

Republican dysfunction is endangering our national security. House Republicans have been so busy fighting one another in the House that FISA may expire.

Republicans, get your act together. Our national security depends on it.

While Democrats have been trying to fund the Secret Service, the TSA, the Coast Guard, CISA, FEMA, and other crucial Agencies, Republicans have been trying to jam through as much as another \$140 billion for Trump's rogue Agencies. And while Democrats have been working diligently and assiduously to try and lower Americans' costs, Republicans want to splurge on a \$400 million gold-plated ballroom for the President. The last thing Americans want us spending their tax dollars on is a gilded palace for Donald Trump.

What will Trump ask Americans to pay for next—a moat?

What else could \$400 million get Americans? A year of childcare for 30,000 families; skills for training 50,000 new electricians, plumbers, and welders; disaster loans for 10,000 households; and so much more.

Keep in mind that, just 1 month ago today, Donald Trump said:

There's not one dime of government money going into the ballroom.

Then put your money where your mouth is, President Trump. Stop trying to waste Americans' hard-earned tax dollars on this extravagance, and get your party to work with Democrats to keep the American people safe.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President, on Iran and gas prices—as I said, there is a lot going on—just hours ago, Pentagon officials told Congress that Trump's disastrous war has cost taxpayers \$25 billion. Can you believe it? At least \$25 billion and we are less than 2 months into this war. And \$25 billion is just the sticker price.

Americans are also paying for this war at the pump. This morning, average gas prices in America hit \$4.23 a gallon. That is a record high since the start of the war.

Let me repeat: U.S. gas prices are at their highest level since the beginning of the war in Iran. It is now \$4.23—up 40 percent since Trump started his costly war with Iran.

The price of gas is the highest it has been in 4 years. There is only one person to blame—Donald J. Trump.

Trump says he is bleeding Iran economically. But he is draining the pockets of American families. And for what? The Strait of Hormuz is still closed. The Iranian regime is still radical. Our servicemembers are still in harm's way. Trump still has no idea how to end this blunder.

Instead, we hear reports that Trump is telling his aides to prepare for a protracted blockade. This morning, Trump warned that Iran better get smart soon.

Well, it is Donald Trump who had better get smart soon and end this war

unless he wants Americans to continue paying \$4.23 at the pump.

This week, Democrats will force a vote on our War Powers Resolution for the sixth time. We will continue to force votes every week as this war rages on.

I urge my Republican friends to help bail Donald Trump out of his mess. Vote with us to end this war, or you, Republican Senators, will continue to face the outrage of the American people.

This Friday marks 60 days since Trump officially notified Congress that he had launched this reckless war. Under the War Powers Act, Trump must seek authorization for his war to continue beyond 60 days. After that deadline, Republicans will have no place to hide and no more hollow excuses to let this fighting continue. Republicans know Trump's handling of this war has been a disaster. They see how much the American people are hurting right now.

How many War Powers Resolutions do Democrats need to put before Senate Republicans until they do what is right?

How many Americans will have to go bankrupt?

How many days do our service members have to spend apart from their families?

How many people will have to die before Trump realizes that this war must end?

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Cekada, of Florida, to be Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives.

VOTE ON CEKADA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Cekada nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Ex.]

YEAS—59

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

NAYS—39

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

NOT VOTING—2

Alsobrooks Tuberville

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Kentucky.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, Paducah, KY, is a town of 26,000 people on the banks of the Ohio River, known for its barbecue, character, and community. At the heart of that community, for more than 70 years, is the Oscar Cross Boys & Girls Club. What began in the 1950s as a small group of men under the leadership of local parole officer Oscar Cross has since grown into a Paducah institution, serving boys and girls from ages 6 to 18.

Through financial responsibility lessons, health education, literacy programs, and community service projects, the club offers kids much more than just a safe place to go after school. It provides stability, mentorship, and life skills that shape their future.

The future of the club, however, is limited by something as simple as paperwork. The building that houses the Oscar Cross Boys & Girls Club sits on a 3½-acre lot owned by the city, constrained by a Federal restriction that prevents the property from being transferred to the Boys & Girls Club. As a result, much needed renovations to improve and expand the space they are in is out of reach, kneecapping growth.

According to the club's executive director Andrew McGlenon, transferring the property would allow for renovations and new facilities like a gym and classrooms that would nearly double the daily attendance from 100 to 200 kids.

Congressman COMER and I have introduced legislation to lift the outdated restriction and allow the city of Paducah to transfer the mere 3½ acres to the club, as has been requested by the city, the club, and the community for several years now. There is no policy change here. It simply seeks to take care of a community back home.

In fact, this is how a unanimous consent request should be used. All parties want to see the land swap effectuated. The only thing the Senate needs to do to ensure that the Boys & Girls Club can better serve its community is to allow this bill to pass today. This isn't a sweeping policy change. This isn't a national regulation. This is something local for a local boys and girls club. I can't imagine why it would be objected to. Passing this bill today will ensure that a cornerstone of Paducah's youth continues to serve generations to come.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1276 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the House is currently holding a number of Senate-passed bills without action, including legislation I have introduced and passed through the Senate and measures led by many of my colleagues. Right now, there are six bills that I have passed out of the Senate that are sitting in the House awaiting action. Nearly every bill that the House is refusing to move is overwhelmingly bipartisan and noncontroversial.

Of the 87 bills that have been signed into law in this Congress, nearly twice as many originated in the House as in the Senate. This imbalance is both unreasonable and unacceptable.

I understand that my colleague from Kentucky is interested in getting yet another House bill, H.R. 1276, passed today, and I appreciate the diligence and effort he has devoted to this legis-

lation affecting property in Paducah, KY. But I cannot let this bill become law until there is resolution on either House or Senate inaction.

For instance, Senator PAUL is, right now, singlehandedly blocking nearly 20 bipartisan bills that have passed the Senate Commerce Committee from getting through this Chamber. Among them are S. 28, Informing Consumers about Smart Devices Act, my bill with Senator CANTWELL; S. 196, the MAIN Event Ticketing Act, by Senator BLACKBURN; S. 244, the ROUTERS Act, by Senator BLACKBURN; S. 245, the Insure Cybersecurity Act of 2025, by Senator HICKENLOOPER; S. 246, the Interstate Transport Act of 2025, by Senator BUDD; S. 258, the TORNADO Act, by Senator WICKER; S. 278, the Kids Off Social Media Act, my bill with Senator SCHATZ; S. 281, the TICKET Act, by Senator SCHMITT; S. 289, the Youth Poisoning Protection Act, by Senator DUCKWORTH; S. 314, the Hotel Fees Transparency Act of 2025, by Senator KLOBUCHAR; S. 315, the AM Radio Act, by Senator MARKEY and myself; S. 434, the Space Commerce Advisory Committee Act, by Senator PETERS; S. 580, the Combating CCP Labor Abuses Act of 2025, by Senator PETERS; S. 841, the Romance Scam Prevention Act, by Senator BLACKBURN; and S. 2357, the Young Fishermen's Development Extension Act, by Senator SULLIVAN.

One of these bills, the Informing Consumers about Smart Devices Act, or "Spy Fridge," as it is known, I have authored along with Commerce ranking member MARIA CANTWELL and Senators CURTIS and WARNOCK. It very simply requires the packaging or listing of an internet-connected appliance to disclose if the product has a camera or recording capability.

Many Americans do not realize that a growing number of these so-called smart household devices and appliances include cameras and/or microphones that can record them and have the ability to transmit their data without their knowledge. In other words, when Americans buy a new refrigerator, they shouldn't have to worry about their refrigerator recording the conversations with their spouse while they are standing in the kitchen or taking a video recording of them in their own home. Americans deserve to know, at a minimum, if their appliances are doing this.

By my count, Senator PAUL has blocked 16 pieces of bipartisan legislation that have been considered and approved by the Commerce Committee. I understand that he has a philosophical objection to all these bills, although I have to say that I am more than a little befuddled by his opposition to the "Spy Fridge" bill given his leadership, which I have stood with him on, fighting against unauthorized surveillance. He may be the only libertarian on planet Earth that is fighting to have more surveillance; fighting to have private, intimate conversations in your home recorded without your knowledge. That

is certainly not consistent with any libertarianism I have ever heard.

But I will say, I am willing to forgo my objection. I am willing to step back and work with Senator PAUL to pass his legislation, despite this widespread blocking of bills, if he will agree, quite reasonably, to lift his hold on the "Spy Fridge" bill. That is a reasonable compromise. Ninety-nine Senators support the "Spy Fridge" bill. He is the only one who opposes it.

And I would also welcome working with the House to ensure that more Senate bills—good bills—receive timely consideration and are passed out of the House in exchange for lifting my own holds on other House-approved measures.

And so if you are home in Paducah, KY, I want to explain what is about to happen right now. In just a moment, I am going to ask for unanimous consent, and then I want you to listen to Senator PAUL because he has total and complete control over whether his legislation about the Boys & Girls Club in Paducah, KY, passes or not.

If Senator PAUL says the magic words "I object," then understand that his bill and my bill both will fail to pass. If he decides we can be reasonable and work together, if he simply doesn't say the words "I object," then his bill will pass and go to President Trump's desk for signature, and my bill protecting you and your home from being surveilled and spied upon will likewise pass and go to President Trump's desk for signature. So Senator PAUL has a choice: pass two bills or zero bills.

Therefore, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the consent be modified; that the Senate also proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 64, H.R. 859; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I think the problem we have here is a misunderstanding, and it is sort of a false equivalency that somehow granting a boys and girls club a deed to 3½ acres they have been using for 50-some-odd years that was once held by the Federal Government and is held by the city—to let this boys and girls club have a deed, that that is somehow equivalent to a nationwide regulation with fines and fees.

There are some questions about these smart refrigerators: Are they so smart that they hook themselves up to the internet unbeknownst to the person? The refrigerator shows up in your house and somehow a cord surreptitiously comes out the back and plugs into the cable or it somehow hooks up to your router; it knows your password and has Bluetooth? How do you get a smart refrigerator that spies on you without your hooking it up to the internet? So that is a question.

But the other question and sort of the mistaken notion here is that somehow, when you voluntarily agree to give information, that that is something that libertarians object to. Libertarians object to the government spying on you. If you voluntarily agree to share your information, that has never been something the libertarians object to.

For example, the internet is predicated upon your anonymous information being shared on your purchases. Sharing of information is not something libertarians object to. They object to the government snooping on you and getting your information.

So having a national mandate that you are going to enforce on the refrigerator manufacturers—that you are going to fine them and if they don't pay, they will be held in contempt for—I just don't see that as a very Republican idea to be introducing national regulations.

To say that is equivalent to the Boys & Girls Club—you are going to hold the Boys & Girls Club unless I agree to a national regulation on the smart refrigerators that are surreptitiously somehow hooking themselves up to the internet and spying on us? It sounds like a solution in search of a problem. It also, to most people with common sense, would not seem to be equivalent. I would never in my right mind come to the floor to object to the Boys & Girls Club of Texas. I don't think they are equivalent.

But if you have 30 bills or 100 bills that want to have nationwide regulations—your a.m. radio bill. You want to mandate to the car manufacturers that they have a.m. radio. Why? Technology has gone beyond this in many ways. We have Teslas now, and nobody in their Tesla is going to tune in through an antenna. But, you know, to get an antenna into a Tesla and get it to work, you have to coat the battery with this special coating. It costs a couple hundred dollars. Your bill says that the manufacturers can't charge more for that. So if I sell Teslas and I have to spend \$300 to get an a.m. antenna radio working in my Tesla that nobody is going to use, that you are going to mandate on behalf of people who really have a vested interest, a monetary interest, in a.m. radio—there are questions that should be asked, and that should be debated, and that is controversial enough not to be a unanimous consent. A Boys & Girls Club kind of sounds to me like a unanimous consent agreement.

The mistaken notion we have around here is that we want to pass hundreds and hundreds of pieces of legislation that affect policy. What I get every time is "Well, this legislation only adds \$50 million" or "It is only going to be \$50 million" because millions of dollars don't matter anymore; nationwide regulations don't matter anymore. Well, it does.

And these are policy differences, and these are honest. These aren't because

I dislike you or I dislike your legislation. I don't want a national regulation on refrigerator people. I just don't want it, and I don't see a need for it, and I think it is a reasonable position to take, but it has nothing to do with the Boys Club.

I would promise you, if you have anything to do with Boys & Girls Clubs or any kind of small, parochial interest, you haven't seen me. I don't come to the floor to object to that. But something that is on policy, I do object to, and I have questions about how the refrigerators are surreptitiously hooking themselves up and spying on people.

The thing is, when you go to buy one of these refrigerators, they charge you more, I would assume, for a smart refrigerator, so my guess is they advertise they are smart so they can charge 200 bucks more. I don't know how you are getting a refrigerator with a microphone and the ability to connect to the internet without knowing it because they charge you and it is an incentive for them to advertise this.

So I don't understand where the problem is, nor do I understand how they hook themselves up, so therefore I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I would note a couple of things.

No. 1, Senator PAUL said libertarians only object to the government surveilling them. That is not what I have ever heard from a libertarian. I am not a full-throated libertarian like Senator PAUL is, but I am easily one of the most libertarian Members of this body, and I have very strong libertarian leanings. I have spent 14 years in the Senate fighting to protect civil liberties.

The libertarians I have talked to, the Texans I have talked to are not particularly interested in giant corporations spying on them either. The government is not the only bad actor. By objecting, what Senator PAUL is saying is that giant corporations can come into your home—can come into your kitchen, can come into your bedroom—can tape-record the most intimate conversations you have, can videotape you, and they don't even have to tell you they are doing that.

Understand, my bill is not prohibiting them from surveilling; it is simply saying: Tell the consumers before you tape-record them or video them.

I thought it was interesting that Senator PAUL says: Gosh, this doesn't sound like a very Republican bill.

Well, there are 535 Members of the U.S. Congress, and 534 of them agree with this bill. The only one that does not is Senator PAUL. And the result of it is that giant corporations are empowered to spy on you without you ever knowing it.

He secondly mentioned the a.m. radio for every vehicle. Listen, a.m. radio—I

have led the fight for 14 years against censorship, against silencing political speech. Censorship comes from government, but it also comes from giant corporations, whether Big Tech, which has been egregious in censoring free speech, or in this instance the giant auto companies that colluded together to remove a.m. radio because a.m. radio, among other things, has been a haven for free speech. Rush Limbaugh would never have been heard in America without a.m. radio; Mark Levin, Glenn Beck, Sean Hannity.

Why do the giant corporations want to take a.m. radio down? Because they want to silence conservative speech. Yet Senator PAUL has objected to that bill as well. He is perfectly happy or at least—I don't know if he is happy or not, but his objection suggests he is willing to do nothing to stop corporations from muzzling conservatives and making it impossible for conservatives to speak, for libertarians to speak.

I think putting everything in the control of giant corporations is the very opposite of being a libertarian.

I want to finally speak to the folks in Paducah, KY. Look, I think this bill is a reasonable bill. I would like to see it pass. I have told the author of it in the House, Representative COMER—he is a good friend. He and I have worked together on a number of matters. I am willing to work with him cooperatively to find a way forward for this bill to pass.

It could have passed today. All that Senator PAUL had to do was not say the words "I object," and this bill on Paducah, KY, would have passed the Senate, gone to the White House, and President Trump would have signed it.

By the way, at the same time, you would be protected against being surveilled in your home without your knowing it.

But, unfortunately, Senator PAUL decided to object across the board, and so at least today, nothing has passed.

Accordingly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, the interesting thing we hear—you know, because typically you don't hear it from Republicans—nationwide mandates on refrigerators, nationwide mandates on car manufactures, penalties and Federal punishment if we don't comply with the way of thinking that is prescribed by these bills. What we didn't hear, though, was any kind of objection to the idea or explanation of how your refrigerator is going to spy on you.

I think it sort of assumes the notion that people are not competent, not smart enough to make any decisions on their own, that Big Brother has to help them out with it.

You have to imagine that someone is buying a smart refrigerator that is going to cost you a couple hundred bucks more than a non-smart refrigerator, is going to cost you more—I can't imagine it isn't advertised. So

let's say you pay \$200 more for your refrigerator than you would normally, you get a smart one, and you take it home. I still didn't hear any explanation of how it spies on you. How does it spy on you unless you hook it up to the internet? Short of that, your refrigerator is not spying on you. "Big Refrigerator" is not spying on you. They are offering you a service if you choose to use it, and you have to choose to use it. You could also choose not to buy it.

Regulation like this are the regulations of the left and of Big Brother, who thinks that Americans are incompetent and can't make their decisions. But regulations like this add up, and they add to the cost of refrigerators, they add to the cost of appliances.

Just go to California. In California, you will see a tag on everything that says "doesn't cause cancer anywhere else in the United States but may cause cancer in California" because they have over-labeled everything to death.

It really isn't the business of the Federal Government to be involved with this.

They need to be committed to the rules of fraud. They shouldn't be able to sell something to you that is hooking itself up to the internet. But if you have to hook it up—if you have ever Bluetoothed something, you have to do something. The internet just doesn't come and grab your picture on the refrigerator or listen to your microphone. It has to be hooked up to the internet. You have to do this.

So there ought to be some thought that goes into this.

I am disappointed that you choose to hurt the Boys & Girls Club, but what is the alternative? I have to just say: I won't use my brain. I won't think about the consequences of this bill. I won't think about how it goes against our philosophy of adding more Federal regulations. I won't think about the cost to corporations. I won't think about the nonsensical assertion that it is going to spy on you without you knowing it because it is going to hook itself up to the internet. I am supposed to ignore all that and take that in order to get a deed for a Boys & Girls Club. I find this a false equivalency and insincere.

Every objection I have to every one of your other bills is a debatable item based on philosophy. If you have a philosophical difference with this, come to the floor and tell us why you hate the Boys & Girls Club of Paducah, but don't come to us and say: Well, you have to accept a regulation on refrigerators in order to help the Boys & Girls Club—which doesn't cost anything. It is a bizarre, arcane thing. The Federal Government, I think, owned the land, gave it to the city, and said the city couldn't transfer it 50 years ago. The Boys & Girls Club has been on this land for 50 years, but they don't have the title, so we are trying to give them the title through legislation.

This is exactly the kind of stuff that, because it doesn't affect nationwide policy, shouldn't have to go to committee, shouldn't have to come to the floor, shouldn't have to tie up a lot of time. These are the things we can dispense with. But a nationwide regulation on cars shouldn't be adopted without debate and without the normal procedure of the Senate. This is a special procedure. We only do things unanimously that typically we agree on.

If we want to have sense of the Senate to recognize John Lewis or a sense of the Senate to recognize some individual, those are the kinds of things we do unanimously, but we don't typically do policy or regulations for the whole country unanimously.

So I hope there is a better way out where we can think about treating and figuring out what levels of legislation rise to the ability of having a serious debate over and what things are parochial and really could be passed unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, the most recent assassination attempt makes approval of a secure White House addition more urgent. The National Planning Commission, of which I am a member, voted 8 to 1 to approve the White House addition. Lawfare, though, is currently delaying construction.

It is clear that the threats of violence against our President are not going away; they keep getting worse. So to prevent further delay, Congress should authorize the White House ballroom and get it on a path to completion. Let's get it built.

I am very glad that this latest assassination attempt was stopped, but it is concerning that the would-be assassin got so close and that these types of threats are growing more frequent.

The fact I even have to qualify my remarks to specifically say that I am talking about the latest assassination attempt rather than the one before it or the one before that should make us all think clearly on how seriously we need to be taking this.

We do need to improve security for the President, and one solution is already right in front of us. The most significant thing we can do—something that will make the biggest improvement in security—is have a secure event space in the White House ballroom project. Its designs are complete. The project has already broken ground. Funding has already been secured from private donors, not taxpayers. My proposal today doesn't involve any tax money.

Congress doesn't need to reinvent the wheel here. I have a straightforward bill, which I will move to pass in a moment, to give this project clear, legal authority to proceed. By passing my bill, we can help build the ballroom

with no more legal delays, no more bureaucratic delays, improved reporting and progress updates to Congress, and no added cost to taxpayers.

I support the building of the ballroom, and the Senate can do something right now to make it happen. Let's do the right thing without delay. Let's formalize and authorize the White House ballroom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCORMICK). Is there objection?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, Donald Trump promised to lower costs on day one. Well, today is day 464 of Donald Trump's Presidency, and we are in a full-blown affordability crisis.

We are 2 months into Trump's illegal war with Iran, a war that, according to experts, is costing taxpayers over \$1 billion a day. American families are getting flattened by rising costs on just about everything, from groceries, to rent, to gas. Just today, gas prices hit a new high since Trump started his war. People are stretching themselves to the brink just to pay their bills. But what is the biggest issue of the day, according to Republicans in Congress? Fast-tracking Donald Trump's gold-encrusted ballroom.

Another recent Republican plan would send \$400 million to the White House—I guess to buy more gold leaf and onyx marble for the want-to-be King. But I want to be clear: It is common sense that we can, of course, protect the President without shoveling millions of dollars into Trump's ballroom in the middle of an affordability crisis.

This bill to rubberstamp Trump's latest vanity project is a giant slap in the face to American families, just plain and simple. Americans are selling their plasma to pay for groceries and gas. Think about that.

Americans right now today are selling their blood just to pay their bills. And what is the Republicans' solution? Dump more money into Donald Trump's golden-crusted vanity project, and let's do it on the fast track because it is that urgent.

Well, here are a few other ideas for things we could fast-track to actually help the American people: We could reverse Trump's and the Republicans' giant healthcare costs that kicked millions of Americans off their health insurance and jacked up insurance premiums for millions more; or we could deliver affordable childcare for every American family; or we could undo Republicans' cuts to food assistance for families; or we could put a stop to Trump's across-the-board tariffs; or we could end Donald Trump's war with Iran. And, look, the list goes on and on.