

proposal is basically the House version proposal's evil twin, dressed in a slightly nicer suit.

And one other thing, to take food out of the mouths of hungry kids, all they want is to fill their little tummies and give it in tax cuts to billionaires—how perverse, how cruel, even vicious—even vicious. And then they come up with these shibboleths: Oh, people aren't working. Oh, people are cheating.

They have no proof. They just cut.

It is mean. It is against what our Scriptures teach us. And this—feeding the hungry; giving drink to the poor, to the thirsty—should not be a political issue. It should not be a partisan issue. It should be a moral issue.

SILENCERS

Mr. President, on guns, as we speak, Republicans are once again trying to jam through a reckless, extreme giveaway to the gun lobby, a provision that will endanger our kids, betray law enforcement, and lead to more gun deaths. Despite their so-called Big Beautiful Bill, Republicans snuck in a radical measure to reverse nearly a century—100 years—of commonsense gun rules on silencers.

Senate Democrats will fight this dangerous provision with every tool at our disposal, including trying to strike it in the Byrd bath.

Parents don't want silencers on their streets. Police don't want silencers on their streets. The only ones who do? The gun lobby. And that is exactly who this provision is written for.

Silencers have been used in mass killings, murders. Lawbreakers, they are the ones who want silencers. And they have been used in targeted assassinations, in crimes where bystanders didn't even know gunshots had been fired, until it was too late.

There is nothing common sense about making these deadly devices easier to buy, easier to make, easier to use in crimes.

To the extreme Republicans—they are extremists these days—who slipped this silencer sneak attack into their bill: Shame on you. Shame on you for putting the gun lobby over the lives of our kids. Shame on you for endangering families and law enforcement.

All the law enforcement people I speak to don't want this Republican proposal because they know that the people who want silencers are the criminals who our brave police and others are fighting.

Shame on you, Republican rightwing and all the Republicans, even when they know they are wrong, who go along with that rightwing for adding fuel to America's gun epidemic.

As I said, police departments across America have been clear: Silencers make their jobs harder, delaying response times, making it harder to catch criminals, harder to solve gun crimes, and, yes, easier for criminals to get away with murder. You cannot call yourself pro-law enforcement while voting to put more silencers in criminals' hands.

If Republicans get their way, it will be open season for criminals with silencers. Senate Democrats will fight this provision at the parliamentary level and at every other level with everything we have got.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM LONG

Mr. President, on the IRS nomination today, this one is another doozy. Senate Republicans want to put a tax fraudster in charge of the IRS.

Let me repeat that. Senate Republicans want to put a tax fraudster in charge of the IRS.

And I wish that was just a figure of speech. But in a little over an hour, Senate Republicans will vote on the confirmation of William Long to be the Commissioner of the IRS. I will vehemently oppose Long's nomination.

To have a tax fraudster and swindler like Mr. Long in charge of the IRS is abominable. It shows the only thing Donald Trump cares about is helping cheaters and liars get ahead, while leaving honest, hard-working families in the dust.

Mr. Long's background has nothing that makes him qualified to be IRS Commissioner. His only qualification, like so many of Trump's nominees who have had no experience, no knowledge, is that he is a MAGA cheerleader.

He had no expertise in tax policy while in Congress. After he left office, he joined the tax scam industry. In one instance, Mr. Long was paid over \$60,000 by firms that sold totally fabricated tax credits to investors and small businesses.

When asked about his role in this scheme in Committee, Long refused to answer. When investigators sent him questions, he went dark.

After Long's nomination was announced, the CFO of the company that swindled those businesses told its investors not to worry; they will soon have a buddy at the IRS who will take off the heat.

This is rank corruption. Donald Trump naming someone as compromised as Mr. Long is just allowing corruption to be winked at, nodded at, and even approved.

Under Mr. Long, the IRS will become the "Department of MAGA Crooks." Donald Trump will use the IRS, as he has used other Agencies, to punish his political opponents and to help cheaters and tax evaders, all while hard-working families watch billionaires pay less in taxes.

I implore Senate Republicans to reject Long for being IRS Commissioner.

BROADBAND

Mr. President, finally, on broadband, last Friday, Secretary Lutnick and the administration delayed nearly \$43 billion in funding to help 25 million Americans get access to affordable high-speed internet. This funding is vital for kids to do their homework and for families to stay connected. States have worked hard to get this funding program up and running, but now, to help Starlink—we know who owns that—the administration has thrown everyone back to square one.

Donald Trump seems to find endless ways to go after States like New York, and this decision delaying broadband funding does just that. It will endanger \$660 million in funding to help the hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers—many in rural areas, Republican districts—who lack broadband access.

I joined with Ranking Member CANTWELL and Senator LUJAN in urging the administration not to delay this funding, but they did it anyway. It is shameful, and I will keep pushing the administration to change course.

I urge the Trump administration: Don't turn your back on rural families lacking broadband just to help Starlink.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JUDICIARY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the first few months of this administration, we witnessed unprecedented, unacceptable attacks on the Federal judiciary by President Trump and his allies.

In one particularly egregious example, President Trump demanded the impeachment of a Federal judge who ruled against the administration, and President Trump said this man was "a Radical Left Lunatic, a troublemaker and agitator." That is a direct, specific quote from the President of the United States about a sitting Federal judge.

On Memorial Day, President Trump referred to members of the bench as "USA HATING JUDGES" and "MONSTERS WHO WANT OUR COUNTRY TO GO TO HELL." That is a direct quote from the President of the United States about sitting Federal judges.

This kind of reckless, inflammatory language is part of the President's ongoing attempt to intimidate the Federal judiciary. We are supposed to take this as acceptable conduct? It should be condemned by all political leaders, regardless of your political party. But my Republican colleagues have said nothing in response to these attacks on Federal judges. It is the "silence of the lambs."

In April, one of my Republican colleagues had the courage to say out loud why Republicans are not speaking up. As she put it, "We are all afraid."

Their fear is simply emboldening this President. Last month, President Trump was asked if he needs to uphold the Constitution. In response, he said:

I don't know.

It was shocking to hear that response from the President—even this President—and it demonstrates just how little regard he has for our fundamental rights and our Constitution. Yet my Republican colleagues are silent.

Their unwillingness to speak truth to power calls to mind a line from "A Man for All Seasons":

When statesmen foresake their own private conscience for the sake of their public duties, they lead their country by a short route to chaos.

The American people have already seen and suffered through the chaos that has come from the silence of our elected officials. So long as they fail to speak up, the chaos and lawlessness will continue.

It is not only President Trump who is intimidating judges and attacking judicial independence; House Republicans are acting as accomplices, filing Articles of Impeachment against six Federal judges simply because they ruled against President Trump.

House Republicans have continued their attack on the judiciary with their reconciliation bill they passed last month. Buried in this 1,000-page bill is a provision that would strip Federal courts of their ability to enforce a contempt citation when a party fails to comply with certain types of injunctions. The contempt power is integral to the authority of the Federal courts. Without the contempt power, parties could simply disregard court orders.

Currently, Trump administration officials know that if they violate court orders, they can be held in contempt and subject to fines or even jail time. But President Trump doesn't want the courts or anyone else to stand in his way, and that led House Republicans to advance a provision prohibiting courts from enforcing some contempt citations. This would let President Trump pursue his agenda without any concern of being held accountable in the courts, and it would prevent courts from enforcing contempt citations in all manner of cases, whether the injunction issues today, tomorrow, or even 10 years ago.

Maybe House Republicans thought no one would notice this provision. Maybe they thought nobody would have the nerve to oppose the President. But I can tell you, the Senate Democrats read the provision. We noticed it. We spoke out against it all week, and we will do everything in our power to ensure it does not become law.

The attacks on the judiciary not only threaten our Constitution, they threaten the judges and their families themselves. Recent reporting has revealed a dramatic spike in threats against judges. Between the beginning of March and the end of May, 197 Federal judges were threatened. Judges and their families have received threats in the form of anonymous pizza deliveries to their homes. These deliveries are meant to show that the perpetrator knows exactly where the judges and their families live. So far, more than 100 pizzas have been delivered to more than a dozen judges and their relatives.

It is not a laughing matter. At least 20 of these deliveries were made using the name of Judge Esther Salas's son Daniel Anderl, who was murdered—

murdered—at his family's home by a former litigant. Even Justice Amy Coney Barrett's family has been reportedly receiving unsolicited pizza deliveries.

Whether I agree with these judges when it comes to their philosophy is beside the point. This is frightening. Judge Salas herself has characterized the deliveries as "psychological warfare" that sends the message: "Do you want to end up like Judge Salas? 'Do you want to end up like Daniel?'"

These instances are sickening. They threaten not only judges and their families but judicial independence and the rule of law. They must be investigated, and they must be stopped.

Over a month ago, as ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I sent a letter to Attorney General Pam Bondi and FBI Director Kash Patel. I asked them to investigate the deliveries and other threats against Federal judges and provide information on steps they have taken to protect these judges and their families. I have yet to receive a response.

On Tuesday, I sent another letter urging them once again to investigate these threats against judges and highlighting the need for action. The Federal judiciary and our government can wait no longer.

Last week, I met with three Federal judges to discuss judicial security. Judge Salas was among them. Her experience is a reminder how important judicial security is and how much is at stake. Our meeting also served as a reminder of how our judges have shown tremendous courage in the face of these ongoing threats.

We should all be grateful for their public service and their willingness to don black robes and act without fear or favor. We should also be grateful for law enforcement officials protecting our judges. But it is not enough to merely acknowledge and appreciate the courage and dedication of our judges and law enforcement.

The Justice Department and the FBI must investigate and must act now. The President and his allies must stop these attempts to intimidate a coequal branch of government, and congressional Republicans need to step up publicly and stand behind these judges.

In the meantime, I will continue to stand up for the judiciary and highlight the need to protect our judges, and I will continue to stand against those who threaten our judges and the rule of law, whether from the right or the left. I hope my Republican colleagues will find their voices and join me.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GUIDING AND ESTABLISHING NATIONAL INNOVATION FOR U.S. STABLECOINS ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Colleagues, we are at an extraordinary time when there is a "Government For Sale" sign on the White House lawn. We have never seen this in the history of the United States of America.

President Trump is engaged in an extraordinary level of corruption. Let me just provide two examples.

As President, he said to the world: Come and buy my meme coin, my Trump coin, and you will be invited to a very special dinner to have access to me. And the 220 people who buy the most coins over a multimonth period, hold onto them. You will be invited.

This dinner was held 2 weeks ago, and 220 people spent an estimated \$150 million in order to attend that dinner.

A meme coin is basically a nothingburger. What is it? It is not something you can do international transactions on. It is nothing you can print out and put on your wall. It is, simply, kind of a hobby coin.

People didn't pay \$150 million for a digital hobby coin. They paid it because the President said: This will give you access to me and my team. And he provided that access. And he said: The top 25 buyers of this coin will get something extra special, some extra special tour. Initially, it was said it would be of the White House. Later, it was not clear if it would be at the White House. In fact, there is no transparency.

We do not have a list of who these 220 people are or what they paid. But we do know one of these individuals; that is the individual Javier Selgas. He is the CEO of Freight Technologies. He said: We bought \$2 million of the Trump meme coin, and we are planning to buy \$20 million of the Trump coin in order to influence the policy of how freight is treated between Mexico and the United States of America.

He was very clear about it: We are buying access, and we are buying influence.

What happens with that money? It simply goes into Trump's pocket. Is he producing an item of any value that he is selling? No. He is selling access and influence. So that is one example.

Then, he has another crypto enterprise in which he is inviting folks to use a digital coin, a different type of digital coin called a stablecoin; use it in international transactions: Give me your dollars. I will invest your dollars. I get to keep all the proceeds from those investments, and you can use my digital coin called USD1 for international business transactions.

Why would you use this coin instead of just using the dollars themselves? To make special affection on behalf of the President of the United States of America.

There is a company, MGX. MGX is tied to the Government of the United Arab Emirates. MGX said: "We will buy \$2 billion of your coins."

That makes the \$2 million from Freight Technologies or the \$20 million

they were planning pretty small chump change because now you have a company saying we will buy \$2 billion of your coins.

And what did they say they wanted? They said they wanted advanced AI chips, artificial intelligence chips. They wanted a world-leading AI center to be built in the United Arab Emirates.

Now, technically, it would be done through MGX. But who is the chair of MGX? The national security advisor for the Government of UAE.

So what transpired is UAE says: We want this AI center.

MGX, associated with the government, says: We will buy \$2 billion of your digital coins.

And the President goes to the Middle East and says: Do you know what, I support establishing an advanced AI center, and we will partner with it in Abu Dhabi.

Abu Dhabi is one of the Emirates of UAE.

So here we have Freight Technologies on one type of coin saying we are buying these coins to get influence. Now you have MGX and UAE buying \$2 billion of coins in order to get influence. This is the U.S. Government for sale in a way we have never seen. This is the Mount Everest of corruption.

And right at this moment, the Senate is debating a cryptocurrency bill. Isn't this the moment we should debate whether or not Federal elected officials—ourselves, the Vice President, the President, members of the Cabinet—should be offering for sale our personal coins in order for people to give us money? Because, really, it is just like somebody handing us a sack of money. That is what this is like.

Forbes magazine has now estimated that within the first few months of the Trump administration, the Trump family has built value in their crypto industry of \$1 billion. If he had not been elected, it would be worth nothing. But because he is pumping it as President, both the meme coin and USD1 the stablecoin, the world is saying: If we want influence, we have to buy these coins. Just like in his first administration, folks said: If we want influence, we have to stay at his properties. We have to book his hotel rooms. We have to hold our events at his special locations, be it his golf courses or his hotel conference centers.

But those hotel rooms or booking conference centers in his first term are nothing on the order of magnitude of selling these cryptocurrency coins.

That \$2 billion that Trump holds, his family holds, even if 4 percent is invested, that is \$80 million a year. And with the passage of this bill, if we do not put an anti-corruption measure into this bill, the world will be saying: Just as we rented his hotel rooms when we do an international business transaction, we have to use USD1.

That is why we should be debating amendments on this bill. We have a responsibility to address the concerns of

the people of the United States of America.

And from our very beginning—from the very beginning—on through the last now 250 years, we have been concerned about corruption and having our government end up for sale. If we turn the clock back to our Founders, Hamilton said we put an emoluments clause in our Constitution so our elected leaders could not be bribed:

[M]any mortifying examples of the prevalence of foreign corruption in republican governments.

It was to counter that foreign corruption that he had already witnessed in republican governments. So in establishing our Republic, with our separation of powers, with our checks and balances, with our vision of government by and for the people, you can't allow the elected leaders to take bribes or to take, if you will, tribute money to influence.

People say: Well, it is not a bribe if it is not tied to a specific act. Obviously, the CEO of Freight Technologies had a specific act in mind. He wanted to change a rule regarding freight transactions between Mexico and the United States of America. Clearly, the UAE had a specific desire in mind. They wanted AI chips, and they got them.

Maybe in a court you could not establish a direct this-for-that—quid pro quo, if you will—but certainly these companies knew what they were doing. They were buying access and influence. So in that sense it is at least a payment of money to the President of the United States to gain access and gain influence, and that is exactly the type of corruption that Hamilton said he had witnessed “mortifying examples,” and so we put a clause into the Constitution to say this could not be done.

All right. So we have a responsibility. We took an oath to the Constitution. Every single colleague, all 53 across the aisle, took the same oath to the Constitution. So now is the time to actually debate this issue and defend the Constitution. If you are not willing to debate an amendment to defend the Constitution, then essentially you are ignoring your oath to the Constitution; you are violating your oath to the Constitution of the United States of America.

When this bill came to the floor, the majority leader said we will have an open amendment process, and that was a factor considered by many colleagues when they voted for moving this bill to the floor, that there would be an opportunity for amendments. But now that the bill is here, suddenly, the Republican leadership that controls the floor says: No. We are closing off amendments. We are not going to allow any examination of the corruption that is present through this industry. We are not going to allow any examination of the loopholes in the regulatory framework that is in this bill. We are not going to allow any examination of the scams being enacted on ordinary citizens using these digital currency—these cryptocurrency ATMs.

I had never even heard of these ATMs. It turns out that there are over 300 of them in my State of Oregon. I have asked my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Have you heard of these? They said no.

But one of our colleagues was very familiar with this form of scam on senators—Senator DURBIN. He has an amendment that should be considered.

So because it is so important that we take this moment and we honor our responsibility to examine these issues, I will be coming back to the floor in order to offer a point of order that this bill violates the Senate pay-go provisions and, therefore, we shouldn't be doing this bill until that is remedied. I will also be coming back to table the blocking amendment that the majority leader put in place to prevent anyone from offering amendments. So both those votes will occur about half an hour from now.

Let's get our heads together about our responsibilities as Senators representing the people of the United States. Let's get our heads together about our responsibility to the Constitution. Let's get our heads together about taking on this open sale of the government being conducted out of the Oval Office, just down Pennsylvania Avenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss S. 1582, the so-called GENIUS Act.

Several weeks ago, when the majority leader said we would have votes on amendments, I took him seriously, and I was one of the first to file. And we could have been voting on amendments—my amendments, those of my colleagues—at any time in the last few weeks, but that hasn't happened.

That is regrettable because the GENIUS Act, as it is currently drafted, is, I believe, fundamentally flawed. The GENIUS Act exposes taxpayers, consumers, and the financial system to unacceptable risk and creates venues for criminals, terrorists, and rogue governments to finance their illicit activities.

Among other things, this bill places the U.S. Government stamp of approval on Tether, the world's largest stablecoin, which is based in El Salvador and favored by North Korea, Russian arms dealers, ransomware attackers, the Iranian military, the drug cartels, and so many other criminal organizations.

The GENIUS Act takes already weak State laws and makes them weaker and applies them nationwide, making it possible for stablecoin companies to operate with near-zero capital and unable to withstand a financial crisis. It is possible for stablecoin companies to avoid getting an audit. It is impossible for the government to revoke a stablecoin company's charter, even if it turns out to be a Ponzi scheme or if an executive dips into customer funds.

The GENIUS Act buys into the belief that the billionaires running the industry know what they are doing and that the marriage of complex financial products and complex technology simply can't fail. The one thing the billionaires do know how to do is protect their interests.

But, not surprisingly, this bill leaves open the door to bailouts, which we have seen time and time again for other lightly regulated nonbanks that got into trouble, like Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, AIG, and Bear Stearns.

When there is a run on a stablecoin—and there very likely will be a run one day—the industry will turn to the American taxpayer for a bailout, and the GENIUS Act paves the way for that to happen with no limits on the Federal Reserve's authority to prop up the industry.

Finally, this bill perpetuates Donald Trump's naked corruption. It actually green-lights the name of Trump's stablecoin, USD1, and it allows Trump's handpicked regulators to write the rules of the road governing his most recent business venture.

We need to provide real guardrails that will protect consumers, real tools for our national security Agencies to address this new technology, and real authority for regulators to intervene in a crisis—real guardrails and real tools, not words on a page that give only the aura of regulation and protection with no teeth.

My amendments and those offered by colleagues on both sides of the aisle would provide these tools and authorities. However, it appears that we won't have the opportunity to consider a single one of them and improve this legislation. Because of that, I would urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTIAN JASPERSEN

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, just like you do, I get a lot of requests in my office. I get about 150,000 emails a year. I don't know how many different requests that I get to come in for personal meetings, both in-state and here in Washington, DC, but a few weeks ago I got a video request from a bow-tied 8-year-old asking for a meeting with me—a person I had never met before, but he said he wanted to be able to come in and talk to me about rare childhood diseases. And I have to tell you, you would have to see the video to be able to see the meeting request that I got in from Christian Jaspersen.

He is from Keota, OK, which no one can find here without using Google Maps, I promise you. But he was enthu-

siastically wanting to be able to share his story about a complex medical history and how things have gone for him. So we said yes.

Christian was born with a very rare medical condition that most of us couldn't pronounce, much less want to be able to live with. He was born with his intestines outside of his abdomen. That impacts about 1,500 babies a year. It is extremely rare.

Patients are born sometimes with their intestines or other organs outside their abdomen. You can imagine the damage that that does, even while they are still in the womb.

Well, he required a ton of surgeries. Several surgeries were required immediately after birth. Several digestive impacts on him will be felt for a lifetime. He spent 5 months in NICU after birth. He lost a significant portion of his intestinal tissue during those different surgeries. It has impacted his nutritional intake and his bowel function, as you can imagine.

There were some clinicians that had recommended to go ahead and remove all of it, and he would spend the rest of his life living on IV nutrition. But he was able to get a second opinion from Boston Children's Hospital. They left out from beautiful Oklahoma and headed for Boston for that second opinion.

They provided some alternative care for him, and he is growing and doing well at now 8½. He is not just 8; he is 8½. He credits his doctors for saving his life and allowing him to live his best life now. He still has to go back to Boston often, and there are unique challenges that he faces with insurance and with all the challenges of travel and, quite frankly, the finances that go along with that, but he is a very spunky young man with an extremely large personality.

He played the role of Christopher Robin in a youth production of "Winnie the Pooh" recently, and I bet people would pay to see that twice. He also has political aspirations. When I had the opportunity to be able to meet him and his brothers, Noah and Lane, and his mom Rachel yesterday, we had that opportunity to be able to sit down and talk. Christian told me all about the disease that he has struggled with, the treatments that he has had, the heroes at Boston Children's who have worked alongside of him, but he also informed me to be prepared to see him again because he will be a Supreme Court Justice in the days ahead. And he just might be.

So for Christian and for his wonderful family and for all that has happened and the heroes at Boston Children's and for the research that they have done, I have to express the gratitude of my State for all of that work because that is a lot of work to invest in that young man. And he is determined not to waste the investment that has been put into him but to live his best life and to be extremely productive in the days ahead.

I am grateful to the Oklahomans that spent so much time with him,

working to guard his life in the earliest days, and for the folks at Boston Children's.

I look forward to "Chief Justice Christian" in the days ahead and seeing the work that he does and how that pans out for all of us as a country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM LONG

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in a few minutes, the Senate will vote on whether to put somebody who is up to their eyeballs in tax scams, corruption, and coverups in charge of the IRS. This ought to be an easy no.

It is one corruption bombshell after another with former Congressman Billy Long—fake tax credits, scam tax advice, shadowy political donations that went straight into his pocket, promises of personal favors, and no-show jobs with high-paying Federal salaries.

Yesterday came the latest revelation. My Finance Committee staff investigators determined that Long appears to be implicated in a major bribery scheme in his old congressional district. The scandal unfolded while he was in office.

Twelve people in Missouri and Arkansas pled guilty or went to jail when these crimes were prosecuted. It was a criminal case the size of the Ozarks.

Court documents identified him in one guilty plea as "U.S. Representative #1." That is the guilty plea of a man named Donald Andrew Jones, D.A. Jones. Jones's prosecution involved kickbacks and other illicit payments, a network of executives, and the misuse of charity funds in Springfield, MO, his hometown. The Justice Department's summary of the case describes "payments routed through different business entities or lobbying firms" as well as D.A. Jones's "advocacy services, including direct contact with elected and appointed public officials."

The guilty plea describes multiple communications in which Jones said he interacted with Billy Long, "U.S. Representative #1." It includes discussions of services performed by Long's office. It includes descriptions of interactions with Long's top adviser. It includes Jones directing political donations and offering to hand-deliver a check to Billy Long to guarantee he was immediately aware of the money's source.

For his role in this bribery scheme, Jones got a prison sentence of a year and a day behind bars.

The Finance Committee held Billy Long's nomination hearing a few weeks ago. I asked several questions in writing about this matter that were informed by certain reports brought to my investigations team. I laid out the names of all the characters and organizations involved in this massive bribery scandal.

I asked the former Congressman whether he or his campaign received payments from anybody involved. I asked whether he was an unindicted co-conspirator in a Federal criminal case