pilot program" means the pilot program carried out by the Administrator under this section.

(5) URBAN FLOODING.—The term "urban flooding"—

(A) means the inundation, by water, of property in a built environment, particularly in a densely populated area, that—

(i) is caused by falling rain—

(I) collecting on an impervious surface; or

(II) increasing the level of a body of water that is located near that built environment; and

(ii) overwhelms the capacity of drainage systems in the built environment, such as storm sewers;

(B) includes—

(i) a situation in which stormwater enters a building through a window, door, or other opening;

(ii) the backup of water through a sewer pipe, shower, toilet, sink, or floor drain;

(iii) the seepage of water through a wall or a floor;

(iv) the accumulation of water on property or a public right-of-way; and

(v) the overflow from a body of water, such as a river, lake, or ocean; and

(C) does not include flooding in an undeveloped or agricultural area.

(6) URBANIZED AREA.—The term "urbanized area" means an area that has been defined and designated as an urbanized area by the Bureau of the Census during the most recently completed decennial census.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator shall carry out a pilot program to make grants to units of local government to—

(1) enhance the production of maps relating to urban flooding and associated property damage; and

(2) increase the availability of the maps described in paragraph (1) to homeowners, businesses, and units of local government to enable those entities to minimize the risk of urban flooding.

(c) OBJECTIVES.—Amounts from grants made under the pilot program may be used only to carry out activities that meet the following objectives:

(1) Developing a methodology for assessing the risk of urban flooding through the deployment of technology-based mapping tools that—

(A) are easily understandable by the public; and

(B) effectively convey information regarding the level of flood risk.

(2) Providing structure-specific projections of annual chance flood frequency.

(3) Providing structure-based flood risk assessments.

(4) Providing program design for the mitigation of the risk of urban flooding.

(5) Incorporating information regarding climate trends into urban flooding risk assessments.

(6) Making the information described in this subsection publicly available on the internet through a web-based portal so as to increase transparency regarding homeowner flood risks.

(d) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under the pilot program may be made only to—

(A) a unit of general local government that is located in an urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 individuals; or

(B) a stormwater management authority of a unit of general local government described in subparagraph (A).

(2) ONE-TIME GRANTS.—A grant under the pilot program may not be made to—

(A) any unit of general local governmental, or the stormwater management authority of a unit of general local government, that previously received a grant under the pilot program;

(B) any unit of general local government if the stormwater management agency for that unit previously received a grant under the pilot program; or

(C) any stormwater management agency of a unit of general local government if that unit previously received a grant under the pilot program.

(3) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AUTHORITIES.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of a stormwater management authority that operates with respect to more than 1 unit of general local government, the application of that authority shall be considered for purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection and subsections (f), (g), and (h)(1) to be made for the largest unit of general local government with respect to which that authority operates.

(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) may be construed to limit the ability of a stormwater management authority described in that subparagraph to carry out activities under a demonstration project in any other jurisdiction in, or with respect to any other unit of local government with, which that authority operates.

(e) **APPLICATIONS.**—To be eligible for a grant under the pilot program, a unit of general local government or a stormwater management agency shall submit to the Administrator an application in such form and containing such information as the Administrator shall require.

(f) SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS.—

(1) **ANNUAL SELECTION.**—Subject to paragraph (2), and to the submission of approvable applications, in each fiscal year for which amounts are made available for grants under the pilot program, the Administrator shall select, from among applications submitted under subsection (e) for that fiscal year, 3 units of general government or stormwater management authorities to receive grants under the pilot program.

(2) **AGGREGATE LIMIT.**—Subject only to the submission of approvable applications, the Administrator shall select, in the aggregate over the entire duration of the pilot program, 12 units of general government or stormwater management authorities to receive grants under the pilot program, as follows:

(A) **TIER 1.**—Three of the applicants selected shall be units of general local government, or stormwater management authorities for those units, each of which has a population of more than 800,000 individuals, as follows:

(i) **PELAGIC COASTAL CITY.**—One shall be—

(I) a unit of general local government that is a pelagic unit; or

(II) a stormwater authority for a unit described in subclause (I).

(ii) **NON-PELAGIC COASTAL CITY.**—One shall be—

(I) a unit of general local government that—

(aa) is a coastal unit; and

(bb) is not a pelagic unit; or

(II) a stormwater authority for a unit described in subclause (I).

(iii) **NON-COASTAL CITY.**—One shall be—

(I) a unit of general local government that is not a coastal unit; or

(II) a stormwater authority for a unit described in subclause (I).

(B) **TIER 2.**—Six of the applicants selected shall be units of general local government, or stormwater management authorities for those units, each of which has a population of more than 200,000 individuals and not more than 800,000 individuals, as follows:

(i) **COASTAL CITIES.**—Three shall be—

(I) units of general local government that are coastal units; or

(II) stormwater management authorities for units described in subclause (I).

(ii) **NON-COASTAL CITIES.**—Three shall be—

(I) units of general local government that are not coastal units; or

(II) stormwater management authorities for units described in subclause (I).

(C) **TIER 3.**—Three of the applicants selected shall be—

(i) units of general local government, each of which has a population of more than 50,000 individuals and not more than 200,000 individuals; or

(ii) stormwater management authorities for units described in clause (i).

(g) PRIORITY.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall select applicants for grants under the pilot program based on the extent to which the applications of those applicants shall achieve the objectives described in subsection (c).

(2) **TIER 2 AND 3.**—In selecting applicants to receive grants under the pilot program under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (f)(2), the Administrator shall give priority to applicants—

(A) that are highly vulnerable to sea level rise;

(B) within which are located a military installation or another facility relating to national security concerns; or

(C) that have—

(i) populations that are highly vulnerable to urban flooding; and

(ii) an uneven capacity for flood mitigation and response efforts resulting from socioeconomic factors.

(h) AMOUNT.—

(1) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining the amount of a grant under the pilot program, the Administrator shall consider the population of the grant recipient, which may be considered in terms of the tier under subsection (f)(2) with respect to the recipient.

(2) **FEDERAL SHARE.**—The amount of a grant under the pilot program may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost incurred in carrying out the activities described in subsection (c).

(i) **DURATION.**—The Administrator shall require each recipient of a grant under the pilot program to complete the activities described in subsection (c), which shall be, subject to subsection (h)(2), carried out using the grant amounts, not later than 18 months after the date on which the recipient initially receives the grant amounts under the pilot program.

(j) **USE OF CENSUS DATA.**—The Administrator shall make all determinations regarding population under the pilot program by using data from the most recently completed decennial census by the Bureau of the Census.

(k) **GRANTEE REPORTS TO FEMA.**—Each recipient of a grant under the pilot program shall, not later than 30 months after the date on which the recipient initially receives the grant amounts, submit to the Administrator a report that describes—

(1) the activities carried out with the grant amounts;

(2) how the activities carried out with the grant amounts have met the objectives described in subsection (c);

(3) any lessons learned in carrying out the activities described in paragraph (2); and

(4) any recommendations for future mapping modernization efforts by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

(l) **BIENNIAL REPORTS BY FEMA.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter until the date on which all activities carried out with amounts from grants under the pilot program are completed, the Administrator shall submit to Congress and make available to the public on an internet website a report that—

(1) describes—

(A) the progress of the activities carried out with amounts from those grants; and

(B) the effectiveness of technology-based mapping tools used in carrying out the activities described in subparagraph (A); and

(2) with respect to the final report that the Administrator is required to submit under this subsection, includes recommendations to Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government for implementing strategies, practices, and technologies to mitigate the effects of urban flooding.

(m) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that, because the pilot program is limited with respect to scope and resources, communities that participate in the pilot program should acknowledge that the most successful efforts to mitigate the effects of urban flooding—

(1) take a structural-based mitigation approach with respect to construction, which includes—

(A) recognizing any post-storm damage that may occur; and

(B) pursuing designs that proactively minimize future flood damage;

(2) make individuals in the community aware, through any cost-effective and available means of education, of the best approaches regarding the construction of properties that are able to survive floods, which reduces the cost of future repairs; and

(3) encourage home and property owners to consider the measures described in paragraphs (1) and (2), which are the most cost-effective and prudent ways to reduce the impact of flooding, when constructing or renovating building components.

(n) **FUNDING.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under the pilot program—

(1) \$2,000,000 for fiscal year 2027; and

(2) \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2028, to remain available through fiscal year 2030.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 727—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 29, 2026, AS “MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS IN AGRICULTURE DAY” TO RAISE AWARENESS AROUND MENTAL HEALTH IN THE AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY AND WORKFORCE AND TO CONTINUE TO REDUCE STIGMA ASSOCIATED WITH MENTAL ILLNESS

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. COONS, Mr. DAINES, Ms. SMITH, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RICKETTS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 727

Whereas, according to the 2022 Census of Agriculture of the Department of Agriculture, 3,370,000 producers, less than 2 percent of the population of the United States, provide high-quality food, fuel, and fiber to the United States and abroad;

Whereas, according to the Economic Policy Institute, there are approximately 1,600,000 farmworkers in the United States;

Whereas, according to the National Rural Health Association, the rate of suicide

among farmers is 3.5 times higher than among the general population;

Whereas, according to the Mortality-Linked National Health Interview Survey, the rate of suicide among farmworkers is 1.4 times higher than rates across all other occupations;

Whereas the month of May is National Mental Health Awareness Month; and

Whereas the stigma surrounding mental and behavioral health persists and acknowledging this public health crisis and creating awareness is as important as ever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 29, 2026, as “Mental Health Awareness in Agriculture Day” to raise awareness around mental health in the agricultural industry and reduce the stigma associated with mental illness;

(2) recognizes the important role of individuals in agriculture as providers of high-quality products to the United States and the world;

(3) seeks to create awareness for the unique challenges agricultural producers and workers face, such as weather unpredictability, labor intensity and shortages, farm succession, and fluctuating commodity and market prices;

(4) highlights the resources available through the Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network of the Department of Agriculture in connecting agricultural producers and workers to stress assistance programs; and

(5) encourages all to observe Mental Health Awareness in Agriculture Day as an opportunity to promote mental well-being and awareness for current and future agricultural producers and workers.

SENATE RESOLUTION 728—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD PRIORITIZE SECURING THE RELEASE OF PASTOR JIN MINGRI, PASTOR GAO QUANFU AND HIS WIFE PANG YU, JIMMY LAI, DR. GULSHAN ABBAS, AND EKPAR ASAT DETAINED BY THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA DURING FUTURE ENGAGEMENTS WITH CHINESE PRESIDENT XI JINGPING

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. KAINE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 728

Whereas the Government of the People’s Republic of China has arrested Chinese, American, and British citizens for the peaceful expression of freedom of speech or religion, or such acts by family members;

Whereas such arrests have been widely condemned by the international community and human rights organizations, with repeated calls for the release of the detainees;

Whereas, on May 17, 2025, Pastor Gao Quanfu of the Light of Zion Church in Xi’an City was detained and is being held on charges of “using superstitious activities to undermine the implementation of law” and “fraud”;

Whereas Pastor Gao’s wife, Pang Yu, who was subsequently detained on June 7, 2025, remains held despite holding no official position in the church, and has been denied access to critical prescription medication;

Whereas, on or about October 10, 2025, authorities of the People’s Republic of China detained Pastor Jin Mingri, founder of Zion Church, along with other church leaders, on equally dubious charges of “illegal use of information networks”;

Whereas Pastor Jin continues to be detained without access to critical medications to treat diabetes or contact with family members in the People’s Republic of China and the United States;

Whereas, on November 7, 2025, the Senate unanimously passed Senate Resolution 463, calling for the “immediate and unconditional release of all detained members of Zion Church, including Pastor Jin” and for the Government of the People’s Republic of China to end “harassment and intimidation of the relatives of Zion church members and their relatives”;

Whereas, in 1995, Jimmy Lai founded the Apple Daily newspaper in Hong Kong and subsequently faced repeated harassment and arrest, including a 69 month sentence in 2022, on dubious fraud charges that were later overturned, and a subsequent 20-year sentence in February 2026 on dubious national security charges;

Whereas, in December 2025, President Donald Trump said he had asked Chinese President Xi Jinping to consider releasing Jimmy Lai;

Whereas, on December 4, 2025, House Resolution 930 (119th Congress) was introduced commemorating Jimmy Lai and calling on authorities of the People’s Republic of China to “immediately and unconditionally release Jimmy Lai and all other Hong Kong pro-democracy advocates unjustly imprisoned”;

Whereas Gulshan Abbas, a retired medical doctor and grandmother, was forcibly disappeared on September 11, 2018, shortly after her sister, a United States citizen, publicly criticized the treatment of Uyghurs by the Government of the People’s Republic of China;

Whereas Dr. Abbas was later sentenced to 20 years following secret proceedings on charges that independent observers and human rights organizations have characterized as politically motivated;

Whereas the prolonged detention of Dr. Abbas raises grave concerns regarding her health, well-being, and access to a fair trial, as she suffers from severe high blood pressure and osteoporosis, among other conditions;

Whereas, on July 25, 2024, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate unanimously passed an amendment to Senate Bill 4797, 118th Congress, restricting United States visas for “Government officials of the People’s Republic of China about whom the Secretary of State has credible information have been involved in the wrongful detention of Gulshan Abbas”;

Whereas Ekpar Asat, a Uyghur entrepreneur who participated in the International Visitor Leadership Program of the Department of State, was detained in Urumqi on April 9, 2016, just days after returning from the United States;

Whereas Mr. Asat was reportedly sentenced to 15 years in prison without any publicly documented trial or transparent judicial process, suffered from years of solitary confinement, and remains detained in Aksu prison camp, where he continues to be denied access to legal counsel and adequate medical care; and

Whereas addressing individual cases of arbitrary or wrongful detention has historically been an important component of United States diplomacy, reflects longstanding bipartisan commitments to political and religious freedoms, and is an important factor in United States bilateral relations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls upon the President to prioritize securing the humanitarian release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Jimmy Lai, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, Ekpar Asat, and other wrongly detained individuals on the agenda for engagements with President Xi Jinping, including the anticipated May 2026 summit;

(2) urges the President to seek verifiable proof of life and access to independent legal counsel, family communication, and medical care for such detainees; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to defend political and religious freedoms worldwide.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have nine requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open and closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 2026, at 9:30 a.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, May 13, 2026, at 10 a.m., 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, May 13, 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, May 13, 2026, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 2026, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 2026, at 4 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, May 13, 2026, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 13, 2026, at 2:30 p.m.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that James Pomian, an intern in my office, be granted floor privileges until May 14, 2026.

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

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
May 13, 2026.

Hon. J.D. VANCE,
President of the United States Senate,
Washington, DC.

SIR: I have the honor to submit a full and complete statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Senate, showing in detail the items of expense under proper appropriations, the aggregate thereof, and exhibiting the exact condition of all public moneys received, paid out, and remaining in my possession from October 1, 2025 to March 31, 2026, in compliance with §105 of Public Law 88-454, approved August 20, 1964, as amended.

Sincerely,

JACKIE BARBER,
Secretary of the Senate.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD PRIORITIZE SECURING THE RELEASE OF PASTOR JIN MINGRI, PASTOR GAO QUANFU AND HIS WIFE PANG YU, JIMMY LAI, DR. GULSHAN ABBAS, AND EKPAR ASAT DETAINED BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA DURING FUTURE ENGAGEMENTS WITH CHINESE PRESIDENT XI JINPING

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 728, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 728) expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should prioritize securing the release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Jimmy Lai, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, and Ekpar Asat detained by the People's Republic of China during future engagements with Chinese President Xi Jinping.

There being no objection, the Senator will proceed to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, 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. 728) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2026 AS "NATIONAL BEEF MONTH" TO RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANT ROLE CATTLE PLAY IN THE UNITED STATES, AND TO CONSUMERS

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 711.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 711) expressing support for the designation of May 2026 as "National Beef Month" to recognize the important role cattle play in the United States, and to consumers.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, 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.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 711) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 30, 2026, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2026

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 14; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motion with respect to the nominations to be considered en bloc pursuant to S. Res. 690 ripen at 1:45 p.m. tomorrow.

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

Mr. MORENO. For the information of my colleagues, they should expect a vote in relation to S. Res. 526 at noon tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before

the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator KENNEDY.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as the Presiding Officer well knows—because I am about to describe the good people of West Virginia as well as the good people of Louisiana and of many other States—most Americans get up every day. They go to work. They obey the law. They try to teach their children values. They try to do the right thing by their children, and they try to put aside a little money for retirement. I have just described millions of moms and dads across the Presiding Officer's State and mine and all across America.

But, unfortunately, many moms and dads, when they lie down to sleep at night, can't. And they can't because they are worried. They can't because they are scared. Worry and fear are inextricably linked. One of the main things they are worried about today in America is the cost of living. Worry and fear also can lead to anger. There is a lot of anger in America today among our middle-class citizens. That anger is shared not only by the folks in the Presiding Officer's State and in my State and in other States, it is shared all across political party lines and all across demographics. Many of my Democratic friends and neighbors are angry just as they are scared and worried. Many Independent moms and dads or many Republican moms and dads are worried, and they are angry.

Why are they angry? First, let me say I understand their anger. It is perfectly predictable. Here is why they are angry, and this is why they are scared: These moms and dads who can't sleep at night because they are concerned about the cost of living look around and they see too many undeserving people—I want to emphasize "undeserving" because I don't want to paint it with too broad a brush.

These parents—these moms and dads—look around and see too many undeserving people at the top getting bailouts, and they see too many undeserving people—not everybody but too many undeserving people—at the bottom who are getting handouts. And they are in the middle, and they are getting stuck with the bill, and they can't pay it anymore because of the cost of living.

Now, this started back during COVID when we experienced our first inflation—a rise in the cost of living in America. You don't have to be a senior at Caltech to figure out what happened. The Federal Government, at the suggestion of President Biden, spent bucketloads of money that we didn't have, particularly and especially after the pandemic was over. They just spent

billions and billions of dollars. There was money sloshing around the financial system in America like it was confetti. These stimulus bills were passed at the suggestion of President Biden at a time when many of our supply chains had kinks in them, and all this extra money that President Biden spent that we didn't have increased demand at a time when supply was constant or going down.

Well, what is the result of that? Inflation. That is how you get inflation. At one point, we had 9-percent inflation in America—9 percent. And inflation is pernicious. It just guts the middle class like a fish. Those at the top aren't particularly bothered by inflation. I don't want to overstate this, but many people at the bottom who depend on public assistance to live are not as worried about inflation because a lot of their public assistance is adjusted for inflation.

But the folks in the middle—the ones who get up every day and go to work and obey the law and pay their taxes and try to do the right thing by their kids—yes, they have gotten some wage increases but not as fast as inflation.

We have gotten that 9-percent inflation down. Before the conflict in Iran, we had gotten it down to 2.5, 2.8 percent. We were trying to get it down more, but inflation is very sticky. It is like a stray dog. Once you feed it, you can't get rid of it. Our goal was to get it down to 2 percent. The Federal Reserve was doing its part, and I would like to think most Members of Congress were doing their part, but we were having real trouble getting it down.

Then, of course, we had a spike in the cost of energy. Now, energy was already up. Under President Biden, the average electricity bill of the average American went up 28 percent—almost a third. So that started the fear and the anger among middle-class Americans. But the conflict in Iran, predictably, raised the cost of energy and particularly the cost of gas and diesel fuel.

I think most Americans understand. They don't like it. I don't like it. It is as painful as hell. They understand that every time you have a conflict in the Middle East, the price of energy is going to go up, and once the conflict is over, it will gradually come down. Usually, it doesn't come down as fast as it went up, but it is still painful.

This fear, this anger at the cost of living predates the conflict in Iran. I don't want to blame it on the conflict in Iran. It was there before because we had inflation there before the conflict. I am not going to say it is just energy prices. It is not just energy prices. We were seeing it in food prices, for example. You shouldn't have to sell blood plasma to go to the grocery store, but a lot of middle-class Americans felt that they just about had to.

Now, I talked to the President about it. He understands it. It frustrates him because he didn't cause that 9-percent inflation. No disrespect, but President

Biden did. He did. He spent money that we didn't have like it was ditchwater. I think, if we had discovered life on Mars when President Biden was President, he would have sent it money immediately. That is how much money we were spending that caused all this inflation, but it frustrates President Trump.

And these are my words, not his, but I have heard him say, in effect: Why are people mad at me? I didn't cause this inflation. Yes, I did what I had to do in Iran, and gas prices and diesel prices have gone up and fertilizer prices, but the American people aren't stupid. They don't read Aristotle every day because they are too busy earning a living, but they understand the energy prices will gradually come down after the conflict is over.

But the President says: Why am I getting blamed?

And I have told the President gently: Mr. President, I understand your frustration. You didn't father this child—you are not the daddy—but you have got to raise him. You have got to raise him because you are the President.

And I don't want the American people to think we have been doing nothing. We have done a lot already, as the Presiding Officer knows. We passed the One Big Beautiful Bill. Now, I could stand here—and most of the provisions of the One Big Beautiful Bill which are going to help with the cost of living are just now taking effect. People are already seeing tax refunds bigger than they have ever seen, and that is going to help. It is a breathtaking piece of legislation. I don't think I have ever—I know I have never voted for a bill that was more impactful and that covered more subjects.

I have talked before about no tax on tips and the fact that we prevented a \$4.3 trillion tax increase. I am not going to go into that, but I do want to highlight one of the things we did—one among, frankly, thousands in the One Big Beautiful Bill—to try to help people in the middle class who are scared and who are angry.

I will give you an example—and the Presiding Officer knows this. We have a program called the child and dependent care tax credit. Now, we have made it as complicated as hell, as the Federal Government is wont to do, but this is what the child and dependent care tax credit basically does: Basically, if you are a mom and dad and you are working and you have to pay for childcare—which is outrageously expensive; I am not blaming the childcare providers, but it is just really expensive—under the child and dependent care tax credit, we will pay a portion of your childcare expenses.

This program has been around since 2001. In the One Big Beautiful Bill, we amped it up. We don't talk about it much, but we did. For about 4 million working families, they are going to get more money to pay for childcare. For many families, that is going to mean an extra \$900 a family to pay for their

childcare. I am very proud of that. We heard the American people, and we did something about it.

We also have another program—way too complicated—called the employer-provided childcare credit, 45F. Let me tell you what it does in simple terms. It basically says, if you are a businesswoman or a businessman and you want to help your employees and you want to attract new employees because you need them, we will give that company a tax credit to pay for a portion of the childcare expenses of those employees. So that is the second way that we have, at the Federal level, to try to help people pay for their childcare. Under the One Big Beautiful Bill, we expanded that dramatically. That program has also been around since 2001.

To make a long story short, which sometimes is difficult for me to do, basically, in the One Big Beautiful Bill, we have given employers all across America more money so they can, in turn, help their employees by giving them more money to pay for childcare. We don't talk about it enough, but parents with kids will start feeling that immediately.

We also have a third program at the Federal level that we beefed up in the One Big Beautiful Bill. It is called the child tax credit. It is really the simplest of the three. Basically, if you have a child in America, we will give you a certain amount of money to defray the cost of raising that child.

Now, look, children are worth it, OK? I don't need to talk in just purely financial terms. I love my son more than life itself. I remember, when I was young, my dad used to tell me: Son, you will never know love until you have a child.

He would tell me—he said: Son, it is not like the love for a spouse or the love for a dad or a mom or a sibling.

I just can't describe it, Dad would say.

And I would say: Ah, Dad. OK, you know.

Well, he was right, and you can't know that until you have a child. So I don't mean to talk about children just in financial terms, but it is expensive to raise children. We increased in the One Big Beautiful Bill—right now, we give parents \$2,000 per child to defray the expenses. We raised that to \$2,200 a child. But more importantly, had we not acted—we not only acted, but we increased the child tax credits. But had we not acted, it was going to go back to \$1,000 a child. So I think it would be fair to say that we increased the child tax credits from \$1,000 to \$2,200.

I don't want to get too partisan, but I was very disappointed that my Democratic colleagues—not a single solitary one voted for this.

We also increased the adoption tax credit. We basically decided to give more money to people who want to adopt children.

I could go on, but I won't. I could talk about the Dependent Care Assistance Plan. I could talk about the paid

family and medical leave credits. But the point is, this is one of the reasons we passed One Big Beautiful Bill, and I don't want anybody to think that we in Congress—at least our side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle—are not aware of and are not trying to help with the cost of living.

This is just one small part of the One Big Beautiful Bill. Let me tell you what else we are doing. We are doing a lot of stuff, but I will just mention one in particular: housing.

You know, it wasn't that many years ago—I think maybe 10 years ago, 15 years ago—that the average age of a first-time homeowner in America was 29. You know, most people who wanted to buy a home bought their first home when they were 29. Today, it is 39—damn near middle-aged—because the cost of housing has gone up.

Now, that is great if you already have a home and you bought it early enough. God bless you. I am happy for you. You know, you built up equity, and your home is worth more. But it is terrible for our young people who want to buy a home and they just can't. It is not just the downpayment. It is not just the mortgage rates. It is the price of the home.

Now, the Federal Government, the U.S. Congress, is not in charge of housing. That is not part of our job description. That is an issue for local government—State government, yes, but especially local government. Why? Because the supply of housing is determined in large part by municipalities, by cities and counties.

If you increase the supply of housing, the cost is going to go down.

One of the reasons homes have become so expensive is because we don't have enough houses for people to buy. The other reason is that people who have bought and locked in cheap interest rates don't want to sell. But I digress.

The main reason is that we don't have enough housing. If we had more housing, the price would go down, and you wouldn't have to wait until you are 39 years old, for God's sake, to be able to buy a home.

But we at the Federal level can't tell our colleagues in local government—or we shouldn't try to tell them—how to increase the supply of houses. That is their job.

One way to increase the supply of housing is to change your zoning laws. A lot of our local governments—a lot of them—make it terribly, terribly, terribly difficult to build. They do. It is not just the fees and the permits and the regulations; it is the zoning laws.

You know, we all need zoning laws. I am not saying we don't. But there is no appetite by many folks on the city council and many mayors to increase housing starts by relaxing the zoning laws.

I don't want to be the one to tell them how to do their business. That is their business. I don't want to have the Federal Government get in the middle

of zoning laws. That is up to local government because they are closest to the people.

But we have a bill—it has passed the Senate twice. It is in front of the House of Representatives right now. There are one or two Members of Congress over there that are holding it up, and I hope they will let it go. But we passed it twice. In fact, this bill is called the Build Now Act. It is a bill sponsored by myself and Senator WARREN from Massachusetts. I have had it put on the crypto bill that we are going to mark up tomorrow. We have passed it twice, and it is in front of the House now, but in case something goes wrong over there, I am going to send it to them again through the crypto bill.

What does it do? It doesn't tell local government how to do their job; it just tells them: We will give you extra money if you will do your job.

Every year, the Federal Government sends about—I don't know—\$3 billion in cash to our local governments. We call it community development block grant money. But it is free money. We give it to the cities. We give to the counties. There are very few strings attached.

The local governments love it. They love community development block grant money like the Devil loves sin. I mean, it is just free money. They can pretty much spend it on what they want. And we give it to them every year, \$3 billion, just like clockwork.

What Senator WARREN's and my bill would do is, it says to our friends in local government: We are not telling you how to do it, but if you will increase housing starts, if you will allow the private sector to build more houses—how you do it is up to you. You change zoning laws, whatever you do. We are not going to tell you how to do your business. But if you will encourage more housing built by the private sector and increase housing starts, we will give you extra money from that pool of \$3 billion from community development block grants.

That is the good news.

The bad news for local government is—because you are saying: Well, heck, we are already giving them \$3 billion, KENNEDY. Did you just parachute in from Pluto? We have a huge deficit. You want to add more?

No. Senator WARREN's bill and my bill wouldn't cost anything because, yes, we will reward with extra money those counties and cities that increase housing starts. Where are we going to get the money? We are going to take it from the cities and counties that don't increase housing starts. So the net effect is going to be a wash.

Now, we are not telling local government how to do their job. They don't have to do a dadgum thing if they don't want to. But if local government will work with us to increase housing starts, it will be good for them and good for us. If they don't want to work with us, they don't have to, but those that do work with us will get extra

money, and those that don't will get less.

I know this will work. I have seen it with my very own eyes. You have, too, Mr. President. Just look at Austin, TX. About a year or so ago in Austin, it was the hottest housing market in the country. Prices were going through the roof. Why? Because Austin had all these people that were moving in, wanted to live in Austin.

You know, I always have loved their expression and their slogan in Austin. It is "Keep Austin Weird." Austin is a great place. The University of Texas is there. It is just a great place.

Now it is a hub for technology, and people were moving into Austin from all over the country. The supply of houses was remaining the same, and the cost of housing was going through the roof. Nobody could afford a house, and nobody could afford an apartment.

Well, Austin said: You know, this is very uncool.

They changed their zoning laws.

They said: We are going to relax our regulations to try to increase more houses and more apartments.

Do you know what? They did. They did. And the price of homes, but just as important, the price of rent has gone down dramatically.

You increase supply, and price will go down every single time.

You know that. I know you know that, Mr. President. You have been very successful in business.

Most people who weren't playing frisbee in the quad near Econ 101 know it too. So that is what our bill would do.

So I just wanted to come to the floor and say to the American people: Look, I get it. We get it. You know, I wish there was a magic wand and we could just fix it, but we are trying. And it starts with the One Big Beautiful Bill.

We need to do more. We have passed the housing bill that will help if we could get our friends over in the House of Representatives to just take it up and pass it. There is talk of a third reconciliation bill, and I am all for it.

There are things we could do in a reconciliation bill if we could get it past the Parliamentarian. One idea I have: insurance. It is killing people. It is just killing folks. And it is not just homeowners insurance, it is flood insurance, it is car insurance, it is all kinds of insurance.

What I am about to say is going to give all of our insurance commissioners—they are all going to have a grand mal seizure when I say this, but what I think we ought to do—right now, if I want to buy insurance, I have to buy it in my State. I can't say: Man, the quote I got on my homeowners is too high. I want to see what kind of deal I can get in West Virginia or Alabama.

You can't do that. You can't buy insurance across State lines. Craziest thing I have ever seen. Craziest thing I have ever seen.

I want to introduce a bill—I may try to put it in our reconciliation package—that says: Henceforth, you can buy insurance across State lines.

I am sorry that the insurance commissioners are upset, but, you know, enough is enough.

We have—and you know this, Mr. President. You have dozens of ideas. I have them. We all have them. We are working on them.

I just wanted to come to the floor tonight and point that out to the American people, that we get it. We get it. And I am sorry for that worry and that fear among a lot of middle-class Americans. I am sorry for that anger. But we

are working on it, and we are trying, and we are taking some steps to try to make your lives better.

That is it. My work here is done for the evening. I don't know what I am supposed to say next, except—what? Let's go home? Is that what you are saying?

Well, we are done. I am done. I can show myself out.

Whatever the magic words the Parliamentarian is telling me to say, I want to say it, and we will be recessed until we are supposed to come back. How is that?

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:44 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 14, 2026, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 13, 2026:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

KEVIN WARSH, OF FLORIDA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING PARAMEDIC DEJA
COLON

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Citrus County Fire Rescue Paramedic Deja Colon for her exceptional clinical skill, decisive action, and unwavering commitment to patient care. Paramedic Colon consistently demonstrates a level of professionalism that exceeds expectations. Her dedication to serving the residents of Citrus County is evident in every call she answers. One particular response in July 2025 stands out as a powerful example of her ability to make critical decisions under immense pressure. On that day, she responded to a patient suffering from a ruptured abdominal aortic aneurysm—one of the most catastrophic medical emergencies, with an exceedingly low survival rate. Recognizing the severity, she immediately initiated aggressive, life-saving interventions and ensured rapid transport while continuing advanced care. Her swift actions stabilized the patient long enough to reach surgery. Despite overwhelming odds, the patient survived and has since made a meaningful recovery—now walking, talking, and spending time with loved ones.

Paramedic Colon's impact extends far beyond a single call. She has repeatedly demonstrated excellence in prehospital care, earning recognition from hospital partners. In one instance, she treated a 94-year-old patient experiencing supraventricular tachycardia with a heart rate exceeding 230 beats per minute, stabilizing the patient prior to arrival. The patient later improved and was discharged home, with hospital staff commending her care. In another case, she treated a patient in severe respiratory distress with oxygen levels in the 70s. By initiating CPAP and advanced airway support, she significantly improved the patient's condition before arrival. The patient was later stabilized and discharged, with hospital staff again expressing their appreciation.

These examples reflect not only her clinical expertise, but also her calm demeanor, quick thinking, and steadfast dedication. She represents the very best of our emergency medical professionals—those who stand ready to protect and preserve life. I commend Paramedic Deja Colon for her outstanding service to the residents of Florida's 12th Congressional District and proudly recognize her as a 2026 First Responder of the Year.

CELEBRATING THE 2026
DOWNTOWNER OF THE YEAR,
DAN LINDBLADE

HON. JARED MOSKOWITZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and congratulate an exemplary visionary in my district: Dan Lindblade, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce. I proudly recognize his most recent accolade of being named the 2026 Downtowner of the Year by the Chamber's Downtown Council and the Fort Lauderdale Downtown Development Authority. I also recognize and celebrate his retirement, effective June 1, 2026, following decades of distinguished leadership and service to the Fort Lauderdale community.

With nearly two decades of leadership at the helm of the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber, Dan Lindblade is a titan of the industry. By advocating for local businesses, fostering economic growth, and protecting the interests of the business community, Dan has become a central catalyst for the city's economic expansion.

Dan's strategic capabilities have equipped local enterprises with the tools needed to navigate both opportunities and challenges within the business environment. His transformative leadership is evidenced by numerous projects and strategic initiatives centered on advancing pro-business policies, empowering small businesses, and solidifying Greater Fort Lauderdale's reputation as a thriving hub for investment, innovation, and tourism.

Beyond his formal role at the Chamber of Commerce, Dan's enthusiasm and steadfast advocacy have fostered a culture of growth and vitality across the Greater Fort Lauderdale community. His efforts serve as a testament to his vision for a stronger and more prosperous Fort Lauderdale, both within the Chamber and throughout the broader community.

Through his stewardship, collaboration, and commitment to civic engagement, Dan has bridged gaps across the private, public, and nonprofit sectors, exemplifying a spirit of partnership and unity. His extensive experience in community relations, management, professionalism, and leadership development represents only a fraction of the qualities that make him deserving of this distinguished honor.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating Dan Lindblade as the recipient of the 2026 Downtowner of the Year award. His dedicated service and lasting contributions to the Chamber, the business community, and the Greater Fort Lauderdale area are deeply valued and greatly appreciated.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF JOHN
"PHIL" LARSON

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of John "Phil" Larson, a devoted father, friend, and public servant, who passed away on April 23, 2026, at the age of 92.

Phil was born on September 5, 1933, in San Francisco, California, alongside his twin brother, Don Larson. He was raised on his family's farm near Kerman, California, where he developed his deep faith, humility, and tireless work ethic that would guide him throughout his life. After graduating from Kerman High School in 1951, he went on to further his education at Fresno State and Point Loma University.

In 1953, Phil answered the call to serve his country by enlisting in the United States Marine Corps. He served honorably until 1956, including two winters in Korea, and completed his reserve service in 1961. His time in uniform reflected his lifelong commitment to service and sacrifice.

Phil met his wife, Joyce Henriksen, through Fresno First Covenant Church. They were married on March 21, 1959, at Kingsburg Mission Covenant Church, beginning a 67-year marriage grounded in faith, partnership, and devotion. Together, they raised two children, Tim and Lisa, and built a life centered on family and community.

Phil dedicated much of his career to agriculture, beginning on his family's farm near Kerman before joining Wilbur-Ellis company in 1963. Spending over 38 years with the company, he built a reputation for integrity, expertise, and lasting relationships, retiring in 2000. Beyond his professional work, Phil's leadership in agriculture was widely recognized through his service on the Fresno County Farm Bureau Executive Board, including two years as president, where he advocated on critical water issues affecting California's Central Valley.

In 2002, Phil was elected to the Fresno County Board of Supervisors, representing District One. As a steady and principled leader, he expanded services in underserved communities, improved libraries, supported educational partnerships, and contributed to infrastructure projects like Veterans Boulevard. Even after he left the board in 2015, he remained committed to enhancing life across western Fresno County.

As a proud alumnus, Phil received the President's Medal of Distinction from California State University, Fresno, in 2014, for his lifetime of service.

Above all, Phil was a man of strong faith and unwavering dedication to his family. He is survived by his wife, Joyce; children, Tim and Lisa; grandchildren, Tanner, Haylee, and Lindsey; and five great-grandchildren. He was preceded in death by his parents, Ben and Olive, and his brothers, Galen and Don.

● 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.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of John "Phil" Larson. His legacy of faith, service, dedication to agriculture and commitment to family and community will undoubtedly continue to inspire all who knew him.

RECOGNIZING OFFICER JOSEPH
MARTARANA

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of New Port Richey Police Department Officer Joseph Martarana for his exceptional professionalism, leadership, and unwavering commitment to public service. Officer Martarana has consistently demonstrated a level of dedication that reflects great credit upon himself and the agency. His positive attitude, strong work ethic, and leadership by example set him apart as a valued member of the department and a trusted presence within the community he serves. His contributions extend far beyond his daily responsibilities.

Officer Martarana routinely goes above and beyond the call of duty, demonstrating initiative, reliability, and a genuine commitment to excellence in all aspects of his work. His willingness to step up when needed and support both his peers and the department as a whole has made him an invaluable asset to the New Port Richey Police Department. In addition to his operational performance, Officer Martarana is deeply committed to mentorship and fostering a strong team environment. He leads by example, encouraging professionalism and accountability while supporting the development of those around him. His dedication strengthens not only his immediate team, but the department as a whole. These qualities reflect not only his skill as a law enforcement officer, but also his character, integrity, and commitment to serving others. Officer Martarana consistently embodies the values of professionalism, service, and community engagement.

In recognition of his outstanding service, commitment to mentorship, and consistent high performance, I commend Officer Joseph Martarana and proudly recognize him as the 2026 First Responder of the Year for Florida's 12th Congressional District.

HONORING AND REMEMBERING
THE LIFE OF SENATOR JAMES E.
CARNES

HON. MICHAEL A. RULLI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. RULLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Senator James E. Carnes, 84, of St. Clairsville, Ohio, who passed away on April 25, 2026. Born February 19, 1942, in Wheeling, West Virginia, he was the son of the late Edward A. and Avis E. Carnes.

A lifelong Belmont County resident, Carnes graduated from Flushing High School in 1960 and dedicated his career to the Ohio coal industry, rising to President and later President-Emeritus of Cravat Coal Company after 57 years of service. He also owned and operated the Plaza Motel and Carnes Mobile Home and Appliances.

He was a prominent figure in Ohio Republican politics for over five decades, serving as Belmont County GOP Chairman, on state and national party committees, and as a delegate to multiple conventions. He later served in the Ohio Senate from 1995 to 2004, representing southeastern Ohio and chairing key committees, including Energy and Finance.

Following his Senate service, he was appointed Deputy Director of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources and later served on the Ohio Liquor Control Commission until 2025. Known for his pragmatic leadership and ability to work across party lines, he was widely respected for his service to Ohio.

I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring Senator James E. Carnes. He will be remembered as a devoted family man, a man of faith, and a lifelong public servant.

RECOGNIZING RAY MINERVINI FOR
A LIFETIME OF SERVICE AND VI-
SION IN TRAVERSE CITY

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ray Minervini, an extraordinary Northern Michigan leader, on being named the 2025 Distinguished Service Award recipient by Traverse Connect, one of the region's most prestigious civic honors, which has been presented annually since 1929.

For decades, Ray Minervini has exemplified what it means to serve a community with vision, integrity, and purpose. Starting under the guidance of his father, Ray's career in construction and development has had a lasting impact on Traverse City and Northern Michigan. Ray began his career in residential construction in the 1960s, building his sister a cottage just outside of Kingsley, before transitioning to the commercial sector in the 1980s.

After relocating to Traverse City in the 1990s with his wife, Marsha, Ray could have chosen a quiet retirement. Instead, he chose to help redevelop the historic Traverse City State Hospital, a decision that would forever shape the future of the region. Through the Minervini Group, he acquired the property in 2002 and launched what would become the first redevelopment of a former asylum in the United States.

What followed was nothing short of remarkable—today, the once abandoned property has been transformed into a 500-acre property filled with trails, parks, and various community entities. His work has not only protected a vital piece of Northern Michigan's history, but also created jobs, expanded housing opportunities, and fostered a sense of community that con-

tinues to draw residents and visitors alike. His dedication has earned him numerous honors over the years, but what may be most meaningful is the gratitude of a community he has so faithfully served.

Mr. Speaker, let us all join in recognizing Ray Minervini for this well-deserved recognition. On behalf of Michigan's 1st Congressional District, I thank him for his enduring contributions to Traverse City and Northern Michigan.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN MICHAEL
TRAPP

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Citrus County Fire Rescue Captain Michael Trapp for his exceptional leadership, clinical expertise, and unwavering commitment to public safety. Captain Trapp has consistently demonstrated professionalism and dedication that exceed expectations. Since joining Citrus County Fire Rescue in March of 2020, he has served with distinction as Driver Engineer, Lieutenant, and now Captain. Prior to his service in Citrus County, he gained valuable experience as a Firefighter/Paramedic with a neighboring agency, bringing a strong foundation to his work. Throughout his tenure, Captain Trapp has made significant contributions to both fire and emergency medical services operations. He is highly engaged in training and development and serves as an instructor for the Firefighter Minimum Standards program, helping prepare the next generation of firefighters. He is also widely respected as a mentor who sets a high standard of excellence and professionalism.

Captain Trapp's impact is evident in the field, where he consistently delivers exceptional patient care. In one instance, he responded to a critically ill patient in severe respiratory distress with dangerously low oxygen levels. Through rapid assessment and advanced interventions, he stabilized the patient prior to transport. The patient later required intensive care but ultimately recovered and was discharged. Hospital staff recognized Captain Trapp and his crew for their critical role in the patient's survival. In another case involving a patient with worsening altered mental status requiring immediate airway intervention and prolonged intensive care, Captain Trapp again demonstrated a high level of clinical skill. While the patient ultimately required end-of-life care, hospital staff expressed appreciation for the compassionate care provided.

These examples reflect Captain Trapp's clinical excellence, calm demeanor, and steadfast dedication. He represents the very best of the fire service. I commend Captain Michael Trapp for his outstanding service to the residents of Florida's 12th Congressional District and proudly recognize him as a 2026 First Responder of the Year. His leadership and commitment to excellence embody the highest ideals of public service.

RECOGNIZING TREVER BLACKBURN ON HIS OFFER OF APPOINTMENT TO ATTEND THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to pay special tribute to an outstanding student from Ohio's 5th Congressional District. I am pleased to announce that Trever Blackburn of LaGrange, Ohio, has been offered an appointment to the United States Military Academy in West Point, New York.

Trever's offer of appointment permits him to attend the United States Military Academy this fall with the incoming Class of 2030. Attending one of our Nation's military academies not only offers the opportunity to serve our country but also guarantees a world-class education while undertaking one of the most challenging and rewarding experiences of his life. Trever brings a tremendous amount of leadership, service, and dedication to the incoming Class of 2030. While attending Keystone High School, he participated in football, basketball, and baseball, earning his varsity letter in all three. After high school, he attended the Military Academy Preparatory School in West Point, New York. I am confident that he will carry the lessons of his student and athletic leadership to the Military Academy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Trever Blackburn on his offer of appointment to the United States Military Academy. Our service academies offer the finest military training and education available, and I am positive that Trever will excel during his career at the Military Academy. I ask my colleagues to join me in extending their best wishes to him as he begins his service to our Nation.

**CELEBRATING CUHCC'S
GROUNDBREAKING**

HON. ILHAN OMAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Community-University Health Care Center (CUHCC) as it breaks ground on a new facility and celebrates 60 years of service to South Minneapolis.

CUHCC is the oldest Federally Qualified Health Center in Minnesota and the only one in the state connected to an academic health center. Each year, CUHCC serves more than 12,000 patients through over 54,000 visits. They provide whole-person care that looks at both medical needs and the real challenges people face, including income, access, and other barriers to staying healthy. CUHCC has built strong trust in the community by making care accessible and respectful for everyone.

CUHCC is also a leader in training future healthcare workers. Nearly 200 students and residents learn there each year across many fields. This helps grow a workforce that understands the needs of the community. As the

need for care continues to grow, CUHCC is expanding. The new building will be twice the size of the original space and will include services like a pharmacy, imaging, and physical therapy in one place. This will make it easier for patients to get the care they need. The new facility will also allow CUHCC to serve 6,000 more patients while continuing to provide compassionate, trauma-informed care.

We thank CUHCC for 60 years of service and look forward to the continued impact they will have on the community.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL ROBINSON

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Inverness Fire Department Driver/Engineer Michael Robinson for his exceptional professionalism, leadership, and unwavering commitment to excellence in the fire service. Driver/Engineer Robinson has consistently demonstrated a strong work ethic and a level of professionalism that reflects the highest standards of public safety. Since joining the Inverness Fire Department, he has distinguished himself through his dedication to continuous learning, his adaptability to modern technologies and evolving fire service tactics, and his commitment to operational excellence. Throughout his service, Driver/Engineer Robinson has repeatedly stepped up to serve in an acting officer capacity when needed, demonstrating reliability, sound judgment, and composure under pressure. His attention to detail, initiative, and ability to complete tasks at a high level without direct supervision have made him a dependable cornerstone of his crew.

In addition to his technical proficiency, Driver/Engineer Robinson is a team-oriented professional who actively supports his fellow firefighters. He shares knowledge, mentors others, and ensures that no task is overlooked, contributing to both individual development and overall crew effectiveness. His proactive approach has also improved daily operations and enhanced departmental efficiency. These qualities reflect not only his skill as a fire service professional, but also his character, leadership, and dedication to those he serves alongside. Driver/Engineer Robinson consistently leads by example and embodies the values essential to the fire service.

I commend Driver/Engineer Michael Robinson for his outstanding service to the residents of Florida's 12th Congressional District and proudly recognize him as a 2026 First Responder of the Year. His professionalism, leadership, and commitment to excellence make him a role model for all firefighters.

HONORING CHIEF CHARLES ISEMAN FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO THE CITY OF GRANDVIEW

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and honor Chief Charles Iseman, who has dedicated more than 35 years of service to the City of Grandview as a police officer. Let us take a moment to recognize this accomplished individual in Missouri's 5th Congressional District who has worked to protect and provide safety to the people of Grandview for over three decades.

Beginning his career at the young age of 21, Chief Iseman joined the Grandview Police Department, where he would remain for the entirety of his years in service. Chief Iseman's work ethic, integrity, and skill to solve problems allowed him to advance through the ranks within the department. From being promoted to Sergeant of the Patrol Division in 2000 to eventually being appointed Chief of Police for the Grandview Police Department in 2011, Chief Iseman has continuously demonstrated his professionalism and care for his community.

Serving a city with a population of over 20,000 individuals, Chief Iseman used his leadership to lead the Grandview Police Department in a new direction that prioritized a community-oriented policing approach and listened to stakeholders. This new approach proved to be beneficial as trust continued to be built and collaborations began to increase. Additionally, the creation of new initiatives such as the "Move Toward the Badge" further showcased the desire to involve the community in decisions that the Grandview Police Department earned the ICMA 2021 Community Partnership Award.

Moreso, Grandview was one of the first 15 cities in Missouri to earn the Blue Shield Community designation under Governor Mike Kehoe, which recognizes cities with strong community support. Chief Iseman led the department to create successful partnerships with schools and faith leaders which in turn allowed the department to have increased funding to bring in new technology, more officers, crime reduction while maintaining one of the fastest police responses in the Kansas City Metropolitan area.

Chief Iseman's legacy is not just in the cases closed or hours worked, but in the lives, he has touched and the example he has set for the next generation of officers. He has exemplified a long and distinguished career that will not be forgotten. We know that a career of this length involved immense sacrifice, and we are grateful to him and his family, and his dedication.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues today to join me in celebrating the contributions that Chief Iseman has made to Grandview and to Missouri's 5th Congressional District. As Chief Iseman closes out this chapter, we hope he can look back with pride of a job well done. We thank Chief Iseman for his unwavering commitment, he has earned a long and happy retirement, and we wish him all the best in his future endeavors. I thank him for his service.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF MAX RODRIGUEZ

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember the life of Max Rodriguez, a devoted public servant, community leader, and lifelong resident of Madera, California, who passed away on April 24, 2026, at the age of 86.

Born on November 3, 1939, to Josephine and Maximo Rodriguez, Max was raised on Madera's east side, where he developed a lifelong commitment to service, hard work, and community. After graduating from Madera High School in 1958, he continued his education at Fresno City College and went on to proudly serve in the California Army National Guard.

Max's professional life reflected his values of dedication and leadership. He began as a farmworker before spending 25 years at the American Forest Products, also known as North Fork Sawmill, where he became the Financial Secretary and President of Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union Local 2762. Following the closure of the sawmill in 1985, he pursued a career as a Farmers Insurance agent, serving the Madera community until his retirement in 2008.

Max Rodriguez's public service was equally distinguished. First elected to the Madera County Board of Supervisors in 2004, he proudly represented District 4 for four consecutive terms, dedicating 16 years to improving the quality of life for the county's residents. During his tenure, he championed safe neighborhoods, quality schools, economic development, and public safety initiatives.

He played a pivotal role in organizing Fresno River clean-up efforts, expanding law enforcement coverage, and supporting infrastructure projects, including the high-speed rail and associated regional development. He also contributed to education and youth programs, supporting the construction of multiple schools within the Madera Unified School District and helping establish the John Wells Youth Center at Centennial Park.

Beyond the board of supervisors, he served on numerous boards and commissions, including the Madera County Transportation Commission, First 5 Madera County, LAFCO, and the San Joaquin River Conservancy, among others. His civic engagement extended to organizations such as the Pan-American Club, the Madera Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and the NAACP Branch 1084.

Max was preceded in death by his beloved wife of 59 years, Sarah Rodriguez; his parents; and his siblings, Connie Muñoz, Josephine Herrera, Victoria Contreras, Mary Helen Soto, Hope Rosales, Vera Olono, and Phillip Rodriguez. He is survived by his children, Barbara Dolan (John), Karen Scrivner (Gary), and Mark Rodriguez; as well as his grandchildren, Davis Pogue, and Juliana Pogue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Max Rodriguez for his decades of service and enduring impact on the Madera Community. May his life continue to inspire public servants and citizens alike.

RECOGNIZING FIRE INSPECTOR/FIREFIGHTER CRAIG DAVIDE

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Crystal River Fire Department Fire Inspector/Firefighter Craig Davide for his exceptional professionalism, loyalty, and unwavering dedication to public safety. Fire Inspector/Firefighter Davide has consistently demonstrated a level of commitment and integrity that reflects great credit upon himself and the department. He is an invaluable asset to the Crystal River Fire Department, and his service extends well beyond the expectations of his role. In addition to his emergency response responsibilities, Fire Inspector Davide plays a critical role in the department's fire inspection program. Through his diligence and attention to detail, he helps ensure the safety of the community by identifying potential hazards and working proactively to mitigate risks before they become emergencies. His efforts reflect a strong sense of responsibility and a deep commitment to protecting the citizens he serves.

Alongside his inspection duties, Fire Inspector Davide is a dependable and skilled volunteer firefighter who carries out his responsibilities with courage, professionalism, and integrity. He is always willing to step up when needed, consistently supporting both his fellow firefighters and department leadership in times of need. He is also known for his willingness to assist with station projects and operational needs, often going above and beyond his assigned duties. His initiative, teamwork, and strong work ethic make him a trusted and valued member of the department.

Fire Inspector/Firefighter Davide's contributions have a meaningful and lasting impact both within the department and throughout the Crystal River community. His dedication, professionalism, and service-minded approach exemplify the very best qualities of a first responder.

I commend Fire Inspector/Firefighter Craig Davide for his outstanding service to the residents of Florida's 12th Congressional District and proudly recognize him as a 2026 First Responder of the Year. His commitment and professionalism embody the highest ideals of public service.

CELEBRATING THE 2026 DEERFIELD BEACH HOUSING AUTHORITY, WOMEN OF EXCELLENCE LEADERSHIP AWARDS

HON. JARED MOSKOWITZ

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate and honor the incredible achievements of women who are shaping our communities, empowering future generations and leading with grace, courage, and determination. It is a privilege to recognize inspiring women receiving the 2026 Deerfield Beach Housing Authority, Women of Excellence Leadership Award Luncheon.

This celebration is not just about acknowledging individual accomplishments, but it is also about highlighting the collective strength and transformative influence women have in every sector of society. From family leaders to trailblazers in business, education, public service, and beyond, women continue to break barriers and inspire change with remarkable resilience and dedication.

A special thank you to the host of the event, LaTonya Coley-McKenly, the Executive Director of the Deerfield Beach Housing Authority. Her vision, leadership, and commitment to community development made this celebration possible.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in celebrating the honorees being recognized at this year's Women of Excellence Leadership Awards Luncheon and I include in the RECORD their names:

Averi Ruggiero, Melissa Tague, Rev. Dr. Margaret Blake, Valerie Hackett, Lindy Harvey, and Eileen Manniste.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF LOUISE LAMBERT HARRIS

HON. TRENT KELLY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Mrs. Louise Lambert Harris, who passed away on May 6, 2026, at the age of 88.

Born in Mobile, Alabama, Mrs. Harris attended St. Genevieve of the Pines and later Florida State University. In 1959, she married USAF Colonel Carlyle S. "Smitty" Harris, beginning a remarkable partnership marked by faith, resilience, and devotion.

When Colonel Harris was shot down and held as a prisoner of war in Vietnam for nearly eight years, Mrs. Harris courageously raised their three children while supporting POW families and navigating military bureaucracy on their behalf. Her strength and determination sustained her family through one of the most difficult periods of the Vietnam War.

After returning to Tupelo, Mississippi, Mrs. Harris attended nursing school at Itawamba Community College and served as an oncology nurse at North Mississippi Medical Center. She was also a dedicated community leader and played a key role in founding Sanctuary Hospice House, helping establish one of the Nation's first freestanding hospice facilities.

Mrs. Harris is survived by her children, Robin Harris Waldrup and her husband, Ken, Carolyn Harris Cole and her husband, Chris, and Carlyle "Lyle" Smith Harris, Jr. and his wife, Cindy; her grandchildren, Reid Waldrup and his wife, Kaylee, Lauren Waldrup Zuelzke and her husband, Jim, Camie Cole, Carrie Anne Cole, USAF Captain Thomas Harris and his wife, Peyton, Blake Harris and his wife, Ali, and Jack Harris; and her great-grandchildren, Sam and Maggie Waldrup, Mary Lyle and Bo Zuelzke, and Hazel Blake and Carlyle Smith Harris, III.

Mrs. Harris leaves behind a lasting legacy of compassion, service, and perseverance that will continue to inspire all who knew her. We are deeply grateful for her extraordinary life and service.

RECOGNIZING FIREFIGHTER
JOSEPH BUSCEMI

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Hernando County Fire Rescue Firefighter Joseph Buscemi, whose service exemplifies duty, honor, and an unwavering commitment to those he serves. Firefighter Buscemi has made a significant and lasting impact on the department through consistent performance, sound judgment, and exceptional professionalism across a wide range of emergency incidents. He demonstrates superior ability under pressure and embodies the very qualities expected of a top-tier line firefighter. He is widely described by his peers as a firefighter of integrity, resilience, and deep responsibility toward both the department and the community. In the most challenging and high-stress situations, Firefighter Buscemi remains calm, levelheaded, and focused, ensuring the best possible outcomes for those in his care.

Throughout his service, Firefighter Buscemi has consistently demonstrated leadership, discipline, and sound judgment. He leads by example, sets a high standard for those around him, and routinely goes above and beyond the call of duty. His commitment to excellence is evident not only in emergency response, but in his daily approach to training, teamwork, and service. This recognition reflects not only his technical skill, but also his character and steadfast dedication to protecting life and property in Hernando County. He represents the very best of Hernando County Fire Rescue and the fire service as a whole.

I commend Firefighter Joseph Buscemi for his exceptional service and proudly recognize him as the 2026 First Responder of the Year for Florida's 12th Congressional District. His professionalism, courage, and commitment to excellence embody the highest ideals of public service.

HONORING THE HUNTER'S CREEK
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION FOR
THEIR 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. DARREN SOTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the Hunter's Creek Community Association. The Association has faithfully served the residents of Hunter's Creek for four decades, establishing itself as a cornerstone of community governance and neighborhood excellence since its founding in 1986.

The Association has successfully managed and maintained common areas, amenities, and infrastructure of one of Central Florida's premier large-scale residential communities, enhancing property values and the quality of life for many thousands of residents. Through dedicated volunteer leadership and professional management, the Hunter's Creek Community Association has fostered a strong sense of community pride and belonging, with neighborly cooperation from its diverse membership.

The Hunter's Creek Community Association has also demonstrated fiscal responsibility and sound governance practices throughout its 40-year history, ensuring long-term community sustainability and financial health, while maintaining reasonable assessments.

Additionally, the Association has served as a model for other homeowner associations through its innovative programs, community events, and its commitment to transparent communication with its members. The Association has successfully balanced the preservation of the community's initial vision and character with thoughtful adaptation to accommodate changing demographics, technologies, and resident needs, and has significantly contributed to the broader area through its partnerships with local government, participation in regional planning efforts, and its role as a responsible steward of the area's natural resources.

The commitment of countless board members, committee volunteers, staff members, and engaged residents over a 40-year span has established a legacy of community service that continues to benefit both current and future generations of Hunter's Creek.

CELEBRATING DON BOTT'S EX-
TRAORDINARY CAREER IN EDU-
CATION

HON. JOSH HARDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the extraordinary career of Mr. Don Bott as he retires after 41 years of dedicated service as an educator in Stockton, California.

For more than four decades, Mr. Bott has shaped the lives of countless students through his unwavering commitment to education, mentorship, and personal growth. He spent over 30 years teaching English and journalism at Stagg High School, where he inspired generations of young people with a deep appreciation for literature, writing, critical thinking, and lifelong learning. His classroom was more than a place of instruction—it was a place where students were challenged to discover their voices, build confidence, and strive toward their full potential.

In addition to his work in the classroom, Mr. Bott served for 27 years as advisor to the nationally recognized and award-winning Stagg Line newspaper. Under his leadership, student journalists developed not only exceptional writing and reporting skills, but also the confidence and discipline necessary to succeed in college, careers, and civic life. Through journalism, Mr. Bott empowered students to tell meaningful stories, pursue truth, and engage thoughtfully with the world around them.

Throughout his career, Mr. Bott became known not only as an exceptional educator, but as a mentor whose influence extended far beyond graduation. Former students regularly returned to his classroom to share their experiences and offer guidance to younger students—a testament to the lasting impact of his mentorship and the strong community he cultivated over the years. Thousands of students benefitted from his encouragement, compassion, and belief in their ability to succeed.

In the final years of his career, Mr. Bott continued his service to Stockton Unified School District as a teacher's coach, helping support and mentor fellow educators so that future generations of students could continue to receive the highest quality education. His leadership and experience strengthened not only individual classrooms, but the broader educational community across Stockton.

Mr. Bott's legacy is one of service, excellence, and unwavering advocacy for students. He has been a champion for the art of writing, a passionate advocate for reading and journalism, and a transformational figure in public education. His awards and honors include: San Joaquin County Teacher of the Year, National Scholastic Press Association Pioneer, and Journalism Education Association Medal of Merit. His impact on Stockton will continue to be felt for generations through the students, teachers, and community members whose lives he touched.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Don Bott for his remarkable 41-year career and to congratulate him on his well-earned retirement. The people of Stockton and the entire Central Valley are deeply grateful for his decades of dedication and service.

RECOGNIZING EMS PROVIDER
CAMERON EAMES

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of EMS Provider Cameron Eames for his exceptional leadership, clinical excellence, and unwavering commitment to patient care. Paramedic Eames has been a valued member of MedFleet since November 13, 2023, and during that time he has consistently demonstrated a level of professionalism and performance that reflects great credit upon himself and the organization. He began his service as a Critical Care Paramedic, where he quickly distinguished himself as a highly skilled and dependable clinician, delivering advanced patient care with precision, confidence, and sound clinical judgment.

Now serving as a Field Supervisor and Critical Care Paramedic, Paramedic Eames plays a vital role in supporting system-wide operations, mentoring field crews, and maintaining the highest standards of care across the organization. His leadership is evident not only in his clinical expertise, but also in his ability to guide, support, and elevate those around him. Known for his steady presence in high-pressure situations, Paramedic Eames consistently demonstrates strong decision-making, professionalism, and composure when it matters most. He leads by example, ensuring that patients receive exceptional care while fostering a culture of accountability and continuous improvement within the EMS system.

Respected by his peers, Paramedic Eames embodies the values of dedication, integrity, and service. His commitment to excellence strengthens both his team and the broader emergency medical services community. I commend Paramedic Cameron Eames for his outstanding service to the residents of Florida's 12th Congressional District and proudly

recognize him as a 2026 First Responder of the Year. His leadership, professionalism, and clinical excellence exemplify the highest ideals of emergency medical service.

SAVE OUR SHRIMPERS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 12, 2026

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to share a statement on H.R. 2071, the Save Our Shrimpers Act.

Shrimpers in Texas and across the United States are facing real, serious challenges including rising fuel costs, aging equipment, and a workforce shortage as fewer young people enter the trade. These issues that threaten the future of our domestic shrimp industry deserve meaningful attention from Congress.

Regrettably, the Save Our Shrimpers Act does nothing to lower the cost of fuel or provide practical support to American producers. Instead, the bill offers a false promise to shrimpers in the United States by focusing on cutting off financing to some of the most impoverished communities in the world.

Texas shrimpers deserve better. I support growing the domestic shrimping industry and will continue working toward legislation that addresses the challenges our shrimpers face.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF ALPENA

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the lasting impact of the Boys and Girls Club of Alpena as it approaches an extraordinary milestone, their 100th anniversary of service to the youth of Northern Michigan.

Over the last 100 years, the Boys and Girls Club of Alpena has stood as a pillar of opportunity, mentorship, and community. What began as a small effort to provide local youth with a safe and supportive place after school has grown into a vital institution that has positively shaped the lives of multiple generations throughout Northern Michigan. The Club continues to provide a safe and enriching environment where young people can learn, grow, and thrive. Their work not only supports students' individual achievements but also strengthens families' bonds and contributes to a more vibrant and resilient community.

For the Boys and Girls Club of Alpena, this milestone represents 100 years of changing lives, uplifting families, and fostering civic engagement among young people. This work would not have been possible without the countless staff members, volunteers, and supporters whose steadfast dedication has sustained this program for a century.

Mr. Speaker, let us all join in recognizing the Boys and Girls Club of Alpena for its remarkable legacy and its continued commitment to building great futures for the next generation. May the community of Alpena keep up the great work.

RECOGNIZING DR. ALLAN ESCHER

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding physician and leader in the State of Florida, Dr. Allan Escher of Tampa, who has been named the 2026 Physician of the Year by the Florida Osteopathic Medical Association. Dr. Escher's distinguished career reflects an unwavering commitment to excellence in patient care, medical education, and ethical leadership. As a respected anesthesiologist, he has dedicated his professional life to ensuring the safety, dignity, and well-being of his patients—often during their most vulnerable moments.

In addition to his clinical work, Dr. Escher serves as Vice-Chair of the Clinical Ethics Committee at Moffitt Cancer Center, where he helps guide complex and compassionate decision-making for patients and families facing serious illness. His role as an Associate Professor at the University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine further demonstrates his commitment to mentoring the next generation of physicians and strengthening the future of healthcare in our state. Notably, Dr. Escher is the first anesthesiologist in the history of the Florida Osteopathic Medical Association to receive this prestigious honor—an achievement that underscores both his professional excellence and the profound respect he has earned among his peers. This recognition is a testament not only to Dr. Escher's clinical expertise, but also to his leadership in advancing patient-centered care and upholding the highest ethical standards in medicine.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Allan Escher on this well-deserved honor and in thanking him for his continued service to our community. His work exemplifies the very best of the medical profession and serves as an inspiration to us all.

HONORING AND COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF SEYMOUR WYATT, JR.

HON. MICHAEL A. RULLI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. RULLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Seymour Wyatt, Jr., a beloved constituent from Leetonia, Ohio, who passed away on March 20, 2026, at the age of 83. Born in Philippi, West Virginia, Mr. Wyatt served honorably in the United States Army from 1962 to 1965 and carried that same dedication into his work as a machinist, salesman, and security officer.

A devoted husband, father, and grandfather, he shared more than 60 years of marriage with his wife, Audrey, and leaves behind a proud legacy of children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. A proud patriot, Mr. Wyatt often reached out to my office to share his deep love for this country and belief in its promise. He will be deeply missed, and his life of service and devotion will not be forgotten.

I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in hon-

oring and remembering the life of Seymour Wyatt, Jr.

HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WESTERN GROWERS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues, Representative DAVID G. VALADAO, Representative JOHN GARAMENDI, Representative MIKE THOMPSON, Representative VINCE FONG, Representative SALUD CARBAJAL, Representative DAN NEWHOUSE, Representative ADAM GRAY, Representative ZOE LOFGREN, Representative JOSH HARDER, Representative GLENN "GT" THOMPSON, Representative GABE EVANS, Representative KEN CALVERT, Representative JEFF HURD, Representative JULIA BROWNLEY, Representative RAUL RUIZ, M.D., Representative ADELITA S. GRIJALVA, and Representative JIMMY PANETTA to recognize and honor the 100th anniversary of Western Growers for a century of commitment to western agriculture through advocacy and support, resulting in stronger unification and resilience for the industry that provides fresh fruits, vegetables, and tree nuts for our Nation.

Western Growers was founded on March 6, 1926, with the goal to manage and challenge mounting regulatory and transportation pressures. This kind of advocacy set a precedent of adaptive and robust support designed to keep its members competitive and profitable. For 100 years, Western Growers has been a steadfast voice for agriculture in state and national political arenas—championing policies that protect and advance the fresh produce industry.

To bolster its commitment to political alignment and advocacy, Western Growers established a presence in key political centers, opening offices in: Sacramento, California in 1980; Phoenix, Arizona in 1985; and Washington, D.C. in 2007. These offices have enabled Western Growers to develop valuable relationships with state and federal officials and agencies and navigate policies impacting the day-to-day farming operations of its members across our respective states.

By maintaining a constant presence where decisions are made, the organization has positioned itself as both a trusted advisor and a formidable advocate for the agricultural community. The legislative success of Western Growers on behalf of the agriculture industry can be attributed to the persistence and tenacity of its team of professionals. This includes expanding the specialty crop share within the Farm Bill, securing millions of dollars toward Western water infrastructure, leading negotiations for agricultural workforce reform, and elevating the need for improved federal pesticide and food safety policies to better account for fresh produce realities.

The century mark is a further testament to a commitment to longevity, and decades of looking ahead to foresee and mitigate challenges. Western Growers has repeatedly strived to match the resiliency and adaptability demonstrated by the agricultural stewards it represents by expanding its expertise and support throughout the organization. The in-

house Science and Innovation programs are particular points of pride as they focus on driving practical, scalable solutions in ag technology, sustainability, crop protection science, and food safety. Elsewhere, the H-2A services program provides critical support to growers navigating the complexities of agricultural labor and workforce management. Generations of producers also benefit from Western Growers' exceptional member services through its health and commercial insurance solutions, retirement security, legal counsel, employee training resources and more.

Growth has not been limited to programs alone. In the past decade, Western Growers expanded its geographic reach by bringing Colorado and New Mexico into its membership footprint, further strengthening its influence across the western United States. This expansion reflects a vision of unifying diverse agricultural regions under a shared mission: advancing the viability and competitiveness of U.S. specialty crop producers.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues to join us in celebrating Western Growers for 100 years of unwavering support for western agriculture and its goal to champion and strengthen an irreplaceable and vital industry that supplies fresh and healthy food to our Nation's population.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY SAMUEL
"SAM" RUBY

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Citrus County Sheriff's Office Deputy Samuel "Sam" Ruby for his exceptional professionalism, leadership, and unwavering commitment to public safety and community engagement. Deputy Ruby has consistently demonstrated a level of dedication that exceeds expectations throughout his distinguished career. Since joining the Citrus County Sheriff's Office in March of 2007, he has served in a variety of roles, including Patrol Deputy, Community Resource Officer, and Detective in multiple specialized units. His career progression reflects both his versatility and his commitment to serving in positions that require sound judgment and strong community relationships.

Throughout his tenure, Deputy Ruby has made significant contributions to both investigative operations and community policing efforts. He has served as a member of the Crisis Negotiation Team since 2013, where his calm demeanor, emotional intelligence, and communication skills have proven invaluable in high-risk situations. As the Community Resource Officer for the City of Inverness, he has built lasting relationships with residents and serves as a trusted presence within the community. Known affectionately by many as the "Mayor of Circle K," he engages with citizens daily, listening to concerns and strengthening trust between law enforcement and the public. Deputy Ruby's impact is especially evident in critical incidents requiring exceptional composure and skill. On August 8, 2025, he served as the primary negotiator during a tense standoff with an armed homicide suspect barricaded inside a residence. Over more

than four hours, Deputy Ruby demonstrated extraordinary patience, empathy, and tactical expertise, ultimately persuading the suspect to surrender peacefully without further injury or loss of life. This outcome marked a historic moment for the agency and exemplifies the highest standards of professionalism and crisis response.

Beyond emergency response, Deputy Ruby plays a vital role in organizing and supporting community initiatives, including the "Small Town Done Right" program, Patriotic Evening celebrations, and local events. He also serves as a mentor to newly assigned deputies, helping to instill the values of professionalism, compassion, and service.

These accomplishments reflect not only Deputy Ruby's expertise, but also his character, leadership, and deep commitment to the community he serves. He represents the very best of law enforcement.

I commend Deputy Samuel Ruby for his outstanding service to the residents of Florida's 12th Congressional District and proudly recognize him as a 2026 First Responder of the Year. His dedication, professionalism, and compassion embody the highest ideals of public service.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF CONGRESSMAN LARRY SMITH

HON. JARED MOSKOWITZ
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of former U.S. Congressman Larry Smith, whose dedication to public service, commitment to his community, and unwavering leadership left a lasting impact on the State of Florida and our Nation.

Born in New York City on April 25, 1941, Congressman Smith devoted much of his life to public service, civic leadership, and advocacy on behalf of the people of South Florida. After earning his law degree from Brooklyn Law School, he moved to Florida, where he quickly became engaged in local government and community affairs.

Congressman Smith began his public service career at the local level, serving as chairman of the Hollywood Planning and Zoning Board before being elected to the Florida House of Representatives in 1978. His strong commitment to his constituents and his ability to bring people together soon led him to the United States Congress, where he represented Florida's 16th Congressional District from 1983 to 1993.

During his tenure in Congress, Larry Smith worked tirelessly to advocate for the needs of South Florida families and communities. He was deeply committed to strengthening economic opportunities, improving infrastructure and transportation, and ensuring that his constituents' voices were heard in Washington, DC. He approached every challenge with determination, integrity, and a genuine desire to serve others.

Following his service in Congress, Congressman Smith remained active in public affairs and government relations, continuing to lend his experience and leadership to both the legal profession and the broader South Florida community.

Beyond his accomplishments in government, Larry Smith will be remembered for his kindness, mentorship, and devotion to his family and community. His impact extended far beyond elected office, touching the lives of countless individuals across Florida and our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we mourn his passing, we also celebrate a life dedicated to service and leadership. On behalf of the United States Congress, we extend heartfelt condolences to his family, loved ones, former colleagues, and all who had the privilege of knowing him.

RECOGNIZING OFFICER DALTON
GARAFOLO

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 13, 2026

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Dade City Police Department Officer Dalton Garafolo for his professionalism, initiative, and strong commitment to community service. Officer Garafolo has consistently demonstrated maturity and sound judgment beyond his years of service. Since joining the Dade City Police Department in December 2023 alongside his brother, he has quickly established himself as a dependable and proactive member of Uniform Operations. His approach to patrol reflects a strong work ethic and a commitment to public safety, resulting in meaningful traffic enforcement outcomes, including citations, arrests, and a measurable reduction in traffic-related incidents.

Throughout his early career, Officer Garafolo has distinguished himself by seeking opportunities for growth beyond his assigned duties. He voluntarily completed specialized training, including Glock Armorer School, to deepen his technical understanding of department equipment. He has also contributed ideas to enhance the department's social media outreach and is pursuing his associate degree, reflecting a clear dedication to professional development and long-term service.

Officer Garafolo also understands the importance of community engagement. He actively builds positive relationships with residents and participates in department outreach events, including youth tours. On one such occasion, he took time to speak with a young child aspiring to become a police officer, offering encouragement and presenting him with a junior badge. This small but meaningful interaction reflects his ability to connect with the community and positively influence the next generation. Even at this early stage in his career, Officer Garafolo leads by example. He is dependable, professional, and consistently team-oriented. His presence has contributed positively to shift morale, and he represents the department with distinction both on and off duty.

I commend Officer Dalton Garafolo for his outstanding service to the residents of Dade City and proudly recognize him as a 2026 Officer of the Year. His dedication, initiative, and professionalism embody the highest ideals of law enforcement.

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, May 14, 2026 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 19

8 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Business meeting to consider reconciliation recommendations to the Budget Committee.

SD-342

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold closed hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2027 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by an open hearing at approximately 11:00 a.m. in SD-G50.

SVC-217

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 Justice.

SD-138

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 Labor.

SD-124

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 Army.

SD-192

2 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Aviation, Space, and Innovation
To hold hearings to examine the evaluation of FAA safety measures from the DCA crash.

SR-253

2:30 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution
To hold hearings to examine enforcing *Callais*, focusing on implementing the Supreme Court's gerrymandering.

SD-226

3 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Department of Transportation.

SD-192

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities
To hold hearings to examine the science and technology priorities in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2027 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

MAY 20

10 a.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Technology, and Data Privacy
To hold hearings to examine betting, focusing on protecting sports integrity in America.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate, and Nuclear Innovation and Safety
To hold hearings to examine proposed legislation entitled, "Build Nuclear with Local Materials Act", "RECHARGE Act", and "Enrichment Licensing Modernization Act".

SD-406

Committee on Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Michael Kavoukjian, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Norway, Michelle Steel, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Korea, and Brock Dahl, of Mary-

land, to be Legal Adviser, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine meeting the individual needs of all students, focusing on the role of charter schools.

SD-430

10:15 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine certain pending nominations.

SD-106

2:30 p.m.
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 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

SD-124

Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Personnel
To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense personnel policies and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2027 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2027 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

SD-628

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Federal Courts, Oversight, Agency Action, and Federal Rights
To hold hearings to examine the Muslim brotherhood in America.

SD-226

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine blowing the whistle, focusing on inside the grift that keeps giving.

SR-428A

3:30 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To receive a briefing on anomalous health incidents.

SVC-217

Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine preventing falls and preserving independence, focusing on technology, community programs, and innovation in senior safety.

SH-216

4 p.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2027 and 2028 advance appropriations requests for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SD-G50

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2249–S2286

Measures Introduced: Nineteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4506–4524, and S. Res. 727–728. **Pages S2277–78**

Measures Passed:

Release of certain individuals: Senate agreed to S. Res. 728, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should prioritize securing the release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Jimmy Lai, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, and Ekpar Asat detained by the People's Republic of China during future engagements with Chinese President Xi Jinping. **Page S2283**

National Beef Month: Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 711, expressing support for the designation of May 2026 as “National Beef Month” to recognize the important role cattle play in the United States, and to consumers, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S2283**

Measures Considered:

Hostilities Within or Against the Islamic Republic of Iran: By 49 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 118), Senate rejected the motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 163, 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 50 U.S.C. 1546a and in accordance with section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act. **Pages S2250–55**

Withholding Pay of Senators During a Shutdown—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S.Res. 526, withholding the pay of Senators if a Government shutdown occurs. **Pages S2255–59**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 119), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn,

having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the resolution. **Page S2256**

Examinations for Risks to Active-Duty Servicemembers and Their Covered Dependents: By 48 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 121), Senate rejected Reed motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 132, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Examinations for Risks to Active-Duty Servicemembers and Their Covered Dependents”. **Pages S2264–65**

Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Deceptive and Unfair Collection of Medical Debt: By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 122), Senate rejected Warnock motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 141, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Deceptive and Unfair Collection of Medical Debt”. **Page S2265**

Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–05: Improper Overdraft Opt-In Practices: By 47 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 123), Senate rejected Van Hollen motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 130, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to withdrawal of the rule relating to “Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–05: Improper Overdraft Opt-In Practices”. **Pages S2265–66**

Fair Credit Reporting; Background Screening: By voice vote, Senate rejected Blunt Rochester motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 133, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted

by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Fair Credit Reporting; Background Screening”.

Page S2266

Fair Credit Reporting; Permissible Purposes for Furnishing, Using, and Obtaining Consumer Reports: By voice vote, Senate rejected Wyden motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 145, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Fair Credit Reporting; Permissible Purposes for Furnishing, Using, and Obtaining Consumer Reports”.

Pages S2266–67

Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Protections for Home Sales Financed Under Contracts for Deed: By voice vote, Senate rejected Schumer motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 149, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Protections for Home Sales Financed Under Contracts for Deed”.

Page S2267

Fair Credit Reporting; Name-Only Matching Procedures: By voice vote, Senate rejected Warnock motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 140, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Fair Credit Reporting; Name-Only Matching Procedures”.

Page S2267

Limited Applicability of Consumer Financial Protection Act’s ‘Time or Space’ Exception With Respect to Digital Marketing Providers: By voice vote, Senate rejected Blumenthal motion to proceed to consideration of

S.J. Res. 150, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Limited Applicability of Consumer Financial Protection Act’s ‘Time or Space’ Exception With Respect to Digital Marketing Providers”.

Page S2268

Fair Credit Reporting; File Disclosure: By voice vote, Senate rejected Kim motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 127, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the with-

drawal of the rule relating to “Fair Credit Reporting; File Disclosure”.

Page S2268

Fair Credit Reporting Act; Preemption of State Laws: By voice vote, Senate rejected Whitehouse motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 155, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Fair Credit Reporting Act; Preemption of State Laws”.

Pages S2268–69

Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (Regulation F); Time-Barred Debt: By voice vote, Senate rejected Kim motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 126, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (Regulation F); Time-Barred Debt”.

Page S2269

Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Pay-to-Pay Fees: By voice vote, Senate rejected Alsobrooks motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 125, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Pay-to-Pay Fees”.

Page S2269

Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–02: Deceptive Marketing Practices About the Speed or Cost of Sending a Remittance Transfer: By voice vote, Senate rejected Gallego motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 131, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–02: Deceptive Marketing Practices About the Speed or Cost of Sending a Remittance Transfer”.

Pages S2269–70

Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Credit Offered to Borrowers in Advance of Expected Receipt of Compensation for Work: By voice vote, Senate rejected Merkley motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 156, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Consumer Credit Offered to Borrowers in Advance of Expected Receipt of Compensation for Work”.

Page S2270

Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Revocations or Unfavorable Changes to the Terms of Existing Credit Arrangements: By voice vote, Senate rejected Booker motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 154, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Revocations or Unfavorable Changes to the Terms of Existing Credit Arrangements”.

Page S2270

Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–03: Unlawful and Unenforceable Contract Terms and Conditions: By voice vote, Senate rejected Cortez Masto motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 128, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–03: Unlawful and Unenforceable Contract Terms and Conditions”.

Pages S2270–71

The Fair Credit Reporting Act’s Limited Preemption of State Laws: By voice vote, Senate rejected Cortez Masto motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 129, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “The Fair Credit Reporting Act’s Limited Preemption of State Laws”.

Page S2271

Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition on Abusive Acts or Practices: By voice vote, Senate rejected Durbin motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 147, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Statement of Policy Regarding Prohibition on Abusive Acts or Practices”.

Pages S2271–72

Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Use of Digital User Accounts to Access Buy Now, Pay Later Loans: By voice vote, Senate rejected Welch motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 134, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Use of Digital User Accounts to Access Buy Now, Pay Later Loans”.

Page S2272

Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–04: Whistleblower Protections Under CFPA Section 1057: By voice vote, Senate rejected Welch motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res. 135, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to the withdrawal of the rule relating to “Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–04: Whistleblower Protections Under CFPA Section 1057”.

Page S2272

Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to invoke cloture with respect to S. 4344, to extend section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 for 3 years, be withdrawn.

Pages S2249–50

En Bloc Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that notwithstanding Rule XXII, the motion to invoke cloture with respect to the nominations to be considered en bloc, pursuant to S. Res. 690 (119th Congress) ripen at 1:45 p.m., on Thursday, May 14, 2026.

Page S2283

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 120), Kevin Warsh, of Florida, to be Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Pages S2260, S2286

Messages from the House:

Page S2275

Measures Referred:

Pages S2275–76

Executive Communications:

Pages S2276–77

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S2278–80

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

Pages S2280–82

Authorities for Committees to Meet:

Pages S2282–83

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S2283

Record Votes: Six record votes were taken today. (Total—123)

Pages S2255–56, S2260, S2265–66

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 7:44 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 14, 2026. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2283.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the Environmental Protection Agency, after receiving testimony from Lee M. Zeldin, Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

APPROPRIATIONS: GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the General Services Administration, after receiving testimony from Edward C. Forst, Administrator, U.S. General Services Administration.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS NUCLEAR SECURITY PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded open and closed hearings to examine the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration atomic energy defense activities in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2027 and the Future Years Nuclear Security Program, after receiving testimony from Christopher Wright, Secretary, Brandon Williams, Administrator of the National Nuclear Administration, and Timothy J. Walsh, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, all of the Department of Energy.

CYBER OPERATIONS AND READINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity received a closed briefing on cyber operations and readiness for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2025 and the first quarter of fiscal year 2026 from Katherine E. Sutton, Assistant Secretary for Cyber Policy, Brigadier General R. Ryan Messer, USAF, Deputy Director for Global Operations, J3, Joint Staff, and RADM Ronald A. Foy, USN, Director for Operations, J3, all of the Department of Defense.

UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2027 for the United States Forest Service, after receiving testi-

mony from Tom Schultz, Chief, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION BUDGET

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2027 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, after receiving testimony from Ho K. Nieh, Chairman, and David A. Wright, Bradley R. Crowell, Matthew J. Marzano, and Douglas W. Weaver, each a Commissioner, all of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

COVID

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine whistleblower testimony on COVID, after receiving testimony from James E. Erdman III, Senior Operations Officer, Central Intelligence Agency.

PROTECT KIDS ONLINE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology, and the Law concluded a hearing to examine how social media verdicts demand federal action to protect kids online, after receiving testimony from Rachel Lanier, The Lanier Law Firm, Los Angeles, California; Joann Bogard, ParentsSOS, Wadesville, Indiana; Mary Graw Leary, The Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law, Washington, D.C.; and Bridgette Norring, Devin J. Norring Foundation, Hastings, Minnesota.

SMALL MANUFACTURERS

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine industrialization and the rise of small manufacturers, including S.1555, to increase loan limits for loans made to small manufacturers, and H.R. 3174, to increase loan limits for loans made to small manufacturers, after receiving testimony from Edward Hill, The Ohio State University John Glenn College of Public Affairs and Ohio Manufacturing Institute, Columbus; Danielle M. Petrak, West Virginia University Watts Museum, Morgantown; and Bill Zoeller, Zoeller Company, Louisville, Kentucky.

VA POLICE OPERATIONS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine Veterans Affairs police operations, after receiving testimony from Reginald G.A. Neal, Assistant Secretary, and Patrick L. Hernandez, Director of Security and Law Enforcement, both of the Office of Operations, Security, and Preparedness, Mark Engelbaum, Assistant Secretary for Human Resources and Administration, and Chad Allan, Chief of Police, Robert J. Dole, VA Medical Center,

Wichita, Kansas, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Triana McNeil, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office; and Matthew Leffler, American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

SUPPORTING FAMILIES

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine supporting families in the sand-

wich generation, after receiving testimony from Karla Radka, Senior Resource Alliance, Orlando, Florida; Jason Resendez, National Alliance for Caregiving, Washington, D.C.; Josh Protas, Meals on Wheels America, Arlington, Virginia; Rebecca Preve, Association on Aging in New York, Albany; and Meghan Maher, Windermere, Florida.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 31 public bills, H.R. 8776–8806; and 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 184–185; H. Con. Res. 100; and H. Res. 1279–1283 were introduced. **Pages H3452–53**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H3454–53**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows: Joint Economic Committee. Report of the Joint Economic Committee on the 2026 Economic Report of the President (H. Rept. 119–649);

H.R. 3766, to prohibit the District of Columbia from requiring tribunals in court or administrative proceedings in the District of Columbia to defer to the Mayor of the District of Columbia’s interpretation of statutes and regulations, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–650); and

H.R. 7082, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide for greater flexibility in the Federal programs supporting the planning and implementation of charter schools, with an amendment (H. Rept. 119–651).

Page H3452

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Bean to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H3397**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:47 a.m. and reconvened at 12 p.m. **Page H3402**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:09 p.m. and reconvened at 2:45 p.m. **Page H3417**

Nationwide Consumer and Fuel Retailer Choice Act: The House passed H.R. 1346, to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid Vapor Pressure under that Act, by a yeas-and-nay vote of 218 yeas to 203 nays, Roll No. 164.

Pages H3421–28, H3435–36

Rejected the Perry motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Energy and Commerce by a yeas-and-nay vote of 112 yeas to 309 nays, Roll No. 163.

Pages H3428, H3435

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 119–28 shall be considered as adopted. **Pages H3421–22**

H. Res. 1224, the rule providing for consideration was agreed to Wednesday, April 29th.

Providing that section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect: The House agreed to H. Res. 1274, providing that section 11 of House Resolution 1224 shall have no force or effect, by a recorded vote of 213 yeas to 208 noes, Roll No. 161, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nay vote of 211 yeas to 206 nays, Roll No. 160. **Pages H3410–17, H3419–20**

Expressing support for law enforcement officers: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 96, expressing support for law enforcement officers, by a yeas-and-nay vote of 243 yeas to 173 nays with three answering “present”, Roll No. 165. **Pages H3428–34, H3436**

H. Res. 1275, the rule providing for consideration was agreed to by a recorded vote of 214 yeas to 208 noes, Roll No. 159, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nay vote of 211 yeas to 208 nays, Roll No. 158. **Pages H3404–10, H3418–19**

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and agree to the following measures. Consideration began Tuesday, May 12th.

Resolution memorializing law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty: H. Res. 1252, resolution memorializing law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ yeas-and-nay vote of 418 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 162; **Pages H3420–21**

Calling on elected officials and civil society leaders to counter antisemitism and educate the public on the contributions of the Jewish-American community: H. Res. 1251, calling on elected officials and civil society leaders to counter antisemitism and educate the public on the contributions of the Jewish-American community, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 419 yeas with none voting “nay”, Roll No. 166; and

Page H3437

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should prioritize securing the release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, and Jimmy Lai detained by the People's Republic of China during future engagements with Chinese President Xi Jinping: H. Res. 1259, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should prioritize securing the release of Pastor Jin Mingri, Pastor Gao Quanfu and his wife Pang Yu, Dr. Gulshan Abbas, and Jimmy Lai detained by the People's Republic of China during future engagements with Chinese President Xi Jinping, by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-a-and-nay vote of 414 yeas with none answering “nay”, Roll No. 167. **Pages H3437–38**

Directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran: The House considered H. Con. Res. 75, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Further proceedings were postponed. **Pages H3439–46**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Eight ye-a-and-nay votes and two recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H3418, H3418–19, H3419–20, H3420, H3420–21, H3435, H3435–36, H3436, H3437, and H3437–38.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2027. The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2027 was ordered reported, as amended.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE FISCAL YEAR 2027 BUDGET REQUEST FOR SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces held a hearing entitled “Department of the Air Force Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces”. Testimony was heard from William D. Bailey, Performing the Temporary Duties of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of the Air Force; and Lieutenant General David H. Tabor, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, Department of the Air Force.

BUILDING A SAFER FUTURE: PRIVATE-SECTOR STRATEGIES FOR EMERGING SAFETY ISSUES

Committee on Education and Workforce: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled “Building a Safer Future: Private-Sector Strategies for Emerging Safety Issues”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

WIRES, RATES, AND STATES: PERMITTING TRANSMISSION FOR RELIABLE AND AFFORDABLE POWER

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy held a hearing entitled “Wires, Rates, and States: Permitting Transmission for Reliable and Affordable Power”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 4348, to reauthorize the Kay Hagan Tick Act, and for other purposes; H.R. 4541, the “EARLY Act Reauthorization of 2025”; H.R. 3747, the “Accelerating Access to Dementia and Alzheimer's Provider Training Act”; H.R. 8209, the “School-Based Health Centers Reauthorization Act of 2026”; H.R. 5160, the “Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Reauthorization Act of 2025”; H.R. 8205, the “Accelerating Access to Critical Therapies for ALS Reauthorization Act of 2026”; H.R. 2715, the “Destruction of Hazardous Imports Act”; H.R. 2821, the “FDA Modernization Act 3.0”; H.R. 5347, the “Health Care Efficiency Through Flexibility Act”; and H.R. 1703, the “Choices for Increased Mobility Act of 2025”.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 5396, the “Price Stability Act of 2025”; H.R. 2978, the “GUARD Act”; H.R. 2152, the “AI PLAN Act”; H.R. 4801, the “Unleashing AI Innovation in Financial Services Act”; H.R.

8278, the “FUTURES Act”; and H.R. 8671, the “Bank Fraud Technology Advancement Act of 2026”. H.R. 5396, H.R. 2978, H.R. 2152, H.R. 4801, H.R. 8278, and H.R. 8671 were ordered, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 8649, to amend the Arms Export Control Act to authorize the use of foreign military financing for direct commercial contracts, and for other purposes; H.R. 8665, to require the implementation of a strategy to encourage foreign partners to participate in the foreign military sales and direct commercial sales processes on a multinational basis, and for other purposes; H.R. 8661, to authorize the Secretary of State to provide certain direct loans and loan guarantees for the procurement of defense articles, defense services, and design and construction services, and for other purposes; H.R. 8019, to authorize International Military Education and Training Assistance for Greece; H.R. 8562, to designate a building of the Chancery of the United States in Pristina, Kosovo, as the “Eliot L. Engel Building”; H.R. 7037, to promote United States and allied energy and mineral security, and for other purposes; H. Res. 64, affirming the Alliance Between the United States and the Republic of Korea; H.R. 8668, to reduce recurring reporting requirements imposed by law on the Department of State; H. Res. 1179, 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; H.R. 3563, to improve defense cooperation between the United States and Taiwan, and for other purposes; and H.R. 4332, to establish a comprehensive United States Government initiative to build the capacity of young leaders and entrepreneurs in Africa, and for other purposes. H.R. 8665, H.R. 8661, H.R. 8019, H.R. 7037, H.R. 8668, H. Res. 1179, H.R. 3563, H.R. 4332 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 8649, H.R. 8562, and H. Res. 64 were ordered reported, without amendment.

SHARIA-FREE AMERICA: WHY POLITICAL ISLAM & SHARIA LAW ARE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE U.S. CONSTITUTION: PART II

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution and Limited Government held a hearing entitled “Sharia-Free America: Why Political Islam & Sharia Law are Incompatible with the U.S. Constitution: Part II”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EXAMINING THE PRESIDENT’S FY 2027 BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the President’s FY 2027 Budget Request for the Department of the Interior”. Testimony was heard from Doug Burgum, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF WAR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT: EXAMINING PROGRESS AND NEW AUDIT APPROACHES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing entitled “DoW Financial Management: Examining Progress and New Audit Approaches”. Testimony was heard from Ryan A. Busby, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Operations, U.S. Army; Thomas Harker, Deputy Chief Financial Officer, U.S. Department of War; Asif Khan, Director, Financial Management Assurance, Government Accountability Office; and Brett Mansfield, Deputy Inspector General for Audit, U.S. Department of War, Office of Inspector General.

EXPANDING THE MISSION: THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR WARRIOR INDEPENDENCE IN WEST LA

Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Expanding the Mission: The Future of the National Center for Warrior Independence in West LA”. Testimony was heard from John J. Bartrum, Under Secretary for Health, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; Jim Zenner, Executive Director, Department of Military and Veteran Affairs, Los Angeles County, California; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2026

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for Military Construction and Family Housing, 10 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2027 for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold closed 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 an open hearing at approximately 10 a.m. in SD-G50, 8 a.m., SVC-217.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider H.R. 3633, to provide for a system of regulation of the offer and sale of digital commodities by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 10:30 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 3966, to prohibit the enforcement of certain contractual clauses that restrict disclosure of sexual abuse of minors, S. 736, to increase the penalty for prohibited provision of a phone in a correctional facility, S. 825, to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, S. 4394, to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to improve the COPS program with respect to training command-level personnel, S. 3897, to revise administrative procedures relating to public safety officers' death benefits, S. 1890, to establish a grant program for certain State and local forensic activities, S. 3041, to allow the U.S. Marshals Service to assist in certain Tribal criminal matters, and the nominations of Justin D. Smith, of Missouri, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Jeffrey M. Kuhlman, Anthony W. Mattivi, and Anthony J. Powell, each to be a United States District Judge for the District of Kansas, Timothy VerHey, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Michigan, James Arnott, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Missouri, Jack Chambers, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of West Virginia, and Jason Holt, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Oklahoma, all of the Department of Justice, 9 a.m., SH-216.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2027 Budget Request", 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Cyber, Information Technologies, and Innovation, hearing entitled "Science, Technology, and Innovation Posture of the Department of Defense", 3 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Workforce, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Examining the Policies and Priorities of the Department of Education", 10:15 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Environment, markup on H.R. 2145, the "Recycling Infrastructure and Accessibility Act"; H.R. 4109, the "Recycling and Composting Accountability Act"; and H.R. 8739, the "Brownfields Revitalization for a Better Tomorrow Act", 10:15 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Europe Subcommittee, hearing entitled "Securing NATO's Eastern Frontier: Assessing the Strategic Landscape in the Baltic Region", 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence, markup on H.R. 7443, the "I&A Mission Reorientation Act of 2026"; H.R. 7764, the "National Threat Evaluation and Reporting Program Reassignment and Funding Reform Act of 2026"; H.R. 7574, the "ELO Realignment and Strategic Engagement Reform Act of 2026"; H.R. 8142, the "Special Events Program Alignment Act of 2026"; H.R. 7448, the "Modernizing and Improving the National Terrorism Advisory System Act of 2026"; H.R. 7427, the "SAFE VISITS Act"; and H.R. 7436, the "Department of Homeland Security Intelligence and Analysis Training Act", 3 p.m., 310 Cannon.

Committee on House Administration, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 8720, the "Campaign Finance Transparency Act"; H.R. 8721, the "Preventing Foreign Interference in Americans Elections Act"; H.R. 7418, the "Securing Tech and Election Administration Defenses for All States and Territories Act"; H.R. 3535, the "Stop Foreign Funds in Elections Act"; H.R. 6028, the "Legislative Branch Agencies Clarification Act"; H.R. 8738, the "FEC Administrative Improvements Act"; and H.R. 7182, the "Voter Outreach for Transparent Elections", 9:45 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement, hearing entitled "Fairfax County, Virginia: The Dangerous Consequences of Sanctuary Policies", 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Natural Resources, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 741, the "Stronger Engagement for Indian Health Needs Act of 2025"; H.R. 3924, the "Wildfire Risk Evaluation Act"; H.R. 5694, the "ARTIST Act"; H.R. 7250, to reauthorize the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System Act of 2000; H.R. 7487, the "Rural Jobs and Hydropower Expansion Act"; and H.R. 7831, the "License to Drill Act", 10:30 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement, hearing entitled "Privacy Protections and the Second Amendment: Examining ATF's Relationship to the Tiahrt Amendment", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 5634, the "Veterans Flight Training Responsibility Act of 2026"; H.R. 7083, the "CRUISE Act"; H.R. 7103, the "Improving Emerging Tech Opportunities for Veterans Act"; 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. 7950, the "VA Congressional Accountability Act"; H.R. 7683, the "VA Fiscal Management and Modernization Act"; H.R. 8052, the "VIP Act"; H.R. 6698, the "Board of Veterans Appeals Annual Report Transparency Act of 2025"; H.R. 3159, the "Improving SCRA Benefit Utilization Act"; H.R. 5436, the "End Transcript Withholding for Veterans Act"; H.R.

5999, the “Veteran Opioid Emergency Treatment Act”; H.R. 8010, the “VA Police Recruitment and Retention Act of 2026”; H.R. 7260, the “National Cemetery Administration Annual Report Act of 2026”; H.R. 5723,

the “Fraud Reduction And Uncovering Deception in VA Disability Exams Act”; and Leasing Resolutions, 2 p.m., 360 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, May 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will be in a period of morning business. Senate should expect a vote on or in relation to S. Res. 526, Withholding the Pay of Senators During a Shutdown at 12 noon. Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nominations to be considered en bloc, pursuant to S. Res. 690 (119th Congress) at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, May 14

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of H. Con. Res. 75—Directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove the United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E438, E442
 Bilirakis, Gus M., Fla., E437, E438, E439, E440,
 E441, E442, E443, E443

Castro, Joaquin, Tex., E442
 Cleaver, Emanuel, Mo., E439
 Costa, Jim, Calif., E437, E440, E442
 Harder, Josh, Calif., E441
 Kelly, Trent, Miss., E440

Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E439
 Moskowitz, Jared, Fla., E437, E440, E443
 Omar, Ilhan, Minn., E439
 Rulli, Michael A., Ohio, E438, E442
 Soto, Darren, Fla., E441



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.