

HISTORIC GREENWOOD DISTRICT-BLACK WALL STREET NATIONAL MONUMENT ESTABLISHMENT ACT

The bill (S. 3543) to establish the Historic Greenwood District-Black Wall Street National Monument in the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Historic Greenwood District—Black Wall Street National Monument Establishment Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **COMMISSION.**—The term “Commission” means the Historic Greenwood District—Black Wall Street National Monument Advisory Commission established by section 5(a).

(2) **MAP.**—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Greenwood Historic District—Black Wall Street National Monument, Proposed Boundary”, numbered 196/188,275, and dated August 2024.

(3) **NATIONAL MONUMENT.**—The term “National Monument” means the Historic Greenwood District—Black Wall Street National Monument established by section 3(a).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF HISTORIC GREENWOOD DISTRICT—BLACK WALL STREET NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), there is established the Historic Greenwood District—Black Wall Street National Monument in the State of Oklahoma as a unit of the National Park System to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations resources associated with the Historic Greenwood District, Black Wall Street, and the Tulsa Race Massacre of 1921 and the role of each in the history of the State of Oklahoma and the United States.

(2) **CONDITIONS OF ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(A) **DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.**—The National Monument shall be established on the date the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land or interests in land has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(B) **NOTICE.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the National Monument.

(b) **BOUNDARY.**—The boundary of the National Monument shall be as generally depicted on the Map.

(c) **MAP.**—The Map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(d) **ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land located within the boundary of the National Monument by—

- (1) donation;
- (2) purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds; or
- (3) exchange.

(e) **AGREEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements, as appropriate, with public or private entities to provide and facilitate, within or outside the boundary of the National Monument, interpretive and educational services, administrative support, and technical assistance relating to the National Monument.

(2) **MARKING AND INTERPRETATION OF SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC OR CULTURAL RESOURCES.**—The

Secretary may enter into agreements to mark or interpret significant historic or cultural resources or locations on land within the boundary of the National Monument.

(f) **PRIVATE PROPERTY.**—Nothing in this Act affects the rights of an owner of private property within or adjacent to the National Monument.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **ADMINISTRATION BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall administer the National Monument in accordance with—

- (1) this Act; and
- (2) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System.

(b) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the National Monument in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) **CONSULTATION.**—The Secretary shall consult with the Commission on the preparation of the management plan under paragraph (1).

SEC. 5. ESTABLISHMENT OF HISTORIC GREENWOOD DISTRICT—BLACK WALL STREET NATIONAL MONUMENT ADVISORY COMMISSION.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established an advisory commission, to be known as the “Historic Greenwood District—Black Wall Street National Monument Advisory Commission”.

(b) **DUTY.**—The Commission shall advise the Secretary on matters relating to the development and management of the National Monument, including the construction of visitor service facilities and infrastructure.

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **COMPOSITION.**—The Commission shall be composed of 11 members, to be appointed by the Secretary, of whom—

(A) 7 members shall be descendants of individuals who lived or worked in the Greenwood District of Tulsa in 1921, to be appointed after consideration of recommendations from interested organizations or individuals;

(B) 3 members shall have experience in the field of historic preservation or the purposes for which the National Monument was established; and

(C) 1 member shall be appointed after consideration of recommendations submitted by the Mayor of Tulsa.

(2) **TERMS.**—A member of the Commission shall be appointed for a term of 5 years.

(3) **VACANCIES.**—Any vacancy on the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) **SUCCESSORS.**—Notwithstanding the expiration of a 5-year term of a member of the Commission, a member of the Commission may continue to serve on the Commission until the date on which—

(A) the member is reappointed by the Secretary; or

(B) a successor is appointed by the Secretary.

(d) **CHAIR; BYLAWS.**—The Commission shall—

(1) have a Chair, who shall be elected by the members of the Commission; and

(2) adopt such bylaws as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission under this Act.

(e) **MEETINGS.**—The Commission shall meet at the call of—

(1) the Chair; or

(2) a majority of the members of the Commission.

(f) **QUORUM.**—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(g) **COMPENSATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

(2) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—Members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United

States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the member in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(h) **FACA NONAPPLICABILITY.**—Section 1013(b) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to the Commission.

(i) **TERMINATION.**—The Commission shall terminate 10 years after the date on which the National Monument is established.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 3543), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DESIGNATING THE VISITOR AND EDUCATION CENTER AT FORT MCHENRY NATIONAL MONUMENT AND HISTORIC SHRINE AS THE PAUL S. SARBANES VISITOR AND EDUCATION CENTER

The bill (H.R. 6826) to designate the visitor and education center at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine as the Paul S. Sarbanes Visitor and Education Center was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXPANDING THE BOUNDARIES OF THE ATCHAFALAYA NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA TO INCLUDE LAFOURCHE PARISH, LOUISIANA

The bill (H.R. 6843) to expand the boundaries of the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area to include Lafourche Parish, Louisiana was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CLARIFYING JURISDICTION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PUMPED STORAGE DEVELOPMENT

The bill (H.R. 1607) to clarify jurisdiction with respect to certain Bureau of Reclamation pumped storage development, and for other purposes, was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first, I want to thank Senator CASSIDY for his cooperation in putting together this package. It is a package of bills that were favorably considered by the committee. They are noncontroversial. I want to thank also Senator KELLY for his help in putting together this package.

Let me just, if I might, talk about two of the issues we just passed: First, H.R. 6826, to designate the visitor and education center at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine as the Paul S. Sarbanes Visitor and Education Center.

I want to first acknowledge Congressman SARBANES, who is on the floor, who has represented me so well in the House of Representatives. He has also decided not to run for reelection and served for 18 years in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I hold the Sarbanes seat in the U.S. Senate. Paul Sarbanes was a dear friend. He was a Senator's Senator. He was deeply respected by all Members of this body. I think it is particularly appropriate that he is honored with the naming of the Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine visitor center and education center.

The late Paul Sarbanes was a tireless advocate to preserve Fort McHenry in Baltimore, MD. Senator Sarbanes worked to honor the site and elevate the history of the War of 1812 in the national consciousness throughout his career.

I got to know Senator Sarbanes when we were both elected at the same time to the Maryland House of Delegates many years ago. He would go on to serve in the House of Representatives on the Judiciary Committee, which was given the responsibility of the first Article of Impeachment against President Nixon during the Watergate scandal.

Later, while serving in the Senate in the aftermath of the 2002 Enron scandal, Sarbanes worked in a bipartisan manner to pass the Sarbanes-Oxley legislation. Then-President George W. Bush called the Sarbanes-Oxley bill "the most far-reaching reforms of American business practices since the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt."

He had a long and distinguished career of public service to the Nation, and, throughout, he never forgot his Baltimore roots. He saw Fort McHenry as a national treasure in the city and a site worth celebrating. This legislation acknowledges his long-term advocacy for the preservation of the site and the improvement of the visitor experience by designating the visitor and education center the Paul S. Sarbanes Visitor and Education Center. It is a fitting tribute to name the visitor center at Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine after a true American hero: Paul S. Sarbanes.

Mr. President, I also would like to call my colleagues' attention to H.R. 1727, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission Extension Act, which we just approved.

I am proud to have worked together with Representative TRONE and Senators CAPITO, VAN HOLLEN, MANCHIN, WARNER, and KAINE on this legislation. The C&O Canal National Historic Park is 184.5 miles long and covers 20,000 acres, winding north and west along the Potomac River, from the heart of Washington, DC, to Cumberland, MD. The park includes a canal and contiguous towpath that provides runners, cyclists, and backpackers access to hundreds of historic structures that tell a story of this critical economic artery.

The Advisory Commission was established in 1971, and it has been reauthorized at nominal cost by Congress every 10 years for the past three decades with overwhelming bipartisan support. There is no better wealth of knowledge

of the unique issues the C&O Canal and its resources face than the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Advisory Commission. Government works better when policymakers listen to the people who know them best, and this commission ensures that all surrounding communities have a voice in shaping their future.

I am proud to work together with my neighboring delegations to keep this commission running strong.

So, Mr. President, once again, I want to thank my colleagues for their cooperation in getting this done, and I particularly want to acknowledge, as earlier, Representative JOHN SARBANES. He has worked his entire career on good governance, and there is no stronger need in our society than an advocate for good governance in our community. He has done a great job in the House of Representatives.

He is also known for his work on the Chesapeake Bay, as the leader of No Child Left Inside, getting young people to understand the importance of Chesapeake Bay so we have advocates for the future. I congratulate JOHN SARBANES for his incredible record in the House of Representatives and wish him the best.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the courtesies that were just extended.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise to support H.R. 6843, which is part of this package, the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area Boundary Remodification Act.

I want to take just a moment to talk about the Atchafalaya. Le Grand Derangement—my French is off, but stay with me.

When the British kicked the Acadians out of Canada and they migrated down to Louisiana and along the gulf coast, the Atchafalaya basin was where many of them settled, and their culture spread out from there. And if you think of our culture with the etouffee, the jambalaya, the crawfish, it all began in the Atchafalaya basin and built out from there.

And if you look at a map, where the Mississippi comes down, draining most of the continental United States, and then the Red River comes down, which drains Colorado, Oklahoma, Texas—they meet, and the Atchafalaya is born.

Prehistorically, the Atchafalaya River was an outlet for the Mississippi River. And if it were not for human engineering, it would once again be the outlet for the Mississippi. It is 1.4 million acres of swamps and wetlands and rivers—the largest wetlands in the United States.

And I say this because this culture, this Acadian culture—one of the most unique, if not the most unique, in our country—began here. In our boundary modification, we extend the footprint of this, acknowledging that the Cajuns that came from Canada, finding refuge in the United States, putting a unique

imprint—a unique imprint on our country.

And I hesitate because I'm thinking. For example, Breaux Bridge, LA, has the crawfish capital of the world. Now, we are the only State, I am sure, that has the crawfish capital of the world.

But to show where that goes, yesterday, I am at a truck stop in Arkansas, and I stop and they are selling crispy, crunchy chicken. And with the crispy, crunchy chicken, I can get a side. It is jambalaya, it is red beans and rice, and it is something else. I said: This is Louisiana day. The guy laughed. He goes: It sure is. So the food that began when those Acadians settled there has spread out.

What this does is it expands that footprint. It allows more of a celebration of that culture, a preservation of the sportsmen's paradise. And along the way, it created a lot of jobs. It has support across Louisiana, including from the original 14 parishes within the national heritage area.

So I thank my colleagues for getting this across the line. I am very pleased about it, and I look forward to the Atchafalaya National Heritage Area educating even more Americans as to the wonders of my State.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, this bipartisan bill, H.R. 1607, the pumped hydro storage bill, is about delivering affordable and reliable energy to our growing State by expanding hydropower storage.

The way it does that is pretty simple. It clarifies the Bureau of Reclamation's jurisdiction with respect to the future development of pumped storage along the Salt River in Arizona, and it expands an existing withdrawal south of the river from 1 to 2 miles, allowing the Salt River Project to explore developing sites identified in a 2014 Bureau of Reclamation study. This could ultimately bring upwards of 2,000 megawatts of energy storage capacity to the State of Arizona, providing clean energy and improving grid reliability as the demand for energy grows in the coming years.

Representatives SCHWEIKERT and STANTON introduced this bill in the House, and it passed the Chamber last year by a vote of 384 to 1. I appreciate the work of my colleagues on the Energy and National Resources Committee to ensure that our bill received a hearing and a markup.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

REFORMING EMERGENCY POWERS TO UPHOLD THE BALANCES AND LIMITATIONS INHERENT IN THE CONSTITUTION ACT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, we are currently considering the Defense authorization bill. We have considered this most years annually for many decades. Typically, though, we will have a robust debate, we will have amendments offered, and we will try to have participation by Senators from all over the

United States geographically represented in the debate.

That won't happen this year. There will be no debate. It will be very controlled and circumscribed, and there won't be amendments. This is disappointing to me because I think there are some very important issues that need to be brought up, and one of those is emergency powers.

Our Founding Fathers understood that it was very important to divide these powers between the executive branch, the legislative branch, or the judiciary. Over the past hundred years though, we have had a gradual evolution of these powers toward the executive branch. And we now have a very, very strong executive branch that, in many ways, is able to control the narrative and ultimately to control the country.

In the 1970s, Frank Church wrote these words, which I think represent a problem that existed then and even more so now. He wrote:

Hundreds of statutes clothe the President with virtually unchecked powers with which he can affect the lives of American citizens in a host of all-encompassing ways. This vast range of powers, taken together, confers enough authority on the President to rule the country without reference to normal constitutional processes.

Under the authority delegated by these statutes, the President may: seize property; organize and control the means of production; seize commodities; institute martial law; seize and control all transportation and communication; regulate the operation of private enterprises; restrict travel; and, in a plethora of particular ways, control the lives of all American citizens.

These words were written by Senator Frank Church in a 1977 law review article, but they are still true to this day and even more worrisome.

The Church Committee's investigatory work famously convinced many in Congress that the time had come to reassert congressional checks and balances on the Executive that had become all too powerful.

It is ironic that the powers-that-be still conspire to this day to hide the work of the Church Committee. I have been trying for over a year to read the classified version of the Church Committee. All right. This is not some sort of new document; this is a document from 1976. But the powers-that-be have prevented me for over a year from reading the classified report. You got to wonder—does that mean they have something to hide or does that mean they love power so much that they don't want to share it?

The National Emergencies Act of 1976 was supposed to be a reform of Presidential emergencies. It was supposed to limit the power of Presidents. In that act, they actually gave a legislative veto. If an emergency were invoked by a President and the majority of Congress voted it, they would be legislatively able to reject that emergency.

The Court ultimately ruled, though, that that would have to be signed by the President, effectively meaning that

if a President declares an emergency, a majority of us say "We don't think that should be declared," and he vetoes it, it now takes two-thirds of us to overcome a Presidential emergency. This is a very high bar and makes it nearly impossible to stop a Presidential emergency.

Essentially, the National Emergency's Act enforcement mechanism became toothless when the Court got rid of the legislative veto. Subsequently, Congress must muster this veto-proof or two-thirds vote. To thwart a rogue President, it currently takes a two-thirds majority vote in both Houses to overturn a veto. This is a very high bar. Consequently, we live in a country Frank Church would barely recognize.

In some ways, the United States of America is a monarchy in disguise. The United States maintains the veneer of a constitutional republic but often operates as an elected monarchy in which the President exercises awesome and unchecked power by decree and in perpetuity.

If you look at the emergencies on the books, some of them have been on the books for 50 years. If you look at the potential emergencies that could be declared, you would be shocked.

This dangerous imbalance of the constitutional separation of powers is not simply aggrandizement by the executive branch; it is something that Congress has actually been complicit with. Congress has essentially made itself a feckless branch of the Federal Government by granting the President so many emergency powers and refusing to regularly vote on the termination of national emergencies, as required by current law. The emergencies go on and on.

Our concern should not merely be to restore Congress to its proper role in our Madisonian system of government; rather, our true focus should be to restore the Founders' vision of a government of limited and diffuse powers that is devoted to securing our inalienable rights. A government that disperses power among separate, distinct, and competing branches is a government that is less likely to violate our liberties.

We owe the people nothing less than the restoration of the constitutional principles of separation of powers and of checks and balances among the branches of the Federal Government.

I have offered a significant step towards revivifying the Founders' vision. I have introduced a bill called the REPUBLIC Act, which is an amendment to this bill but likely will not be considered because the powers-that-be don't want debate or amendments. But this amendment, were it considered, would restore Congress's role in governance by requiring that declarations of national emergency expire after 30 days. The President would still have the power to declare an emergency, but it would expire after 30 days unless approved affirmatively by Congress. What

this does is essentially switches the role we currently have. Currently, it takes two-thirds of Congress to stop an emergency; now it would take 50 percent of Congress to affirm an emergency.

We did this in my State for our Governor. It is a good reform and goes a long way towards restoring the faith that people have in the separation of powers and the limitation of powers.

This simple reform allows the President to respond to genuine crises but ensures that the Executive cannot rule by unchecked perpetual emergency.

My bill includes other reforms that are designed to safeguard the country from emergency rule. My bill would repeal the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934—also known as the internet kill switch—that allow the President, if he declares an emergency, to take over all communications.

Now, this emergency fortunately has never been declared, but simply having this on the book for so long is a threat that someday a President might occur who says: I am going to take over all communications, and I will shut them down. That is a power so ominous, no President of either party should ever have that power, and this bill would remove that power.

Today, though, with the power still in place, with the stroke of a pen, the President could use this power to monitor emails, restrict access to the internet, control computer systems, television, radio broadcast, and cellphones. Longstanding use of this power would effectively eviscerate the First Amendment.

If the REPUBLIC Act, my amendment today, were accepted, the President would no longer be able to utilize this power—at least would have limited power during a limited time, and a majority of Congress would have to affirm the continued use of this emergency.

Emergency powers were not the type of rule our Founders anticipated for our country. The other name for emergency rule is "martial law." It is something all of us should object to and say that this should only happen in an exceptional case, be very limited, and have the ability of Congress to overturn.

If anyone doubts that emergency powers can be abused, just look to Canada. Gene Healy of the Cato Institute wrote:

America's neighbor to the north offers a cautionary tale about the risks that broad emergency powers could be turned inward against political dissent. In early 2022, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau faced a mass protest against COVID-19 restrictions, in which Canadian truckers obstructed key border crossings and effectively shut down the capital city with their rigs. Instead of simply clearing out the protesters and punishing them via conventional legal means, Trudeau invoked emergency powers broad enough to permit the financial "unpersoning" of anyone participating in the protests.

He went to their bank accounts and took their money. When people raised

money voluntarily through crowd financing to help these truckers, he stole that money as well through martial rule. Without any rule of law, he took the money. No transaction with the protesters; he took their money. People were locked up under martial law.

Canada's 1988 Emergencies Act gave the Trudeau government staggering powers to subject individual protesters to "de-banking" without due process.

This is the danger of Presidential power—of excessive Presidential power. It isn't about any individual President; it is about all Presidents of either party because men and women will succumb to the desire for power. It is inherent in all. That is why we must have checks and balances.

Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister Chrystia Freeland put it this way in describing Trudeau's martial law in a February 2022 warning to the truckers:

As of today, a bank or other financial service provider will be able to immediately freeze or suspend an account without a court order.

The Government of Canada—essentially Trudeau—could freeze a bank account without a court order, without due process of law.

We are today serving notice: If your truck is being used in these protests, your corporate accounts will be frozen. The insurance on your vehicle will be suspended. Send your . . . trailers home.

While native-born Americans may think that emergency powers are to be used to target others, I would venture to guess that the Canadian truckers protesting COVID-era mandates didn't expect that their government would treat them as foreign adversaries and freeze their accounts.

If it can happen in Canada, it can happen in the United States.

Expansive emergency powers do not end there. Today in the United States—a country that owes its very existence to tax revolt—the President can unilaterally impose and raise taxes on foreign imports. Now, some of that power, unfortunately, Congress gave to the President, but it was a mistake, and we should take the power back.

The rallying cry of our American Revolution—"no taxation without representation"—was not just a protest of the past, it is a core principle of American governance. Yet Congress, in its feckless desire to abscond on all responsibilities, said to the President: You can have it; we don't want it. You can raise taxes anytime you want without a vote of Congress.

Terrible idea. Our Constitution was designed to prevent any branch from overstepping its bounds.

Unchecked Executive actions—enacting tariffs on our citizens without a vote of Congress threatens our economy, raises prices on everyday goods, and erodes the system of checks and balances that our Founders so carefully crafted.

The REPUBLIC Act, the reform of emergency powers, the limitation of

emergency powers, would correct this. We end up saying to the President: You can't declare an emergency to raise a tax.

Our Founding Fathers were very specific. Not only did taxes have to originate in Congress, they had to originate in the House before coming to the Senate because the House was seen as being closer to the people. Yet here we are talking about vast taxes being levied by one person through emergency powers. We should not let this stand.

Finally, the REPUBLIC Act, my reform, requires the President to disclose Presidential emergency action documents to the Congress. What are these? These are Executive orders that are prepared in anticipation of a wide range of emergency scenarios. These documents are kept secret, and Congress has historically had little oversight or insight into how many exist, what they say, and what are the powers that the President anticipates taking in an emergency.

Although the documents have never been made public, there have reportedly been emergency orders designed to unilaterally suspend habeas corpus, impose censorship, and seize property without warrants. We don't know for certain because they will not reveal these Executive orders, but we do know that they exist. Congress desperately needs to see these documents to conduct oversight of these secret plans that can threaten basic constitutional rights.

We do not have to accept as inevitable or as an inevitability the degeneration of a republic into rule by an all-powerful Executive. We do not have to live in a monarchy disguised as a republic.

We would do well to remember Montesquieu, who wrote that "when the executive and legislative powers are combined into one branch, no liberty will remain."

It is time to reclaim the authority of Congress and protect the liberties of people by paring back the vast emergency powers delegated to the President.

I hope the powers-that-be will change their mind and see fit to allow a vote on this amendment. There is significant bipartisan support. We passed it out of committee I believe 13 to 1. The Democrat chairman is a cosponsor of this bill. I think this is a bill that really should bring both sides together.

There used to be pride in our country, pride in the legislative branch to hold firm against usurpation of power by the other branches. This was a pride that went beyond party label and brought legislators together. In recent years, it has been disappointing.

Some people are for reform of Presidential emergencies when their party is not in power, and some people are for it until they are against it when their guy or their woman is in power.

I can tell you this: I have been for this emergency reform under the previous President. I am for this emer-

gency reform under the next President because this is about power. It is about the dispersion of power. It is about decentralizing power. It is about the constitutional separation of powers. It is about checks and balances.

It is important enough that it should be considered. I think it would pass were it considered. But the American people need to know that important debates like this will only occur if the powers-that-be allow the vote to occur. So I would beseech the powers-to-be to allow a vote on this amendment and for my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from North Dakota.

H.R. 5009

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the National Defense Authorization Act. The act that is called the NDAA covers a wide range of topics, but, overall, it helps us chart a course to defend our country during these very dangerous times.

Russia, China, and Iran are working together to undermine U.S. interests across the globe. A world led by those nations is, in fact, a very dangerous world. And it is a world where the economic well-being of ordinary Americans suffer.

I have visited key U.S. allies and partners in recent years, and I am convinced that when we are strong—when the United States is strong—as a nation, we attract like-minded partners who will work with us to push back on our adversaries and defend freedom, not only here for our country but across the globe. And the NDAA is about bolstering our defenses and strengthening those very partnerships.

This bill, for example, establishes a Taiwan Security Cooperation Initiative. Now, that is modeled after the Indo-Pacific and Ukraine's security assistance initiatives, and it is designed to enable Taiwan to maintain sufficient self-defense capabilities, vitally important in the Pacific and vitally important that we not work just with Taiwan but with all our allies in the Pacific: Japan, Australia, New Zealand, South Korea, and others.

And also, this pact requires the Department of Defense to provide Israel with intelligence and advice in support of their war effort in the Middle East against Hamas and other terrorist organizations, including the largest sponsor of state terrorism in the world, Iran.

In addition, the NDAA supports a handful of missions that are both critical to our security around the globe and of particular interest to my State.

First, for example, UAS and counter-UAS. It is a huge issue right now, not only in terms of the battlefield, what we are seeing in Ukraine, in the Middle East, and other places, but even here in our own country, civilian uses of drones and counter-drones is certainly very much at the forefront of the

public's attention. And we have real problems with UAS threats across all of the areas that we operate, here at home and overseas.

Now, we still have a patchwork approach that has grown out of an ad hoc response to specific threats to domestic military installations. The Department of Defense very much needs a coherent strategy and clear guidance when it comes to drones and countering drones.

This bill takes a number of important steps toward addressing the issue, including: directing the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for countering unmanned aerial systems and the threats they pose to Department of Defense facilities, personnel, and assets. And that means not only here at home but across the globe where we have personnel and where we have military installations.

So having that strategy for drones and counter-drones is very, very important right now. And it is very complex, as we are seeing.

This legislation also requires standing up a counter-UAS—unmanned aerial system—drone task force to review and update all of DOD guidances to provide clarity and expedited decision-making processes and information processes so that the public knows what we are doing and has confidence in what we are doing.

In North Dakota, we have a UAS ecosystem that is ready to support this initiative, both in the military aspects and in the civilian aspects. And we have had that focus on UAS technology going back all the way to 2005.

And again, I think we are one of the only air bases in the country, at the Grand Forks Air Force Base, where we operate military and civilian, manned and unmanned aircraft, all at the same base, as well as our connection to the lower orbit satellites through the Space Defense Agency.

So we have established what we call their Project ULTRA. Project ULTRA is specifically designed to move unmanned aerial systems and to counter unmanned aerial systems from the drawing board to the warfighter. As I say, we have been at that for almost 20 years.

As DOD contemplates this counter-UAS strategy, we are ready to bring industry partners, and I mean some of the leading industry partners like Northrup Grumman, like General Atomics, like Raytheon, and many others as well. They are already operating. They are in the Grand Sky Technology Park on the Grand Forks Air Force Base. And we are ready to bring those partnerships—those companies that have developed these technologies—together with the Department of Defense under the directive in this legislation to defend, like I say, not only our military installations but to do more in the civilian airspace so that the public can have confidence that when they see a drone flying in our national airspace, that it has been accounted for and properly dealt with.

Second, the second huge issue in the NDAA is nuclear modernization. Our nuclear deterrent is the foundation of global stability and is prerequisite for the success of our conventional forces.

If we have a nuclear deterrent that no adversary ever questions, then they will never go beyond conventional forces. We have the finest military in the world. Our conventional forces are more than a match for anyone in the world. And so that could create the temptation for somebody to actually use nuclear forces. But if they know our deterrent is so strong, then they will never actually challenge us. So it is the bedrock or the foundation on which our conventional forces reside. We are facing an increasingly dangerous nuclear world where we must deter multiple nuclear powers at the same time.

Now, several years ago, I led efforts to ensure that the Department of Defense kept our inventory of silos for our intercontinental ballistic missiles and preserve a full deployment of these missiles to support deterrence.

Today, we need those missiles to support deterrence against China, which is building up its forces incredibly, as well as Russia and North Korea.

This NDAA continues to carry language preserving the number of ICBMs that we deploy. It also creates a new Assistant Secretary of Defense to oversee nuclear deterrence policies and programs across the Department of Defense.

And most importantly—most importantly—it authorizes the next steps in modernizing not only the ICBM force but all three legs of the nuclear triad—bombers, the missiles, and submarines. It provides more than \$5.6 billion in authorizations for modernizing these programs; for example, Minot Air Force Base in North Dakota, which is the only dual nuclear base that we have, both the bombers and the missiles. But it also updates the aircraft, the Sentinel, which is the new missile program, the LRSO, long-range stand-off, which is the new air-launched cruise missile, which is part of the bomber fleet; the B-52s, the new B-2 bombers, as well as our other long-range stand-off missile programs.

All of those things, as well as our submarines, form the nuclear deterrent that is the bedrock of our military forces. With the evolution of technology, the environment, and our own ambitions—the military environment I am talking about—and the near-peer challenges that we face with Russia and particularly with China, we have no choice but to make sure that we are updating and modernizing our nuclear forces so that no one ever challenges the United States or our ability to defend ourselves and our allies.

Space Development Agency—I mentioned that just a minute ago—another area of emphasis that is very important in this legislation. We know that space is an increasingly important part of defending our Nation and our inter-

ests around the globe. When we look at Russia, when we look at China and what they are doing in space, we must not only keep up, we must continue to exceed what they are doing. It is vitally important to making sure that our nuclear forces have the best technology and a technological advantage in warfare over our adversaries.

This legislation authorizes more than \$4 billion for the Space Development Agency, including how the Low Earth Orbit Satellite Program is operated. This program is significant and will fundamentally change—the low Earth orbit satellites, which we are putting out in space now, and we will have many of them, I mean, hundreds of them. This program is significant and will fundamentally change the way our forces operate around the globe.

Every soldier, every weapon system, and every mission will benefit from getting information from these low Earth orbit satellites. And we are taking steps in this bill and in the appropriations processes to do just that.

And so when you look at SpaceX, sending those rockets in space, many of those have low Earth orbit satellites that we are already putting out in space.

Those low Earth orbit satellites will be controlled from one Army base and from one Air Force base. The Army base is the Redstone Army base in Alabama. And the Air Force base is the Grand Forks Air Force Base in my State.

Some other provisions that I want to mention are noteworthy as well. First, greenhouse gas emissions. This NDAA extends a prohibition that we passed last year on any rules that would force contractors to report on greenhouse gas emissions.

I fought hard against these types of regulations, which would add unnecessary redtape and delays, drive up costs, and provide no benefit to the warfighter.

The purpose of our weapons systems must be to make sure that our forces have a superior advantage to any other forces in the world in lethality. And that is exactly how they need to be designed. And that is what this provision is designed to ensure.

Support for our servicemembers, this bill includes a number of provisions that I have heard about in regard to strongly supporting our servicemembers and their families; for example, pay increases. It authorizes a 14.5-percent pay increase for junior enlisted servicemembers, E-4 and below, and a 4.5-percent basic pay increase for all other servicemembers.

Second, access to mental health. The bill improves access to services for mental health, making it easier for telehealth providers to offer services and expand accreditation opportunities for behavioral health providers, which is a big need.

Specialty care travel allowances. The bill includes a provision I supported to require the Secretary to reassess the

travel and transportation allowances provided to servicemembers and dependents seeking specialty care—healthcare, within a hundred miles of their duty station.

Military spouse professional licensing permanently grants authority to the Department of Defense to make transferring professional licenses between States easier for military spouses.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion: It is important that our military members can put mission first, and this bill eliminates authorizations for a range of disruptive DEI programs while establishing a 1-year freeze on hiring for DEI work at the Department of Defense.

Like I said at the beginning of my remarks, the NDAA helps us chart a course to defend our country during these dangerous times. With the passage of the NDAA, we will have the authorization for these important programs, and as a member of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, we are ready—I and others are ready—to get to work to fund these important programs for our Nation's defense. We have the finest military in the world, and we must do all that we can to support our men and women in uniform.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am laughing because it was Senator HOEVEN over there probably talking about you and me, Mr. President, and I just couldn't let that go unchallenged.

TRIBUTE TO PALOMA CHACON

Mr. President, with me today is one of my able colleagues from my Senate office, Ms. Paloma Chacon. Behind my back, some of my staffers call Paloma "Kennedy's brain." They think I don't know that they are saying that, but it is probably true, and I want to thank her for her good judgment, counsel, and advice.

NEW ORLEANS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. President, what I want to talk about briefly tonight breaks my heart, but it also makes me mad. But it does break my heart.

On Thursday, November 21, we had another mass shooting in New Orleans—this time in the French Quarter. It happened at the corner of Iberville and Royal Streets, across from Dickie Brennan's Steakhouse. Three masked men pulled up in a car and started firing. Bystanders testified they fired about 40 rounds. One person was killed. Three others were injured.

Some people, particularly back home, are probably thinking: OK. What else is new? Another mass shooting in Louisiana and in New Orleans. But this one was preventable.

One of the shooters, who was arrested—his name is Nicholas Miorana.

Mr. Miorana is 28 years old. He has spent most of his adult life in prison. He is, based on his record, a career criminal. He served 7 years in prison for armed robbery. He got out. Shortly thereafter, in 2023, Miorana was arrested for a bunch of things: domestic battery, child endangerment, a series of gun charges, including being a felon with a firearm.

What happened next is disgusting.

In January of 2024, our district attorney offered Mr. Miorana a really sweet deal. Forget about the child endangerment. Forget about the domestic battery. Forget about all the gun charges.

The DA said: You can plead guilty.

He said this to Mr. Miorana: You can plead guilty to attempted possession of a firearm by a felon—attempted possession of a firearm by a felon.

What? Attempted possession?

I don't mean to be metaphysical here or teleological, but you either possess a firearm or you don't. I don't understand the "attempted" possession of a firearm. Maybe it was because, had Mr. Miorana been offered a deal—take it or leave it—for possession of a firearm as opposed to attempted possession of a firearm, which I didn't even know exists, it would have carried a 5-year sentence. Obviously, Mr. Miorana took the deal, and he appeared before Judge Leon Roche in our criminal court in New Orleans. Mr. Roche gave him probation.

Eight months later, while he was on probation, Mr. Miorana violated his probation, and his probation officer sought to revoke his probation. Then, 1 month later—nobody did anything about revoking his probation. So, 1 month later, Miorana was arrested for domestic abuse battery. He went back before Judge Roche. Judge Roche didn't revoke his probation. He just gave him house arrest and told him he had to wear an ankle monitor. That was in September of 2024. Then, a little bit later, Judge Roche decided to lighten even those conditions. He allowed Mr. Miorana to be free every day from 9 to 6—every day from 9 to 6—supposedly, to go to work.

Beginning on October 8, Mr. Miorana violated the judge's orders every single day—every single day for 45 days. How do we know this? He had on an ankle monitor, and the monitor company reported to the district attorney and to Judge Roche that Mr. Miorana was violating the terms of his house arrest and ankle monitoring—45 days.

Do you know what the district attorney did? Do you know what Judge Roche did? Nothing. Zero. Zilch. Nada. I have already told you how this story ends. Allegedly—I have to say "allegedly"—he has been arrested for it anyway. Mr. Miorana and three of his buddies put on a mask, got in a Honda, killed somebody in the French Quarter, and shot three others. Mr. Miorana was caught. Do you know how he was caught? He had on an ankle monitor. He was caught within hours. This was a system failure.

I love New Orleans. I used to live in New Orleans. I earned a living in New Orleans. I met my wife in New Orleans. My son lived the first couple of years of his life in New Orleans. I love New Orleans.

What did Tennessee Williams say? "America has only three cities: New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans. Everything else," Tennessee Williams said, "is Cleveland."

Now, before my friends in Cleveland get mad at me, I didn't say it; Tennessee Williams said it. But I think what Mr. Williams was trying to convey is what an extraordinary, unique, city New Orleans is. Every other State in America would kill to have a New Orleans. Twenty million people from all over the world come to visit the city in America which is perhaps the most European city and the most diverse city in our country. And I love New Orleans. But New Orleans deserves better.

I wish this hadn't happened. I wish there weren't more people in this world like Mr. Miorana. But there are some people in this world who just habitually, consistently hurt other people, and they take other people's stuff. I wish they wouldn't, but they do. I don't know why they do. If I make it to Heaven, I am going to ask. But they do, and they have got to be separated from society. And our judges and our district attorneys are not doing anybody—anybody—in New Orleans a favor by not putting those folks into jail. It breaks my heart. It also makes me mad.

TÜRKIYE

Mr. President, the second thing I want to just mention briefly, and I say this gently—respectfully, but gently—to President Erdogan, the distinguished President of Türkiye: Leave the Kurds alone. Leave the Kurds alone.

The Kurds, as you know, are wonderful people. There are probably 30 to 40 million Kurds throughout the world. Some we are blessed to have here in the United States. They live mostly in Türkiye, Iran, northern Iraq, and Syria. The Kurds are a distinct ethnic group. They are sort of a stateless country because they are spread all over the world.

The Kurds are America's friends. It hadn't been that many years ago since ISIS was rising high. ISIS had established a caliphate in the Middle East. That is a fancy word for a country. They established their own country in the Middle East, and America and other countries beat them back. We destroyed ISIS. They are still there, but we destroyed their caliphate.

The people most responsible for helping us, most responsible for destroying ISIS, were the Kurds. We lost less than 20 American lives in destroying ISIS in the Middle East. Our friends the Kurds lost over 10,000—10,000—fighting alongside of us. Over 30,000 Kurds were wounded. Without the Kurds, ISIS would still be there.

Now, Mr. Erdogan, the President of Türkiye, does not like the Kurds. I am not going to go into why. He is entitled to his opinion. But, right now, Mr. Erdogan has troops and tanks and weapons marshaled on the border between Türkiye and Syria.

As we know, the people in Syria finally had enough, and they overthrew Mr. Assad, their President. Predictably, Assad, who we think stole billions of dollars from the good people of Syria, is now, predictably, living in Russia. We are going to try to find his money.

Mr. Assad, like his father, is a butcher. He killed tens and tens of thousands of Syrians, and many of them he hurt the entire time they were dying.

To keep power and his money—a lot of which he made by dealing drugs—he used chemical weapons against his own people. And now the people in Syria are free of him.

Everybody else, stay out of Syria. President Trump has already talked about it. It doesn't mean we can't offer our advice, but we all need to stay out of Syria.

The defeat of Mr. Assad in Syria would not have happened but for Israel. We know that. You don't have to be a graduate of Cal Tech to know that. Israel destroyed Hezbollah, which was working with Iran, which was working with Russia to keep Assad in power.

Russia and Iran and Hezbollah were on the side of the butcher. But Russia is tied up in Ukraine. Hezbollah was holding down the fort while Russia was tied up in Ukraine. And Israel ignored the advice of many and just went out and destroyed Hezbollah.

Thank you, Israel.

But that is why the people of Syria today are free, and they are entitled to self-determination.

Mr. Erdogan in Türkiye, I worry, is going to invade Syria. I am not accusing him of anything, but I worry that he is because we have intelligence that he has many soldiers and many tanks and much equipment and many weapons right now stationed on the border between Türkiye and Syria. And our Kurd friends are afraid that Mr. Erdogan, because of his hatred for the Kurds, is going to attack now. The Kurds live very peacefully in northeast Syria.

My message today is: President Erdogan, I don't want to mess in the affairs of your country, but don't do it. Leave the Kurds alone. Leave the people of Syria alone.

Türkiye has problems now. Türkiye is supposed to be our friend. Türkiye is a member of NATO. Lately, they haven't been acting like our friend. Türkiye has its own problems. If we think interest rates are high in America, they are close to 50 percent in Türkiye. Some people think they are in a recession. Their inflation is between 40 and 50 percent.

If you invade Syria and touch a hair on the head of the Kurds, I am going to ask this U.S. Congress to do some-

thing, and our sanctions are not going to help the economy of Türkiye. I don't want to do that. Leave the Kurds alone.

My work here is done. I will show myself to the door, and I will 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. LEE. 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 CALENDAR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3324 and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills, en bloc: Calendar No. 277, S. 1097; Calendar No. 528, H.R. 2468; Calendar No. 530, H.R. 4094; Calendar No. 640, S. 5005; Calendar No. 660, H.R. 7332; and H.R. 3324.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged of the relevant bill, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bills, en bloc.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment, where applicable, be agreed to; that the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The bills passed, en bloc, as follows:

CÉSAR E. CHÁVEZ AND THE FARMWORKER MOVEMENT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ACT

The bill (S. 1097), to establish the César E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park in the States of California and Arizona, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is in boldfaced brackets and the part of the bill intended to be inserted is in italic.)

S. 1097

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “César E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

[(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

[(1) on October 8, 2012, the César E. Chávez National Monument was established by Presidential Proclamation 8884 (54 U.S.C. 320301 note) for the purposes of protecting and interpreting the nationally significant resources associated with the property in Keene, California, known as “Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz”;

[(2) Nuestra Señora Reina de la Paz—

[(A) served as the national headquarters of the United Farm Workers; and

[(B) was the home and workplace of César E. Chávez, the family of César E. Chávez, union members, and supporters of César E. Chávez;

[(3) while the César E. Chávez National Monument marks the extraordinary achievements and contributions to the history of the United States by César Chávez and the farmworker movement, there are other significant sites in the States of California and Arizona that are important to the story of the farmworker movement; and

[(4) in the study conducted by the National Park Service entitled “César Chávez Special Resource Study and Environmental Assessment” and submitted to Congress on October 24, 2013, the National Park Service—

[(A)(i) found that several sites associated with César E. Chávez and the farmworker movement—

[(I) are suitable for inclusion in the National Park System; and

[(II) depict a distinct and important aspect of the history of the United States not otherwise adequately represented at existing units of the National Park System; and

[(ii) recommended that Congress establish a national historical park to honor the role that César E. Chávez played in lifting up the lives of farmworkers; and

[(B)(i) found that the route of the 1966 march from Delano to Sacramento, California, meets National Historic Landmark criteria;

[(ii) recommended that the potential for designation of the route as a national historical trail be further explored; and

[(iii) indicated that the National Park Service could work with partner organizations and agencies to provide for interpretation programs along the route of the 1966 march from Delano to Sacramento, California.

[(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to establish the César E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park—

[(1) to help preserve, protect, and interpret the nationally significant resources associated with César Chávez and the farmworker movement;

[(2) to interpret and provide for a broader understanding of the extraordinary achievements and contributions to the history of the United States made by César Chávez and the farmworker movement; and

[(3) to support and enhance the network of sites and resources associated with César Chávez and the farmworker movement.]

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to establish the César E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park—

(1) to help preserve, protect, and interpret the nationally significant resources associated with César Chávez and the farmworker movement;

(2) to interpret and provide for a broader understanding of the extraordinary achievements and contributions to the history of the United States made by César Chávez and the farmworker movement; and

(3) to support and enhance the network of sites and resources associated with César Chávez and the farmworker movement.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) HISTORICAL PARK.—The term “historical park” means the César E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park established by section 4.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Cesar E. Chávez and the Farmworker Movement National Historical Park Proposed Boundary”, numbered 502/179857B, and dated September 2022.