

endorsing certain financial instruments, and for other purposes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION RELATING TO "ADDRESSING THE HOMEWORK GAP THROUGH THE E-RATE PROGRAM"

GENIUS ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has been well over a decade since the term "cryptocurrency" entered our lexicon. Like many innovations, cryptocurrencies were at first seen as a novelty—something used by few and understood by even fewer.

But that changed quickly. More people began using and purchasing digital assets, innovation took place, and crypto demonstrated its staying power.

Stablecoins are an important part of the crypto ecosystem. Many digital asset advocates believe in holding Bitcoin, given its price fluctuations and growth in value over the last several years.

Stablecoins, however, have a value that is pegged to an asset, usually the U.S. dollar. They offer the speed and security of the blockchain with the stability and usability of a dollar bill, and they are a business and consumer friendly way of making payments.

Hundreds of billions of dollars of stablecoins are in circulation today. The vast majority are dollar denominated. But in the United States, stablecoins have operated in a legal gray zone. Stablecoin issuers trying to follow the rules can't be sure what rules to follow.

The Biden administration chose to regulate crypto companies by arbitrary enforcement measures. Regulators filed numerous lawsuits against crypto firms. These hostile actions led a number of U.S.-based companies to consider moving out of the United States altogether.

I think we all agree the United States should be the world's leader in financial innovation. Stablecoins should be "Made in the U.S.A." But we can't lead in innovation if there is no clarity for the innovators.

The GENIUS Act provides that clarity. It is the first step in bringing digital assets into our financial system by setting a clear framework for stablecoins. To be clear, Americans are already using stablecoins and will continue to use them with or without this legislation. What this bill does is establish a framework that protects consumers and safeguards national security while promoting that innovation right here in the United States.

The GENIUS Act would implement light-touch and tailored standards for stablecoin issuers so consumers can trust whom they are doing business with. Reserve requirements would give consumers confidence in the value of the stablecoins that they hold, and the bill's enforcement provisions would provide companies with clarity on what the rules are and ensure accountability for any violations.

The GENIUS Act would also protect against national security threats and money laundering. Stablecoin issuers would be held to the same standards as other financial institutions subject to the Bank Secrecy Act. They would need to monitor and report suspicious activity. They would have to comply with U.S. sanctions, and they would have to block transactions that violate State and Federal laws.

Stablecoins are operating today without any of these requirements, and not passing this bill means allowing the status quo to continue—no consumer protections, no national security safeguards, and the risk of arbitrary enforcement actions from financial regulators.

Passing this bill is also about American strength. It would create demand for the U.S. dollar and for Treasuries. That is a good thing both for our national security and for our fiscal house.

This bill is the product of bipartisan consensus building. I am proud of the process that this has gone through, and I am grateful to Senators LUMMIS, HAGERTY, GILLIBRAND, and ALSOBROOKS for their leadership on this issue and their work on the bill. Chairman TIM SCOTT has also been a critical member of the team.

The Banking Committee held a 3-hour markup during which the committee considered 40 amendments to the bill. That bill was reported out by a vote of 18 to 6, with 5 Democrats supporting it.

But the work didn't end there. Bill sponsors have been meeting for weeks—including nights and weekends—since the markup to address changes that made this bill better.

Today, we are voting on the sixth—sixth—version of the GENIUS Act, drafted with input from both Republicans and Democrats. And if Senators would like the opportunity to make further modifications to the bill, I encourage them to vote for cloture. Once we are on the bill, we can discuss changes here on the floor. We have had an open process on this bill so far. So why stop now?

The GENIUS Act is by no means the last word on digital assets. I expect the Senate will continue to work in this space, including work toward market structure legislation to address features of the crypto market that are not captured solely by stablecoins.

But the GENIUS Act is a first step toward bringing digital assets into our financial system and promoting American leadership and financial innovation. We have the opportunity to move

the ball forward today. I encourage my colleagues to take it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TARIFFS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Donald Trump's trade war is a gut punch to the American people. It is the biggest tax hike on families in half a century.

If Donald Trump is going to tax the American people, they have a right to know precisely how much. So, today, I am introducing legislation with Representative RASKIN requiring retailers to show consumers precisely how much tariffs are increasing the prices of their products. It is no different than when your utility bill shows fees or a receipt shows if a service charge is included or not.

Specifically, the legislation that Representative RASKIN has introduced in the House and I am introducing in the Senate requires large retailers to display in a "clear and conspicuous" way the amount that tariffs contribute to a good's final price tag.

Our bill is about transparency. It is about being straight with consumers. It is about informing the consumers how Donald Trump's tariffs will impact the family budget. And retailers should like it because these increases in prices are not their fault; it is Trump's fault, with his tariffs.

So let the public know. And that is a secondary benefit that will make the public even more angry, and they may call their Republican Senators and Congressmen and say join with Democrats and pass some of our legislation that would repeal some of these tariffs.

The White House growsls that companies with the audacity, they said—audacity—to be honest with consumers about the cost of tariffs are being hostile and political. But this is not hostile or political at all; it is simply being honest with consumers. It is clarity. It is transparency.

It is a smart policy, so of course the White House opposes it because they don't want people to know how much these tariffs are damaging them. It is estimated that if the present tariffs go into effect, the average family will pay \$4,000 more. Well, we want to let them know how much the price is increased for food, for housing, for gasoline, for groceries, for prescription drugs.

Last week, for instance, Ford announced they are increasing the price of at least three models by as much as \$2,000, in part because of Trump's tariffs. Under our bill, that \$2,000 price hike should be spelled out to consumers as in reality what it is—a tariff tax.

Americans deserve to know who is picking their pockets. Our bill will make clear to the American people that Donald Trump's tariffs are a painful tax eating away at their hard-earned money. It will make clear to the American people that Donald Trump's promise to "lower costs starting on day one" is a mirage, a fiction—a cruel fiction—all for a chaotic tariff policy that is sending our economy into a tailspin.

On those tariffs themselves, today, Donald Trump is set to announce a new supposed trade deal between the United States and the UK, the United Kingdom. We are still waiting to get the details, but this much is clear: Whatever Donald Trump's announcement with the UK looks like, it isn't a triumph of strategy; rather, it is a product of chaos. And with this President, if past is prologue, who knows if this deal will actually stick.

This is the Trump administration's credo: government by chaos. Just look at how Donald Trump is dealing with Canada, and it tells you everything you need to know about how untrustworthy his UK announcement is. First, Donald Trump says yes on tariffs with Canada; then he says no. Then he insults Canada, calls it the "51st State." Moments later, he meets with Prime Minister Carney and says "Canada loves us and we love Canada."

No one knows what Donald Trump will say next. If this were a roller coaster, the whiplash would paralyze everybody involved. So American businesses and American consumers have no faith that the President has a design. Whatever is in front of his face that day, whatever pressure there might be on him, he reacts. And it doesn't matter if he said the complete opposite thing a day or a week earlier.

Early this morning, members of the President's own Cabinet are already lowering expectations of the deal, saying it is only "an agreement in concept"; "there's a lot of details to be worked out." And we know what happens when that happens, particularly in a Trump administration.

Donald Trump's new trade deal with the UK seems to be built entirely on quicksand. It is likely to be built on quicksand. He blows with the political winds. When people say he is too reckless, he backs off. When there is criticism of him backing off, he reintroduces the bill. So it would be hard to take anything the President says about this deal seriously because, in all likelihood, he will change his mind again.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. President, on anti-Semitism, this morning, the Anti-Defamation League issued a new report illustrating a disturbing trend I have been warning about: the rise of anti-Semitism in America. Specifically, this report looked at anti-Semitism toward Jewish Members of Congress, which has dramatically risen—something I can attest to firsthand.

Social media has become a breeding ground for anti-Semitism. But it is not

just elected officials. Social media has become an easy way for hate groups to organize and proliferate their message against all sorts of communities and individuals. They go after Jewish-owned businesses. They go after synagogues. They go after families. They direct anti-Semitic slurs even against individuals who might not be Jewish.

We must not allow anti-Semitism to grow unabated in America like wild weeds. As the great poet Conor Cruise O'Brien said, anti-Semitism is a light sleeper. When there is trouble, somehow anti-Semitism always pops its head up—the Jewish people being made scapegoats, as we have been for centuries. It must be confronted at every instance. It must be rooted out.

We all play a part in fighting back against the forces of intolerance. People of all backgrounds, faiths, beliefs, and opinions have a duty to stand up and speak out against hate, no matter where it comes from.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. President, now, on the Trump budget, if you asked AI to come up with a Federal budget that utterly screws over average Americans, do you know what the AI would come up with? Donald Trump's latest budget proposal. So, today, let's look at Trump's so-called skinny budget a little more closely. It is hard to believe that this is a serious proposal.

If enacted, the Trump budget would completely gut public safety, something they say they want to strengthen. Trump's own FBI Director, Kash Patel, one of the most loyal Trumpites, testified in the House yesterday that the FBI can't meet its mission to keep Americans safe with the cuts in Trump's budget.

If Kash Patel, one of Donald Trump's most loyal acolytes, says this budget won't work, who else is going to come out against it? How can we take this budget seriously? If Patel is against it, so will be many other Cabinet officers, publicly or privately. How carefully was it even done? Did the people who put it out know they are slashing the FBI? The budget has sloppy and reckless written all over it, and even Kash Patel agrees.

That is not all. The Trump budget would also strangle American families. It is an all-out assault on American healthcare. Under Donald Trump's budget, America's housing crisis would go from bad to worse.

Hell will freeze over before Democrats entertain anything remotely close to Trump's budget. This budget proposal is dead on arrival in the Senate, and anything close to it will go nowhere as well.

MEDICAID

Mr. President, on Medicaid and the CBO, the Republicans right now are struggling with a very basic idea that the truth sometimes hurts. In their case, the truth is that Republican policies are so deeply unpopular with the American people. Republicans are realizing that, and it has left them paralyzed.

Now that Republicans actually have to produce a bill, reality is catching up with them. No more bland words. No more: Don't worry; we will protect you. The budget shows what they are actually up to.

Yesterday, the CBO reported that no matter which scheme of Medicaid cuts Republicans are likely to choose, the result will be that millions will become uninsured. Republicans can try any which way to make their bill work, but their numbers just don't add up. There is no way for Republicans to accomplish their massive tax giveaways without devastating millions of working and middle-class people.

Even if the Republicans pass a fraction of their proposed Medicaid cuts, it still means millions will lose their healthcare. And for what? So that billionaires can get another tax break that they don't need at a time of high inflation and a possible recession? That is the definition of cruelty.

This is the fundamental problem Republicans are facing right now as their infighting continues—that their policies are deeply, deeply unpopular with the American people—not just blue State Republicans but purple and red State Republicans too. Telling the American people that you want to ax their healthcare so that extremely rich people can pay less in taxes is a horrible message that virtually hardly anyone in America agrees with, but that is precisely what Republicans are trying to do. So it is no surprise they are eating their own tails trying to figure out how to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

WYOMING VETERANS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this week, I had an opportunity, as part of Veterans Appreciation Week, to speak with incredible Wyoming veterans from all across our State. I thanked them for their service and also took the opportunity to listen closely to their concerns.

On Tuesday, Senator CYNTHIA LUMMIS and I hosted a telephone townhall meeting with Veterans Affairs Secretary Doug Collins. Also, Col. Tim Sheppard, who is executive director of the Wyoming Veterans Commission, joined us on the call.

The call was very productive and informative. Wyoming veterans shared their experience directly with Secretary Collins. They shared with us what works with the VA and how improvements can still be made. We heard many ideas for improvement. Suggestions ranged from changes to online scheduling to more flexibility for out-of-State appointments.

Secretary Collins took this feedback seriously. He himself is a veteran. He knows that the VA is too bureaucratic. He is committed to fixing it. So I am proud to partner with him to deliver the care that our veterans deserve.

On Wednesday, here in Washington, I met with 16 Wyoming Vietnam veterans. They came to town to visit their

memorial. These 16 veteran heroes come from across the State: Guernsey, Thermopolis, Powell, Casper, Cheyenne, Mountain View, Douglas, Newcastle, and Green River. Their stories of service and sacrifice are moving.

This weekend in Wyoming, we will be holding “Welcome Home” events across the State in Afton, Riverton, Sheridan, and Wheatland. It is a welcome home many veterans from Vietnam never really received. It is sad to report but true. This weekend, we honor all of our Wyoming veterans.

Wyoming has one of the highest per-capita rates of veterans in America. The pride in those individuals runs deep.

It is an honor to represent them here in the Senate, and I am going to continue to listen to the concerns of our veterans and work to improve the care they need and continue to honor their sacrifices.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE MANDATE

Mr. President, on another matter, in 2024, in November, on election day, voters demanded more economic freedom and less government overreach. President Trump and Republicans in Congress heard them. The State of California did not.

California wants to export its radical and impractical electric vehicle mandate to all 50 States. California’s mandates are a progressive power grab. They dictate what cars and what trucks Americans can buy and can drive. These mandates aren’t limited to California; they are calculated to control the policy of the entire Nation.

Congress must now act to protect the rights of the American people to drive the gas-powered vehicles they want to drive. Last week, House Republicans—with 35 House Democrats joining all of the Republicans—voted to defend that freedom and to defeat this California mandate, and it is now up to the Senate to finish the job.

California mandates spread far and wide. They affect 133 million Americans—nearly 40 percent of the population of this country. Here is why: Twelve States copy the California mandate to ban gas-powered cars by 2036. Ten States copy the California mandate to ban gas-powered trucks by 2036. These include large-population States, like New York.

Even the junior Senator from California admits that California’s liberal mandates affect the entire country, and he says he is very proud of it. The American people think differently.

The Washington Post reported last month that “Americans are losing interest in EVs.” That is the quote. The Washington Post: “Americans are losing interest in EVs.” Interest in owning an EV has dropped 8 percent since 2023.

The message is clear: Americans don’t want these EVs even when the government tries to bribe them—bribe them—into buying them and using them. People want to buy the car and truck that works best for them and where they live and the life they lead.

The average price of an electric vehicle is \$62,000, which is \$16,000 more than comparable gas-powered vehicles. The California mandates that the Democrats are pushing would raise prices even more. It would also limit options.

This isn’t progress. This is a policy that punishes working families, punishes farmers, punishes truckers, punishes the people that live in rural areas.

Worse, EV batteries rely on China. Eighty percent of EV battery components come from China. Republicans here in the Senate are fighting to end America’s dependence on China. The California mandate supported by the Democrats makes that dependence even more dangerous. It risks our safety, it risks our security, and it risks our strategic independence.

The Biden administration used its final days in office to grant California permission to export its EV mandate across the country. They did this just 1 month before President Trump took office. They had already lost the election. They already knew the American people rejected what they stood for. Yet they still tried to push this onto the American people, and are trying to push it today.

This is midnight meddling. Senate Republicans are ready to use the Congressional Review Act to stop it. We will protect Americans’ rights—the rights to purchase a gas-powered vehicle. That is what we are fighting for, and we have every right to do so.

California’s mandates have already taken root in a dozen States. They affect 40 percent of all the new light-duty vehicle registrations and a quarter of the new heavy-duty vehicle registrations nationwide. They clearly affect the kinds of vehicles which will be manufactured and sold in America. These California mandates affect the cost and the availability of gas-powered cars and trucks all across the country, even in the States that do not adopt the mandates.

To my Democrat colleagues who will tolerate California controlling what Americans can drive: Do you think the American people really support what you are trying to shove down their throats? No, they don’t.

No wonder the Democrats lost the election.

Are the Democrats willing to strip consumers and small businesses of their right to choose the vehicles that work for their needs and for their budgets? Do Democrats want to continue to protect the failures and the fallacies of the Green New Deal? Or for once, will the Democrats join Republicans who are trying to protect working families?

It is no surprise, then, that Republicans have become the party supporting and protecting the rights of working families. People have rejected the Democrats.

The Senate also needs to reject the cheerleading by these climate extremists for more regulations by unelected bureaucrats, but that is what the

Democrats are here supporting. The Senate should use the Congressional Review Act to reject this Joe Biden midnight madness. By doing so, we would be protecting consumer choice, protecting affordability, and protecting congressional authority.

It is time to put Americans, Mr. President, back in the driver’s seat.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

NOMINATION OF ED MARTIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Justice is a powerful Agency. The Attorney General heads it. Throughout the United States, there are over 90 U.S. attorneys who are the Federal prosecutors—a powerful position, a position that can make or break an individual or a corporation. Two of the most important and the most powerful are the Southern District of New York and the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor today to speak in opposition to the nomination of Ed Martin to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans: Closely examine this nominee’s record.

Ed Martin’s commentary and affiliations leave no doubt that he is unqualified to serve as the top Federal law enforcement individual for our Nation’s Capital City. Nearly every day, new, disqualifying information surfaces.

Recently, ProPublica published a troubling report detailing Mr. Martin’s conduct in multiple cases involving Eagle Forum, a conservative organization which has its roots in my home State of Illinois, formally led by well-known activist Phyllis Schlafly.

Within a year—within a year—of Mr. Martin becoming the head of the Eagle Forum, the board of directors of that organization fired him, in 2016, and they stated the reason: mismanagement and poor leadership.

A majority of the board also filed a lawsuit to bar him from any association with the organization. Instead of arguing his case in court, according to the ProPublica publication, Mr. Martin secretly orchestrated a social media campaign attacking the presiding Illinois judge.

Ironically, that judge, John Barberis from Madison County, IL—directly across the river from St. Louis—was the only Republican judge sitting in that county at the time.

Mr. Martin went so far as to buy a laptop computer for a former colleague so that she could attack the judge on Facebook and ghostwrote posts for her.

Mr. Martin, who seeks to be the top Federal prosecutor in the District of Columbia, urged her to “turn up the heat with others” on the Facebook page of this judge and to “[c]all what [the judge] did unfair and rigged over and over” again—Mr. Martin’s instruction to his colleague.

This outrageous effort to intimidate a judge is a clear violation of ethical

norms and professional rules of conduct. It led to more than \$600,000 in legal settlements or judgments against Mr. Martin or his employers.

In the Eagle Forum lawsuit, a judge held Mr. Martin in contempt of court, citing his “willful disregard” of a court order that barred him from interfering with the organization.

Remember, this is the President’s choice to be the head U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, and he is being held in contempt of court for willful disregard of a court order that barred him from interfering.

A jury found Mr. Martin liable for defamation of Phyllis Schlafly’s daughter, Anne Schlafly Cori—a jury decision finding him liable for defamation—for, among other things—he shared a post on Facebook falsely claiming—listen to this—Mr. Martin shared a Facebook post falsely claiming that Anne Schlafly Cori should be charged with manslaughter in her mother’s death.

Mr. Martin also has a disturbing history of downplaying the January 6 insurrection in the U.S. Capitol. He has made it a habit to attack the law enforcement officers who protected the Vice President, who sat before this Chamber, Members of the Senate, Members of the House, thousands of staffers, and visitors.

Those law enforcement individuals put their lives on the line for me and for all of us, but Mr. Martin doesn’t see it that way.

He was at the U.S. Capitol on January 6 when he posted on social media, and I quote word for word what he said on January 6 about what was going on in this insurrection in the Capitol. Here is what he said:

Like Mardi Gras in DC today; love, faith, and joy. Ignore #FakeNews.

In August 2023, he excused violence by January 6 rioters, saying:

We have to have less judgment on somebody who hits a cop.

Ed Martin, seeking the U.S. attorney’s post for the District of Columbia, said of the January 6 rioters:

We have to have less judgment on somebody who hits a cop.

He continued:

I’ve seen people hit a cop and that doesn’t make it the end of the world.

Ed Martin, the top law enforcement officer in the District of Columbia—that is his quote.

He had the audacity to call Michael Fanone, a 20-year veteran of the Metropolitan Police Department who was nearly killed on January 6, “a fake cop.”

“[A] fake cop.”

This disgusting and dangerous rhetoric puts at greater risk officers who already put their lives on the line every day to protect you and me and our families. This lack of respect for law enforcement is inconsistent with his goal to be the presiding U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

According to Mr. Martin, January 6 rioters who beat the cops are “patri-

ots”—his word; “victims”—his word. He has also attacked prosecutors who were assigned to work on January 6 cases.

Incidentally, until he was selected for this position, he had never been a prosecutor. The top position in the U.S. Department of Justice in terms of U.S. attorneys—the District of Columbia—the man for the job never had any experience as a prosecutor.

He has also attacked the prosecutors who were assigned to work on January 6 cases. What does he call those prosecutors? “Terrorists.” His word. He said:

I shun them. I ostracize them. . . . These are despicable people.

Ed Martin.

Just as alarming, Mr. Martin has close ties to Timothy Hale-Cusanelli, a January 6 rioter and Nazi sympathizer.

Look at this picture. In 2024 alone, Mr. Martin interviewed Mr. Hale-Cusanelli at least five times. In one of these interviews, Mr. Martin said:

Tim Hale is an extraordinary guy. I have gotten to know him really well. I’d say we’re friends.

Friends with a Nazi sympathizer. This is who the President believes should be the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

Ed Martin now claims that despite these five interviews that we know of, he was not aware of Mr. Hale-Cusanelli’s anti-Semitic commentary or penchant for donning a Hitler mustache until after he had presented him personally with an award last July.

But Mr. Martin’s own words demonstrate the opposite. Just weeks before this award ceremony, where Martin gives this man who dresses up as Hitler an award, Mr. Martin excused his dressing up as “goofing around” and claimed he is being “smeared and slurred” by allegations of anti-Semitism.

Documents filed in Mr. Hale-Cusanelli’s criminal trial, he was a January 6 rioter, show that he has a long history of saying horrifying things. Let me give you one of Mr. Hale-Cusanelli’s quotes, this man who was referred to as an “extraordinary leader” by Ed Martin.

Here is what he said:

Hitler should have finished the job.

Hale-Cusanelli. He also claimed that he “would kill”—this is so disgusting. I hate to put it in the RECORD, but it has to be. He also claimed he “would kill all the Jews and eat them for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, and he wouldn’t need to season them because the salt from their tears would make it flavorful enough.”

This is the person that Ed Martin, the would-be prosecuting attorney for the District of Columbia, called “an extraordinary man, an extraordinary leader.”

In a letter sent to the Judiciary Committee opposing Mr. Martin’s nomination, 11 separate national Jewish organizations, representing more than 1 million people, wrote that Mr. Martin’s

associations are “not only dangerous—they reveal a pattern of behavior incompatible with the responsibilities of a US Attorney, a role meant to uphold justice and [to] protect all communities, including Jewish Americans, from hate and extremism.”

On top of all of this, Mr. Ed Martin has failed to disclose to the Senate an unprecedented number of required requests for information. Of approximately 2,200 writings and remarks that he was required to submit to the Senate Judiciary Committee, he omitted at least 700—over 30 percent of his known record.

This includes his failure to disclose that he made nearly 150 appearances on networks funded and directed by the Russian Government, and interviews on Infowars—do you remember the term “Infowars”?—hosted by a man named Alex Jones, the rightwing conspiracy monger who falsely claimed that the Sandy Hook massacre of those little kids was false.

Just yesterday, my Judiciary Committee discovered more than 300 additional items that Mr. Martin failed to provide to the committee. This is the fifth time that Mr. Martin will be required to update his disclosures to the committee. This nominee is treating the Senate’s constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on his nomination with utter contempt.

Just to put this in context, omitting over 700 items, we discovered 300 more that he failed to disclose, in the previous history of the committee—all the staff have looked closely—when it comes to omissions, Mr. Martin wins the trophy permanently. Why? Because the most in any previous case before was fewer than 10, his is over 700 failures to disclose before the committee.

Mr. Ed Martin has his own history of making his own discriminatory comments. He baselessly called his fellow panelists on CNN “black racists,” and he later claimed, with no evidence, Mr. Martin said, “[I] got fired because of the crazy Black ladies on CNN that demanded I be fired because I didn’t take their nonsense.”

The fact that Ed Martin feels the need to note the race and gender of the people who cross him speaks volumes about his character. And in a speech that Martin did not disclose to the Judiciary Committee, we discovered he made the following statement:

You’re not racist if you don’t like Mexicans.

Just last year he said in an interview:

You show me a Jewish American—

Ed Martin said—

who feels good about the Democrat Administration, and I’ll show you someone who is not really Jewish.”

How dare Ed Martin pass judgment on someone else’s religious faith?

The serious concerns about Ed Martin’s nomination have only been heightened by his conduct as an interim U.S. attorney. One of his first official acts after his appointment was to

fire numerous prosecutors simply for handling the January 6 cases that were assigned to them.

He has also baselessly threatened to investigate numerous nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, lawmakers, and others simply because he disagrees with them politically.

The top prosecutor in the Nation's Capital should be focused on fighting violent crime and terrorism, not threatening our First Amendment rights.

Mr. Martin's record makes it clear that he does not have the temperament, the judgment, or the experience to be entrusted with the power and responsibility of being U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

I urge my Democratic and Republican colleagues to oppose his nomination.

I yield the floor.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE
CALENDAR

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to seek unanimous consent to confirm Casey Mulligan, the President's nominee to be the chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy at the Small Business Administration.

I will make that motion in just a moment, but first, let me explain why I am doing this. This week is National Small Business Week, a week to recognize the achievements of our Nation's entrepreneurs.

As chair of the Small Business Committee, I have a front row seat to the successes and challenges of our small business owners, and I have the privilege of being a champion for Iowa entrepreneurs.

Our small businesses are more vulnerable to burdensome government regulations. Over the past few years, the cost of regulations for small businesses has been out of control. The previous administration created more than 1,100 final rules costing \$1.8 trillion. The Biden administration's regulatory costs were 600 times higher than that of the first Trump administration and 3.7 times higher than that of the Obama administration.

I have been encouraged by President Trump's efforts to freeze and roll back regulations. SBA Administrator Loeffler and the White House are working hard to eliminate burdensome and unnecessary regulations, but to be truly effective, small businesses need a Senate-confirmed chief counsel to continue this mission.

The Office of Chief Counsel for Advocacy has been vacant, without a Senate-confirmed occupant for nearly a decade. This key role ensures small business interests are protected.

Having served as the top Republican on the Small Business Committee for years now, I truly understand the need for this position to be filled immediately, and we are fortunate that President Trump nominated a highly qualified individual for this role.

Dr. Casey Mulligan's unique mix of academic success and real-world small business experience makes him the best candidate for the job. A Harvard graduate, Dr. Mulligan received his Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago where he currently serves as an economics professor.

In addition to his academic role, Dr. Mulligan also owns two small consulting and economic research businesses. He has also conducted extensive research on the economic effects of regulation on small businesses.

At the SBA Office of Advocacy, Dr. Mulligan would serve as a champion for small businesses nationwide as the Agency undergoes much needed changes to policy and direction.

Advocacy's role remains true regardless of party, to ensure that a strong chief counsel stands up for the little guy and warns regulators when small firms will be harmed.

Dr. Mulligan understands Main Street and the importance of examining all costs imposed on America's entrepreneurs.

I urge my colleagues to consent to the confirmation of Dr. Mulligan as chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy at the SBA.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, Calendar No. 59; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARKEY. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak on this motion to confirm Casey Mulligan to be chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy.

In the last 3½ months, we have seen an unprecedented assault by the Trump administration on America's small businesses.

Elon Musk and DOGE have taken a chain saw to SBA. They have done away with 43 percent of its staff and an estimated 2,700 people, and I say "estimated" because SBA won't share who has been fired and who has been retained with the public or with the U.S. Senate. We don't know.

We requested a meeting with DOGE in February and have yet to hear back. The little we do know about what DOGE is doing at SBA is gleaned through media reports rather than through their responses to our congressional requests.

Because of this administration's utter contempt for accountability and its shameless lack of transparency, we don't know if SBA has sufficient staff on hand to carry out its day-to-day operations.

We don't know which congressionally authorized and funded programs have been illegally shut down. We don't know which SBA field offices will remain open to serve small business owners where they live and work. And yet, the Senate Republicans want us to rubberstamp their slash-and-burn tactics and confirm this SBA nominee by unanimous consent with a total disregard from the Trump administration to tell the U.S. Senate what is going on inside of the SBA.

They have the SBA inside one big "witness protection program." We can't get them to tell us anything about anything.

And they want us to come out here by unanimous consent and to start to confirm appointees to the SBA to further dismantle programs that are essential to small businesses all across our country?

And let me say this: My Republicans do not see how the Trump administration is turning Main Street into "Pain Street," and it is in their home States. Small businesses are being forced to absorb skyrocketing costs because of President Trump's destructive tariffs. They are terrified of losing customers, as consumer confidence levels take a historic nosedive. They are listening with shock and disbelief.

Small businessmen and women across the country have to have their bottle of Pepto Bismol right next to them every single day, not knowing what the impact is going to be of the Trump tariffs on their small businesses across the country.

And by the way, there are 34 million of those small businesses right now, and we have got a Small Business Administration that won't even talk to the U.S. Senate, much less to those small business people who are terrified right now.

They, right now, are terrified. They are shocked, as President Trump tells American consumers that they are going to pay luxury prices to shop at mom-and-pop shops in the United States.

Does anyone in this administration understand the harm they are causing to small businesses?

I can tell you at least one entity that does: the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Last week, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce called on the Trump administration to develop a tariff exclusion process to prevent irreparable harm to small businesses and to stop the country from falling into a recession. The U.S. Chamber is speaking on behalf of chambers of commerce all across this country—every city and town. They are speaking for them. They are saying: Protect small businesses from the Trump tariffs.

That is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. That is what we should be debating out here on the floor right now—a bill to protect all small businesses from the Trump tariffs.

Instead, we are talking about confirming someone who absolutely should

not be debated on the Senate floor at this time, because those little businesses don't have the protections that big companies with big margins have. They are very, very vulnerable, and Casey Mulligan, the nominee for Chief Counsel for Advocacy, has actually questioned the value of longstanding and widely expected worker protections, including sick leave and paid healthcare and the right to unionize. And, not surprisingly, not a single Democrat on the Small Business Committee voted to advance his nomination.

So this is not the right time, and he is not the right person to have this job. Confirming Dr. Mulligan will only further President Trump's radical, damaging attack on small businesses and their workers.

And with that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to today's resolution to overturn an FCC rule that provides greater flexibility to ensure that every student has the access to the internet that they need.

We have known for a long time that internet access is critical for education. Students need Wi-Fi to connect with classmates and teachers, work on group projects, do research, and even just hit the "submit" button on some assignments. Yet too many Americans can't access reliable internet at home. It is called the "homework gap," and it is leaving thousands of kids behind.

This disparity only worsened during the pandemic, when the homework gap became a full learning gap for thousands of students. Many kids without internet at home had to sit in McDonald's parking lots so they could Zoom into class. As part of the American Rescue Plan, I worked with my colleague from Massachusetts Senator ED MARKEY and former FCC Chairwoman Rosenworcel to launch the Emergency Educational Connectivity Fund, or ECF. This \$7 billion program provided nearly 18 million students at over 10,000 schools and libraries with hotspots, routers, and other equipment for students and educators to connect to the internet at home. Maryland schools and libraries received over \$145 million through this program to help bridge the homework gap in my State.

Even as we worked to provide support for students on an emergency basis, we worked with the FCC on modernization of the E-Rate program to ensure it meets student needs. The new FCC rule allows schools and libraries to loan out Wi-Fi hotspots to students and educators at home so we can continue to address the homework gap. But now, the Republicans want to repeal this commonsense reform and take away hotspots from low-income and rural families.

This is a backwards step at a time when access to the internet is more important than ever. And because the

new rule simply allowed the use of existing E-Rate funds more flexibly, the repeal of this rule does not save a dime. A vote to repeal this rule is a vote to limit the FCC's ability to address a critical need for students and to put a stop to good work being done by schools and libraries to support learning. This was an issue before the pandemic and remains an issue today.

We all know that access to the internet is essential. We have worked on a bipartisan basis to expand broadband access, but we have a long way to go. The FCC modernized E-Rate to ensure that students are not disadvantaged by lack of access to broadband at home, whether that is because they are in a rural area with no connection or because it is unaffordable for their parents. This is a commonsense measure, and I urge my colleagues to vote against its repeal today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Ms. HASSAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Cruz	Justice
Barrasso	Curtis	Kennedy
Blackburn	Daines	Lankford
Boozman	Ernst	Lee
Britt	Fischer	Marshall
Budd	Graham	McConnell
Capito	Grassley	McCormick
Cassidy	Hagerty	Moody
Collins	Hawley	Moran
Cornyn	Hoeven	Moreno
Cotton	Husted	Mullin
Cramer	Hyde-Smith	Murkowski
Crapo	Johnson	Paul

Ricketts	Scott (SC)	Tillis
Rounds	Sheehy	Tuberville
Schmitt	Sullivan	Young
Scott (FL)	Thune	

NAYS—38

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

NOT VOTING—12

Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Risch
Duckworth	Lummis	Shaheen
Fetterman	Murphy	Smith
Gallego	Padilla	Wicker

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) was passed as follows:

S.J. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Addressing the Homework Gap Through the E-Rate Program" (89 Fed. Reg. 67303 (August 20, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RELATING TO "GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA: MOTOR VEHICLES"—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 60, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 60) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Park Service relating to "Glen Canyon National Recreation Area: Motor Vehicles".

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 60

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, 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 Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER),