

The bad news keeps coming. The Senate proposal does nothing to moderate the House SNAP benefits. It is still the biggest cut to SNAP in history, depriving millions of kids and parents of vital food assistance.

Senate Republicans have even found a way to bow down to the radical gun lobby. Remember the House bill already had an insane provision that deregulated commonsense rules on silencers that go back almost a century? But Senate Republicans, refusing to be outdone by their extreme House colleagues, removed registration requirements not just for silencers but for short-barreled rifles, short-barreled shotguns, and other devices.

This is unhinged. Shame on Senate Republicans for choosing the gun lobby over the lives of our kids. Their proposal will mean gun violence will rise, police officers will be put at risk, and innocent people will die.

Finally, why are Republicans doing all of this? What is their North Star? Tax cuts for billionaires, paid for by working families.

Here is the big difference, folks, between Democrats and Republicans: Democrats believe in lowering taxes, but we need to prioritize Americans who aren't ultrarich: working families, the middle class, parents raising their kids, and small business owners trying to grow.

But Republicans, meanwhile, believe in giving most of the help to the people at the very top. They believe that helping billionaires and big corporations is somehow going to make everyone better off. It has never worked. Trickle down is discredited. They cling to it because they are in the obeisance of a handful of very greedy billionaires who seem to run the Republican Party on economic issues.

Under their proposal, the top 0.1 percent of our earners will get an average tax cut of \$400,000. But families earning less than \$75,000 will be worse off. They will actually lose household wealth. Under \$75,000, you lose wealth. The top 0.1 percent, you gain an average cut of \$400,000.

Do the American people like that? The more they know, the less they like.

When you put it all together, the Senate Republican's version of Donald Trump's "Big Ugly Bill" is even worse than the House's. It makes even deeper cuts to healthcare. It destroys American clean energy. It raises costs on working and middle-class families, and rewards the billionaires at the very top of the economic ladder.

Mr. President, I have a few more things to say.

On abortion, next week marks a very grim anniversary in America: 3 years since the disastrous Dobbs decision. Three years later, 21 States have restricted the right to choose, and 14 States have practically total abortion bans.

And what is the Republicans' response? They want to keep going and attack reproductive care even more.

Deep inside the Republicans' "Big, Ugly Betrayal Bill," they have snuck in a backdoor abortion ban. First, they have a provision that would defund Planned Parenthood. Second, they have a provision to eliminate coverage for comprehensive reproductive care from the marketplace.

Senate Democrats will fight these devastating and deadly measures with everything we have got, including through the Byrd bath—both provisions have to go through the Byrd bath—because here are the consequences of the Republican provisions: 200 Planned Parenthood health centers in 24 States would close, and 90 percent of these closures would be in States where abortion is currently legal. So much for State's rights—not when it comes to abortion or guns with this Republican Party.

Why are they doing this? Well, part of it is ideological, and part of it is to fund tax cuts for billionaires. It is an assault not just on Planned Parenthood, not just on reproductive care but on every woman in America.

Democrats will fight these backdoor abortion bans with every fiber of our being.

ALEX PADILLA

Mr. President, finally, on Senator PADILLA's speech—I see he has just come into the Chamber.

Today, at 12:30, our colleague Senator PADILLA will speak on the Senate floor for the first time since he was forcibly removed from a public briefing just for doing his job.

I will be here on the floor to listen to Senator PADILLA's speech. I encourage all of my colleagues—Democrat and Republican—to come and listen as well.

What Senator PADILLA experienced last week sickened all of us to our core—sickened every decent American to their core. No Senator should be treated the way he was—manhandled, taken to the ground, and handcuffed.

It is not a moment for partisanship. Oh, no, it is about all Senators supporting a colleague who was treated inexcusably for doing his job.

I look forward to hearing Senator PADILLA's speech later, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 98, Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025.

John Thune, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Roger Marshall, Katie Boyd Britt, Tommy Tuberville, Ashley B. Moody, Ted Budd, John Barrasso, Marsha Blackburn, Roger F. Wicker, Steve

Daines, Mike Rounds, Jon A. Husted, Markwayne Mullin, Rick Scott of Florida, Pete Ricketts.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Olivia Trusty, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 2025, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 314 Ex.]

YEAS—46

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Banks | Grassley | Mullin |
| Barrasso | Hagerty | Murkowski |
| Blackburn | Hawley | Paul |
| Boozman | Hoeben | Ricketts |
| Capito | Husted | Risch |
| Cassidy | Hyde-Smith | Rounds |
| Collins | Johnson | Schmitt |
| Cornyn | Justice | Scott (FL) |
| Cramer | Lankford | Scott (SC) |
| Crapo | Lee | Sheehy |
| Cruz | Lummis | Thune |
| Curtis | Marshall | Tillis |
| Daines | McConnell | Tuberville |
| Ernst | McCormick | Young |
| Fetterman | Moody | |
| Graham | Moreno | |

NAYS—39

| | | |
|------------|--------------|------------|
| Alsobrooks | Hickenlooper | Reed |
| Baldwin | Hirono | Sanders |
| Bennet | Kaine | Schatz |
| Blumenthal | Kim | Schiff |
| Blunt | Rochester | Schumer |
| Booker | Klobuchar | Slotkin |
| Cantwell | Lujan | Smith |
| Coons | Markey | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Warner |
| Durbin | Murphy | Warnock |
| Gillibrand | Murray | Warren |
| Hassan | Ossoff | Whitehouse |
| Heinrich | Padilla | Wyden |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|--------------|---------|----------|
| Britt | Galleo | Rosen |
| Budd | Kelly | Shaheen |
| Cortez Masto | Kennedy | Sullivan |
| Cotton | Moran | Welch |
| Fischer | Peters | Wicker |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 39, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

LOS ANGELES PRESS BRIEFING

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, it is important to me for this body to know that over the last 2 weeks in Los Angeles, my hometown, we are seeing masked Federal agents in tactical gear ordered into our communities. We have seen the disturbing pattern of increasingly extreme and cruel immigration enforcement operations targeting non-violent people at places of worship, at schools, in courthouses—all to meet an arbitrary quota. Now we are seeing President Trump federalize National Guard troops and deploy them without the Governor's consent. Active-Duty marines are now being deployed, escalating tensions in our city. It is important to note—all this without coordination with State and local law enforcement.

Despite repeated requests for the justification for these extreme actions and after months and months of little to no response from the administration on their aggressive and theatrical immigration raids, the Trump administration has done everything in their power but to provide transparency to the American people about their mission in Los Angeles. So last week, I chose to go home to try to get answers from the administration as they are literally militarizing our city. I want to share what I learned and I want to share what I heard because it should shock the conscience of our country.

One of the first items on my schedule last Thursday was a meeting and a briefing with General Guillot, the 4-star general in charge of U.S. Northern Command. Many of you know him. The briefing was scheduled at the Federal building in West Los Angeles where they are overseeing these military operations.

Now, colleagues, when the U.S. military is deployed domestically, when our troops are deployed against the wishes of the Governor for the first time since 1965, against the wishes of the local mayor, and even against the wishes of local law enforcement—both the police chief and the sheriff—we are in uncharted territory.

So in my efforts to do my duty to conduct congressional oversight and to try to get answers from the Department of Defense that State and local officials were not receiving, I went to the Federal building in West Los Angeles. I was met at the entrance—at the entrance—by a National Guardsman and an FBI agent, who escorted me through security screening and up to a conference room for my scheduled briefing.

While waiting for my scheduled briefing with General Guillot, I learned that Homeland Security Secretary Noem was holding a press conference literally just down the hall, and that press con-

ference was causing my briefing to be delayed. The thought occurred to me that, well, maybe I could attend this press conference and listen in—just listen—in the hopes of hearing Secretary Noem provide some new information that could help us make sense of what was happening.

I didn't just get up and go; I asked and was escorted by the National Guardsman and the FBI agent into the press conference. They opened the door for me. They accompanied me into the press briefing room, and they stood next to me as I stood there for a while, listening.

At one point, the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security said that the purpose of Federal law enforcement and the purpose of the U.S. military was to “liberate” Los Angeles from our Governor and our mayor, to somehow liberate us from the very people that we democratically elected to lead our city and our State.

Colleagues, let that fundamentally un-American mission statement sink in. That is not a mission focused on public safety, and that simply is not and cannot be the mission of Federal law enforcement and the U.S. military.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, are we truly prepared to live in a country where the President can deploy the Armed Forces to decide which duly-elected Governors and mayors should be allowed to lead their constituents? Is that really the precedent that we are OK with setting?

As Secretary Noem herself said last year when she was Governor of South Dakota—at the time, she said:

If Joe Biden federalizes the National Guard, that would be a direct attack on states' rights.

That was Governor Noem, now-Secretary Noem.

Throughout this country's history, we have had conflict, we have had tumult, but we have never had a tyrant as a Commander in Chief. That is not by coincidence; it is because the American people have always been willing to speak up and exercise their First Amendment right to protest, especially when our fundamental rights have been threatened.

As the proud son of immigrants from Mexico, it is that same right that I came to revere when marching through the streets with my family and my friends in 1994 in Los Angeles, protesting against the vile anti-immigrant rhetoric that was growing in California at that time. It was that year that a Republican Governor was up for reelection and was down in the polls, and he turned to scapegoating immigrants to try to improve his political standing and his reelection chances. That fight is what inspired me to leave an engineering career behind and dedicate myself to trying to influence our government and our politics.

So I have seen this before. California has seen this before. So last week, when I heard something so blatantly un-American from the Secretary of

Homeland Security, a Cabinet official, of course I was compelled, both as a Senator and as an American, to speak up. But before I could even get out my question, I was physically and aggressively forced out of the room, even as I repeatedly announced that I was a U.S. Senator and I had a question for the Secretary and even as the National Guardsman and the FBI agent who served as my escorts and brought me into that press briefing room stood by silently, knowing full well who I was.

You have seen the video. I was pushed and pulled, struggled to maintain my balance. I was forced to the ground—first on my knees and then flat on my chest. And as I was handcuffed and marched down a hallway, repeatedly asking “Why am I being detained?” not once did they tell me why.

I pray you never have a moment like this, but I will tell you, in that moment, a lot of questions came to my mind.

First of all, where are they taking me? Because I know I am not just being escorted out of the building. Am I being arrested here? And what will a city already on edge from being militarized think when they see their U.S. Senator being handcuffed just for trying to ask a question?

And what will my wife think? What will our boys think?

And I also remember asking myself, If this aggressive escalation is the result of someone speaking up against the abuses and overreach of the Trump administration, was it really worth it?

But, colleagues, how many Americans in our Nation's history have marched, have protested, have shed blood, even lost their lives to protect our rights? How many Americans have served in wars overseas to protect our freedoms here at home? And how many Americans in the year 2025 see a vindictive President on a tour of retribution, unrestrained by the majority of this separate and coequal branch of government and wonder if it is worth it to stand up or to speak out?

If a U.S. Senator becomes too afraid to speak up, how can we expect any other American to do the same?

Colleagues, you know me. I can't think of a person who would describe me as a flamethrower. I try to be respectful. I try to be considerate to every Member of this body, regardless of our political differences.

And so I do want to take a moment to thank all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, who have reached out to share your messages of support—whether they were public messages or many in private. Trust me, they mean the world to me, and I know they mean the world to my family.

But if you watched what unfolded last week and thought what happened is just about one politician and one press conference, you are missing the point. If that is what the administration is willing to do to a U.S. Senator for having the audacity to simply ask a question, imagine what they will do to