



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2026

No. 120

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.

Almighty God, source of all goodness, use our lawmakers today for Your glory. Make them undaunted people, striving to know Your will and experience Your power.

Lord, provide them with exactly what they need to accomplish Your purposes. May they receive Heaven's approval for their faithful service to You and country.

Lord, transform their complex problems with solutions from Your throne.

We commit the work of this day to You, receiving Your strength to honor Your Name.

We pray in Your glorious 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.

ETHANOL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, once again, I am here to educate my colleagues about the necessity for passing the ethanol issue of E15 in this Congress.

As Iowa families are going on their summer vacations and people visit or pass through my home State, we are seeing the evidence in Iowa that drivers are demanding E15 with their pocketbooks.

New data from the Iowa Department of Revenue shows Iowa drivers purchased 47 million gallons of E15 in May. This is a new monthly record. That puts E15 on track to be about 50 percent of all gasoline sales in Iowa in 2026, up from 27 percent last year.

Drivers know that E15 delivers lower costs for families, saving them up to 40 cents per gallon. This can be hundreds of dollars per year, giving working families more money for groceries, housing, and necessities.

When Iowans are allowed to make choices at the pump, more are choosing E15. The growth of E15 in Iowa shows that American consumers want this chance to save money. This is another reason why the Senate must pass year-round E15, putting \$14 billion more in the pockets of farmers with the increased price of corn.

CAITLIN CLARK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on a second matter, I want to talk about Caitlin Clark, a native of West Des Moines, IA. Caitlin Clark played basketball at the University of Iowa. She changed women's college basketball but also inspired athletes of all ages across all sports. She plays professionally for the Indiana Fever.

Since joining the professional ranks 3 years ago, Caitlin has been the subject of very unfair treatment on the basketball court, and the referees are not doing their job.

Recently, she got a fist to her throat by a player. Yet, the refs at the time

did not call a foul. I am glad that the WNBA corrected this matter a few days later by charging a foul and suspending the player, but the unfair treatment of Caitlin and others in the WNBA has got to stop.

Officials are human, but we have seen time after time where Caitlin has suffered physically—beyond what you would expect in competitive professional sports—with little accountability from the people that run the WNBA or from the referees.

So I hope for Caitlin—and for the growth of women's basketball—things improve quickly in the WNBA. Caitlin is a generational talent. Her hard work and dedication should be rewarded, not penalized.

She has revolutionized WNBA. Attendance has shot up since she has been with the Indiana Fever, and income has shot up for the league and their teams. Salaries for players went from five figures to six figures, all because of her playing. So every player of all teams are better off. They should be thanking Caitlin as opposed to mistreating her on the floor.

Someday I would like to meet Caitlin Clark.

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.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4203

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 833.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter Clayton, of New York, to be Director of National Intelligence.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 833, Walter Clayton, of New York, to be Director of National Intelligence.

John Thune, Tom Cotton, Jon Husted, Alan Armstrong, Jim Banks, Bernie Moreno, Chuck Grassley, John Barasso, Marsha Blackburn, Joni Ernst, John R. Curtis, Roger F. Wicker, Pete Ricketts, Katie Boyd Britt, Bill Hagerty, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Mike Crapo.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Senate is in the middle of a busy work period, and we have a lot to accomplish in the coming weeks and months. We have some great opportunities for bipartisan collaboration: market structure legislation; the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia Act; the National Defense Authorization Act; PISA.

But at the top of the list right now is funding the government. If there is any responsibility we have as Members of Congress, it is that. And our country cannot afford another shutdown like the two shutdowns we have experienced over the course of this fiscal year. Shutdowns take a toll on our economy, on our national security. They create havoc at airports. And, of course, they take an incredible toll on hard-working Americans inside and outside the government whose paychecks depend on the government being open.

I think a lot of Americans remember pretty clearly what things looked like during the Democrats' two record-breaking shutdowns this past year: government workers lining up at food banks, charging essentials on credit cards, and taking up any work they could find in hopes of being able to make ends meet; government services reduced; national security Agencies strained.

I don't think any American who traveled will forget the effect those two shutdowns had on air travel: hourslong TSA lines snaking around airport concourses and out airport doors; canceled and delayed flights; a nationwide reduction in air traffic, when our air traffic control system could no longer safely maintain regular flight schedules.

The list goes on.

We cannot—cannot—have this again, and that is why I have asked Appropriations Chair COLLINS to draft a bipartisan and clean continuing resolution to fund the government until after the November election. I intend for the Senate to vote on that before we head to our States to work during August.

The Senate Appropriations Committee is hard at work reviewing anomalies from OMB to ensure we have a bipartisan product ready to move quickly. No one is served by our waiting until the last minute to take this up.

And after all that our country has been through with the past two shutdowns, the American people deserve to have confidence that the government will be open and running, not to mention the fact that government employees—like our own staffers and the Capitol Police officers standing guard around this building—deserve to know that their paychecks will be coming.

It was not a good year on the government funding front, with two record-breaking government shutdowns, but we have an opportunity now to chart a new path.

I am encouraged that, so far, my Democrat colleagues have signaled that they do not want to force another government shutdown, and I appreciate Chair COLLINS' work to engage with Democrats and produce a bipartisan continuing resolution.

No one—no one—is served by a shutdown, not either political party, and most of all not the people that we represent.

So I look forward to bringing up a bipartisan CR in the coming days, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation and give the American people the certainty that they deserve.

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.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Donald Trump's cavalier disregard for the lives of our servicemembers is beneath contempt and beyond despicable.

In a Truth Social post, yesterday, Trump seemed to brag that 18 servicemembers had been killed in his disas-

trous Iran war compared to the tens of thousands who died in Vietnam.

Donald, stop treating our servicemembers' lives like they are points on a scoreboard in your twisted game.

Asked about his handling of the Iran war, yesterday, Trump said:

I think people are very impressed.

Very impressed? What kind of bubble does he live in?

Every survey shows how much the American people are against this war. Americans are not impressed that Trump has botched this war from the start. Americans are not impressed when they see headlines like the one behind me right here—that the price of gasoline is back over \$4 a gallon because of Trump's war. And Americans are certainly not impressed that 18 Americans have been killed and hundreds more wounded and that Trump has tried to cover it up.

Donald Trump may believe that, if he conceals the casualties, Americans will forget the war. But our servicemembers are not numbers to bury. They are human beings with families who have lives. They are the sons and daughters, husbands and wives, and mothers and fathers who are sent into harm's way without a strategy for bringing them home—and bring them home we must.

This week, Senate Democrats will force another vote on our War Powers Resolution to end this unauthorized war and get our troops out of harm's way. Every Senator will have to make a choice. You cannot claim to support the troops while leaving them trapped in a war with no mission and no end. You cannot call it a victory while the battlefield keeps expanding. And you cannot hide the wounded and call it peace.

AIR FORCE ONE

Now, Mr. President, on Air Force One, Donald Trump's corruption truly knows no limits. Apparently, it wasn't enough for Trump to charge the American people for his golden ballroom on the ground. Now he wants the taxpayers to fund his palace in the sky as well. Trump's \$400 million foreign jet—the biggest gift a President has received from a foreign government ever—is anything but free. Taxpayers will have to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to outfit Trump's luxury jet with the security upgrades it needs to serve as Air Force One.

I am advancing the Presidential Air-lift Security Act for immediate passage to ensure that Americans don't have to foot the bill to "max out" Trump's luxury jet when he already has access to a perfectly fine Air Force One. There is no way we are letting Trump charge Americans so he can fly in style while they are struggling to make ends meet.

I introduced this legislation last year, but every single Republican Senator voted against the bill. Senate Republicans cleared the way for Trump's Air Force One spending spree. I urge my colleagues across the aisle not to

repeat the same mistake. Trump always finds a way to saddle the American people with the cost of his corruption. We have an opportunity to stop it. Will our Republican colleagues join us to make that happen?

Democrats will continue to expose how the Trump administration's corruption is driving up Americans' costs every chance we get—the slush fund, an exemption from taxes, what he did on his own social media in charging people for it, and now this Air Force One corruption. Every day—just about every day—there is a new story about how Trump's corruption is rampant and raises the costs of the American people.

ELECTION PROTECTION TASK FORCE

Mr. President, on the Election Protection Task Force, Donald Trump knows he can't defend Republicans' disastrous record. So he is attacking the midterm elections that could hold him accountable. Instead of trying to earn Americans' votes, Trump is trying to discount them.

That is not going to happen, Donald. Today, Senate Democrats' Election Protection Task Force will gather for a second time to war-game responses and to plan how we can counter Trump's effort to subvert our elections. We are going to red-team a number of different instances that Trump might try to subvert our election and what we will do to counter them. We are fighting to protect the right of every eligible American voter to cast a ballot and to have it counted without interference, intimidation, or obstruction.

Our task force is preparing, over and over again, to meet the election threats we know are coming. We are bringing together top experts to identify threats to the election, to test responses, and to strengthen our defenses because we are defending the American people's right to vote and have a free and fair election. We are preparing our responses to what they might do now so that voters can have confidence later.

Trump is doing everything he can to undermine confidence in our elections because he knows just how bad of a bind he is in. The Trump administration has made life harder and more expensive for the American people. Trump knows Americans won't ignore the higher costs, the rampant corruption, and the widespread chaos he has unleashed on our country, which is why he is trying to ignore their votes altogether. But this country and this election belong to the American people, not to Trump. Democrats are going to make sure it stays that way.

NOMINATION OF CHARLTON ALLEN

Finally, Mr. President, on the Charlton Allen nomination, you know, it is no secret that the Trump administration is chock-full of people who have a known history of racism, anti-Semitism, and other forms of prejudice; and Trump's nominee for general counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, Charlton Allen, is no exception to this.

Back in 1996, Allen published a front-page article in his student newspaper that included a cartoon depicting a Jewish candidate for student president as the devil. Allen's article explicitly highlighted the candidate's Jewish identity and parroted numerous anti-Semitic tropes. Allen also reportedly displayed homophobic signs around campus and even drew comparisons between homosexuality and bestiality. He also wrote other articles that were racist and Islamophobic.

A bigot like Allen doesn't belong on the board of a student newspaper, let alone in a Presidential administration. Every Senate Republican ought to be against this guy.

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

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

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Martin nomination.

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

WORKING FAMILIES TAX CUT ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the American people deserve to have more money in their own pockets. The Working Families Tax Cut law made that happen. Republicans stopped the largest single tax increase in American history. That is what the Democrats wanted.

Americans already filed their taxes this year, and working families are keeping more of what they earned, and the data proves it.

More than 7½ million Americans benefited from the no-tax-on-tips policy that we put into place right here on this Senate floor. So today, there are waiters, barbers, bartenders, tour guides—all were able to claim deductions—and it averaged over \$7,100 in deductions—because of no tax on tips. More than 29 million Americans benefited from no tax on overtime. These are firefighters, police officers, and nurses. They are linemen and coal miners in Wyoming. They claimed an average deduction of over \$3,000—all as a result of the law the Republicans have passed. Money that once went to bureaucrats in Washington, DC, now stays in the pockets of hard-working Americans, and that is where it belongs.

Had Democrats gotten their way, taxes would have gone up by a lot. Every Democrat in this Chamber voted to continue taxing tip income, overtime income. They just wanted to get a hand on people's money. Every Democrat voted to raise taxes by \$4 trillion. Well, because Republicans were in the majority in the Senate and in the

House, we were able to stop this Democrat price increase and tax increase.

Now what we see is that extremist Democrats in Governor mansions across the country and State legislatures are trying to undermine the Working Families Tax Cut law, and they are doing it in city halls and in State capitals.

In Washington, DC—right here—the city council tried to force hard-working Americans to pay taxes to the city. They can't force them to pay it to the Federal Government; hey, the city wants the money on tips and on overtime. The city council of Washington, DC, refused to allow the hard-working waiters, bartenders, police officers, and firefighters to keep that hard-earned money. They didn't have to pay it on Federal taxes, but local taxes in DC—the DC city council said: Give it to us. This is the city that is soon going to get a socialist mayor, just like they have in New York City right now.

Right now, in 21 different States, we have far-left Governors refusing to allow the tax cuts that we passed to be passed down to the State level. So Democrats in California, in New York, in Minnesota, Illinois, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Virginia continue to take away people's tip money and overtime money so they can spend it locally. That is the States and the cities, not the people, the individuals.

So just like Democrats here in Congress, the leaders in Democrat States around the country want to raise taxes, not cut them. They believe they can spend your money better than you can. They believe they make better decisions than you do. They decide, and you end up as a loser if you are living in one of those liberal States.

Well, we know why Democrats refuse to loosen the grip on your tax dollars. Democrats want to take more money out of your pocket to give free healthcare to illegal immigrants. And that is what we see in so many of these States with sanctuary cities, sanctuary States—free healthcare. And it is not free. People pay for it. It is taxpayers. It is people going to work every day and having their tax dollars taken to pay for healthcare for illegal immigrants. That seems to be part of the manifesto that the extremists in the Democrat Party are trying to slam down the throats of American taxpayers.

We know these extremists are winning Democrat primaries all across the country. Their manifesto includes mass amnesty, open borders, and elimination of Immigration and Customs Enforcement in the country. That is what they are demanding, and it is not for the benefit of the American people. That is the agenda of the radical left.

In far-left States, from California to Minnesota, we have seen their policies in action. Working families are overtaxed, and fraud is out of control.

Now Democrats are going to make life less affordable. That is what we see. That is their model. Take it to the

government; they know better than we do as taxpayers. That is not what the American people want.

Here is what Republicans are doing: We are protecting taxpayers. We are putting more money back in their pockets so they can decide how to spend it, how to save it, and what to invest in. We are fighting the fraud. And that is what I hear about so much in Wyoming—the fraud in Democrat States that Democrats ignore, that Democrats enable. It is awful fraud. You look at it and say: How can this continue?

Just this week, Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent announced that we stopped nearly \$100 million in taxpayer money from going to dead people—going to dead people.

Just yesterday, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services stopped more than \$1 billion in Medicaid funding from going to California and Minnesota. Why? Because of fraud and failure to comply with the regulations to make sure that the money is actually not wasted, that the money is spent as it is supposed to be—taking care of people who need those services, and there are people who need those services. Every time a fraudster takes \$1 or \$100 or \$1,000 or \$1 million, that is services that don't go to people that need them, desperately need them.

Here in the Senate, Senator JONI ERNST of Iowa is a leader in the war on fraud. When it comes to exposing that fraud, Senator ERNST is both a watchdog and an attack dog. She has proposed a comprehensive anti-fraud piece of legislation. Her bill cracks down on fraud. It claws back stolen money. It prosecutes the crooks and the criminals and the scammers who prey upon the taxpayers. I support what Senator ERNST is doing. I am a cosponsor. Her anti-fraud legislation would save taxpayers \$240 billion. That is what kind of fraud is out there.

Senator SCHUMER recently said on this very floor that Democrats want to fight corruption. It is time for Democrats to prove it.

Republicans are cutting taxes. We are stopping fraud. Democrats, on the other hand, are voting to raise taxes and, up until now, have been protecting the fraud.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to react to the statement of my friend and colleague from Wyoming. I am against fraud. That is it. On the record: I am against fraud. I am a Democrat, and I don't know where he reached this different conclusion, but I want to make it very clear.

Having said that, I am also a realist. I know that the families I represent in Illinois and across the Nation are facing budgets, family budgets, which are impossible to live with. They are not only struggling paycheck to paycheck, they are also watching the price of groceries go up. They know the price of

gasoline goes up and down, and now it is on the upward trend because of the President's war in Iran. Utility bills in my State are up 15 percent this year over last year because of President Trump's energy policy, which is opposed to sustainable, renewable sources of energy, which are the most affordable. The list goes on and on.

The Big Beautiful Bill, which Republicans brag about, was a bill that ended up with millions of Americans losing their health insurance because the cost of premiums had gone up too high.

So I think it is just great that we have tipped income exempt from taxes and that other breaks are given to working people. I would support those any day. But the bill that created those also gave the biggest tax cuts in the history of the United States to the wealthiest people in the United States—nothing, very little, for families in comparison. That is the difference.

I think we ought to be honest with the American people. The No. 1 issue in this campaign is the affordability that families worry about every single week. There is an issue I am going to address here more particularly, which gets to the heart of this as well.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. President, in 1983, I was elected to the House of Representatives. I was a freshman Congressman and as nervous as any politician could be. I had defeated a Republican incumbent to come to the House, and I was just sure, looking over my shoulder, there was an issue, a press release, a vote that was going to do me in in the next election. I was as nervous as could be.

In the midst of that situation, I had a visit from the leaders of the U.S. House of Representatives, and they said: Congressman DURBIN, there is news for you which may decide your fate in the years to come.

I said: What is it?

Social Security is about to go broke.

In 1983, we faced the possibility that we would not be able to make the promised Social Security payments to beneficiaries across America.

I couldn't imagine a tougher challenge. One of the most popular programs in America, one out of five Americans on Social Security—and in 1983, it faced the situation where they couldn't make their payments as promised.

And so I proposed a Commission to take a look at it—a bipartisan Commission—and come up with changes in Social Security in 1983: raise the retirement age, raise the amount of money paid by employers and employees into Social Security, and tax income from Social Security for the first time.

These changes were not easy. Some were controversial, but we knew we had to do it. Our goal was to buy 50 years of solvency for Social Security with the changes in 1983. You know, what? It worked.

It worked to the point where we just had an announcement last week by the

trustees in bankruptcy that the system will make every payment promised until the end of 2032—50 years after the 1983 changes were made.

So the promise was kept, but then the problems arise. After that, the Social Security trust fund will not have enough money to pay the promised benefits.

What does that mean? Well, go back to my notation that one out of five Americans receive Social Security—either elderly or disabled receive Social Security. Out of those, one out of five of the recipients of Social Security have no other source of income.

The average Social Security check in America is about \$2,400 a month. The announcement, according to the trustees, is each one of those recipients will see their monthly paycheck cut between \$450 and \$500. So if \$2,400 is the average payment and there is a cut of \$400 to \$500, you can imagine the impact it will have on families. They will be making some very difficult decisions because one out of five, as I mentioned, Social Security recipients have no other source of income. They depend on Social Security.

What happens when those people lose \$450 to \$500 a month? They have to make hard decisions on prescription drugs; on paying some utility bills and not others; on groceries—what they are able to buy, if anything. So it boils down to a very terrible situation, a terrible challenge.

So the obvious question from the American people, just those receiving Social Security today as well as those that will in the future is, What is Congress going to do about it now? In 1983, you responded with 50 years of solvency by changing the policy. What is the plan in the current situation where we face another dramatic situation with Social Security?

And the answer is, if you look at the agenda of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, this year we are going to do little or nothing—little or nothing.

Why is it important that we move now instead of waiting another year, 2, 3 years before we do something? It becomes more expensive and more difficult the longer you wait to fix Social Security. The sooner you do it, the easier it is.

And it won't be totally easy. There will be some changes people will like and some they won't like. But the bottom line is, the longer Congress waits to act on Social Security, the more expensive it will be, the more difficult the policy choices will be.

I have reached out to several of my colleagues saying: Can we finally agree, as Democrats and Republicans, that the No. 1 social policy of the U.S. Government, Social Security, should be a bipartisan issue that we address?

Well, it turns out that four Republicans joined me as well as three other Democrats, and we have eight members, Democrats and Republicans, who are supporting the bill that I call the PROMISE Act.

What is the PROMISE Act? Is it the solution to the problem with Social Security? No, but it is a procedure so that we can reach that solution.

Here is what it says: We are going to set up a system where the Social Security Advisory Board sends us a proposed change in Social Security. That is the starting point—just the starting point—for hearings and for a national discussion about where we want Social Security to go at the end of 2032.

That does not presume any solution. There are many Senators who have come up with ideas on what to do with Social Security—some surprising. A Republican Senator from Ohio joined a Democratic Senator from Massachusetts just 2 weeks ago, and they came up with a bipartisan proposal to save Social Security beyond 2032. The same thing has been offered by the Senator from Vermont and other Senators. They have ideas. The junior Senator from Rhode Island has a proposal as well.

What I am trying to do is not to pick the winners and losers, not to choose one plan over others but to create a process on the floor where we actually, physically, verbally debate the issue.

Trust me, Congress is not overworked. The House of Representatives taking off this week for 4 or 5 weeks of being back home for the August recess is fine. We do it every year. But before they leave, I think they should take up some procedure that says we are going to return to fix Social Security after the August recess.

The same thing should be true in the Senate. It is a bipartisan Senate in one respect, but the majority is on the Republican side. If they believe Social Security is important enough to make it a priority, let's put it on the legislative agenda when we return this year. Let's give peace of mind to the millions of Americans who currently live with Social Security benefits and those that work every week and every month paying into Social Security for their own retirement in the future.

This is not easy, but it is doable. I was part of that process many years ago, and I want to be part of it again before I retire at the end of this year.

So we have a bipartisan procedure. It does not assume any changes. It basically says we have to reach a point where we pass something that gives us another 50 years of solvency for Social Security.

It is not too much to ask. I have seen it done. I voted for it 50 years ago, and I am prepared to vote again if we have—not quite 50 years ago. It was 44 years ago I did it, and I would do it again. It is a challenge, which I think we can meet. We have the bipartisan starting point: the PROMISE Act.

I want to see, I hope, a bipartisan vote to set up that procedure that we will return to in September or October of this year so that we get something done and we give peace of mind to the people who are depending on Social Security for their future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Iowa.

THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again, as I have before, to discuss misleading reporting in the New York Times.

The New York Times has a global reputation. They work hard to maintain that. So I don't understand why their journalists can miss so many important facts. This time the misleading article was written by Devlin Barrett and a second one was written by Charlie Savage.

Barrett's article discusses the White House's release of government records about an alleged scheme by China to meddle in the 2020 election. The records at issue showed that FBI personnel suppressed intelligence of that alleged Chinese interference.

Barrett's article said, in part:

Mr. GRASSLEY and others have cited the Albany memo as evidence that F.B.I. leaders covered up evidence that China might be taking aggressive steps to interfere with the U.S. election results in 2020, because admitting it might contradict prior testimony to Congress from then-F.B.I. Director Wray.

That is not what I said when I made those records public. That is what the FBI said 6 years ago.

The Albany memo, as the New York Times called it, is actually an FBI memo. It contained information from an FBI Confidential Human Source and was titled by the FBI. The titles by the FBI:

Chinese Government Production and Export of Fraudulent U.S. Driver's Licenses to Chinese Sympathizers in the United States, in Order to Create Tens of Thousands of Fraudulent Mail-in Votes for US Presidential Candidate Joe Biden, in late August 2020.

End of the FBI title.

Let me emphasize what I said. The memo was an FBI memo based on an FBI Confidential Human Source. It was not a CHUCK GRASSLEY-created memo.

The FBI analyst involved said the FBI memo "was coordinated and disseminated in textbook fashion."

But based on the records the FBI provided to me, the allegations weren't fully investigated at the time because the FBI decided to recall its own memo.

The FBI also described the FBI's sources as competent and authentic with reporting. So let the FBI do their job and investigate.

An FBI analyst said in an email—and when I quote this email, the words "me" and "I" refer to the FBI analyst.

Most concerning to me, is stating the reporting would contradict Director Wray's

testimony. I found this troubling because it implied to me that one of the reasons we weren't putting this out is for a political reason, which goes directly against our organization's mission to remain apolitical and simply state what we know. . . . My concern is that I think it gets dangerous if we cite potential political implications as reasons for not putting out our information.

This FBI analyst raises legitimate concerns. Is the New York Times digging into those concerns? In other words, is the New York Times journalist doing what journalists should be doing? They ought to be good investigators, get all the facts.

And guess who was involved in recalling the FBI memo: That person was then-Deputy Assistant Director Nikki Floris. She was also the main briefer for the fake briefing Senator JOHNSON and I received in August of 2020 from the now-disbanded Foreign Influence Task Force. You will remember, that was the briefing that was used to attack the Grassley-Johnson Biden family investigation.

So I ask, Is the New York Times investigating that material connection?

By the way, my and Senator JOHNSON's investigation was based on authentic bank records, authentic Treasury records, authentic Obama administration records, and transcribed interviews. In other words, it was not Russian disinformation, as the partisan media tried and failed to argue.

Here, with this FBI memo, I released records last year because the facts and evidence ought to breathe. Let the American people see what is happening on their watch.

I also issued the records as support to those FBI agents and analysts who were just trying to do their job under extreme pressure from inside the FBI.

I don't know why people in the FBI care if the truth gets out, but a lot of people at the FBI get pressured not to let the truth out. And I want you to know that I will continue to make records public because that is what the taxpayers need and deserve and expect.

As I said last July about this same FBI memo:

One way or the other, intelligence must be fully investigated to determine whether it's true, or if it's just smoke and mirrors.

End of this Senator's quote from last July. That is a quote, by the way, that the New York Times failed to mention.

Now, turning to the Savage article from the New York Times, Charlie Savage wrote in part:

Since President Trump returned to office last year, the senator—

Referring to CHUCK GRASSLEY—has released a flood of internal law enforcement files that normally would be off limits to disclosure, sometimes attributing them to "whistle-blowers" or not saying who gave them to him.

The New York Times seems to be very obsessed with how I have obtained government records, maybe because they haven't been able to or maybe they haven't even tried to get these records. For too many years, the executive branch, under both Republicans

and Democrats, has failed to produce certain records to the Congress of the United States. The fact that the Trump administration has produced what the New York Times believes wouldn't be normally produced ought to be good news to the American people and good news to the New York Times. You see, these records are exactly the type that should be produced to Congress just as a matter of course, and the Trump administration understands that, and I thank them for their cooperation.

Now, I am still not fully satisfied. There are many more records that ought to be public. For many years, whistleblowers have been hard at work to expose those and many other records. As difficult as it may be for the partisan media to understand this, I have made public thousands of pages of records to this Congress pursuant to lawful whistleblower disclosures. True whistleblowers stick their neck out just for telling the truth, and they do it no matter the risk to them. And a lot of these whistleblowers ruin themselves professionally by just doing what the law requires. So when I do get records, I owe it to the whistleblowers to make those records public. That is called congressional oversight, and it is my constitutional responsibility to get the job of congressional oversight done as the Constitution requires.

This Senator's work will continue. I encourage the Trump administration to continue making records public for transparency, and hopefully the New York Times will get future stories right.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the previously scheduled vote to begin now.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin M. Flowers, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

VOTE ON FLOWERS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Flowers nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—5

Budd	McConnell	Tillis
Coons	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). 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.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 829, Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Thom Tillis, Rick Scott of Florida, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Bernie Moreno, John R. Curtis, Chuck Grassley, Jim Banks, Mike Crapo,

James Lankford, Kevin Cramer, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons), is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Armstrong	Graham	Moran
Banks	Grassley	Moreno
Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Peters
Boozman	Heinrich	Ricketts
Britt	Hirono	Risch
Capito	Hoeven	Rosen
Cassidy	Husted	Rounds
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kaine	Shaheen
Crapo	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cruz	King	Slotkin
Curtis	Lankford	Sullivan
Daines	Lee	Thune
Durbin	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Whitehouse
Fetterman	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

NAYS—35

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Kelly	Schatz
Bennet	Kim	Schiff
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Lujan	Smith
Booker	Markey	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Budd	McConnell	Tillis
Coons	Murkowski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 35. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

HONORING TYLER FEEHAN

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I am heartbroken on behalf of everybody in

Hawaii and everybody across this country about the death of 1LT Tyler Feehan of Ewa Beach, HI, who was among those killed in Jordan this past weekend while serving our country. His courage, his dedication, and his unwavering commitment to duty reflect the very best of our Armed Forces. We extend our deepest condolences to his family, his loved ones, and to his fellow servicemembers.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. President, it shouldn't be this difficult to get the State Department to follow the law. Earlier this year, when we passed the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill on a bipartisan basis, we were very clear that the spending requirements in it were not suggestions; they were a matter of law. We are not asking the State Department to do us a favor and spend the money we provided; we made a law. Yet we are still having to fight tooth and nail with the State Department officials to get money out to the people in places around the world that are counting on the United States of America.

Let's take funding for Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance. For months, the administration has been withholding \$600 million which is meant to help millions of children get vaccinated against preventable diseases, including Ebola, cholera, and mpox.

And even though the Secretary has told us repeatedly, including in a hearing last month, that he will personally see to it that this money is released, it is still stuck. Why? Because people at HHS, who have their own views and theories about vaccines, keep blocking it.

Here is the thing: This funding is in the State Department's budget. HHS has no jurisdiction here. And I want to be really clear about this. Sure, this is a jurisdictional dispute. Sure, this is a legal matter. A, this is a law, not a suggestion. B, this just doesn't go through HHS; they have no jurisdiction here.

Why am I so animated about it? It is because little kids are not getting vaccinated right now.

Gavi, the global Vaccine Alliance, they come to us, and they articulate to us that children across the planet are getting sick unnecessarily because they are not getting vaccinated. What happened was, because of the COVID pandemic and the disagreement about mandatory COVID vaccines, now certain people are so brain-poisoned that we think we shouldn't even prevent disease in children. And kids are dying because the United States is sitting on its butt, not disbursing money that is a matter of law.

Here is another example with the Global Fund. Last week, after months of fighting to release funding, the administration finally made a \$661 million contribution to the Global Fund, which will help to fight deadly epidemics like HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria by providing medicines and

strengthening health infrastructure. But even then, the administration is still withholding close to \$2 billion in additional contributions, all while HIV prevention is falling, malaria is surging, and we are trying to contain multiple outbreaks globally, including Ebola.

When the Congress got all animated about attacking USAID, it was because: Hey, we want to help PEPFAR; we want to help Gavi; we want to help the Global Fund. We want to be the good guys around the world, but let's not do all this cultural stuff. Let's not waste all this money on superfluous stuff.

And do you know what is happening? They eliminated a tiny portion of the tens of billions of dollars that get pushed out every year—tiny—and I mean we are talking tens of millions versus tens of billions. That was like cultural stuff and arguably—arguably—progressive or leftwing, a tiny portion of it.

But I want everybody to understand what they did in the process. They cut previously bipartisan priorities, and lots and lots of people died. These are not bureaucratic mixups. Every day that this money doesn't get to where it is supposed to go, every contribution worth hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars is delayed, people go hungry, people get sick, people die.

That is what has made what happened last year at USAID particularly cruel. The richest man in the world wanted to send USAID to the wood chipper, and this Congress and this Senate ratified those decisions. And yet we worked with the Secretary and we worked with appropriators on both sides of the aisle and we worked with the great, late Senator Lindsey Graham—may his memory be a blessing—to reestablish the principle that the United States is the good guys and that it is not just the example of our power but the power of our example that makes the United States the indispensable Nation. We are the good guys. And when a batch of aid medicine or communications infrastructure or food arrives with that little patch with "United States of America" on it, people go: Help is on the way. The good guys are here.

And so we got through this process on the appropriations side to reestablish the principle that USAID, in its new iteration, under mostly the State Department, is still a bipartisan priority. And there are lots of people who believe that. But the State Department is not executing on these dollars. And the consequences are geopolitical, but they are also human. People are still literally dying because we are not pushing this money out.

And just so you know that I don't think this is an entirely partisan question, there were Democrats, people who consider themselves Democratic strategists, who said out loud—who said out loud—that Democrats were walking into a trap because USAID doesn't poll well.

I don't care if it polls well. I am not here to have a pollster tell me that I shouldn't care that kids are getting malaria. I am not here to get talked out of the United States being the good guys because healthcare polls higher, because the cost of gasoline polls higher. I am not deciding what to put into a 30-second spot. I am deciding how to use the power given to me by the people of the State of Hawaii, and I think they care about whether people die unnecessarily because of the stupidity of this Congress. And I want everybody to know what is happening now, in addition to all that money being still throttled.

So there were parades and festivals and other things that were funded that ended up on a FOX News chyron that were embarrassing to USAID. And I would say about two-thirds of them were just flatly untrue, but some of them actually happened.

So the idea—I went to Lindsey, I went to Marco, I went to MARIO DIAZ-BALART, I went to LOIS FRANKEL, I went to JOHN THUNE, and I went to others, and I said: Look, you are pushing on an open door. If the principle here is USAID should stick to its knitting, stay in a narrow couple of lanes—foreign military financing, economic assistance, disaster response, and humanitarian assistance—and we should do nothing superfluous, you are pushing on an open door. If you would like USAID to be a little more aligned with the State Department and not working sort of against each other's interests—even in country—fine, you are pushing on an open door.

So that is what we tried to ratify in the last appropriations bill. But here is the crazy thing. It is not that they are not spending money on ideological projects. They have just decided to spend money on their own ideological projects. So instead of vaccinating little kids against deadly diseases, they are now spending millions of dollars to help British nonprofits—one of them recently established and now receiving \$7 million from United States taxpayer dollars—to help British nonprofits report on whether free speech is being censored in London.

This is how they explained the funding:

American diplomacy should continue to stand up for genuine democracy, freedom of expression, and unapologetic celebrations of European nations' individual character and history.

Just so we are all clear, they were trying to get out of the business of saving lives in order to get into the business of promoting "unapologetic celebrations of European nations' individual character and history." That is what we are now paying for with our tax dollars.

Here is another one. They want to send millions of dollars to protect free speech and foster dialogue in the UK, Europe, and Australia—not Equatorial Guinea or Eswatini, which despite

being among the world's most repressive governments, the Trump administration is still sending tax dollars to them.

They are going after our allies. Is the UK or the EU or Australia a threat to democracy?

One more example: The State Department set up a \$200 million fund to make private sector investments in and around Armenia, and the guy they appointed to lead it just so happens to be one of Trump's ballroom donors and has deep business ties in the region.

You could have made a credible argument that USAID strayed from its central mission by supporting societal and cultural activities, that it tried to do too many things in too many places and that actually focusing our efforts on a few key priorities was a better strategy. But they didn't do that. They have just picked their own rightwing version of wokeness to fund with taxpayer dollars.

And so we are only partially through metabolizing what has happened to foreign aid globally and in the United States. The good news is that we have reestablished the bipartisan principle that we should still be present in the world, that we should still alleviate suffering, that we should still provide economic assistance, that we should still respond to disasters, that we should still do foreign military financing, and that all of that is the right thing to do because we are the good guys. And, also, all of that is the right thing to do because it is way cheaper than any military engagement, and winning hearts and minds is just a hell of a lot cheaper than going to war. And so we reestablished that principle in the legislative context.

But now the State Department has to start executing on what the law says. And this is not like the USAID thing, where we gave them a pile of money and gave them the authority to do a bunch of grants and then they canceled a bunch of grants and moved things around. I may have objected to that, but that was permissible. What they are doing now is not permissible. PEPFAR money is not a choice they get to make; it is a choice we already made. Gavi money is not a choice they get to make; it is a choice we already made. The Global Fund money is not a choice they get to make; it is a choice we already made. These are things in statutory law.

They are not the Ford Foundation, where they say: Well, we have changed our grant criteria.

This is a matter of Federal law, and they have to follow it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

WAIVING QUORUM CALLS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the Pozos and Traynor nominations.

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

Mrs. FISCHER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1804

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Trump's corruption has no ceiling, and it apparently doesn't have an altitude limit either. Trump's \$400 million luxury jet is the single biggest bribe an American President has ever accepted from another country in all of American history—the single biggest bribe in all of American history. And make no mistake about it, Trump's so-called palace in the sky is a boondoggle at 40,000 feet.

If you thought this illegal gift was bad before, it is even worse now. We just learned that this new jet wasn't safe enough for Trump to make the return flight from the NATO summit in Türkiye, a country that borders on Iran. It doesn't have the countermeasures for heat-seeking missiles and the other security equipment that it needs to keep the President safe.

The rest of the Air Force One fleet had all these security features, but Trump left them in the hangar back at home.

So I call on Senate Republicans to pass my Presidential Airlift Security Act so Americans don't have to pay to upgrade Trump's luxury jet when he already has access to a fleet of U.S. planes that are far safer and far less expensive to maintain.

The luxury jet may have come wrapped in a bow for Donald Trump, but it came with a massive price tag for the American people. Trump is asking taxpayers to fork over an estimated \$1 billion to retrofit and max out his flying palace so it can meet the security standards of the existing Air Force One fleet that, of course, we already paid for.

Americans can't afford gas, can't afford groceries, can't afford the electric bill, but Trump thinks they can afford to fly him in style.

Trump's luxury jet also poses a great risk to our national security. All the experts agree: no matter how many modifications are made or how much is spent or how intensely it is retrofitted, there will never be 100 percent confidence that the plane is secure. This is not a gamble anyone should be willing to take.

I introduced this legislation last year, but every single Republican Senator voted against the bill. Now, with this new information, hopefully they will see the light, what a boondoggle this is.

Why do they back up Trump on every one of his boondoggles that is as plain as can be for Americans to see is a gross waste of taxpayer dollars and gross corruption?

Why don't they ever stop him?

Whether it is the slush fund, the ballroom, the family tax exemption deal, or this Air Force One nonsense, we see a new grift coming out of this administration every day.

Where are the Republicans?

Senate Republicans need to stop letting Trump off the hook for fleecing the American people.

And so, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1804; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to say a few words about Senator SCHUMER's legislation on the Presidential airlift.

This has been discussed before, and it was voted down earlier this year as part of a vote-arama that we participated in.

Senator SCHUMER's legislation would prevent any funding to be used to modify a foreign aircraft for Presidential airlift. We made this point during the vote-arama. The Senator is trying to make a political point today, of course, about the VC-25 Bridge aircraft, which was made in America and then owned by Qatar.

Unfortunately, this legislation would also apply to a different aircraft, the Survivable Airborne Operations Center aircraft, or SAOC. Those aircraft were actually purchased from Korean Air. So this legislation would hamper a crucial program that ensures Presidential safety in the event of a nuclear war.

Thus, Senator SCHUMER's bill would significantly harm our U.S. nuclear deterrents. To be clear, the SAOC is the cornerstone of our NC3 modernization. This is the plane that will command and control our nuclear weapons on America's worst day.

We cannot play these political games with the NC3. So with that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Nebraska.

SANCTIONING RUSSIA ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, Lindsey Graham, a friend, a colleague, and a tireless national security advocate. He was a true leader in strengthening our military and our country's defense, and I miss him dearly. I am so pleased that his sister DARLINE now serves here in this institution. She is carrying on his legacy and honoring his commitment to the people of South Carolina and to this country.

So I rise here today to, yes, pay tribute to Lindsey Graham, but to also call on my colleagues to help us carry on one of his greatest efforts: ending Putin's barbaric and unjust war against sovereign Ukraine.

For more than 4 years, the Ukrainian people have shown extraordinary resilience and resolve. They have defended their homeland with courage that has inspired the world.

In 2022, Putin thought he could seize eastern Ukraine in days. He thought he

could drag Europe back into the dark shadow of the Soviet Union. He thought that he would be feared and respected.

But he is neither strong nor powerful; he is a war criminal.

Putin has made clear his intentions to push beyond Ukraine and into NATO territory. Russian drones have encroached on Polish, Finnish, Lithuanian, Latvian, Estonian, and Romanian airspace. These were deliberate—deliberate—provocations to test NATO's resolve.

Putin seeks to push deeper into Europe to see just how far he can go before we push back. That is why the United States and our allies must raise the stakes through tougher sanctions and a stronger United States' deterrence posture along NATO's eastern flank.

I commend the Polish and Dutch, German, and the Italian Armed Forces for their swift and also their professional response in intercepting drones that could have killed innocent civilians during these incursions. Their actions remind us that NATO's strength lies in that unity and readiness.

President Trump has made clear that Europe must carry more of the burden for its own security. Poland, in particular, has answered that call, committing 5 percent of its GDP to defense. Other allies are stepping up as well.

This is the path forward, a stronger more capable NATO prepared to deter but also to defeat any threat. But make no mistake on this: Putin understands only one language, and that is power. The surest road to peace in Europe lies in NATO's strength and Ukraine's survival.

Yet, strength must also be economic. The Kremlin's war machine runs on money it makes from selling cheap oil and gas to countries like China and India and Brazil. Those nations, well, then they profit by turning around and reselling Russian energy at a markup, and that must end.

It is long overdue for the financial enablers of Russia's atrocities to pay a price. They cannot keep fueling Putin's war and expect business as usual with us, with the United States.

That is why Congress must pass the Sanctioning Russia Act. This legislation would impose mandatory sanctions on Russia's political leadership, financial institutions, energy sector, and sanctions evasion networks. By employing targeted tariffs, this policy would pressure the world's largest purchasers of Russian energy to reduce their dependence on Moscow.

This gives the President maximum flexibility to enforce these measures, ensuring both legal strength and political durability.

I am grateful to Senator BLUMENTHAL who worked closely with Lindsey on this important bipartisan legislation, and I am encouraged to see him carry this effort forward.

I was proud to be an early supporter of the bill, and I am proud to support

this updated version now. The Sanctioning Russia Act is the sledgehammer that we need, decisive economic pressure that cripples Putin's lifeline, and it hastens the day that his war with Ukraine is finally going to end.

Peace will not come from weakness or hesitation; it will come from strength—military, economic, and moral strength, welded together by the free nations of the world.

So I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join our broad coalition in supporting this bill. Let us carry on Lindsey's mission. Let us stand up to evil. Let us bring freedom and security to the people of Ukraine.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from North Dakota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 811

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight and ask unanimous consent to pass a resolution I introduced to call for greater action from the Canadian Government to fight the almost annual wildfires that send smoke over the border, blanketing much of the United States.

Over the past several days, more than 100 million people nationwide have been under air quality alerts due to the smoke from Canadian wildfires. This smoke has real impacts to the health and well-being of individuals and families. In my home State of North Dakota, this is an issue we are very familiar with. Unfortunately, over the past number of summers, we have been experiencing hazy skies from wildfires in Canada.

The United States and Canada have a longstanding and close relationship based on our shared values and common interests. I know; I grew up 50 miles from the border. But with that shared border between the United States and Canada, we need to manage it to the benefit of the people that reside in both countries. I mean, we have water that flows up into Canada, and we are always working on water quality issues and all those kinds of things. We understand that what we do here in the United States affects our friends in Canada as well.

So we feel for those in Canada whose homes and communities are directly impacted by the fires. We also recognize and thank the thousands of firefighters and emergency responders who are working to combat wildfires and protect lives and personal property under dangerous conditions.

But at the same time, we need responsible forest management, including hazardous fuels reduction, timber harvesting, grazing, and other forest

restoration practices that help reduce the severity and frequency of catastrophic wildfires.

With more than 3,640 wildfires in Canada this year alone, it is clear that more action needs to be taken to prevent and stop these fires. And, in fact, in the United States, we have worked many years to help our friends in Canada battle these fires, but, clearly, more action needs to be taken.

So the resolution I have introduced does three things: Specifically, it recognizes the significant impact that smoke from the Canadian wildfires has on the safety, health, and well-being of the American people, and it calls upon the Government of Canada to take responsibility for the cross-border impact of these wildfires, including immediate efforts to extinguish the fires and prevent their reoccurrence. And finally, the resolution urges President Trump to further discuss with Canadian Prime Minister Carney the importance of extinguishing these fires and finding ways to prevent their reoccurrence, something that we can do together and we should do together for the mutual benefit of both our great countries.

So with that, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 811, which is at the desk. I further ask 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I am going to ask pretty bluntly, what on earth are my colleagues doing here? I don't know why Republicans are focused on making a really petty and offensive statement to Canada, saying they need to do a better job of containing wildfire smoke as if the Canadian Government is letting their forest burn and its own citizens inhale wildfire smoke just to spite us. This is a joke. Maybe my colleagues across the aisle don't realize this, but Canadian firefighters cross that border to help us fight our wildfires right here all the time.

And guess what. Our firefighters do the exact same when they are able. In fact, for the information of all Senators, a firefighter actually just passed away who was helping us fight a wildfire in Colorado; he was from British Columbia.

Now, what we don't do is pass resolutions here telling our friends and our neighbors to do a better job of handling wildfire smoke.

And also, maybe somebody should alert the President and my colleagues, but wildfire smoke from the United States often makes its way into Canada. It is happening right now where wildfires are burning in Oregon and in Washington.

I think what this might be really about is telling Trump that, Mr. President, look how much we agree with you.

This is a waste of everybody's time. So, respectfully, to my colleagues, understanding that time on the Senate floor is precious, here are my suggestions: Maybe we should pass legislation to rehire all of the red card holders that Trump fired. Those are the Forest Service employees who are trained here to help fight wildfires.

Or how about we pass legislation to stop the Trump administration's so-called reorganization of the Forest Service, which would actually shutter offices across our country, including the research labs that helped us study the wildfires and pushed out even more Forest Service employees.

Or maybe instead of entertaining Trump's outrageous requests for a \$1.5 trillion war budget, Republicans could work with us to adequately fund our needs here at home.

Our Forest Service, right here in the United States, is understaffed and underresourced. Maybe my colleagues don't realize it, but Trump's chaotic funding cuts and freezes, along with the chaotic mass layoffs, have actually hurt our public lands and leave us here less prepared to prevent and respond to wildfires here at home.

I remember speaking with a Forest Service ranger last year. He was a longtime dedicated employee. He was a former marine. He served our country in more ways than one, and he did an incredible job. He literally saved people's lives on forest trails, and he fought wildfires here and even saved a small rural town in my State from being burned to the ground. Know what happened to him? Trump and DOGE fired him. No cause, just fired him. That was a huge loss for our State and for our country.

So I do want my colleagues to get serious about the wildfires. And I will just say this, the President should actually apologize to our Canadian neighbors for the many threats and insults and, of course, drop those absurd tariffs he is imposing on these wildfires. I am not holding my breath, so enough with gimmicks, Mr. President. You want to work together to prevent wildfires? My door is wide open, and I hope we can all work together to do that.

But I will tell you what I am not going to do: insult our Canadian friends to suck up to a President who does nothing but threaten our neighbors.

Thank you, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, if I could, I am wondering if my colleague heard the speech I just gave. I guess I want to repeat it because maybe she might have missed it.

The United States and Canada—this is what I said, so I can't think of a bigger mischaracterization of what I just said. And I am not even sure why. If

she wanted to come down and criticize our President, that is fine. She can do that, I guess, whenever she wants if that is what she wants to do. But to completely mischaracterize what I said, I don't think is fair.

So I am going to reiterate what I said just a minute ago for the record.

The United States and Canada have a long-standing and close relationship based on our shared values and common interests.

I even referenced the fact that I grew up 50 miles from the Canadian border. I went back and forth to Canada so many times I couldn't even count.

But, and I go on, with a shared border between the United States and Canada, we want to manage it to the benefit of people residing in both countries.

We feel for those in Canada whose homes and communities are directly impacted.

I am reading from the speech I just wrote; I was listening to the mischaracterization.

We also recognize and thank the thousands of firefighters and emergency responders who are working to combat wildfires and protect lives and personal property under dangerous conditions.

At the same time, we need responsible forest management, including hazardous fuels reduction, timber harvesting, grazing, and other forest restoration practices that help reduce the severity and the frequency of catastrophic wildfires.

With more than 3,640 wildfires in Canada this year alone, it is clear that more action needs to be taken to prevent and stop these fires.

That is what I am calling for. And in the resolution itself, I make it very clear that this is something that is important to benefit both countries.

So, again, you know, I think it would be—if my colleague wants to object, I understand she has that right. But I think it is unfair to characterize that other than I am saying we need more action on these wildfires.

Now, if she feels we don't need more action on these wildfires, it is just fine, OK. But she shouldn't misrepresent what I am trying to do, which is call attention to the fact that we need more work done so we can avoid these wildfires in the future and that that is something that is mutually beneficial for both of our Nations.

And with that, I would yield the floor to my colleague the good Senator from Ohio.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if I could respond quickly. If the Senator would just let me respond quickly before you pass it on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, let me just say to my friend, and he is a friend, and I do hear his quiet, calm tone. I appreciate it. It is not something we all often hear here. But I will say this, in the words that you hear from this resolution, if you are a Canadian, it is that we are insulting them by saying you are not trying to fight your forest fires.

And I will tell you this, I am working my tail off to help us fight our

wildfires; our Canadian friends are as well. And I think, in this very heightened time—when I know I don't live far from the border either; we have a lot of trade with our Canadian friends; we go back and forth—they feel very insulted by a lot that is going on. So I think this adds fuel to that fire.

So what I say to my friend, let's work on our country, making sure that we are fighting our forest fires, which I outlined in my response to you, of some of the things we can do, and I believe that our Canadian friends are doing the same. But that is why I object at this time.

Mr. HOEVEN. And to my colleague from Washington, we work together on many things, important things. I appreciate that. I think we both come from border States and recognize the importance of this incredible bond and relationship that we have with our friends in Canada, and I want to make clear, I have tremendous respect, appreciation, and admiration for our friends and allies and that this is about working together for mutual benefit.

And with that, I would yield to my good friend and colleague from the State of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, very briefly, let me make a couple of things clear. This resolution isn't about insulting Canadians; this resolution is about calling out inept leaders in Canada. I have total and complete respect for the people of Canada. Unfortunately, they are victimized by terrible leaders.

To just turn a blind eye to the fact that they just dumped in your State and my State the equivalent of a year's worth of auto pollution in America, on the Midwest, and pretend it isn't man-made—they don't have centralized response.

This idea that they helped us is totally false. They charge us to come to the United States to help put out our forest fires that, by the way, are also created by ineptitude in Washington, Oregon, and California. And then when our firefighters ask to go to Canada to help them, they prevent them from coming in.

So this is completely a manmade disaster, but it is not made by the people of Canada; it is made by the leaders of Canada. And shame on them, and shame on anybody apologizing for what they are doing to the people of our States.

VOTE ON MARTIN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Martin nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Armstrong	Graham	Moreno
Banks	Grassley	Paul
Barrasso	Hagerty	Peters
Blackburn	Hawley	Ricketts
Boozman	Heinrich	Risch
Britt	Hirono	Rosen
Budd	Hoeben	Rounds
Capito	Husted	Schmitt
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Justice	Shaheen
Cotton	Kaine	Sheehy
Cramer	Kennedy	Slotkin
Crapo	King	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Curtis	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Lummis	Tuberville
Durbin	Marshall	Whitehouse
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fetterman	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—36

Alsobrooks	Hassan	Reed
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Bennet	Kelly	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Klobuchar	Schumer
Booker	Lujan	Smith
Cantwell	Markey	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

McConnell Murkowski

The nomination was confirmed.
(Ms. LUMMIS assumed the Chair.)

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 831, Antonio M. Pozos, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Thom Tillis, Rick Scott of Florida, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Bernie Moreno, John R. Curtis, Chuck Grassley, Jim Banks, Mike Crapo, James Lankford, Kevin Cramer, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd.

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 nomination of Antonio M. Pozos, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Ex.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—2

McConnell Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 44. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Antonio M. Pozos, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1689

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am beginning a series of Senators who are speaking about Haiti and TPS.

The Haitian community is woven into the fabric of our great American family, but Donald Trump is trying to tear it apart by terminating Haiti's temporary protected status.

As someone who takes great pride in representing the State that is home to the largest Haitian population in the country, I know just how important the Haitian community is to the American economy, to culture, to society.

But, unfortunately, Donald Trump clearly doesn't. Trump has vilified Hai-

tians with his bigoted attacks and stereotypes, over and over again. Now, Trump is trying to force Haitians who are here legally to return to the dangerous conditions they fled in Haiti.

Let's be clear: Revoking Haitians' temporary protected status will not only hurt them; it hurts our entire country.

In New York, you can't go into a hospital, a nursing home, or a clinic without seeing scores of dedicated healthcare professionals who are fiercely proud of their Haitian heritage. That is true in cities and towns throughout the country.

We have heard warnings that if Trump expels our Haitian TPS holders, it will strain our health system and create a gap in our caregiving workforce that will be difficult to fill.

These people are our friends. They are our neighbors. They take care of the elderly and people with disabilities. They are entrepreneurs and small businessowners. They work hard and pay taxes.

Let's not forget Haitian TPS holders add nearly \$6 billion to the U.S. economy each year.

Ending TPS doesn't fix our broken system; it only makes things worse. It is cruel. It is counterproductive. Sending 300,000 people to Haiti with little or no support will further destabilize an already severe humanitarian and security crisis on our country's doorstep.

I urge all of my colleagues to support our legislation and preserve Haitians' TPS status. I will keep fighting for Haitian Americans in New York and beyond—any time, any place.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 1689, a bill to designate Haiti for Temporary Protected Status through March 20, 2029.

I thank my colleagues Senator MARKEY and Senator BLUNT ROCHESTER for their leadership on this important humanitarian issue.

This bill passed the House on a strong bipartisan vote, and the Senate should pass it as well. Supporting this legislation is the right thing to do; nationals of Haiti cannot safely return to their home country.

The Department of State has issued a level 4 travel advisory, telling Americans that it is unsafe to travel to Haiti due to the risk of crime, kidnapping, terrorism, civil unrest, and limited healthcare.

The Federal Aviation Administration prohibits U.S. carriers from flying to Haiti because of the danger to planes of being shot at by the gangs.

But this bill is not just a humanitarian action. Haitian TPS holders have become integral parts of their communities.

In fact, our former Senate colleague Mike Dewine—now the Republican Governor of Ohio—called the Trump administration's decision to terminate Haiti's TPS "a mistake" and a "job killer" that is "not in the best interest of the United States nor Ohio."

He noted that Haitian TPS holders are opening small businesses, working, and raising families in Ohio communities.

Illinois is no different; hundreds of Haitian families in Illinois will be impacted by the terminations of TPS.

In fact, there are 350,000 Haitian TPS holders nationwide, with 50,000 U.S. citizen children who will be harmed by the administration's decision to terminate Haiti's TPS.

They work in critical industries, providing essential care to our elderly and harvesting the food that we rely on each day.

Business organizations and labor unions have warned that the decision to end work authorization for many TPS holders could have sweeping consequences for both workers and the U.S. economy.

DHS Secretary Mullin has tried to deflect, saying, "Either try to fill out the paperwork and be here underneath a permanent status, or we'll help you get back to your country."

But he leaves out the important part: The Trump-Mullin Department of Homeland Security has indefinitely banned processing for any immigration application from a Haitian national. So there is no way for Haitians TPS holders to apply for permanent status.

The administration's goal is clear: to force Haitian TPS holders to go back to a country where they are at risk of violence, kidnapping, or death.

That should tell you everything you need to know. But the President showed his hand long ago; I was at the meeting in 2018 where he used the term "s-hole" nations to describe Haiti and African countries.

I will never forget it—it was an embarrassment to the White House, to the Oval Office, and to the Presidency.

At the time, President Trump denied making this statement, but now, he proudly proclaims his bigotry toward the Haitian people.

I happen to disagree with the President. Haitian TPS holders make our country better every day. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this live unanimous consent request to extend TPS for Haiti.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today to underscore the critical importance of maintaining temporary protected status, or TPS, for Haiti.

TPS allows nationals from designated countries facing ongoing armed conflict, environmental disasters, or extraordinary conditions to live and to work legally in the United States until it is safe to return to their homeland.

First of all, I would like to thank my colleague LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER from Delaware for leading this effort in the U.S. Senate. Thank you.

I want to thank the Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, for his statement today, which is basically reflecting the views of millions of Americans

who are outraged at what is transpiring and affecting dramatically the Haitian community in the United States.

I would really like to thank Massachusetts Congresswoman AYANNA PRESSLEY for leading the successful effort in the House of Representatives to extend Haiti's TPS designation. I am also thankful to Congresswoman PRESSLEY for her partnership, not only today but in her yearslong fight to advocate for our Haitian-American communities.

In January of this year, we cohosted a field hearing in Massachusetts to hear from Haitian TPS holders, business and union leaders, and advocates about the importance of Haiti TPS.

And in April, alongside Senator VAN HOLLEN and Congresswoman WASSERMANN SCHULTZ, we led an amicus brief in the Supreme Court on behalf of 180 Members of Congress in support of Haiti and Syria TPS.

But last month, the Supreme Court delivered a devastating ruling in the case. The far-right Justices green-lit the Trump administration's unlawful, racist termination of TPS for Haiti and for Syria. The Court failed a test of morality. It slammed the doors of justice in the face of more than a million TPS holders, including 45,000 Haitian TPS holders in Massachusetts. It is an outrage; it is a travesty.

For years, Donald Trump has demonized and attacked Haitian TPS holders. Trump has spewed racist, cruel lies about Haitians.

We know that Trump does not want to make America great again. Trump wants to make America hate again. That is what these policies represent—to make America White again.

And to do so, he is terminating the critical TPS protections that nearly hundreds of thousands of Haitians rely on. The Trump administration plans to force Haitian TPS holders to return to dangerous and life-threatening conditions.

But Haiti continues to confront overlapping crisis, political instability, widespread violence, and a humanitarian emergency that has strained every single facet of daily life.

In the wake of Hurricane Matthew, in September of 2016, I traveled to Haiti to deliver relief goods and meet with aid providers, even amidst devastation. The resilience of the Haitian people was palpable.

At the time, the country was still battling the cholera epidemic caused by the U.N. peacekeepers after the devastating 2010 earthquake that killed thousands and thousands and thousands of Haitians. Haiti faced this crisis without sufficient international support.

And, ultimately, I led the effort to get the United Nations to apologize to Haiti for what the U.N. had done to that country. And, finally, the United Nations did that.

I came away from that trip knowing that Haiti would continue to hurt and

that the United States should do everything in its power to help the Haitian people.

Sadly, Haiti is still hurting. Haiti's security crisis is eroding the promise and future of an entire nation. Armed groups now exert control over much of Port-au-Prince. Kidnappings, targeted violence, and blockades have made it difficult for people to reach hospitals, attend school, and access basic services.

At the same time, natural disasters, including earthquakes, hurricanes, and recurrent flooding have further damaged infrastructure that was already stretched to its limits.

Together, these forces have left millions without certainty or without security. It is clear that Haitian TPS holders cannot return home safely.

And yet—and yet—the State Department currently advises American citizens against traveling to Haiti because of the dangers and instability. That is utter hypocrisy. You can't tell Americans it is too dangerous to go to Haiti and then say that you are going to tell 350,000 Haitians that they have got to go back to a place that is too dangerous for any American to go and visit.

It is protected status. It is protecting them against that which is too dangerous.

Instead of meeting this undeniable humanitarian catastrophe with compassion, the Trump administration has chosen to compound the trauma. And this brings us to the dangerous and politically cruel reality that Haitian TPS holders face today in our country.

For families with children born here—American children—it may mean a choice no parent should ever be forced to make: tearing their family apart or taking a child who has never stepped foot outside of the United States into danger in a country that child has never lived in and that the State Department is telling every American is too dangerous to go to. But parents may have to take children into that situation.

Imagine a mother or a father sitting at their kitchen table tonight, looking across at their child and trying to decide if that child has a better chance of survival returning to Haiti, a country consumed by violence, or staying in the United States, separated from the loving care of their parents.

If we do not act, this is the brutal reality of family separation that will play out in thousands of homes across this country. Families are being forced to endure agonizing and impossible calculations. We cannot stand by while hundreds and thousands of Haitians who have lived and worked and built lives in the United States are suddenly staring into an abyss of uncertainty.

What of the daily life for those who will remain? The moment these protections lapse, TPS holders—who have been here legally for years working, paying taxes, and raising families—will stare down the looming threat of detention and deportation.

That is what the Trump administration wants: to give ICE agents more work to do on our streets, to give his private army the authority to arrest a million more people to meet racist, cruel quotas. And no one should have to live through that constant fear of a sudden knock on the door or the panic of a random traffic stop.

To strip Haitians of their status of protection, which we have given them because of the catastrophic conditions that still exist in Haiti, is to strip them of their agency, of their safety, of their peace of mind.

Haitian TPS holders are Massachusetts. They are the United States. They are hard working. They are kind. They are resilient. They are strong in the face adversity and deeply committed to the communities in which they live, whether it is Mattapan or Brockton or Malden. And the same thing is true for all across our country.

A Haitian TPS holder is a friend and home-health aide who has taken care of grandma or grandpa for years. A Haitian TPS holder is a coworker and a construction worker that has helped build homes in our neighborhoods.

A Haitian TPS holder is a neighbor and a small business owner on Blue Hill Avenue who helps support the livelihoods of others.

Haitian TPS holders are essential workers. They are nurses. They are home health aides, educators, grocery store workers. They keep us safe. They keep us fed. They keep us healthy. They have followed the rules. They have committed no crimes at all, and yet they are now being told they are going to be sent home.

And these are the same people who have made our seniors smile, that have been in homes all across our country, in homes taking care of our loved ones, in hospitals taking care of our loved ones. That is who they are. They have protected our babies. They soothe our sick. They are us. We have a moral duty to protect TPS holders and provide them with protections and a permanent pathway to citizenship. Let's help them make America home.

For generations, Massachusetts has been shaped by our immigrant communities. It was one of our own, Congressman Joe Moakley, who served as one of the architects of the TPS statute and who understood both the moral clarity and the practical necessity of providing refuge in times of crisis.

In defending his provision for TPS protection on the House of Representatives floor in 1990, Congressman Moakley emphasized our "deep moral obligation" to protect innocent victims fleeing violence abroad. His words remain as urgent and relevant today as they were when he spoke them.

Protecting the vulnerable is not a political choice; it is a moral duty. Congresswoman PRESSLEY's success in passing the Haiti TPS bill in the House of Representatives is an inspiration. And now the Senate must pass the bill, which I introduced alongside Senator

BLUNT ROCHESTER, to designate Haiti for TPS until after the next Presidential election.

I have called on every recent administration to designate, extend, and redesignate TPS for Haiti. I have also supported legislation to provide a legal pathway to residency for TPS holders. I will keep supporting this community.

The narrative of TPS holders in the United States is a story of resilience, of hope, and of an enduring spirit. Despite facing adversity, TPS holders have continued to contribute to build lives and set down roots.

Haitian TPS holders deserve our full protection. We cannot turn our backs on them now. That is the choice which we have to confront right now.

And, again, I thank Senator BLUNT ROCHESTER for her leadership on this issue as well. And if you would like to be recognized now, or I will make the motion right now and then we will continue the debate.

So as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 374, H.R. 1689; further, I ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I object to this legislation, which would once again extend Haitian temporary protected status. Washington has invented a new definition of temporary—it means permanent.

Haitian TPS was supposed to be just 18 months when it began in 2010. Sixteen years later, 350,000 Haitians are still here. Today, after the Supreme Court cleared the way for President Trump to end TPS and send them home, Democrats are trying to change the law to keep the 350,000 Haitians here permanently. Not on my watch.

I rise today to block the bill, and also do something else, to make clear that those supporting this bill have a message for the American people: Your vote doesn't matter. Your community doesn't matter. Your livelihood doesn't matter.

They are trying to use Washington's oldest immigration trick: Call it temporary, extend it forever, and cash in on a new voter base.

The American people voted to end this scam. Washington Democrats are voting to keep it alive and remind you who they think is really in charge.

Here is the truth Democrats won't say out loud: They never, ever plan to end any of these programs. They call them temporary to get them started, then they manufacture an excuse for every extension—another year, another election, another deadline ignored.

By the time the public notices, temporary status has become permanent residency in everything but name.

Democrats can use this scam to build a new political constituency, a new voter base. Haiti was first designated for temporary protected status following the 2010 earthquake. The designation was supposed to last for 18 months; it has now lasted 16 years. Yet, we are still being told that this is a temporary program. In Washington, temporary, apparently, means forever.

A child born when Haitian TPS began is nearly old enough to vote or sponsor their family for green cards now. That is how long Washington has been calling this program temporary for the Haitians who are here. TPS was created for emergencies. Democrats turned it into a one-way racket towards permanent mass migration.

Here is how the racket works: An emergency creates temporary status. Then the emergency passes, but the status stays. The deadline arrives, but Washington extends it. The voters demand enforcement; the Democrats refuse.

Every click moves towards permanence; none moves back toward the law. That is the TPS racket. Democrats have decided that mass migration must continue and that no President chosen by the American people, who ran on this issue, by the way, will ever be permitted to end it. That is the real purpose of the bill. Its supporters will wrap this bill in language of compassion, but they never seem to have any compassion for the American worker, competing against an ever-expanding cheap labor supply.

They have no compassion for families priced out of housing, workers whose wages are undercut, schools punished and pushed beyond capacity, or communities forced to absorb decisions Washington made for them that they voted against. Their compassion always flows outward, but the bill always arrives on your doorstep.

America is not a global refugee camp. America is not a get-rich scheme for the Third World. America is our home. And when houseguests become squatters, you don't delay enforcement; you call the sheriff and you send them home. That is exactly what we must do here today.

If Democrats want 350,000 Haitians to stay permanently, they should say it plainly. Introduce a bill. Put your name on it. Vote for the permanent status. Then explain that vote to the American people. Quit with the games. But stop calling permanent immigration temporary. The voters are not stupid, and they already made their choice. The voters demanded enforcement. President Trump is delivering on that, but Democrats are fighting to keep the same old scam alive.

I have the power to stop this nonsense bill, and I am going to use it. That is why I am here today. So I object to the bill, which would keep 350,000 Haitians here permanently. I object to changing temporary to permanent. I object to flooding American communities with cheap foreign labor.

I object to treating foreigners as the priority and Americans as the afterthought. I object to mass migration.

Temporary must mean temporary; and elections have consequences, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the objection we just heard is exactly why this law to protect Haiti TPS is necessary, and I am incredibly disappointed in my Republican colleagues for turning their backs on the Haitian TPS community in this dire time.

TPS represents America's longstanding commitment to serve as a beacon of hope and refuge for the vulnerable. To honor and to protect Haitian TPS holders is a moral duty. It is also an acknowledgment of the immense contributions TPS holders make to our families, to our neighborhoods.

And for years, TPS holders have reliably, patiently, and emphatically offered stability and dignity and security to so many.

The Senator from Missouri said the keyword is "temporary"; no, the keyword is "protection."

The duration of how long it should be extended to give people protection is what we are debating here today. If the State Department says it is too dangerous for Americans to go to Haiti, then Haitians who are given TPS protections are also living with a danger that is too great for them and their families to be returned to a State Department-designated country too dangerous to visit.

They only ask for something that is just so clear, so decent, so obvious—just the stability of preserving their status, the dignity to live without fear, the security of not being returned to danger. It is the least we owe to them. But this fight to protect Haiti and its TPS protections is not over.

To the families lying awake tonight afraid of what comes next: We will continue to fight for you. To the children asking if their parents will be here in the morning: We will continue to fight for you. To every person who did everything right, who followed the rules, who believed in the promise of America: We will continue to fight for you.

We are not done. This administration and Senate Republicans cannot take away your humanity, your dignity, your future. We are going to continue to fight, and it is my honor to be able to partner with the great Senator from Delaware, my partner in this effort, the great Senator LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking Senator ED MARKEY for your leadership, for your compassion, for your brilliance on this issue, as well as the great Congresswoman AYANNA PRESSLEY, who we are proud to have in the room today.

You know, the State of Massachusetts is such a powerful State for free-

dom, justice, and liberty. You embody the ideals that we were sent here to fight for.

And so I too am disappointed in our colleague's objection. I think what we proposed here that Congresswoman PRESSLEY was able to pass in the House on a bipartisan—she got it done. She was doing what we need to get done here in the Senate.

And what we wanted to do was clear and simple. We wanted a bill that would extend temporary protected status for Haitian immigrants.

Why is that so important?

TPS is a designation the Department of Homeland Security can give to a foreign country to indicate that it is unsafe for its citizens to return home. Home. They weren't fleeing here because they don't want to be home; it was unsafe.

And there are many reasons that a country could receive this designation: Ongoing conflicts like a civil war or gang violence, a natural disaster like a hurricane or an earthquake, or temporary conditions like civil unrest.

Unfortunately, at this time, Haiti meets all three requirements. Yet, the Trump administration, with the help of a Supreme Court decision, as well as colleagues here, has decided to terminate TPS status for Haiti.

This policy decision is driven by cruelty and xenophobia, and it has real consequences. The decision to uproot your entire life and start again in a different country isn't something someone takes lightly. The reality for many Haitians is this: decades of corrupt governance was ended by a political assassination 5 years ago. The country has been in political turmoil ever since. Daily life is characterized by civil unrest, violence, and kidnappings by armed gangs.

On top of that, hurricanes and earthquakes have left the country with limited access to healthcare, food, and public services.

There are real, tangible reasons that 350,000 Haitians have fled to the United States for pursuit of a better life: real reasons, reasons that your own families could not withstand.

In my home State of Delaware, this is deeply personal. Delaware is called the "State of Neighbors," and over 5,000 of those neighbors are Haitian immigrants with TPS status. And at this moment, they are scared. They are terrified that they will lose their status and be unable to work and, ultimately, deported back to Haiti. Families are worried that they won't be able to make ends meet or, worse, be forcibly deported from a country they have grown to call home.

These are real people with a real stake in the decisions that we make here in this body, people like Marie, who came to Delaware with her family when she was 12. Her memories of growing up are full of Sundays spent at church, going to mass in the morning, spending the day with her family at the pastor's house, and then going back to afternoon service.

Now an adult, Marie became one of the very first Haitian Realtors in our State, where she helps families buy their first homes, establish roots, and get one step closer to the American dream.

Or people like Anne—she received a deportation letter last April. Everyone in her family received the letter, including her 1-year-old niece—her 1-year-old niece.

Anne and her family fled to Delaware after a gang war broke out in Haiti following the assassination of the President in 2021. Receiving deportation letters left them depressed and scared. They were sent into a tailspin and faced a devastating choice: Do you stay here illegally? They don't want to do that. Do you stay here illegally? Do you try to figure it out and go back to a country with danger and chaos with a small child or do you flee?

As I said before, Delaware is a State of neighbors, and we are losing neighbors. Anne and her entire family have fled.

Now, if the moral imperative doesn't convince you, I will try the economic. Hundreds of thousands of Haitian TPS recipients are in our workforce. These are good, hard-working people. They work in healthcare, in agriculture. They are small business owners, Realtors, pastors, and more.

They are necessary contributors to our economy. They provide over \$800 million in taxes every year and generate over \$5.9 billion for our economy.

The loss of the Haitian TPS workforce would impact and cause harm to multiple industries, from the ag sector to education, to healthcare, including nursing homes, hospitals, and senior centers. My office has already heard reports from private employers who are being forced to let these employees go, whose authorizations are tied to TPS.

Today, we had a chance to set things right. We had a chance to extend these protections to our Haitian neighbors. We had a chance to do the right thing. But I am here to tell you, yes, elections have consequences, and people are watching. And we are not giving up.

Thank you to all of the individuals who are supporting these families. Thank you to our staffs who are receiving the phone calls. Thank you to the pastors who are praying. Thank you to all who are fighting for our neighbors. As I said, we won't give up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues Senator MARKEY and Senator BLUNT ROCHESTER for bringing this motion to the floor.

I do want to thank Congresswoman PRESSLEY—who I know had to leave the floor—for her leadership in the House.

And like my colleagues, I am extremely disappointed that Republican Senators today blocked our ability to move forward and have a vote on this

matter and pass this very important matter, which is to extend temporary protected status for Haiti.

As my colleagues have said, temporary protected status—TPS—was established decades ago with bipartisan support because Congress understood then a very basic truth: When people cannot safely return to their countries of origin, we do not put their lives at risk by forcing them to go back. That is the essence of the protection in TPS, and that principle is worth defending today.

For years, hundreds of thousands of Haitians have lived and worked legally in the United States of America under TPS. They built their lives here. They have paid taxes here, including Social Security taxes. They started small businesses here. They are our neighbors, our friends, our colleagues. They are our community members.

They are deeply rooted in communities all over the country, including in my State of Maryland. Some have lived here for decades—again, legally—with this status. To rip all of that away, while the danger in Haiti persists, is wrong and it is cruel. And it does not align with the values that the United States claims to stand for, and yet that is exactly what the Trump administration is doing. And, sadly, it is what our Republican Senate colleagues just did in their motion.

And I do want to underscore what Senator BLUNT ROCHESTER and Senator MARKEY have said. They may be able to block it today in the U.S. Senate, but we will keep working on this matter because it is a matter of important American principles.

You know, last year, the administration moved to terminate Haiti's TPS designation, and that action was challenged in court. And the Federal courts temporarily blocked that termination.

Then it went to the Supreme Court, and on a devastating 6-to-3 decision, the Supreme Court reversed the lower courts and sided with the Trump administration. It was another—in my view—very bad decision from this Supreme Court that will have very harmful consequences for the Haitian community but, really, for all of our communities because now TPS holders face imminent loss of their legal status and of their work authorizations, the latter of which is slated to happen as soon as the end of this week.

So let's be clear about what that means. Let's just be clear about the harm that we are forcing these individuals to face. It means hundreds of thousands of our community members who followed the rules, worked legally, paid taxes, and built lives in this country will lose their ability to work legally and be forced to return to a country where it is not safe to return.

That is the reality right now. Anyone following the situation in Haiti knows it remains very dangerous. Indeed, as my colleagues have said, the State Department continues to warn Americans not to travel to Haiti because of crime,

kidnapping, terrorism, unrest, and other factors.

The country remains under a state of emergency, and the U.S. Government has extremely limited ability to provide any emergency assistance, even to our own citizens who are there now.

And the humanitarian situation there continues to deteriorate. When you are evaluating whether it is safe to force anybody back to their country of origin, we are supposed to look at whether the situation is getting better or worse. It is getting worse over a long period of time in Haiti. While there are some small signs of hope right now, the reality is, it is a very, very dangerous place.

In fact, 1.5 million people have been displaced from their homes. More than half the population needs humanitarian assistance. More than 5.8 million people are expected to face hunger this year. Meanwhile, armed gangs continue to control large parts of Port-au-Prince and other parts of the country.

A lot of these gangs are responsible for killings, kidnappings, sexual violence, and forced displacements of entire communities. And yet, by the decision the Republican Senator took to the floor, blocking this action, they are forcing people who have been members of our community for a long time—again, working here legally—forcing them back into imminent danger and harm.

You know, we shouldn't be doing this, colleagues. We should not be forcing anybody back into a situation of imminent harm, especially people who have been here and working legally and playing by all of the rules. And now we are changing the rules on them midstream because what had been a bipartisan law of the temporary protected status program is now having the "protected status" part of it ripped out by our colleagues. So this is really part of the Trump administration's mass deportation strategy.

You know, the President told Americans that they were going to go after the "worst of the worst." You know, we had a vote on this floor weeks back. I think it was a unanimous vote that, you know, folks who have committed crimes—people who are dangerous to our communities—yes, the worst of the worst should be essentially held accountable and deported.

But folks under TPS? These are people who are working legally in our country. These are people paying taxes. These are not the worst of the worst. In fact, they have to check in every single year and make sure that they continue to meet the requirements of the law. And yet these are the people—these are the people—that the President and now our Republican colleagues seek to uproot and send into certain danger.

Sadly, the Supreme Court—the Trump-stacked Supreme Court—went along with these decisions, but we have a chance in this body to fix that. And that was what we tried to do today with Senator MARKEY's motion.

Again, it was blocked by our Republican colleagues, but this will not be the end of this debate. It will not be the end of this discussion because the essence of TPS was, at least at one time in our country, a bipartisan effort. On a bipartisan basis, we agreed that it was wrong to send people back to their home country if they faced certain danger. And that is why we allowed these individuals to stay here. And many of them have made really successful lives here in our communities, working—again legally—paying taxes.

And so it is a very sad day when what once was a bipartisan consensus to stand by important principles that had made this country stronger are shredded by this White House and where we now have a rubberstamped Congress to go along with the Trump administration's mass deportation agenda.

So I regret the action that was taken today. I, again, thank my colleague Senator MARKEY for his efforts, and we will keep at it together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). The Senator from Iowa.

PROTECTING AMERICAN TAXPAYERS ACT

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, we have all received that email from a wealthy Nigerian "Prince," asking us to wire him some money with promises that he will return the favor with a huge reward as soon as he can access his fortune, or we have gotten that phone call from an unknown number claiming to be the IRS, warning that an arrest warrant will be issued if we don't immediately pay off our outstanding tax debt, and, of course, everyone has been told that our extended vehicle warranty is about to expire unless we renew immediately.

Folks, we all know these are scams, and we aren't being fooled. Yet, somehow, government bureaucrats are being bamboozled by even less sophisticated schemes, except they are not giving out access to their own bank accounts but, rather, to taxpayer dollars and the U.S. Treasury.

Folks, I am not making this up. A Nigerian socialite actually submitted more than 100 fraudulent applications for unemployment and disability assistance that were approved. He finagled more than \$1.3 million of U.S. taxpayer money in this scheme. Some of the funds were intended to provide daycare services for disabled children, but he, instead, spent the money on constructing a luxury resort and nightclub in Nigeria.

This Nigerian "Prince of Fraud" was outdone by California prison inmates, who collected about \$1 billion in unemployment benefits by using names like "John Doe," "John Adams," and "Poopy Britches" while serving time behind bars.

Other con artists successfully applied for COVID cash during the pandemic by using the names of well-known celebrities and fictional characters, like "Charlie Brown" and "Nancy Drew."

Taxpayer dollars have even been handed out to phony businesses with such obviously made-up names that are so outrageous that no one could possibly believe they were real, such as “Satanic Lives Matter” and others that are so tasteless I can’t even say them.

Others uploaded pictures of doll faces to “verify” their identities on applications for government assistance and were still approved. Too often, the bilking is being done by the very bureaucrats who are overseeing the benefits. Over the years, I have documented countless examples of government employees who have been caught with their hands in the cookie jar—embezzling millions of dollars and abusing their positions for personal gain.

As a veteran, one particular example that really makes my blood boil involves a service representative for the Department of Veterans Affairs who was shaking down disabled veterans for bribes to “grease the wheels” to speed up the approval of backlogged claims. A \$3,385 kickback paid to him via Venmo was listed on the memo line as “crooked shit.” I apologize for my language, but that is what the Venmo actually said. We had to modify our chart today. So a VA representative was shaking down disabled veterans. This actually happened. That representative was caught and is being held responsible for shaking down our disabled veterans.

The problem in most of these cases is the money is going out the door before verifying if the recipient is legitimate. If fraud is later detected, then the government has to decide if it is worth trying to recover the stolen money. This pay-and-chase system makes it way too easy for scammers to take the money and run. It is like giving the cash advance and your bank routing number to the Nigerian “Prince” who promised you a financial reward for your help only for you to realize, later, you have been ripped off. Good luck getting any of your money back. It is the gift that keeps giving.

As a result, fraudsters are getting away with stealing more than \$1.4 billion in taxpayer money every single day. Every single day, folks, \$1.4 billion fraudsters are making off with. If gift were a government agency, the “Department of Fraud” would be the fifth largest. The \$521 billion going to fraud every year exceeds the individual annual budgets of the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Agriculture, Transportation, Homeland Security, State, and Justice. That is right, folks. Fraudsters are being better taken care of than our veterans and our farmers.

While hard-working Americans are struggling to make ends meet, fraudsters are living large on the loot that they are taking from the Treasury. Government graft and graft are endless, and so are the excuses for not stopping it, but the public’s patience isn’t.

So who is responsible for allowing fraud to continue?

Folks, the buck stops right here with Congress. Congress decides how much of your paycheck must be sent to Washington, and it writes the laws determining exactly how every one of those dollars is spent. But the haste to spend trillions of tax dollars as quickly as possible is resulting in outrageous amounts of waste, fraud, and abuse. From fake childcare centers in Minnesota to convicts collecting unemployment checks, fraudsters are blatantly getting away with treating the National Treasury like their own personal piggy bank.

At the request of Majority Leader THUNE, I have compiled a comprehensive package of proposals put forth by our Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle to end fraud once and for all.

Specifically, my Protecting American Taxpayers Act will stop handing out quick cash with no questions asked, trigger automatic investigations when there are sudden and suspicious spikes in payment claims, ban convicted fraudsters from receiving taxpayer dollars, take back the money that was already stolen, and send scammers to the slammer. If enacted, this bill would save \$240 billion.

The choice is quite simple: Give this money to fraudsters or return it to the taxpayers.

The bill is now before the Senate, and every day we delay in passing it, gift-givers are getting away with stealing another \$1.4 billion. Allowing that to continue is the greatest fraud of all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today as the son of a small business owner. I rise as someone who has seen how hard an entrepreneur must work to get an idea off the ground, to build a business, to keep it solvent, and to work year after year through ups and downs, to make sure one can put enough food on the table for one’s family and all of one’s employees’ families. And I rise today in support of Senator ERNST’s Protecting American Taxpayers Act.

You see, as chair of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship—a committee on which I proudly serve—Senator ERNST has really been relentlessly focused on and has been a tireless advocate for combating fraud and ensuring that taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly—responsibly.

So I want to thank Senator ERNST for her good work on this important legislation and for her ongoing efforts to shine a spotlight on waste, fraud, and abuse. I am especially proud that in this package is found my Assisting Small Businesses Not Fraudsters Act.

ASSISTING SMALL BUSINESSES NOT FRAUDSTERS ACT

Mr. President, you see, over 1.2 million Hoosiers are employed by small businesses. As you look across our Nation, small businesses are the backbone of our modern economy. In fact, the way to grow an economy is to figure

out how to get more people to start businesses and to grow those small businesses into larger businesses. Our Federal small business programs exist for that purpose—to help hard-working entrepreneurs grow their businesses and to create more jobs.

They don’t exist to reward those who have defrauded taxpayers. That is not why they exist. Unfortunately, during the COVID pandemic, some individuals exploited emergency Small Business Administration relief programs for personal gain. Their actions diverted resources away from legitimate small businesses in Indiana and across the country. They undermine confidence in these important programs, and they undermine confidence in government at a time when confidence is already low.

The principle behind my bill is quite simple. If someone is convicted of defrauding the Small Business Administration through certain COVID-era loan or grant programs, then that individual should not be eligible to receive future financial assistance from the Small Business Administration. It is that simple. They should not be eligible if they are a fraudster. Likewise, businesses controlled by those who are convicted shouldn’t be eligible for future SBA assistance.

This is the essence of the Assisting Small Businesses Not Fraudsters Act. It should not be—I would imagine it is not—controversial. This is something everyone should enthusiastically support. I would add that this bill only applies after a criminal conviction in order to ensure due process.

Honest, hard-working entrepreneurs and small business owners shouldn’t have to compete with convicted fraudsters for Federal opportunities. Every taxpayer dollar lost to fraud is a dollar that cannot help legitimate small businesses expand, hire workers, or invest in their futures.

Chair ERNST’s Protecting American Taxpayers Act advances that same goal across government by strengthening accountability, protecting taxpayer dollars, and ensuring Federal programs work as intended.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this package and my Assisting Small Businesses Not Fraudsters Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

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

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, just 2 years ago, we were a land of open borders, crime was surging across the country, and fraud was rampant. But today, the borders are secure; crime,

murder rates—a 100-year low; and fraudsters are going to jail. That is why today I am rising to support the Protecting American Taxpayers Act.

For years, Washington accepted fraud as the cost of doing business. The government wrote the checks, the fraudsters cashed them, and hard-working Americans were left to foot the bill. Those same hard-working Americans knew intuitively that was driving up their cost of living.

But those days are coming to an end. Under President Trump, we have seen historic momentum to root out waste, fraud, and abuse across the Federal Government. For the first time in a long time, Washington is shining a flashlight on the billions of taxpayer dollars disappearing through fraud, improper payments, and outright criminal activity. Now Congress has the responsibility to finish the job.

The American people are asking a simple question: If Washington knows where the fraud is, why aren't we stopping it? And they are right to ask. Today, an estimated \$1.4 billion is stolen from taxpayers every single day. That is money that should be strengthening our military, supporting our veterans, protecting Medicare and Social Security, or reducing the debt we are leaving to our children and our grandchildren. Instead, it is ending up in the hands of organized fraud rings, scam artists, and criminals who have learned exactly where the holes in our Federal Government are.

We are already seeing what happens when the Federal Government makes fraud enforcement a priority. In one of the largest healthcare fraud takedowns in our Nation's history, Federal prosecutors charged hundreds of defendants accused of submitting more than \$6 billion in fraudulent claims to Medicare, Medicaid, and other taxpayer-funded health programs. And the best part? People are finally going to jail.

Investigators uncovered transnational criminal organizations, fraudulent medical equipment schemes, and providers accused of billing the government for services that were never provided. These weren't bookkeeping mistakes; they were sophisticated efforts to steal billions from the American taxpayer.

The truth is simple: Fraudsters follow the money, and for too long, Washington has rolled out the welcome mat. This legislation finally starts closing that door. The Protecting American Taxpayers Act is projected to save taxpayers \$240 billion—that is \$240 billion—by preventing fraud before it happens, recovering stolen taxpayer dollars, and ensuring criminals are held accountable. It doesn't just respond to fraud after the fact; it helps stop it before another billion dollars walks out the door.

One piece of this package that I am proud to see included is my WALZ Act—W-A-L-Z, the WALZ Act—named after, you guessed it, a certain Governor who allowed fraud to run ramp-

ant in his State. The idea behind it is about as simple as it gets: Don't pay first and ask questions later. Kansas families don't do business that way. Small businesses don't do business that way. If you are remodeling your kitchen, you don't hand the contractor every penny before a single cabinet is installed. If you are hiring someone to fix your roof, you don't write the check before the work is finished. You pay after the job is done.

Yet that is exactly the opposite of how Washington has too often operated. For years, the Federal Government has pushed billions of dollars out the door up front with little accountability and then acted surprised when criminals disappeared with the money.

My WALZ Act simply says: Federal payments should be made as reimbursements after—after—the services have actually been provided. That one simple reform closes one of the biggest loopholes that have allowed billions of taxpayer dollars to be stolen before they ever get the chance to disappear.

But this package doesn't stop there. It claws back unused COVID funds, strengthens Treasury's fraud detection systems, extends the statute of limitations so pandemic fraudsters can't simply run out the clock. It protects our veterans from scammers. It combats emerging AI-generated fraud and gives law enforcement stronger tools to hold criminals accountable. Taken together, these reforms represent one of the strongest anti-fraud packages Congress has considered in years.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle spent years responding to every problem the same way: throwing more money at it. We believe the first question should be: Where is the fraud? Where is the waste? Where is the abuse? And how do we stop it before asking taxpayers for another dime?

This administration has created real momentum for the first time in years. We are not just talking about fraud, we are finding it, prosecuting it, and putting criminals on notice that stealing from the American taxpayer has consequences. People are already being held accountable, and more need to be.

Congress should build on that momentum by giving law enforcement and Federal Agencies the tools they need to keep fraudsters out of our programs and behind bars where they belong.

So let's not waste this opportunity. Let's make these reforms permanent. Let's close the loopholes once and for all. Let's protect the taxpayers who fund the government. Let's send a clear message that the era of easy money for fraudsters is over.

I urge every one of our colleagues to support the Protecting American Taxpayers Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Louisiana.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I have been coming up here and talking about, well, a couple of things.

How much does healthcare cost? Right now, people watching from the Gallery, people watching at home, people who happen to be in here—all of us are experiencing a commonality, which is that healthcare is incredibly expensive.

By the way, you may say: No, I have great insurance. It pays for everything.

No, that is coming out of your wages. You are a successful businessman. The people you employ, when you buy them insurance, that comes out of their compensation otherwise, and that is a reality.

The more you pay for health insurance, the less you get paid in your pocketbook because it is coming out of the same bucket.

But if you are one of those who are just having a hard time making it happen, if we look at the things we think of as being expensive—utilities, entertainment for the family, car payments, groceries, college tuition—it just keeps on climbing—a mortgage. More expensive than all for a family of four is healthcare. That is our problem.

So I have been trying to address it with something that I call the MVP agenda. We, under this plan, would give up to \$2,000 to a family of four in a prefunded health savings account, and you add that to price transparency. So money in your pocket with value for the patient—the MVP plan.

It seems really ambitious, but let me just put a little bit more of a point on why this is important. The average family is carrying \$10,000 in credit card debt. Now, think about that—\$10,000. A family is not paying that off every month. It turns out they are paying the minimum balance due. How do we know that? Because the percentage of income going to credit card interest has almost tripled over the last number of years. They are paying the minimal amount and carrying greater and greater debt in order to make ends meet. Well, they are not really making ends meet; they are just trying to get by right now.

So that is what is stressing the importance of having a plan that actually addresses their needs, not some abstract "Oh, can't we do it in the by and by, and it may make some indirect difference." No. You can directly help a family by putting money in the pocket and coupling that with price transparency to bring value to the patient.

Now, I have some good news. We did something today in HELP Committee, the committee which I chair, called the Price Tags Act—Patients Deserve Price Tags.

ROGER MARSHALL and JOHN HICKENLOOPER, Senators from Kansas and Colorado, came together for a bill, which my staff helped to put together, and we passed it out of committee, and it is the Patients Deserve Price Tags, which is price transparency for the goods and services you purchase in the healthcare arena.

Now, let's put a little bit of a point on this. I suspect the Presiding Officer

has gone into a restaurant where they don't have the price on the menu. It is like a five-star French restaurant, if there are that many stars, and the waiter doesn't tell you the price. If you ask the price, he looks at you like you shouldn't belong there. If you have to ask the price, you can't afford it.

Usually, if that is the case for my wife and me—in fact, always—we excuse ourselves after having a couple of crackers, and we say: Thank you very much, but we have a crying baby at home. We look a little bit old for a baby. Well, it is a grandchild.

The point being: If they are not telling you the price, probably you can't afford it.

Now, audience, people watching, anybody here, when is the last time you went to a hospital and you said "Show me the price. Show me the price." It just doesn't happen. Do you know there are actually laws out there? But I can tell you, if you ask "Show me the price," you are going to cause confusion.

Now, I am a doctor. I have been in this environment. I always kind of admire—kind of chuckle. I am a gastroenterologist. I used to do colonoscopies. So the patient is there. He has been prepped, which means that his colon has been cleaned out and he has been having diarrhea for about 6 hours. He has a gown on that covers everything but the derriere, a thin sheet above him. And he is given a lot of pieces of paper to sign, and at that point, he has the ability to ask "How much does this colonoscopy cost?"

Now, that is—you are beyond the point of no return. You are not going to find actionable items, if they are even able to give you the price, at that point. You have already ordered at the French restaurant where they don't show you the price, and they are bringing the food to the table, and by golly, you are going to pay for it no matter how much it is.

But we have passed the Patients Deserve Price Tags Act, and that means that now, the patient is going to be told how much something costs.

If we have a health savings account or if you are just paying cash or in some way you are responsible for the goods and services that you are purchasing, you are going to be told the price.

Why is that? Why is that important? A cardiologist friend told me recently—a couple of years ago, actually—of a cardioversion for atrial fibrillation. If you did it in the doctor's office, it costs you \$130; if you did it in the hospital, it costs you \$13,000. Now, would it make a difference to someone, if they had a \$4,000 deductible, to know that they either pay \$130 if they went to the doctor's office or they pay the full deductible and the insurance company pays more but they pay 20 percent of that more if they went to the hospital? I think it would.

So price transparency lowers the cost of being insured and increases wages over time.

By the way, let's get back to our restaurant metaphor. When you go and they don't tell you the price, you kind of have a sense that no matter what you order, you are going to come out substantially poorer. But you are a little bit tight. You go in—you know, maybe when I was a teenager on a date, this was more common—and I can order the surf and turf with the lobster and the filet mignon, and it is going to cost me four times what the spaghetti costs. Now, depending on my budget, I may decide to get the spaghetti. I still have a great meal, still walk away full, nutrition is all satisfied, but because I had the price, I was able to control how much I spent. That is what price transparency does, and the Patients Deserve Price Tags Act begins to give them that price transparency.

Now, by the way, that promotes competition. If you know that if you get your colonoscopy here it is \$1,000 and if you get it over there it is \$5,000, I can promise you that the place charging \$5,000 is going to lower the price.

And the patient with the prefunded health savings account—remember, in the MVP plan—they will have money in their pocket. They have an extra incentive.

I use the example of the woman whose child has an earache. She says: Hey, Siri, which urgent care center near me has the best afterhours price for an appointment for an earache?

Well, here, it is \$50; there, it is \$250. She is going to go where it is \$50, but the one that charges \$250 is going to lower their price.

Now, the advantage of this: If you combine the money in the pocket, where they have the prefunded health savings account, with the price transparency, you begin to lower the price of being insured. The patient has the money in their pocket, but now, with the Patients Deserve Price Tags Act, they can spend that money wisely. Instead of that money put into their health savings account being something that people just rebuff, instead, it is something that they can spend wisely.

By the way, they can also begin to purchase a more affordable insurance policy. The Presiding Officer probably, in his businesses, gives a "You can choose option A or B or C for your insurance." If you choose the option with the higher deductible, then the premium is lower. If we have put \$2,000 into your health savings account, you can choose that higher deductible because the first \$2,000 is covered, and that higher deductible means that you have a lower premium.

The business owner saves money. He can use it to increase wages. But the employee saves money because their share of the premium is likewise less.

So I try to put it this way: If you have the Patients Deserve Price Tags Act and we are able to put money in the pocket and the patients choose the more affordable plan, they pay less. And if you look at the amount of

money going to someone's salary—can I see that one. This is the total compensation package that someone gets when they are employed. Now, some of it goes to payroll taxes. That is a fixed portion. That is going out of your income. There is nothing you can do about that.

Your benefits—principally, what you pay for your health insurance—is the next biggest slice. The more healthcare costs, the more bread you spend on benefits. The less your healthcare costs, the more bread goes into your salary.

Now, for those people who grew up in the sixties, "bread" was the word they used for "money." So think about this as being something literal: You have more money in your pocket not just because we have put money into your health savings account but because, as you pay less for insurance, you have less money to pay out of your pocket for the insurance, and the more money you get to keep to live the rest of your life.

We have been talking about people's wages not growing. Boom. That is how wages start to grow again. They begin to shrink the amount going for benefits, which increases the amount somebody has for the rest of their life.

Now, let me just go back to the Patients Deserve Price Tags Act. This is the most expansive, aggressive, comprehensive, patient-focused, business owner-focused piece of legislation for price transparency that has ever passed in Congress. If we pursue further healthcare bills—for example, reconciliation—we can move the "money in your pocket" portion, but this would stand on its own—a bipartisan piece of legislation that passed almost unanimously out of committee today and which would benefit almost every American who has got employer-sponsored insurance.

It is a huge first step. We will reconcile with the House, which has passed their own version of price transparency. This administration has been very aggressive promoting transparency. I am pleased to say that a significant portion of the MVP agenda passed out of committee; it is going to be headed to the President's desk soon; and, most importantly, individuals will have more money in their pocket and better coverage for their health.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. President, I have been working on Social Security now 8 years. Why? One, it is a guarantee—an intergenerational guarantee—made to Americans, when they get to a certain age, to retire. It is an earned benefit which says that, after a lifetime of work and contribution, Americans can count on a measure of financial security.

Today, more than 75 million Americans rely on Social Security. Most are retired workers. Many are disabled. Others are widows or widowers and children.

Now, let's just set the context: A program that 75 million Americans rely

on, 10 million baby boomers a day become eligible for, and in 6 years, if Congress does nothing, by law, their benefits will be cut almost 29 percent. So let's just say that once more. If Congress does nothing, in 6 years, by law, benefits going to 75 million Americans—and more at that time—will be cut by almost 29 percent.

We have known this is coming. It is because there has been a continued drawdown from the Social Security trust fund. By law, Social Security cannot pay out more than it receives. Currently, it is receiving money from payroll taxes but also from the trust fund. When the trust fund goes belly up in 6 years and the only income is that which current workers are paying, then the amount going out has to fall, and it will fall 28.5 percent if we wait until then to fix things.

I am pleased to say, though, that there is now momentum on both sides—Republicans and Democrats—to find a solution and to preserve benefits for those who have spent their lifetime earning them.

By the way, people ask: How is Social Security going bankrupt? I have been paying into it my whole life. Everybody I know has been paying into it their whole life. So why is it going bankrupt now?

I point out to people that when Social Security came along—I don't know—there were like five kids per family, and now there are like two kids per family. And when Social Security was first enacted, you didn't get benefits until you were 65, but the average age of death was 62. Now people live until they are 82, and they are getting their hips replaced when they are 75 to go bungee jumping in New Zealand. So the point being is that people are living far longer and they are living more actively, and as a result of that, we are drawing down that trust fund.

So my Democratic colleague from Illinois DICK DURBIN, he and I just introduced the PROMISE Act, along with a group of colleagues, Republican and Democrat. And the PROMISE Act sets up a process. It doesn't dictate a policy. It sets up a process that puts Congress on the clock to save Social Security.

What the PROMISE Act does, it says that Congress shall come up with multiple options to present to the Senate Finance Committee or to the Ways and Means Committee in the House in order for them to consider it, have it scored, and be delivered to Congress in order to deliberate. And then it says that the relevant committee—say, Senate Finance—has 7 working days to consider it and then it comes to the floor and then we have a vote on it.

That begs the question, Why do it now? Why not wait until next Congress? Because every year we wait, it gets harder and harder to fix Social Security. The amount of cuts required or the amount of taxes to be raised are more dramatic, more drastic, and more likely to harm an individual's personal finances.

We are not dictating a policy. We are just setting up a process.

Now, by the way, in full honesty, I have a policy I have been working on, but my policy will be just one of several policies that will be considered. My policy, we have something in it which we call the big idea. In our big idea, we look at pension funds that are doing well, that are not going bankrupt, that are growing in line with the needs of the people whom they cover. This will be the kind of pension fund that Exxon or Google or Deloitte & Touche has—it is called a pension investment fund—in which dollars are invested at an early stage, allowed to grow, and as those dollars grow over time, they meet the need of the retirees as the retirees become eligible for pulling those dollars down.

We have actually done that in the Federal Government. Under George W. Bush, the Federal railroad retirement system was going insolvent, and so Congress voted to allow to diversify the investments of this pension fund. I think every Democrat voted for it in the Senate. Three Republicans voted no, and the concerns they had have been proven to be wrong because what has happened now, in the Federal railroad retirement system, we still have more and more retirees relative to fewer workers, but that system is in the black because it invests in the strength of the U.S. economy, and the strength of the U.S. economy has been able to pay all future obligations.

That is our big idea: What has the Congress already done successfully with the Federal railroad retirement system? What is being done with major corporations to meet their pension benefits? And kind of what do you do with your own 401(k)?

So if we can set up this investment fund to supplement the payroll taxes that are the primary source for funding Social Security, we can meet that future obligation.

By the way, let me go back to the PROMISE Act. I am not dictating my proposal will be the answer. We are dictating a process that can be considered so that any proposal can be brought up. The Presiding Officer has a proposal with Senator WARREN. His proposal can come up. So it might be his proposal. More likely, it is going to be some sort of amalgamation.

But the only option that should not be an option is to do nothing. Congress is—I am searching for the right word. Congress is being irresponsible—destructively irresponsible—if we don't address Social Security. It is driving the national debt. And if we cut benefits by 28 percent, that will double poverty among the elderly. The promised benefit will not be delivered. By the way, if all we do is borrow, it is going to tank our credit rating.

By the way, going back to my particular plan, folks say: Well, what if the stock market goes down?

Under our plan, all risk is borne by the investment fund; no risk is borne

by the individual. That individual gets all the benefits she has been promised even if the market goes up and down.

They ask me: Is it putting the trust fund into the stock market?

No way. We have a separate investment fund, separate from the Social Security trust fund, and that is where the investment goes.

And one more thing. Folks want to say: Well, wait a second. I don't trust the Congress, and I don't trust the President. If you put a pot of money there, it is like honey to a bear; they are going to reach in and grab it.

We have guardrails all over the place, including an annual audit of how the money is invested and how the money is spent or not spent, and that audit is put online so the American people can keep track of what is happening with their trust fund.

I will finish by saying this. I like my plan. I think it is a good plan. I think it is going to make it a lot easier to address the problem. But the PROMISE Act is not about my plan. The PROMISE Act, which DICK DURBIN and I introduced, is only setting up a process by which Congress is forced to take action before it gets any worse. My proposal may be the one considered. It may be the Presiding Officer's. It may be somebody else's. The only option that should not be taken is the option of doing nothing. We need to do something.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, on Monday, we saw yet another example of what has become disturbingly common, and that is an act of far-left terrorism. Outside the Jacob K. Javits Federal Building, a man poured gasoline on the entrance, set it ablaze, and tossed fireworks into the raging flames.

Thankfully, law enforcement responded swiftly to apprehend the suspect, who was armed with two axes, a hammer, a machete, and three knives, but not before he injured four innocent people.

Authorities believe the attack was motivated by the suspect's hatred of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. The Federal building he targeted is home to New York's ICE field office and other Department of Homeland Security offices. Before the attack, he allegedly pushed a cart with a sign reading "ICE Off Our Streets" and made anti-ICE statements.

This attack did not come out of nowhere. It follows a monthslong campaign by Democrats to demonize ICE and our brave Federal law enforcement officers who are simply doing their job. They have likened them to "secret police," the Nazi Gestapo, the Soviet

KGB, and “slave patrols.” They have called them a “clear and present danger,” a “reign of terror,” and “non-descript thugs.” They have accused them of “mayhem and death,” “terror and violence,” and “scar[ing] the American public.”

These are not statements from fringe figures. This is what is so astounding. These are statements from prominent Governors, Senators, and lawmakers calling our Federal law enforcement and ICE these names. The vilification of Federal law enforcement is now central to the Democrats’ identity and their messaging.

Look at the proposals by the Democrat Socialists of America. They would do away with ICE. They believe that by attacking our officers, they can get at President Trump. And in reality, what they are doing is putting a target on the officers’ backs.

I have to admit that I was surprised when New York’s far-left socialist Mayor Zohran Mamdani called Monday’s attack “deeply disturbing.” In many ways, he has led the attack on ICE. He has called ICE a “cruel agency that does nothing to further the interests of public safety” and “too rotten to reform.” He claimed that they are “terrorizing people” and should be abolished. He even signed an order to block ICE officers from arresting criminal—criminal—illegal aliens in schools, shelters, and hospitals.

While Democrats bow to their radical base, Republicans are continuing to stand for the rule of law. Under President Trump’s leadership, we have focused on ensuring that our Federal law enforcement Agencies have all the resources they need to do their jobs.

It is why we passed the Secure America Act. That is a landmark law that will fund ICE and Border Patrol through the end of President Trump’s term. That way, Federal law enforcement officers can continue to track down the violent criminal illegal aliens that Joe Biden brought into this country through that porous southern border.

It is important to remember that every single Democrat voted against the law. Every single one voted against funding ICE and Border Patrol.

Whenever they have the chance, they put illegal aliens in front of American citizens. They keep working overtime to try to make illegal legal.

They want to return to Biden’s open border. But as long as Republicans are in charge, that will never happen.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomi-

nation of Executive Calendar No. 827, Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Ted Budd, Shelley Moore Capito, Bill Hagerty, Kevin Cramer, Cynthia M. Lummis, Marsha Blackburn, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Tom Cotton, John Hoeven, Darline Graham, Ted Cruz.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

McConnell	Murkowski	Warnock
-----------	-----------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Mack

Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Americans are worried that the money in their pockets will not cover the increasing costs of gas and groceries and housing or healthcare. Meanwhile, the President of the United States, Donald Trump, is worried that the money in Americans’ pockets doesn’t currently have his face or his signature on it.

You know, in 2020, Congress passed a law to produce new coins to celebrate America’s 250th anniversary. In that law, we wrote that the coins should be emblematic of our 250th anniversary—the U.S. semiquincentennial celebration of 250 years of the vision of a democratic Republic—of a government by and for the people; of our values as a free people, with the rights of free speech and free assembly and free expression. Well, certainly, this we know—that the symbol of putting a sitting President or leader on a coin is not a symbol of a democratic Republic; it is a symbol of an authoritarian strongman.

If we turn the clock back to the year 44 BC, Julius Caesar was Emperor and he decided to have a coin with his face on it. He was the first to do so. It was a radical departure from Roman tradition, and it alarmed the Senate. It was viewed widely as a blatant display of personal power—of personal authoritarian power. And if you missed the point, on the backside of this coin, it had the words “dictator perpetuo”—“dictator in perpetuity” or “dictator forever.” That is what it represents to put your face on a coin.

Then, at the time our Nation was founded—and, again, we are celebrating the 250th anniversary of that vision—King George III put his face on a coin, on the silver sipping, and it was viewed, as it was with Julius Caesar and the Emperors who followed him, as an expression of authoritarian personal power.

Does our Constitution provide for an authoritarian structure of government, where power flows down from the King to the people? I think not. It flows up from the people through elections.

That is why putting your face on a coin just is absolutely wrong and why it violates the very premise of the law that created the permission to have this 250th anniversary coin. The design that Trump has come up with—that of a fake gold coin with his face on it—violates the law that we passed. It is widely out of sync with the values of our Nation. It is widely out of sync with our history and our best traditions. So these coins should never be made, and, if made, they should never be distributed.

It is part of a long list of this authoritarian, would-be strongman, dictator President, who is trying to stamp his name onto every public place available.

He is renaming the Kennedy Center for himself; renaming the U.S. Institute of Peace for himself; hanging "Dear Leader"-sized, North Korean-style banners on the sides of the buildings here in Washington, DC; putting his face onto passports; putting his face onto the national park passes; naming a class of warships after himself; insisting that it be his signature, not the Treasury Secretary's signature on the currency; planning to build a massive triumphal arch to himself—and let's not forget: tearing down the "People's House"—the East Wing of the White House—to build his gold-plated, billion-dollar ballroom boondoggle.

I say to my colleagues, whether they sit to the left of the aisle or to the right of the aisle, didn't we take the same oath to the same Constitution? Didn't we pledge ourselves to sustaining a democratic Republic, not a strongman state?

So I urge you: Join together—Ds and Rs together—to defend our Constitution; to defend the vision of a government by and for the people.

If we want to turn to the opinion of George Washington 250 years ago, what was his opinion? He was strongly opposed to having his portrait put on coins. Why? Because he considered it a King-like act, completely out of sync with the vision of the Nation we were founding.

Washington's example has endured. It has endured for 250 years until now. Well, my colleagues may say that there was one exception—one exception in 1926—when there was a coin of George Washington, and behind him, there was the outline of a face of President Calvin Coolidge, but it wasn't Calvin Coolidge on the coin. It wasn't his portrait; he wasn't alone; and you would have to be really knowledgeable to know that that outline hanging in the background happened to be of Calvin Coolidge.

Well, this is quite different. This is a full-on, Caesar-style, King George III-style, self-ego amplification that just doesn't fit with the United States of America. So Congress should immediately pass the Change Corruption Act, which I have introduced with Senator CORTEZ MASTO, so as to ban all coins from featuring the image or signature of the sitting U.S. President or living former Presidents—aimed at the principle involved, not aimed simply at President Trump.

You know, families need foundations to thrive, foundations like healthcare, housing, education, and good-paying jobs. What they don't need is to have President Trump's face on fake gold Trump bucks. Instead of putting his face on our money, like a King, let's ask our President to focus on putting money back in the pockets of working Americans. Let's honor 250 years of government by and for the people. Let's prohibit this Caesar-esque, King George III-, Louis XIV-style of displaying authoritarianism. Let's pass the Change Corruption Act.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill, the Change Corruption Act, which is at the desk; that the bill be considered read three times and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I have been very proud to work with my colleagues and very much want to continue to work with my colleagues to make our currency work better for all Americans.

That is why, a year ago this month, Republicans passed the Working Families Tax Cut Act. It did exactly what my friend from Oregon just asked us for, which is to concentrate on how we can make our currency in our country work better for the American people. That is why we passed no tax on tips, no tax on overtime, no tax on Social Security benefits—so we can help the very working families who are struggling in this economy. Millions of Americans have taken advantage of the benefits provided them in the Working Families Tax Cut, but not a single Democrat voted for the bill—not one. So, instead of focusing on what is on our Nation's currency, I would urge my Democratic colleagues to join Republicans and focus on pocketbook issues that impact all Americans.

I might add, interestingly, that I, too, was thinking: Wow. Why would we build an arch in Washington, DC, or near Washington, DC? That sounds a little French to me, like the Champs-Élysées. I found out that it has been planned for years. It wasn't planned by President Trump to self-aggrandize. It has been planned for years, but nobody built it. Then President Trump talks to his friends who are willing to open their pocketbooks to do things that haven't been done previously but that have been planned for our Nation's Capital.

When we recognize the risk that we now put our Presidents in when we have large events like the National Press Club or, you know, a press dinner at the Hilton hotel here in town, where an attacker with guns was just about to enter a roomful of elected officials and Cabinet Secretaries and the President and the Vice President and their spouses and shoot the place up, the President recognizes we have to have a secure ballroom that we can use to entertain foreign dignitaries; in which to have special events; that has special bulletproof glass that is very expensive on the windows; and that has a foundation structure that will support all that because it is very heavy.

The design is so complementary to the White House. The design is very much in keeping with the historic facade of the White House.

It is going to be safer for elected officials and visiting dignitaries. It is going to be elegant, and it is going to be befitting of the White House campus that it sits on, in celebration of our 250th anniversary.

Come on. Let's quit attacking the person who holds the Office of President, every day with every bill, and maybe think about what he is doing for the American people, with nontaxpayer money, to make Washington, DC, something we can be totally proud of—safe, clean, and beautiful.

And why don't we, as a Congress, focus on ways to make Americans' lives better so they can keep more of their own money, so they can self-determine how they spend it, so they can maybe buy a house or help their kids buy a car or help their kids buy an education. You do that by keeping more of their dollars in their own pockets.

That is what we did last summer with the Working Families Tax Cut provision, and we can do it again this year.

So I would encourage my Democrat colleagues and friends to join us in helping the American people instead of obsessing about who is in the White House right now.

So, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I so enjoy working with my colleague from Wyoming. But I did notice that her speech had nothing to do with my point that sitting Presidents don't belong on coins because it is an authoritarian symbol.

And I also noticed that her description of the bill passed last year involved changing the name of it. Trump called it the Big Beautiful Bill. And it became widely ridiculed because it cut nutrition, and it cut healthcare to fund tax breaks for the very richest Americans.

It had nothing to do with working Americans. In fact, when you take the impact of the healthcare cuts and the nutrition cuts, the little, smallest crumbs on the table that were sprinkled to the less affluent Americans don't make up for the cuts to healthcare and nutrition. So they come out the losers. It was a "families lose and megamillionaires win" bill, and I am happy to debate that all day long.

I realize they renamed it because it was such a horrific attack on ordinary people and, quite frankly, an embarrassment.

So I do support my colleague's vision of fighting for families. But to fight for families, we don't need legislation that is "families lose and billionaires win." We need legislation that is "families thrive and the affluent, they pay their fair share." Their marginal tax as a percent of their income is a tiny fraction of what the working American pays.

You know, in any sane system, the richest Americans would pay a higher

percent of their income in taxes, not a lower percent.

But these are disagreements that I am sure we will continue to debate. And I know my colleague is not planning to run for reelection and won't be here next year. I am going to miss that a great deal. But we still have time and several other things that we are working on together, and maybe that is a topic we will switch to in our next conversation.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and 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.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE 119TH CONGRESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the revised memberships on the 12 subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations for the 119th Congress be printed in the RECORD. The new assignments reflect the service on the committee of Senator DARLINE GRAHAM, who was selected to fill the vacancy created by the passing of former Senator Lindsey Graham, as well as other revisions related to the change in committee membership.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Senator COLLINS, as Chair of the Committee, and Senator MURRAY, as Vice Chair of the Committee, are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators HOEVEN (chair), MCCONNELL, COLLINS, MORAN, HYDE-SMITH, FISCHER, ROUNDS, HUSTED, SHAHEEN (ranking member), MERKLEY, BALDWIN, HEINRICH, PETERS, GILLIBRAND, and OSSOFF. (8-7)

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators MORAN (chair), MURKOWSKI, COLLINS, CAPITO, KENNEDY, HAGERTY, BRITT, FISCHER, GRAHAM, VAN HOLLEN (ranking member), REED, SHAHEEN, COONS, SCHATZ, MERKLEY, PETERS, and GILLIBRAND. (9-8)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Senators MCCONNELL (chair), COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, MORAN, HOEVEN, BOOZMAN, CAPITO, KENNEDY, HYDE-SMITH, COONS (ranking member), DURBIN, MURRAY, REED, SCHATZ, BALDWIN, SHAHEEN, and MURPHY. (9-8)

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Senators KENNEDY (chair), MCCONNELL, MURKOWSKI, HOEVEN, HYDE-SMITH, HAGERTY,

BRITT, ROUNDS, GRAHAM, MURRAY (ranking member), DURBIN, MERKLEY, COONS, BALDWIN, HEINRICH, PETERS, and OSSOFF. (9-8)

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Senators HAGERTY (chair), BOOZMAN, FISCHER, HUSTED, GRAHAM, REED (ranking member), DURBIN, COONS, and VAN HOLLEN. (5-4)

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Senators BRITT (chair), MURKOWSKI, CAPITO, KENNEDY, HYDE-SMITH, HAGERTY, MURPHY (ranking member), MURRAY, SHAHEEN, PETERS, and VAN HOLLEN. (6-5)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators MURKOWSKI (chair), MCCONNELL, CAPITO, HOEVEN, FISCHER, ROUNDS, HUSTED, MERKLEY (ranking member), VAN HOLLEN, HEINRICH, BALDWIN, GILLIBRAND, and OSSOFF. (7-6)

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators CAPITO (chair), MORAN, KENNEDY, HYDE-SMITH, BOOZMAN, BRITT, ROUNDS, HUSTED, GRAHAM, BALDWIN (ranking member), MURRAY, DURBIN, REED, SHAHEEN, MERKLEY, SCHATZ, and MURPHY. (9-8)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senators FISCHER (chair), ROUNDS, HUSTED, HEINRICH (ranking member), and OSSOFF. (3-2)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VERTEANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators BOOZMAN (chair), MCCONNELL, MURKOWSKI, HOEVEN, COLLINS, HAGERTY, FISCHER, ROUNDS, GRAHAM, OSSOFF (ranking member), MURRAY, REED, SCHATZ, BALDWIN, HEINRICH, PETERS, and GILLIBRAND. (9-8)

STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Senators COLLINS (interim chair), MCCONNELL, BOOZMAN, MORAN, HAGERTY, BRITT, HUSTED, SCHATZ (ranking member), DURBIN, SHAHEEN, COONS, MERKLEY, and MURPHY. (7-6)

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators HYDE-SMITH (chair), COLLINS, BOOZMAN, CAPITO, HOEVEN, KENNEDY, MORAN, BRITT, GRAHAM, GILLIBRAND (ranking member), MURRAY, DURBIN, REED, COONS, SCHATZ, MURPHY, and VAN HOLLEN. (9-8)

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 26-76.

Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), as amended, we are forwarding Transmittal No. 26-76 concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Greece for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$80.1 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Recipients:

Speaker of the House of Representatives
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Sincerely,

KAITLYN WOLFE,
Senior Bureau Official,
Bureau of Legislative Affairs.

TRANSMITTAL NO. RSAT 26-76

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Greece.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$32.1 million.

Other \$48 million.

Total \$80.1 million.

Funding Source: Foreign Military Financing and National Funds.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Three hundred fifty (350) Switchblade 300 Block 20 (SB300B20) Lethal Miniature Aerial Missile System (LMAMS).

Thirty-five (35) SB300B20 LMAMS Fire Control Systems (FCS).

Non-MDE: The following non-MDE items will also be included: Switchblade 600 (SB600) Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module Global Positioning System LMAMS; SB600 FCS; SB300B20 tactical battery chargers; smart battery chargers; spares packages; training services; field service representative support; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (GR-B-UBA).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 16, 2026.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Greece—Switchblade 300 Block 20 Lethal Miniature Aerial Missile System

The Government of Greece has requested to buy three hundred fifty (350) Switchblade 300 Block 20 (SB300B20) Lethal Miniature Aerial Missile System (LMAMS) and thirty-five (35) SB300B20 LMAMS Fire Control Systems (FCS). The following non-major defense equipment items will also be included: Switchblade 600 (SB600) Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module Global Positioning System LMAMS; SB600 FCS; SB300B20 tactical battery chargers; SB600

smart battery chargers; spares packages; training services; field service representative support; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$80.1 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that continues to be a force for political and economic stability in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve Greece's capability to deter current and future threats, support coalition operations, and increase interoperability with the United States. Greece will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Aero Vironment Inc., located in Simi Valley, CA. At this time, the U.S. Government is not aware of any offset agreement proposed in connection with this potential sale. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Greece.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 26-76

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The Switchblade 300 Block 20 (SB300B20) Lethal Miniature Aerial Missile System (LMAMS) is loitering precision guided munitions intended to allow small unit engagement of enemy combatants without direct enemy fire. The SB300B20 LMAMS uses a common Fire Control System (FCS) and core capabilities, including Electro-Optical/Infrared (EO/IR) imagery for day and night operations, automated mission planning, and a "Forward Pass" feature to extend operational range. The SB300B20 is a lightweight system with beyond-visual-range capability, optimized for anti-personnel missions. The SB300B20 LMAMS is anti-personnel, surface-to-surface launched missile that utilizes proprietary pixel lock technology and a fragmenting warhead to engage targets. The system is controlled via a secure Digital Data Link (DDL), which provides the connection between the operator's FCS and the air vehicle for both command inputs and near real-time video transmission.

2. The Switchblade 600 (SB600) Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module Global Positioning System (GPS) LMAMS is loitering precision guided munitions intended to allow small unit engagement of enemy combatants without direct enemy fire. The SB600 uses a common FCS and core capabilities, including EO/IR imagery for day and night operations, automated mission planning, and a "Forward Pass" feature to extend operational range. The larger SB600 provides extended capabilities, featuring a high-performance anti-armor warhead and a significantly longer flight endurance of over sixty minutes, enabling it to engage hardened targets and conduct prolonged reconnaissance. The SB600 is an antitank, surface-to-surface launched missile that utilizes the same pixel lock technology and a shaped charge warhead to engage hardened targets. The system is controlled via a secure DDL, which provides the connection between the operator's FCS and the air vehicle for both

command inputs and near real-time video transmission, and all its support equipment to facilitate proper operation. This software is hosted on the Flight Control Unit (FCU) and is where Built-in Tests (BIT), payload arming/disarming, and waypoints are initiated. Aerial Reconfigurable Embedded System (ARES) is also where a range of non-flight functions are conducted; to include preflight checks, periodic maintenance checks, loading of Operational Flight Program (OFP) data, and loading of GPS cryptographic keys.

3. The SB300B20 features an Advanced Encryption Standard (AES) 256-bit encryption, securing both video and data transmission. As a key security feature, a unique bind code links the ground controller to its specific air vehicle, preventing unauthorized systems from taking control. The ARES is flight software used across the Switchblade family of systems, it interfaces with the SB300B20.

4. The SB600 features an AES 256-bit encryption, securing both video and data transmission. As a key security feature, a unique bind code links the ground controller to its specific air vehicle, preventing unauthorized systems from taking control. The ARES is flight software used across the Switchblade family of systems, it interfaces with the SB600 and all its support equipment to facilitate proper operation. This software is hosted on the FCU and is where BIT, payload arming/disarming, and waypoints are initiated. Ares is also where a range of non-flight functions are conducted; including preflight checks, periodic maintenance checks, loading of OFP data, and loading of GPS cryptographic keys.

5. The SB300B20 is controlled by the FCU which hosts the ARES flight software. The warhead and other capabilities of the SB300B20 are also controlled by the FCU. Specific to the warhead, there is an Electronic Safe and Arm Device (ESAD) that sets the sensing environment and logic to ensure the warhead only goes off under certain conditions.

6. The SB600 is controlled by the FCU which hosts the ARES flight software. The warhead and other capabilities of the SB300B20 are also controlled by the FCU. Specific to the warhead, there is an ESAD that sets the sensing environment and logic to ensure the warhead only goes off under certain conditions.

7. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

8. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

9. A determination has been made that Greece can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

10. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Greece.

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 0D-26.

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. 0D-26. 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 23-72 of September 15, 2023.

Recipients:

Speaker of the House of Representatives
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
Sincerely,

KAITLYN WOLFE,
Senior Bureau Official,
Bureau of Legislative Affairs.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 0D-26

Report of Enhancement or Upgrade of Sensitivity of Technology or Capability (Sec. 36(b)(5)(A), AECA)

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Canada.

(ii) Sec. 36(b)(1), AECA Transmittal No.: 23-72; Date: September 15, 2023; Implementing Agency: Air Force.

(iii) Description: On September 15, 2023, Congress was notified by congressional certification transmittal number 23-72 of the possible sale, under Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), of munitions and other systems to be integrated into MQ-9Bs purchased through Direct Commercial Sales, to include: twelve (12) AN/APY-8 Lynx Synthetic Aperture radars; two hundred nineteen (219) AGM-114R2 Hellfire II missiles; eighteen (18) KMU-572 tail kits for the GBU-38 Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) and GBU-54 Laser JDAM (LJDAM); twelve (12) Mk82 500-lb general purpose bombs; and six (6) Mk82 filled inert bombs. Also included were Due Regard Radars; SAGE 750 and SNC 4500 Electronic Surveillance Measures Systems; AN/ARC-210 radios; Compact Multi-Band Data Link; KY-100M narrowband/wideband terminals; KOR-24A small tactical terminals; High-Bandwidth Compact Telemetry Modules (HCTM); KIV-77 cryptographic appliques and other Identification Friend or Foe equipment; AN/PYQ-10C Simple Key Loaders; Common Munitions Built-In-Test/Reprogramming Equipment; FMU-139 Joint Programmable Fuses; M299 Hellfire launchers and training missiles;

DSU-38 Precision Laser Guidance Sets; classified publications and technical documentation; munitions support and support equipment; secure communications, precision navigation, and cryptographic equipment; spare and repair parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; unclassified software delivery and support; testing and integration support and equipment; maps and charts; personnel training and training equipment; transportation support; warranties; studies and surveys; Contractor Logistics Support; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total value was \$313.4 million. Major defense equipment (MDE) constituted \$75.2 million of this total.

On June 10, 2025, Congress was notified by congressional certification transmittal number 25-0P of the possible sale, under section 36(b)(5)(C) of the AECA, of the addition of the following MDE items: sixteen (16) JDAM KMU-572 tail kits for GBU-38 or LJDAM GBU-54; eighteen (18) inert filled Mk-82 bombs; four (4) AN/APY-8 Lynx synthetic aperture radars; and eight (8) Hellfire Captive Air Training Missiles. Also included were: M34 Hellfire training missiles; Hellfire support equipment; AN/ALQ-230 Radar Warning Receiver/Electronic Support Measures system; Computer Program Identification Numbers; minor and major modifications and kits; aircraft and engine support equipment; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total value of the new items was \$149 million. The estimated MDE value increased by \$27 million to a revised \$102.2 million. The estimated non-MDE value increased by \$122 million to a revised \$359.2 million. The estimated total case value increased by \$149 million to a revised \$462.4 million.

This transmittal reports the inclusion of the following additional MDE items: forty (40) Embedded Global Positioning System (GPS)/Inertial Navigation Systems (EGI) (33 installed, 7 spares). The estimated total value of the new items is \$12 million. The estimated MDE value will increase by \$12 million to a revised \$114.2 million. The estimated non-WDE value will not increase and remain at \$359.2 million. The estimated total case value will increase by \$12 million to a revised \$474.4 million.

(iv) Significance: This notification accounts for additional MDE items not included in the original notification. The inclusion of this MDE represents an increase in capability over what was previously notified. The proposed articles and services will improve Canada's capability to meet current and future threats by enabling unmanned surveillance and reconnaissance patrols of its northern arctic territories. It will also enable Canada to optimally fulfill its North American Aerospace Defense and NATO missions while increasing 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 military capability of a NATO Ally that is an important force for ensuring political stability and economic progress and is a contributor to military, peacekeeping, and humanitarian operations around the world.

(vi) Sensitivity of Technology:

The EGI with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM), Y-Code, or M-Code receiver when available, and Precise Positioning Service is a self-contained navigation system, SAASM, Y-Code, or M-Code enables the GPS receiver access to an encrypted P-signal, providing protection against active spoofing attacks.

The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

(vii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 21, 2026.

PROMISE ACT OF 2026

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am announcing my intention to object to any unanimous consent request to proceed to S. 4979, the PROMISE Act of 2026.

I support my colleagues' efforts to address one of the most pressing issues for Americans: the future of Social Security. However, this bill creates a fast-track process to change Social Security in just 5 months, limiting the public's ability to participate and provide input on the future of their earned benefits.

This bill would direct the Social Security Advisory Board to produce a legislative proposal that extends Social Security's financing at least 50 years in less than 2 months. The Social Security Advisory Board is a seven-member advisory body appointed by Congress and the President to provide advice and recommendations of matters related to the Social Security and Supplemental Security Income programs and policies.

Producing a solvency proposal in such a short timeframe would be a herculean task for an Agency with hundreds of employees. However, Trump, Russ Vought, and DOGE's crusade against career civil servants has slashed the Board's staff down to three full-time employees.

Following the Board's work, Congress would have to deliberate and pass a bill during a lameduck session with limited opportunities to amend the proposal. In contrast, the 1983 Social Security solvency reform package—the last comprehensive solvency bill passed by Congress—was the culmination of 2 years of debate, dozens of days of hearings and markups, hundreds of amendments in committee and on the floor, and a full conference committee to further amend the bill. Limiting debate in the open pushes debate behind closed doors.

Finally, the Finance Committee has not had an opportunity to hold a hearing on the legislation or the underlying policy issue. It is premature for the full Senate to debate this legislation.

The solution to addressing Social Security's solvency challenges is to address Social Security's solvency challenges. Democrats have put forward several proposals that would strengthen Social Security's finances and extend the program's funding into the next century. Republicans have yet to put forward a single proposal.

For these reasons, I will object to any unanimous consent request in relation to this legislation.

REMEMBERING FRANK TEDESCHI

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and service of

Frank Tedeschi, who passed away on July 9, 2026.

Frank served as a dedicated soldier, extraordinary public servant, and a true patriot. His contributions to our Nation's national defense were tremendously significant. While the American public may never know of his accomplishments, our country is safer and stronger because of his commitment, integrity, and tireless work.

Frank's journey of service began in uniform. He enlisted in the U.S. Army and served in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as an enlisted soldier and an officer. He was a veteran of the war in Afghanistan, and his outstanding leadership and dedication resulted in his selection for battalion command, an honor reserved for a minority of Army officers who have demonstrated exceptional ability, character, and leadership.

Unfortunately, Frank's Army career was cut short due to medical reasons. But for Frank, leaving military service did not mean leaving the fight. He brought the same dedication, discipline, and commitment to public service when he joined my Senate staff.

Frank began his time on my team as a fellow. He quickly distinguished himself and went on to serve as my defense policy adviser and later as my legislative director. In every role, Frank demonstrated an uncommon commitment to getting things right. We called him bulldog. He cared deeply about national security, the Department of Defense, and most importantly, the people of South Dakota.

Frank was one of a kind. He was a proud New Yorker, and he carried that personality with him every day. He was direct, blunt, and never one to waste words. He would tell you exactly what he thought—and usually, he was right. But behind that sometimes gruff exterior was a man with a tremendous heart, a great sense of humor, and a deep concern for others.

As legislative director, Frank held himself and those around him to the highest standards. He believed public service was a profound responsibility, not merely a job. He rolled up his sleeves, did the hard work, and expected the same commitment from everyone around him. At every opportunity, Frank chose the right path, even when it was the harder path. His integrity was unwavering.

Frank's dedication to our Nation's security was remarkable. After leaving my office, he continued his service as the congressional and interagency adviser to the 12th and 13th Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, where he continued advocating for our military and helping to make sure Congress had the information needed to make sound decisions. He was the major driving force behind a generational change in the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, which sets military requirements for the future force. Another example of Frank's myriad impacts as a member of my

staff was his work helping defend the Department of Defense's exclusive use of a critical portion of the electromagnetic spectrum. This effort was vital to making sure our military retained the capabilities necessary to protect our Nation. It was exactly the type of complex national security challenge where Frank's expertise, persistence, and commitment made a difference.

Frank Tedeschi embodied the very best qualities of a soldier and a public servant. He was loyal, courageous, hard working, and committed to something greater than himself. His loss is deeply felt by his family, his friends, his colleagues, and all those fortunate enough to have served alongside him.

To Frank's family, I extend my deepest condolences and my gratitude for sharing him with our Nation. Frank gave so much of himself in service to others. The United States is better because of his life. My team and I are all better because we had the privilege of knowing him.

May God bless Frank Tedeschi, his family, and the United States of America.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hanley, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13882 OF JULY 26, 2019, WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN MALI—PM 65

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the situation in Mali declared in Executive Order 13882 of July 26, 2019, is to continue in effect beyond July 26, 2026.

The situation in Mali, including repeated violations of ceasefire arrangements made pursuant to the 2015

Agreement on Peace and Reconciliation in Mali; a coup d'etat resulting in the termination of that agreement; the expansion of terrorist activities into southern and central Mali; the intensification of drug trafficking and trafficking in persons, human rights abuses, and hostage-taking; a further coup d'etat; the presence of foreign mercenaries threatening peace, security, and stability; and the intensification of attacks against civilians, the Malian defense and security forces, the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), and international security presences, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13882 with respect to the situation in Mali.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 21, 2026.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:49 p.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. 1118. An act to amend title 41, United States Code, to provide best value through the multiple award schedule program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6955. An act to make improvements to the Federal banking laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 9770. An act making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1118. An act to amend title 41, United States Code, to provide best value through the multiple award schedule program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 6955. An act to make improvements to the Federal banking laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

* Rudolph Bauer, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belize.

Nominee: Rudolph Bauer.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Belize.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent con-

tributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, donee, date, and amount:

Self: none. Spouse: none.

*Kari Lake, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

Nominee: Kari Lake.

Post: US Ambassador to Jamaica.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

RNC, \$415, 01/17/23, Self. NRSC, \$41,300, 09/20/24, Kari Lake Campaign Committee. Hovde for Wisconsin, \$2,000, 10/30/24, Kari Lake Campaign Committee. NRSC, \$48,000, 10/30/24, Kari Lake Campaign Committee. NRSC, \$199.17, 09/30/25, Kari Lake Victory Committee. WinRed (Trump), \$100, 03/30/24, Spouse. Never Surrender (Trump), \$468.46, 05/30/24, Spouse. WinRed (Trump), \$104.10, 10/29/24, Spouse. Never Surrender (Trump), \$93.69, 10/29/24, Spouse. Trump Nat'l Committee, \$104.10, 10/29/24, Spouse.

*Douglas Mastriano, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Slovak Republic.

Nominee: Douglas Mastriano.

Post: Ambassador.

Nominated: Slovak Republic.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Dan Cox for Congress: \$500, Apr. 2024, Rebecca Mastriano. Aaron Bashir for Congress: \$500, Oct. 2024, Douglas/Rebecca Mastriano. Patriots for Perry: \$1000, Jul. 2024, Rebecca Mastriano. Dan Cox for Congress: \$500, Dec. 2023, Rebecca Mastriano. Ceci Truman for Congress: \$250, Dec. 2023, Rebecca Mastriano. Republican Fed Com of PA: \$2,000, Sep. 2021, Douglas Mastriano. Donald J. Trump Pres., Inc.: \$225, Jun. 2020, Rebecca Mastriano. Trump MAGA Com.: \$300, Jun. 2020, Rebecca Mastriano.

*Barbera Thornhill, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large.

Nominee: Barbara Hale Thornhill.

Post: Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking with rank of Ambassador at large.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, donee:

Self: \$3,500.00, 11.17.2025, Pamela Evette for Governor; \$10,000.00, 11.07.2025, Southeastern Conservative Foundation; \$25,000.00, 11.07.2025, Whatley Victory Committee; \$7,000.00, 09.04.2025, Joe Mitchell for Congress; \$7,000.00, 07.07.2025, Sarah Sanders Event in Chicago; \$3,500.00, 06.24.2025, Friends of Tim Moore; \$24,675.84, 06.23.2025, American Voice; \$44,300.00, 06.03.2025, RNC Team 100; \$3,500.00, 05.28.2025, Grow the Majority; \$3,500.00, 04.22.2025, Graham Majority Fun; \$2,750.00, 03.22.2025, Karrin Taylor Robson for Governor; \$5,000.00, 02.21.2025, McHenry County GOPAC; \$98,527.00, 12.11.2024, Trump Vance Inaugural Committee; \$3,500.00, 10.27.2024, WinRed Ted Cruz for Senate; \$50,222.25, 10.21.2024, Trump 47 Committee, Inc.;

\$45,844.75, 09.19.2024, Trump 47 Committee, Inc.; \$80,427.34, 09.19.2024, Trump 47 Committee, Inc.; \$98,895.80, 09.19.2024, Trump 47 Committee, Inc.; \$196,323.60, 09.19.2024, Trump 47 Committee, Inc.; \$79,487.62, 09.19.2024, Trump 47 Committee, Inc.; \$123,900.00, 09.19.2024, Republican National Committee; \$3,300.00, 08.27.2024, Tim Moore NC Victory Fund; \$3,000.00, 08.23.2024, WinRed Josh Hawley Victory Committee; \$10,000.00, 07.15.2024, Log Cabin Republicans; \$5,000.00, 06.14.2024, WinRed the Republican National Committee; \$100,000.00, 03.10.2024, Trump 47 Committee; \$25,000.00, 03.05.2024, Buckeye Values PAC; \$3,300.00, 03.05.2024, Blackburn Tennessee Victory Fund; \$2,900.00, 11.02.2022, Budd NC Victory Fund; \$2,000.00, 10.26.2022, Jan Perry for Congress; \$2,900.00, 10.20.2022, Oz Victory Fund; \$2,900.00, 10.18.2022, WinRed Leora Levy for U.S. Senate Inc.; \$2,900.00, 06.30.2022, Blake Masters for Senate; \$1,500.00, 04.25.2022, Jill Homan for NC; \$1,000.00, 04.18.2022, WinRed Tim Scott Victory Fund; \$2,900.00, 04.03.2022, Van Orden U.S. Congress.

*Christopher Anderson, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

Nominee: Christopher Anderson.

Post: Kingdom of Cambodia.

Nominated: June 1, 2026.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Christopher Anderson: none, Jennifer Anderson: none.

*Stanley Brown, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Equatorial Guinea.

Nominee: Stanley Brown.

Post: Equatorial Guinea.

Nominated: June 1, 2026.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

None, zero, N/A, Sharon M. Brown. None, zero, N/A, Stanley L. Brown.

*Joseph Burkhalter, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Moldova.

Nominee: Joseph Mark Burkhalter.

Post: Republic of Moldova.

Nominated: June 1, 2026.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self, \$135.35, 6/2/2025, Tim Sheehy for Montana. Self, \$2,082.03, 12/6/2025, Brian Jack for Congress. Self, \$1,000.00, 10/7/2024, Strong America Fund. Self, \$1,000.00, 10/7/2024, Loudermilk for Congress. Self, \$24,557.02, 9/4/2024, Republican National Committee. Self, \$135.35 (returned), 8/1/2024, Tim Sheehy for Montana. Self, \$3,435.35, 6/14/2024, Tim Sheehy for Montana. Self, \$3,435.35, 6/14/2024, Tim Sheehy for Montana. Self, \$1,041.02, 5/17/2024, Brian Jack for Congress. Self, \$34.00, 10/15/2022, WinRed. Self, \$1,000.00, 8/16/2022, Team Herschel, Inc.

*John Hurley, of California, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: John K. Hurley.

Post: Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Kamilla Bren Hurley (deceased).

Recipient, date, donor, and amount:

Cotton Majority Committee: 1/7/2026, John K. Hurley, \$6,200.

Trump 47 Committee: 10/8/2024, John K. Hurley, \$25,000.

Young Victory Committee: 9/26/2024, John K. Hurley, \$3,300.

Senate Leadership Fund: 9/3/2024, John K. Hurley, \$50,000.

Hogan for Maryland: 8/21/2024, John K. Hurley, \$3,300.

Tim Sheehy for Montana: 8/21/2024, John K. Hurley, \$3,300.

Hovde for Wisconsin: 8/21/2024, John K. Hurley, \$3,300.

Bernie Moreno for Senate: 8/21/2024, John K. Hurley, \$3,300.

Sam Brown for Nevada: 8/21/2024, John K. Hurley, \$3,300.

Cornyn Victory Fund: 8/21/2024, John K. Hurley, \$16,500.

Trump 47 Committee: 6/18/2024, John K. Hurley, \$100,000.

NRSC: 3/5/2024, John K. Hurley, \$41,300.

Sullivan Victory Committee, Alaska: 10/18/2023, John K. Hurley, \$11,600.

NRSC: 6/27/2023, John K. Hurley, \$41,300.

Republican Governors Association: 10/20/2022, John K. Hurley, \$10,000.

California Republican Party PAC: 10/7/2022, John K. Hurley, \$10,000.

Joe O'Dea Victory, Colorado Republican Committee: 9/28/2022, John K. Hurley, \$2,900.

Joe O'Dea Victory, Colorado Republican Committee: 9/28/2022, John K. Hurley, \$2,900.

Dr. Oz PAC: 9/15/2022, John K. Hurley, \$2,900.

Dr. Oz U.S. Senate: 9/15/2022, John K. Hurley, \$5,000.

Tom Cotton—U.S. Senate and Republican Majority PAC (Arkansas): 9/14/2022, John K. Hurley, \$10,800.

Ron Johnson—Senate Republican Party of Wisconsin: 9/12/2022, John K. Hurley, \$2,900.

Tiffany Smiley U.S. Senate: 8/10/2022, John K. Hurley, \$2,900.

Doctor Oz for Senate: 6/27/2022, John K. Hurley, \$2,900.

County Commissioner, County Commissioner, Teton, WY: 6/3/2022, John K. Hurley, \$2,900.

Laxalt for U.S. Senate—NV: 6/3/2022, John K. Hurley & Kamilla, \$11,600.

Michela Alioto-Pier for Board of Equalization: 4/20/2022, John K. Hurley, \$8,100.

Opportunity Matters Fund: 3/30/2022, John K. Hurley, \$20,000.

Independent Super PAC: 3/23/2022, John K. Hurley, \$100,000.

Dave McCormick, U.S. Senate, Pennsylvania: 3/4/2022, John K. Hurley & Kamilla, \$11,600.

National Republican Senatorial Committee: 1/7/2022, John K. Hurley, \$36,500.

*Daniel Perez, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

Nominee: Daniel Perez

Post: Federative Republic of Brazil

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:
\$0, Daniel Perez; \$0, Stephanie Perez.

*Laurence Socha, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of The Gambia.

Nominee: Laurence Socha.

Post: Republic of The Gambia.

Nominated: June 1, 2026.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Laurence Socha, \$0, N/A, None.

Denice Socha, \$0, N/A, None.

*Juan Segura, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Western Hemisphere Affairs).

*Juan Segura, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring September 20, 2026.

*Juan Segura, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring September 20, 2022.

*Brendan Hanrahan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (European and Eurasian Affairs).

*Donald Blome, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

*Katherine Bowles, of Alabama, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs).

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Amy Caldwell and ending with Robert Tuebner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 25, 2026.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Aziz Ahmed Ahang and ending with Charlie J. Franta, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2026.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Andres Jaime Albarran and ending with Carson H. Wu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2026.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Megan Marie Alvarez and ending with Elizabeth Q. Younger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2026.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with Ani M. Ahn and ending with Rebecca Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2026.

*Foreign Service nominations beginning with John Armstrong and ending with Noah D. Ross, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 14, 2026.

By Mr. WICKER for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Erich Hernandez-Baquero, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

*Roger Mason, of Virginia, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office.

*Jules Hurst III, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Suelzer, to be Lieutenant General.

*Space Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Douglas A. Schiess, to be General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Michael C. Alfaro and ending with Col. David J. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 18, 2026.

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Paul R. Fast, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Peter M. Bonetti, to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Jon A. Eberlan and ending with Brig. Gen. Stephen P. Snelson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Mary K. Haddad and ending with Brig. Gen. Mark D. Richey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 17, 2026.

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Bradford R. Everman, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. James B. Bartholomees, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Charles T. Lombardo, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. James P. Isenhower III, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Clair A. Gill, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Feltey, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. John W. Lubas, to be Lieutenant General.

*Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Brian S. Eifler, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Nicholas H. Gist, to be Brigadier General.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Michael S. Wosje, to be Vice Admiral.

*Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Mark D. Behning, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Joshua C. Himes and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Kurtis A. Mole, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas J. Dickinson and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Todd S. Weeks, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Kevin J. Brown, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas A. Donovan and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) David P. Walt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Space Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Matthew S. Cantore and ending with Brig. Gen. Kristin L. Panzenhagen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Jeffrey D. Baldrige and ending with Joshua J. Wendell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Micah B. Baker and ending with Joseph G. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Micheal P. Allen and ending with Denean V. Zozo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jon R. Alexander and ending with Peter H. Yuschkat, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jareatha N. Abdul Raheem and ending with Ning Y. Zheng, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Bryon G. Alger and ending with Jenny H. Yoo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Amanda M. Adams and ending with Dominique I. Zuluaga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Air Force nominations beginning with Isaac L. Bacon and ending with William B. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Air Force nomination of Jennifer H. Hall, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Christina J. Lee, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jenicia S. McFadden, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Anthony C. Clark, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Bryan E. Abell and ending with 1393647040, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph K. Abel, Jr. and ending with 1402783164, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Army nominations beginning with Jamie E. Abel and ending with 1292411770, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher A. Arnett and ending with 1363803810, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Army nomination of Nicholas H. Orr, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Amanda B. Love, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Khalid R. Rodriguez, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of William S. Mulkeen, to be Major.

Army nomination of Craig B. Morehead, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nominations beginning with Jayson S. Belmes and ending with Sheldon C. Wallen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Luslaida Barbosa and ending with Jorge Vargas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Ryan J. Ellwood and ending with Preston T. Tilus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew D. Akers and ending with Alexander D. Washofsky, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Jorge L. Bauzo and ending with Todd W. Wish, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael J. Atterbery and ending with Timothy A. Shaw, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory N. Anderson and ending with Scott H. Zinn II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Troy M. Beiderbecke and ending with Sequoia M. Youngblood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Elizabeth A. Arrow and ending with Robert E. Woods, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nomination of Benjamin J. Robinson, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Grant R. Gagnon and ending with Clinton J. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Benjamin T. Anderson and ending with Karl F. Schonberg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Nicholas P. Celone and ending with Ismael Tounkara, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeremy M. Bullard and ending with Niklas H. Rueter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Dylan L. Aaker and ending with Jonathan J. Yaede, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin S. Carlsen and ending with Keith D. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Aaron M. Ackerman and ending with Alexander J. Wunderlich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Curtis D. T. Bolen and ending with Christopher J. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 23, 2026.

Navy nomination of Aldo Gutierrez, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Dahlia M. Hassan, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Raymond J. Ahaus and ending with Thomas A. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven W. Arnold and ending with Kristia M. Wiltshire, which nominations were received by

the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Dakota J. Allen and ending with Robert T. Yoder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Manoj K. Maloo and ending with Matthias C. Sommer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nomination of Laura H. Artabazon, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Samir Shaikh, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Caroline R. Triepel and ending with Matthias C. Sommer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nominations beginning with Ester E. Cobb and ending with Aimee K. Wu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Navy nomination of Joshua M. Markley, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Adekunle O. Ajayi and ending with Ryan S. Nolan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 13, 2026.

Space Force nomination of Jason H. Furman, to be Major.

By Mr. CRUZ for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Edward Eppler, of Connecticut, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Transportation.

*Karen Sessions, of Texas, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2025.

*Thomas B. Chapman, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2028.

*Karen Jean Hedlund, of New York, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for a term expiring December 31, 2030.

*David Cummins, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration for a term of five years.

*Brien Lorenze, of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2024.

By Mrs. CAPITO for the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

*Kevin Lilly, of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

By Mr. PAUL for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Charlton Allen, of North Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years.

*Christopher Michael De Bono, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Sharon E. Goodie, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Bradford Pentony Wilson, of New Jersey, to be Archivist of the United States.

*Jeffrey Brodsky, of Florida, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2029.

*William Gallo, of Florida, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service for a term expiring December 8, 2030.

*Brian Cavanaugh, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security.

*James Woodruff, of Florida, to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board.

*Michael Christopher DiLorenzo, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years, Craig S. Iscoe, retired.

*Craig Edward Leen, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Christine Michelle Macey, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*John Barlow Timmer, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Cameron Hamilton, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

*Charles Baldis, of Virginia, to be Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, for the term of five years.

*James Andrew Crowell IV, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of fifteen years.

*Stuart Gordon Nash, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the term of fifteen years.

*Hal Duncan, of Texas, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

By Mr. HOEVEN for Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Indian Affairs.

*Mark Cruz, of Oregon, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, for the term of four years.

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on the Budget.

*Hal Duncan, of Texas, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. CASSIDY:

S. 5062. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require medicare administrative contractors, unified program integrity contractors, and qualified independent contractors to pay the legal fees for certain durable medical equipment suppliers that were incorrectly denied payment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. RICKETTS, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 5063. A bill to establish in the Department of State a Foundational Infrastructure for Responsible Use of Small Modular Reactor Technology program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

S. 5064. A bill to modify the procedure for an institution of higher education to change the institution's primary accrediting agency or association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 5065. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to provide for better protections for children raised in kinship families outside of the foster care system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 5066. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 5067. A bill to authorize the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to establish an apprenticeship program and to establish a pilot program on cybersecurity training for veterans and members of the Armed Forces transitioning to civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 5068. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to provide for the nomination and appointment of cadets to the Coast Guard Academy; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 5069. A bill to establish a Secretary of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

S. 5070. A bill to provide free post office boxes to individuals who are unhoused or experiencing housing instability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 5071. A bill to provide protections for children in immigration custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 5072. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Internal Revenue Service to send quarterly notices to taxpayers with unpaid balances; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 5073. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit fraud prevention reports and annual analyses of sources of tax law complexity; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WELCH:

S. 5074. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to authorize the allocation of the costs of certain interstate electric power transmission lines and electric power transmission lines that are located offshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. KIM, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 5075. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals under such Act to foreign-controlled, foreign-influenced, and foreign-owned domestic business entities, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. 5076. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the regularized appointment of justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

S. 5077. A bill to authorize workforce development innovation grants for the implementation, expansion, and evaluation of evidence-based workforce programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. LUIJÁN):

S. 5078. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to adjust the threshold for conducting Tax Court proceedings relating to small disputes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCORMICK (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 5079. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to reauthorize the Genome to Phenome Initiative; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. ALSOBROOKS (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 5080. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to clarify the assistance available for recipients of assistance under chapter 53 of such title for acquisition of real property interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 5081. A bill to reclaim the authority of Congress over the imposition of duties and other trade actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 5082. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to provide for better monitoring and verification of the use of defense articles and defense services by countries of concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 5083. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require reporting by certain charitable organizations relating to fiscal sponsorship arrangements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 5084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply inflation adjustments to the base amount and adjusted base amount for purposes of determining taxable social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 5085. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply inflation adjustments to the additional hospital insurance tax on high income taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. MCCORMICK):

S. 5086. A bill to amend chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, to provide competitive grants to assist State and local governmental authorities in addressing accessibility needs of legacy rail fixed guideway public transportation systems; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. KEN-

NEDY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 5087. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to modify the definition of renewable biomass for purposes of the renewable fuel standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. ALSOBROOKS:

S. 5088. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to prohibit lifetime or annual limits on dental coverage under the Children's Health Insurance Program, and to require wraparound coverage of dental services for certain children under such program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ALSOBROOKS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 5089. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of dental services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 5090. A bill to require operating system providers to require users to indicate their age and developers of applications, covered internet website operators, and browser providers to request a signal from operating system providers that indicates a user's age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. ALSOBROOKS:

S. 5091. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve coverage of dental and oral health services for adults under Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 5092. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to eliminate corporate average fuel economy standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 5093. A bill to establish the Office of the Ombudsperson for Immigrant Children in Immigration Custody, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. KIM):

S. 5094. A bill to establish, under Article I of the Constitution of the United States, a court of record, which shall be known as the United States Immigration Courts; 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 Mr. HOEVEN:

S. Res. 811. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the adverse impacts on the United States of the recent Canadian wildfires and the importance of the Government of Canada to take responsibility for such impacts by increasing efforts to extinguish these fires and prevent their recurrence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 137

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

BANKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 137, a bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to prohibit the Federal Government from entering into contracts with an entity that discriminates against firearm or ammunition industries, and for other purposes.

S. 186

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Ms. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 186, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 189

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 189, a bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to expand the capacity of junior or community colleges and area career and technical education schools to conduct training services, education, and outreach activities for careers in the residential construction industry.

S. 575

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 575, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to increase access to services provided by advanced practice registered nurses under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1277

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1277, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 1289

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Florida (Mrs. MOODY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1289, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States and to support programs at the National September 11 Memorial and Museum at the World Trade Center.

S. 1379

At the request of Mr. LUIJÁN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1379, a bill to ensure consumers have access to data relating to their motor vehicles, critical repair information, and tools, and to provide them choices for the maintenance, service, and repair of their motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 1454

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1454, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes.

S. 1542

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1542, a bill to support the human rights of Uyghurs and members of other minority groups residing primarily in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, to safeguard their distinct identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1630

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Ms. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1630, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide more opportunities for mothers to succeed, and for other purposes.

S. 1723

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1723, a bill to support the creation and implementation of State policies, as well as the expansion of existing State policies, for improving the quality and affordability of charter school facilities and to authorize the provision of technical assistance that will support the growth and expansion of high-quality charter schools.

S. 2439

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2439, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 2955

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2955, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal penalties for the knowing and intentional administration of any abortion-inducing drug to a woman without her informed consent, if the abortion-inducing drug has been shipped or transported in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 3077

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3077, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide appropriate standards for the inclusion of a term of supervised release after imprisonment, and for other purposes.

S. 3122

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3122, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to

require notifications to the Food and Drug Administration regarding food substances generally recognized as safe, and for other purposes.

S. 3208

At the request of Mr. CURTIS, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 3208, a bill to codify the Six Assurances to Taiwan, provide congressional review of the Six Assurances, protect Taiwan from coercion, and for other purposes.

S. 3267

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3267, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of blood-based dementia screening tests.

S. 3697

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Ms. GRAHAM) 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. 3925

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3925, a bill to establish the Julius Rosenwald and Rosenwald Schools National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

S. 3981

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3981, a bill to amend the Burma Unified through Rigorous Military Accountability Act of 2022 to extend the sunset, to require a determination with respect to the imposition of sanctions on certain persons of Burma, and for other purposes.

S. 4436

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4436, a bill to nullify certain rules related to foreign assistance.

S. 4775

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4775, a bill to amend the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act to clarify liability protections for firearms and associated manufacturers and retailers, and for other purposes.

S. 4801

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4801, a bill to amend laws re-

lating to duty performed by members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 4814

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4814, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status.

S. 4886

At the request of Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 4886, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect against high out-of-pocket expenditures for Medicare fee-for-service benefits, and to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to enhance programs that protect low-income Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 4906

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4906, a bill to amend the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 to establish a dairy market stabilization program, and for other purposes.

S. 4918

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4918, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for students to earn child care-related degrees and to work in child care facilities.

S. 4952

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4952, a bill to combat fraud in Federal programs, and for other purposes.

S. 4954

At the request of Mr. BANKS, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4954, a bill to declare that any person who enters the United States without authorization or for the purpose of engaging in birth tourism is considered an invader and to amend section 301(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exclude the children of invaders from birthright citizenship.

S. 4975

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4975, a bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to waive the requirement for a Federal drilling permit for certain activities, to exempt certain activities from the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and for other purposes.

S. 4990

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4990, a bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to review and update Federal

Aviation Administration regulations, policies, and guidance related to low-altitude airspace safety, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 6120

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 6120 intended to be proposed to S. 4784, an original 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 5066. A bill to improve the health of minority individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2026. This comprehensive piece of legislation would eliminate racial and ethnic health inequities and increase access to healthcare for vulnerable communities across the entire spectrum of care by taking a comprehensive approach to health equity.

This bill is a comprehensive approach to address these systemic disparities impacting communities across the country. The bill would expand access to culturally and linguistically appropriate care; strengthen and diversify the healthcare workforce; remove cost, citizenship, and administrative barriers to coverage and care; increase Federal support for Medicare, Medicaid, and public health systems; establish innovative models for maternal, child, mental, and behavioral health; fund prevention programs for high-impact diseases that disproportionately affect marginalized populations; modernize data collection efforts and expand telehealth access; address the social determinants of health through investments in nutrition, environmental justice, and community-based supports so that health outcomes improve and disparities are systematically reduced.

The bill also lays out additional investments and policy changes to improve the health and well-being of underserved communities, address systemic health inequities, and ensure access to high-quality and affordable healthcare for all.

At a time when access to healthcare is under increasing threat for our most vulnerable communities, including through recent Federal policy changes and the implementation of H.R. 1, which has already resulted in significant coverage losses for millions of low-income families and communities

of color, the Health Equity and Accountability Act is more important than ever.

Rather than allowing existing inequities to widen, this legislation reaffirms a commitment to ensuring that all people have a fair opportunity to access the care and services they need. By prioritizing equity and accountability across the healthcare system, HEAA would help build a more resilient, inclusive, and effective system that better serves communities that have historically faced barriers to care.

I would like to thank the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and Congressman RAUL RUIZ for leading this legislation in the House of Representatives, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the Health Equity and Accountability Act as soon as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 811—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ADVERSE IMPACTS ON THE UNITED STATES OF THE RECENT CANADIAN WILDFIRES AND THE IMPORTANCE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SUCH IMPACTS BY INCREASING EFFORTS TO EXTINGUISH THESE FIRES AND PREVENT THEIR RECURRENCE

Mr. HOEVEN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 811

Whereas the United States and Canada have a longstanding and close relationship based on shared values and common interests;

Whereas the shared border between the United States and Canada should be managed to the benefit of the people residing in both countries;

Whereas wildfires can adversely affect people on both sides of the shared border;

Whereas the safety, health, and well-being of United States residents is of the highest importance;

Whereas smoke from the recent wildfires in Canada has adversely affected the safety, health, and well-being of United States residents;

Whereas thousands of firefighters and emergency responders provide service and sacrifice to combat wildfires in order to protect lives and personal property under dangerous conditions;

Whereas responsible forest management, including hazardous fuels reduction, timber harvesting, grazing, and other forest restoration practices help reduce the severity and frequency of catastrophic wildfires; and

Whereas cooperation and collaboration between the United States and Canada on wildfire response, wildfire prevention, and long-term forest health and stewardship is in the mutual interest of both countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significant adverse impact that smoke from the recent Canadian wildfires has had on the United States econ-

omy and the safety, health, and well-being of the American people;

(2) calls upon the Government of Canada to take responsibility for the cross-border impacts of these wildfires, including by immediately increasing efforts to extinguish the fires and prevent their recurrence; and

(3) urges President Donald Trump to further discuss with Prime Minister Mark Carney the importance of extinguishing these fires and preventing their recurrence.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to S. 4979, a bill to establish a process to assure the long-term fiscal stability of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, dated July 22, 2026.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I have 11 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 2 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 10:30 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, July 22, 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, July 22, 2026, at 2 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 9 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 10 a.m.

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, July 22, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 2 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 4 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 22, 2026, at 3 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the following interns in my office to be granted floor privileges until July 23, 2026: Anna Shaffer and David Rockett.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding rule XXII, that the postcloture time with respect to the Traynor nomination be expired, and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination immediately following disposition of the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 180, or at 12 noon if no motion is made; further, that it be in order for Senator VAN HOLLEN or his designee to make a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 180 from the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 23,
2026

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, July 23; 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, that if Senator VAN HOLLEN or his designee makes a motion to discharge S.J. Res. 180 from the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate vote on the motion to discharge at 11:30 a.m.; further, that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate execute the order of Tuesday, July 21, with respect

to the Pozos nomination; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during tomorrow's session of the Senate, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of my Democratic colleagues.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

REMEMBERING DAVID ROSNER

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I won't speak long. David Rosner has died. You have probably never heard of him, but I knew him. His research, along with his colleague Gerry Markowitz, helped expose the role of the lead paint industry in poisoning millions of children.

He was a great public health researcher. Here is his book with Gerry Markowitz, which I just took down from my Senate bookshelf, where I keep it: "Deceit and Denial: The Deadly Politics of Industrial Pollution."

David had smarts, and he had discipline, and he had guts. The smarts made him and Gerry path-breaking researchers. The discipline made their research incontrovertible, and the guts helped him weather the response, all too common, from American industry when faced with inconvenient truths: to lie, to bully, to disparage.

Well, that behavior did not defeat David. His work stands.

As I said, I won't speak long. I will instead ask unanimous consent that three obituaries be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appended to these remarks. One is his obituary in *The Lancet*, the distinguished medical publication. The second is a reminiscence by his professional peer Bruce Lanphear. And the last is a Substack reminiscence by his daughter Molly.

David was a special man. He did special work. I was proud to have worked with him.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBITUARY—DAVID ROSNER

(By Andrew Green)

Pioneering public health historian. Born on March 13, 1947, in New York, NY, USA, he died on May 24, 2026, in New York, aged 79 years.

As a leading historian of public health, David Rosner pursued "the highest level of scholarship that he then put to work for the benefit of people who had suffered illness and death at the hands of industry", said Amy Fairchild, Professor in the Division of Health Policy and Management at the University of

Minnesota in Minneapolis, MN. Rosner helped develop and expand the field of occupational and environmental history, showing how disease and death were often foreseeable—and avoidable—by-products of industrialisation. "What he really wanted to accomplish in labour history was to bring attention to health and the effects of working conditions on worker's health", said Gerald Markowitz, Distinguished Professor at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York, NY, and Rosner's long-time collaborator. "He also really wanted to show how the workplace and the environment are crucial elements in improving public health."

Rosner received a bachelor's degree from City College of New York, NY, in 1968 and a master's degree in public health 4 years later from the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, MA. In that period, Rosner also worked at a hospital for developmentally challenged children in New York. "That's really where he began to see the relationship between environmental factors and disease, because many of the children had been lead poisoned", Markowitz said. "That really was an important education for him about how life chances are completely altered because of housing conditions or diets or just poverty." Rosner completed a doctorate in the history of science at Harvard University in Cambridge, MA in 1978. 4 years later, he published his first book, *A Once Charitable Enterprise*, documenting how hospitals in New York had transitioned from community-based institutions to bureaucratised facilities. "That was really a pathbreaking work that got a lot of attention", Markowitz said. At City University Distinguished Professor, Rosner initiated and academic career "teaching public health students to think not only about public health policy and practice and epidemiology, but to think about history", Fairchild said. "You have to know something about what came before you. It shapes our assumptions and sense of what's possible."

In 1998, Rosner moved to Columbia University in New York, where he was named the Ronald H. Lauterstein Professor of Sociomedical Sciences and Professor of History. He also co-founded and co-directed the Center for the History and Ethics of Public Health, which was jointly hosted by Columbia's Mailman School of Public Health. "He was great to younger scholars and just very supportive of younger people coming into the field", said Susan Reverby, Marion Butler McLean Professor Emerita in the History of Ideas and Professor Emerita of Women's and Gender Studies at Wellesley College, in Wellesley, MA.

Rosner challenged the health and environmental harms caused by industry both through his scholarship and in legal settings. He would regularly testify as an expert witness on behalf of people affected by workplace and environmental hazards, including silica dust, asbestos, and lead poisoning. "He spent all this time testifying for workers and much of that money he ploughed back into Columbia to build the history of the public health programme", Reverby said. "More than the content of his work on environmental and occupational exposures, he really modelled what it means to be an intellectual who contributes to our world", said Mary Bassett, Professor of the Practice of Health and Human Rights at the Harvard T H Chan School of Public Health in Boston, MA.

With Markowitz, Rosner would write or edit several books, including *Deadly Dust: Silicosis and the Politics of Occupational Disease in Twentieth Century America* (1991), *Deceit and Denial: The Deadly Politics of Industrial Pollution* (2002), and *Building the Worlds That Kill Us: Disease, Death, and Inequality in American History* (2024).

Rosner, who retired from Columbia University as a Professor Emeritus of Sociomedical Sciences in 2025, received a Guggenheim Fellowship in 1987 and was named the recipient of the 2026 Genevieve Miller Lifetime Achievement Award from the American Association for the History of Medicine. He is survived by his wife, Kathlyn Conway, a psychotherapist, and their children, Zachary and Molly. “Disease is not only a matter of bacteria and viruses, but it is produced by the social and political conditions that society makes”, Markowitz said; Rosner “very much believed that and that is what he wanted his legacy to be, to make that known in the public health world and the broader society”.

[May 25, 2026]

HOW ROSNER AND MARKOWITZ REVEALED THE HIDDEN ARCHITECTURE OF DISEASE

(By Bruce Lanphear)

David Rosner and Gerald Markowitz did not simply write history. Together, they changed how many of us understand the relationship between industry, disease, science, and public health. Their work became so intertwined that it is difficult to think of one without the other. Yet David’s death this past week invites reflection not only on their partnership, but on the singular role he played in reshaping public health history.

I had the opportunity and privilege to work with David and Jerry—they were a package deal—in the Rhode Island and California public nuisance cases against the paint and pigment manufacturers. Watching them work was to see historians operating not as distant chroniclers of the past, but as investigators reconstructing how societies normalize harm. They brought archives to life. Internal memos, trade association minutes, and forgotten correspondence became evidence not only of what industries knew, but of how uncertainty itself was cultivated and deployed. More broadly, Rosner and Markowitz helped redefine what public health history could be. Rosner and Markowitz stood at the intersection of history and public health. They understood that disease does not emerge in a vacuum. It arises from the worlds we build—our industries, our housing, our labor systems, our politics, and our willingness to accept certain harms as the price of progress.

Their work on lead poisoning fundamentally reshaped the public conversation. Lead was long portrayed as an unfortunate but isolated problem affecting poor children in deteriorating housing. Rosner and Markowitz showed something much larger and more unsettling: lead poisoning was not an accident. It was the foreseeable consequence of industrial decisions, aggressive marketing, political compromise, and delayed regulation. Their landmark work, *Deceit and Denial*, documented how industries understood the dangers of lead long before the public did and how scientific uncertainty was often amplified to delay action.

The same themes ran through their work on silica and vinyl chloride. They chronicled how workers developed silicosis, cancer, and other occupational diseases while industries debated standards, questioned evidence, and insisted more study was needed. They showed that uncertainty was not merely a scientific condition; it was a political strategy.

Rosner and Markowitz read corporate archives the way epidemiologists read outbreaks: searching for patterns, timelines, concealment, and consequence. They reconstructed not only what companies knew, but when they knew it and how they responded. In doing so, they helped expose a recurring pattern in public health: the long gap between recognition of harm and willingness to

act. Their work did not remain confined to universities or academic journals. It entered courtrooms, regulatory debates, and public policy battles, where it was often intensely contested precisely because it challenged powerful industries and long-standing assumptions about responsibility for disease.

They also understood something profound about modern disease. Many of the illnesses surrounding us are not sudden catastrophes. They accumulate slowly across decades, hidden within the ordinary routines of industrial life. Lead in paint and gasoline. Silica in mines and factories. Vinyl chloride in plastics manufacturing. These were not exotic hazards. They were woven into modernity itself.

That insight feels even more relevant today. We increasingly inhabit a world saturated with synthetic chemicals, pollutants, and technologies introduced long before their long-term effects are fully understood. Rosner and Markowitz’s workforced us to confront an uncomfortable possibility: we are, in part, dying from the world we built.

Yet David was never merely cynical. His work carried a moral seriousness without drifting into selfrighteousness. He believed history mattered because it illuminated choices—choices made differently in the future if we were willing to learn from the past.

Many scholars write about public health. David Rosner helped reveal its deeper architecture: the political decisions, economic incentives, institutional hesitations, and cultural assumptions that shape who becomes sick and who is protected.

That is an extraordinary legacy.

[June 16, 2026]

LOSING MY DAD WHILE THE KNICKS WIN

(By Molly Rosner)

As Knicks fever took over NYC the last few weeks, I’ve been excavating more memories of my dad and the Knicks, more lessons that 1990s fandom taught me. So I wrote a fuller piece about it. And here it is:

My dad, a lifelong New Yorker and dedicated Knicks fan, died on the Sunday of Memorial Day weekend, May 24th. One day later, the Knicks won their first Eastern Conference championship since 1999. Making sense of the cruelty of that timing isn’t easy.

One tough reality about mourning is that the rest of life keeps happening while you do it. Grief settles into you while you go about your daily routine pretending a piece of yourself isn’t broken, missing. The Knicks kept playing, magnificently, even though my dad wasn’t there to answer the phone after the game.

My childhood in the 1990s was the last heyday for Knicks basketball and I have a lot of memories mixed up with the events of Madison Square Garden. As an awkwardly tall pre-teen, I found comfort in fancying myself as Patrick Ewing on my basketball team. When Allan Houston played with a Band-Aid on his head because he’d bumped it in the night while feeding his baby, I thought there was nothing more noble or sweet. In that moment, I saw that being a fan was about more than athletic ability: Everyone loved Michael Jordan, but I could see the qualities that made my own dad so wonderful in Allan Houston. When I wore my Latrell Sprewell jersey to class, my middle school science teacher asked me—a rule follower to the core—if I supported his assault on his coach (before he came to the Knicks). I grappled with adoring someone who broke rules. I idolized the players my dad idolized.

It was while my mom was undergoing chemo for breast cancer, that my dad and uncle got season tickets as a relief valve. Because of those tickets, my dad was there

cheering in the crowd when my brother and I played the national anthem with the East Harlem Violin Program before a Knicks game. We practiced while the Knicks warmed up and, for the length of the song, the Knicks watched and applauded for us—a group of local public-school kids—as we played on their court. When the electronics store Nobody Beats The Wiz, sponsored the Knicks, we played the free giveaway cassette tape with jingles about The Wiz and raps about—and performed by—the Knicks over and over again. “I’m a Knicks fan <what!>, I’m a Knicks fan <what!> / I’m down with the orange and the blue!”

My dad was always unabashedly proud and supportive of me, so I can pinpoint the one time I knew I’d disappointed him. I was approached at the Garden during a game and asked if I wanted to shoot free throws during half time. As a teenage girl who’d watched so many other fans miss in front of thousands of people, I was too scared and I declined. When I got back to the seats from the concession stand and confessed to him, I remember his astonishment, “My own daughter turned down a chance to play at Madison Square Garden?” So certain am I in his love for me, that this “failure” became a running joke that would pop up at various life milestones.

My dad had that chance himself, playing for his high school team on that hallowed court in Madison Square Garden in 1964. Though he was a renowned scholar, one of his prized possessions was the photo of him mid-air, arms stretched high for a jump ball, converse sneakers dangling above the floor during that game.

As he got older, my dad’s appreciation for the team turned into one of awe for their athleticism. He’d repeat comments throughout the game—look how strong they are, look how high they can jump. “Just incredible,” he’d mutter to no one in particular.

This year on Mother’s Day, when I called him during game 3 of the second round to tell him our car had broken down on the highway about an hour south of Philly, he’d comforted me first with the Knicks score and then noted that train tickets home might be expensive because of all the Knicks fans coming home that evening. He offered to come get me instead.

Two days later, he went into the ICU.

The final round of the Eastern Conference began—Knicks vs. Cavs. After he stopped responding to our voices in the hospital, my brother and I would put the Knicks game on in the room, both holding on to the hope that the sound of sneakers squeaking on the court, or the announcers calling the plays, or the chants of “de-fence” would get through to him—that those familiar sounds might just be powerful enough to wake him up.

We’d stay until halftime, when visiting hours ended, watching, hoping. I walked the mile and a half home from the hospital checking the score on my phone, eavesdropping on conversations and shouts from inside bars where the game was playing, unsure of how to navigate all the emotions I was feeling: Devastation at my dad’s condition; joy at the Knicks glory punctuated by pain that I couldn’t share this with him; certainty that he’d want me to enjoy this; heartbreak that I wouldn’t receive a “Yeah!” text at the end of the game. As I walked through Harlem, I stopped next to a group of four men on folding chairs who’d set up a projector to watch the game. I checked the score and complimented their set up. Being conversant in Knicks meant we could talk to each other with a certain level of familiarity. “Let’s Go Knicks,” I said in lieu of, “have a good night.” As I continued home, I felt grateful that the whole city, it seemed, was rooting for their hometown team—our team.

The next morning, the ICU nurse caring for my dad, who is not a basketball fan, told us that she'd checked the score on her way to work just so that she could tell him the good news. For us, that was a real act of care. His fandom was a part of his identity as a New Yorker. The Knicks gave us something hopeful to talk about even as we felt increasingly alarmed that he wasn't responding to that news, or anything else.

And then, there they were, our childhood heroes: Patrick Ewing, John Starks, Allan Houston, Latrell Sprewell, Larry Johnson, and all our favorite players, thirty years older, showing up to support this team that was, for the most part, not born when the Knicks last saw a division championship. It felt like they were coming together specially for my family. The whole city has awakened in a way only New Yorkers can—with innovative watching parties, public joy, orange and blue bagels, and signature snark that makes the city into a home.

My dad bestowed on my brother and me the gift of being part of the crowd. He taught us what it means to cheer through thick and thin, what it means to maintain hope, and that there is power in believing in something “just for fun.” I share the bond of fandom with friends who send me texts throughout every game even if we haven't spoken all year, and I thank my dad for bringing me into this community.

The day he died, we told my dad that the Knicks were one game away from the Eastern Conference title that he'd waited 27 years to see. We told him that they looked like they were going to sweep. We told him the Knicks were honoring him at MSG. We told him the wait was over, we told him we loved him.

You can't time grief. I know that writing this is an attempt to make sense of something that defies logic. I wondered if a Knicks win would exacerbate my grief, as many things seem to right now. I'd cried big slobbery tears when they won the East. But the road through the finals was filled with moments of pure joy and camaraderie, the drama of an historic comeback, and a team so likeable you can't help but smile. It has felt like a balm on this open wound. I think it's healing decades of strife for fans with people who didn't live to see this victory. Karl-Anthony Towns said after winning the championship that he felt like his mom, who many fans know died in 2020, helped pull some strings for this win. “Thank you, mama. I appreciate you getting me one,” he said. Every lifelong Knicks fan has someone like my dad who didn't get to see this championship, but believes they might have helped pull some strings, too.

I know my dad would not want our grief compounded by a Knicks loss. Being a Knicks fan in the '90s was an exercise in resilience. It taught us not to take anything for granted and I draw on those lessons today.

Now, even without my dad, my family cheers because being a fan in New York is a legacy we are tasked with carrying on. A chance to be part of something bigger than us. Something to cheer for through pain.

Go New York, Go New York, Go.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

IRAN

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to, once again, try to end President Trump's war of choice in Iran.

We are nearly 5 months into this war, with no end in sight. President Trump

and Pete Hegseth have spent at least \$37.5 billion on a war that Americans overwhelmingly oppose. Americans are footing the bill with their tax dollars and at the pump, as higher prices continue.

We have lost 18 American servicemembers, with hundreds more wounded. My heart is with the military families who are grieving the loss of a loved one.

Now, after months of chaos, Secretary Hegseth wants Congress to sign off on nearly \$70 billion for this illegal war—nearly \$70 billion more of our money to fund a war that Americans did not choose. That is \$70 billion that we could be using to bring down the cost of housing and help folks get their foot in the door to buy their very first home. That is \$70 billion that we could be using to help families afford childcare and allow parents to get back to work. And that is \$70 billion that we could be using to lower Americans' health insurance premiums, fund our rural hospitals, or put some of the damage from Republicans' cuts to Medicaid to rest—in other words, restore that money.

Instead, this President wants nearly \$70 billion for a war that is spiraling further out of control. That is his priority, not Americans' housing costs or insurance premiums, but rather a war across the globe that nobody asked for.

Even worse, we are 5 months into this war, and this administration refuses to give us straight answers about when this conflict will end.

It does not have to be this way. It is clear the only way to stop this war and find a political solution through diplomacy and tough negotiations is for Congress to force President Trump's hand. He started this war, and he is clearly incapable of ending it on his own.

So on behalf of all of our constituents who are paying the price, I urge my Republican colleagues to join us in bringing an end to this war before another American life is lost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island—Oregon. I am sorry. Please forgive me.

IRAN

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you. The Senator appreciates your pronunciation of my home State, which people across America have a hard time often figuring out.

Mr. President, I am here tonight joining my colleague from Wisconsin on a very serious topic: that our Nation is at war; that our servicemembers are dying; that for every one who dies, so many are injured—a war that is absolutely hurting us in every possible way.

Operation Epic Fury has become “Operation Epic Failure.”

On February 28, President Trump and Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu launched this unconstitutional war against Iran.

President Trump was asked how long would this last. He said: 4 or 5 weeks. He talked about how our overwhelming military power would produce Iranian leaders who would plead—who would plead—for an unconditional surrender.

Mr. President, 16 weeks later, the war was still going on, but then there was agreement to a 14-point outline of a cease-fire agreement. But because it was just an outline, because the countries hadn't worked out their different understandings of the points, just as President Trump completely blotched the war, he completely blotched the negotiation; so it was back to war.

President Trump announced new strikes on Iran, and we are now in the 21st week of that 4- to 5-week war. Time and time again, leaders think they can launch a war and make a series of assumptions that prove to be wrong, and here we are again.

We were wrong with the assumption you could occupy Afghanistan and build something resembling a modern democratic nation.

We were wrong in spending our resources to attack Iraq, which was a counterbalance to Iran and undid this balance in a way that created Iranian influence through an arc that extended clear across to Lebanon.

You know, our Constitution clearly assigns the question of war to Congress. So to my Republican colleagues: Why aren't you insisting that Congress make this decision rather than the President?

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].

That is us. That is us. It is not the President. And the reasoning was that an Executive can too easily make assumptions that something will be quick and easy, but you are committing the lives of our citizens—you are committing the treasure of the Nation—and that should require careful consideration. One person alone, our Founders said, should not be able to take a Republic to war. That is what Kings do. That is what authoritarian strongmen do. But we are not—need I remind you—a strongman authoritarian state—at least we are not by our Constitution. We are a democratic Republic, so let's start acting like it and let's start honoring the structure of our Constitution.

That structure assigns the power of the purse to Congress. So every single Senator should be down here protesting when the President cancels a program that has been authorized and funded. Every single Senator should be down here protesting when the President creates a slush fund to do projects that are not authorized and not funded—that is our responsibility. Unfortunately, this Chamber has failed, for the most part, to defend its role and to defend the Constitution.

We did have a concurrent resolution under the War Powers Act that directed the President to remove United States forces from hostilities with Iran, but the majority has acted like we didn't actually pass it, and the President has acted like it wasn't passed. And the majority has failed to protest to the President that he is not respecting the fact that it was passed.

If you can't stand behind the acts of this Chamber, if you can't stand behind the Constitution, then how far off track are we as a nation?

We just got through with a conversation about the fact that this Congress asked for a coin to be minted that reflected the values of our Nation upon our 250 years since our Declaration of Independence, but instead Trump did what dictators do, just as Caesar broke Roman tradition to put his face on a coin and to declare dictator forever, "dictator in perpetuity," just as King George III put his face on a coin to reflect that power came from him down to the people rather than flowing up from the people—that is a mega difference between an authoritarian state and a democratic republic.

The consequences of Trump's war of choice and the consequences of the Republican leadership's failure to exert their constitutional responsibility to end President Trump's war of choice is that 18 servicemembers are dead and hundreds and hundreds of Americans are badly injured.

Thousands of Iranian civilians are dead—including a whole lot of children, many of whom died from a strike by America, by President Trump's team, on a girl's elementary school.

The war strengthened Iran's hardliners—that is what happens when you assassinate the religious leaders and the political leaders—people rally to their country.

It weakened Iran's reformers who wanted to see a different path for their nation.

It enriched Russia. In fact, President Trump proceeded to say that we would no longer enforce the restriction on the Russian sale of oil so they could sell at the world price. Billions and billions of dollars flowed into Russia because of this war—billions and billions of dollars that could be used in the war against Ukraine. That is a war started by a dictatorship against a democratic republic that we should be standing with.

We should be standing with the people of Ukraine, not enriching Russia to buy more weapons to attack them.

The taxpayers, they are certainly losers—\$40 billion of national treasure was the estimate given to us yesterday from the Secretary of Defense. And by all estimates, that doesn't include repairing all of the facilities damaged throughout the Middle East that the United States is involved in.

Before the war, the Strait of Hormuz was open. Now it is closed. That certainly doesn't benefit us or the world.

It has driven up the cost of gas; it has driven up the inflation rate. So Ameri-

cans, in addition to \$40 billion of their collective treasure, are paying out of their pocket so much more at the pump. The price in Oregon has been over \$5 a gallon.

Farmers, they have lost too. They were already hit hard by the tariffs, but now they are hit by the high diesel prices to operate their machinery and by the high cost of fertilizer, all of which could be envisioned if there had been a debate here over whether we should go to war with Iran.

We would have heard from the experts who would say: You understand the Strait of Hormuz is a very narrow channel, and Iran has cruise missiles that can proceed to hit ships in the strait, so they have cards to play. We would have debated that if we had had that debate and carried out our constitutional responsibility.

We would have observed that that would have a horrific impact on American families. We would have observed that it would have a terrible impact on American farmers. But we didn't observe that because we didn't hold the debate.

But, say you: Did we not hold oversight hearings at least? Not a single one—another failure of our constitutional responsibility. This group of Senators, through the committees, not a single oversight hearing of the war.

President Trump promised to lower prices and end wars, but he has raised prices, and he has started a war.

Trump posted on Truth Social:

From this point forward, any time the Islamic Republic of Iran shoots at a ship in the Strait of Hormuz . . . the United States will bomb and destroy ONE BRIDGE OR POWER PLANT, including those located next to, or in, the Capital City of Tehran.

From the beginning, President Trump thought the power to bomb was his ace up his sleeve. Is President Trump a strategic analyst of wars? No. He just had this instinct—his gut—saying: We have more bombs than they do, so they will fold.

But he was wrong. And through this campaign, he just keeps repeating the same thing: If they don't do what we want, we will bomb them even more.

We will bomb them even more—the echo time and time and time again.

In the beginning, Trump said this war was one we entered because Binyamin Netanyahu was going to bomb Iran anyway, and there would be retaliation so we might as well join the war with him. That was the justification for the United States going to war?

Eventually, he got around to saying: This is about the nuclear materials and making sure that they don't make a nuclear bomb. Our Director of National Intelligence had been very clear that Iran had never made a decision to build a bomb.

And the basic measures to prevent them from having a bomb—getting rid of their highly enriched uranium and moving it out of their country under international supervision; having the

IAEA—the International Atomic Energy Agency—monitor everything they do; dismantle their plutonium nuclear reactor—all those measures were already done by an international agreement supported by five major powers—Britain and France and China and Russia and the United States—all together, insisting that these measures were necessary to make sure Iran never got a bomb.

So they did all those things. They dismantled their nuclear reactor—their plutonium nuclear reactors called a rock reactor—and they proceeded to ship their highly enriched uranium out, and they let in all of the inspectors, and they followed all the rules of the centrifuges.

And who tore up that agreement and created a pathway for Iran to potentially covertly pursue a bomb? That man is President Trump.

So President Trump destroys the international agreement that prevents pursuit of a nuclear weapon and then proceeds to start a war to achieve the same result. And then he discovers the war doesn't work, so he has a 14-point plan.

Well, that plan kind of was jaw-dropping, particularly to my Republican colleagues. It called for America to organize an international Marshall Plan for Iran with some \$300-plus million of help. It called for immediate access for Iran to some \$24 billion of funds—after they had spent a decade complaining about Iran getting access to \$1.5 billion, under the previous agreement, of its own money. What is \$1.5 billion compared to the hundreds of billions of dollars that Trump was providing to Iran in the 14-point agreement?

Now we are hearing reports that homes have been hit, schools have been hit, hospitals have been hit. We are taking out bridges. The President is bragging about doing that. There was a report that two desalination plants have been hit in Iran. We don't have confirmation of it. I asked the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff yesterday if indeed we had targeted or hit desalination plants. He said he didn't know but that he would get back to us. So I am looking forward to getting that information.

And why is that important? Because targeting a desalination plant is widely considered to be a war crime. So I hope those reports are wrong.

Why is it a war crime? Because destroying access to drinkable water—and one of these plants was reported to serve some 10,000 people in 20 villages—is considered unacceptable under international law. That is why it is a war crime—because it is not a strategic military objective, unless forcing people to have no access to water is a war strategy, which it is not.

I hope that report is wrong. I hope it is not the case that we targeted desalination plants. Iran is reported to have targeted a desalination plant as well.

So the war is potentially devolving here as we are hitting more and more

things that affect civilian life as well as having killed thousands of civilians directly. The laws of war prohibit attacks on objects indispensable to civilian survival, including water and food.

So where are we? Trump now claims the main mission of this war is to stop Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. But Iran's highly enriched uranium—that it only has because he tore up the agreement that prevented them from having that—is buried deep underground, so there is no easy way to extract it. If there is no easy way to extract it, how is this war supposed to solve that?

So the administration now believes negotiations are essential to be able to withdraw because there is no military answer. Maybe if we had had a debate here in Congress, we would have discussed the fact that there was no military strategy that would result in the extraction of that highly enriched uranium, that it would have to be done by agreement. So we are in the fifth month of Trump trying to bomb his way to an answer, the fifth month of that strategy failing.

Negotiators and facilitators of negotiators have proceeded to suggest a 10-day cease-fire to enable return to try to work out some of the details from that previous 14-point outline to solve this war. I support that effort because the path we are on is hurting America in every possible way and hurting a whole lot of civilians overseas.

So let's embrace and exercise our constitutional responsibility and pass Senator VAN HOLLEN's War Powers Resolution to end this reckless war of choice. If the President ignores it after we have passed it, then let's collectively insist on defending the role of the Senate and the House under our Constitution to be the place where the decisions are made about going to war. It is time that we honor our responsibility.

I know there are a lot of Members who don't want to have to have that debate because they are afraid they will get it wrong—they will make a vote for war and it will be a disaster or they will vote against war and their constituents will disagree. But shirking the responsibility is unacceptable. So strap your big-boy pants on and do the work we were elected under our Constitution to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

SUDAN

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, 3 years. For 3 years, the people of Sudan have lived through an unimaginable nightmare and hell: 3 years of the worst raging war on our planet, 3 years of displacement, 3 years of starvation, 3 years of children growing up surrounded by violence instead of possibility.

Perhaps what is most shocking is not only the horror that is unfolding in Sudan, it is how little of the world

seems to be paying attention. Twenty years ago, the horrors of Darfur captured the conscience of the international community. The world declared: Never again. Yet, today, another generation of Sudanese civilians is being terrorized while the world looks away.

Since April 2023, the Sudanese Armed Forces and the Rapid Support Forces have waged an unimaginably brutal war for power. But it is not those fighting for power who have paid the ultimate price; it is ordinary people—mothers, fathers, children, families.

This war has become the world's worst humanitarian crisis, period. Entire communities have been cut off from food and medicine and lifesaving humanitarian assistance. Large parts of the country are experiencing severe food insecurity, with some areas facing outright famine and famine-like conditions. Women, children, families, journalists, aid workers—civilians of every kind have endured horrific violations of human rights and human dignity.

Consider what this war has done. More than 15 million people have been driven from their homes. More than 4 million have fled Sudan altogether. More than 30 million people now depend on humanitarian assistance simply to survive. Nearly 19 million children—roughly 90 percent of Sudan's school-age children—have lost access to formal education. Think about that. An entire generation is being robbed not only of their safety but of their future.

The United States has determined that the Rapid Support Forces have committed war crimes, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing, and genocide. The Sudanese Armed Forces have also committed horrific war crimes. The Trump administration has maintained that the genocide determination against the RSF is correct. Two administrations. Two declarations of an ongoing genocide.

None of this, though, is inevitable. None of this war is inevitable. The war is continuing because outside actors continue to arm it, continue to finance it, and continue to sustain it. Every weapon that enters Sudan prolongs this crisis and the suffering of the Sudanese people.

Yet, despite the staggering scale of this crisis, the Trump administration terminated bilateral humanitarian assistance to Sudan. And despite the need for sustained American leadership, the Trump administration has still not appointed a Special Envoy for Sudan.

The people of Sudan deserve more than divided attention. They deserve more than the American public looking the other way. They deserve focused American leadership in this time of crisis.

Today, the warning lights are flashing all over the city of El Obeid. We have seen the crisis already when it comes to El Fasher and the horrors that existed there. But now we see the

pattern starting again in another major community. We know this pattern. First, roads are cut. Then humanitarian aid is blocked. Then electricity disappears. Then water disappears. Communications are shut down and disappear. Civilians are trapped. And then the killing begins.

Strategically located between Darfur and Khartoum, El Obeid has become the RSF's next major target. It is home to nearly 1 million people. They are at risk again. Most roads into and out of El Obeid have already been cut off. Only one major route remains, and it has already come under repeated drone attacks. Those attacks are growing more frequent and more destructive. Water systems, powerplants, telecommunications infrastructure, health facilities—the very infrastructure civilians depend on to survive is under assault.

We know this story, and we know how it ends. It is a call to the conscience of all of humanity and the conscience of this country. The only question now is, Will we act before history repeats itself in this city of 1 million people?

The head of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission for Sudan warned:

The patterns we documented in El Fasher—including encirclement, attacks on civilian infrastructure, restrictions on humanitarian access, and widespread abuses against civilians—serve as a stark warning. The international community must heed these lessons and act to prevent further catastrophes.

The warning has been issued. The question is whether we will listen—because we know what happened in El Fasher. Families were hunted down house by house. Civilians were massacred at an unimaginable rate. Women were subjected to horrific sexual abuse. Children were caught between the shelling and the starvation. Thousands and thousands were killed. People who stayed were killed. People who tried to flee were killed.

And the tragedy is this: None of it came without a warning. The warning signs were there. The intelligence was there. The risk was known, but the urgency was not.

We cannot allow history to repeat itself in El Obeid, nor can we allow the violence consuming Sudan to continue simply because it has fallen from the world's headlines—fallen or never been in the U.S. headlines.

I traveled to the Chad-Sudan border. As this crisis raged, I went there to witness with my own eyes. I met humanitarian workers forced to make impossible choices because they simply did not have enough food, medicine, or resources for the overwhelming need before them. I met mothers carrying children who were obviously malnourished. I met families who had watched their loved ones be murdered. I met survivors of horrific sexual violence. I met people surviving on grass because there was simply nothing left to eat.

I saw what seemed like an ocean of humanity in desperation. Those images

will stay with me for a lifetime. The conversations are seared into my memory, the cries for help—not just from those who were suffering as victims but from the aid workers themselves, from Americans themselves—for all of us to do more, to pay attention.

Even when the United States increased humanitarian assistance under the last administration during the first 2 years of the war, the need still exceeded the resources available. Yet, as the crisis deepened, the new Trump administration chose to terminate or allow bilateral humanitarian programs in Sudan to expire.

While the administration's contributions of \$200 million to the U.N.-managed humanitarian fund is important—it is not nothing—but it is nowhere near enough to meet the scale of this catastrophe.

The reality on the ground demands far more from our Nation than expressions of concern; it demands action. That is why I call on the Trump administration to restore and increase lifesaving humanitarian assistance to the people of Sudan. That is why the United States and our partners must increase pressure on the outside actors who continue to fuel this conflict. That is why I introduced a bipartisan resolution calling on the United Nations Security Council to fully enforce the existing Darfur arms embargo and expand it to cover all of Sudan and hold accountable anyone who breaks that embargo.

I urge my colleagues in this body to join me in supporting this effort; to not turn away from this crisis; to stand, as America has stood in past generations, and call out the crisis and answer the call of humanity; to lead to end it. It is too long overdue.

This administration—I demand that Donald Trump appoint a Special Envoy to Sudan. It is required by the law of this body for him to do so, and the people of Sudan deserve an American diplomat whose full attention is dedicated to ending this war, not one whose focus

is divided upon multiple crises. The biggest humanitarian crisis on the planet Earth demands that we have a Special Envoy. If not this, then what? If not now, then when?

If the staggering human suffering is not enough to compel action, then the growing threat to regional stability should be. But I hope we don't act because instability threatens our interest alone, even though it does; I hope we act because humanity demands it.

History has a way of asking really difficult questions: Where were you, what did you know, and what did you do?

No one will be able to say that we did not know about this crisis, that we did not know children are starving by the thousands upon thousands, that we did not know civilians are being massacred at rates and levels seen nowhere else on the planet Earth.

The genocide wasn't declared by the United Nations simply or some outside Agency, our own government has declared it a genocide. And now another city of a million people stands at the edge of a catastrophe. The call of humanity now is who will act. Indifference has never saved a single life but has condemned millions. Silence has never stopped a genocide, but it has allowed them to continue. Sympathy without action is impotency and failure.

The people of Sudan deserve more. They deserve our action. They deserve our focus. They deserve our urgency. They deserve a nation of people in solidarity to say: This should never exist amongst humanity. It should never exist in our world.

This is not just a call for the full weight of the international community, it is a call for who has led the international community since World War II. We have been the Nation that has answered the call on so many occasions. We have been the Nation united in our conviction that such horrors and atrocities should not exist. It has been American compassion that has led

other nations to move. It has been American urgency that has led other nations to move. It has been American leadership that has helped to end crises across the world. It has risen to meet the AIDS crisis. It has risen to help people in natural disasters.

We are the United States of America. The test of our values is not how much we preach them but how much we live them.

The core of the faith of our Nation is to love thy neighbor, and who is your neighbor? The people of Sudan are our neighbors. They are part of our human family. There are children and families now calling to God, but it is not up to some deity to answer that call, it is up to His children to do so.

Another city is in peril. The horrors that might emerge in these coming days will rage again and thousands upon thousands could die or we could act. Let's not wait until another massacre to discover our conscience. Let our Nation rise to its truth. Let our Nation rise to this crisis.

In this dark time, let our Nation be a light to the world. Let us act now.

May we act now.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:49 p.m. adjourned until Thursday, July 23, 2026, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 22, 2026:

THE JUDICIARY

BENJAMIN M. FLOWERS, OF OHIO, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT.
MICHAEL C. MARTIN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.