

appropriate action well ahead of what you would be able to do.

So you would not be able to take advantage of any inside information ahead of what the public had. You would not be able to sell until the public knew well in advance, and, of course, you would be prohibited from buying stocks as well.

My bill also has real teeth in it, a minimum of a \$2,000 fine or 10 percent of the cost of the proceeds.

So, for example, if you went and sold a stock after getting elected, without giving the proper notice, and say it was a million-dollar transaction, you would have to pay a \$100,000 fine. In addition, you would have to forfeit all of the profits. The Stop Insider Trading Act has real teeth in it to back up the policy.

By making sure that Members of Congress cannot buy stock on inside information and would have to notify the public if they wish to sell any stock well in advance of their actually being able to do that, we can help restore the faith of the American people that we are keeping separate the inside information that we get for very good reasons from our finances.

Let's be clear, no Member of the House or Senate should benefit from inside information. They should not be allowed to profit from it. This is supposed to be a public service, and we need to take steps to restore the credibility with the American people.

The Stop Insider Trading Act is the solution to be able to help restore that credibility, to let the American people know that we are not financially benefiting from inside information. It would apply to not only Members of the House and Senate but their spouses and their dependent children as well.

The President has called on us to pass the Stop Insider Trading Act. The Vice President just last week, in addressing House Republicans, said we need to pass the Stop Insider Trading Act. It is time for Congress to act on this important piece of legislation that will help restore people's faith in their institutions.

I call on my colleagues to support this bill and send it to the President's desk.

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.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a bill that, at its core, asks for something almost embarrassingly simple: That the person registering to vote in an American election is actually an American citizen and that the person showing up to cast

the ballot is actually who they say they are.

The SAVE Act does not reinvent our elections. It does not add redtape for the sake of redtape. It asks for documentary proof of citizenship at registration and identification at the ballot box—the same basic verification we already accept without complaint when we board an airplane, open a bank account, or pick up a prescription.

If we trust that system to protect a checking account, we should trust it enough to protect the vote. That is not extremism. That is common sense, and it is long past time this Chamber treated it that way.

This past Saturday, I was riding in the Cheyenne Frontier Days parade alongside Senator BARRASSO. Cheyenne is my hometown. It is the world's largest outdoor rodeo. And we have great parades—four of them—during the course of the week of the world's largest outdoor rodeo. It is an exceptional tradition in my hometown.

Senator BARRASSO and I are riding along the parade route, the same parade route Wyoming has watched for generations. And as we came down the street, I could hear it from my constituents over and over: Pass the SAVE Act, Senator. Pass the SAVE Act. Not once. Not from just one corner of the crowd, all along the parade route. That is not a talking point; that just happened last weekend. That is the people of Wyoming telling us what they want.

So, I came home from that parade wondering if Wyoming was maybe a little ahead of the country on this.

It turns out, Wyoming is right where the country already is. And it turns out these constituents aren't just in line with the people of Wyoming; they are in line with the country.

A Gallup poll found 84 percent of U.S. adults favor requiring photo identification to vote. In that same poll, 83 percent—just one less—support requiring proof of citizenship for new voter registrants. Mr. President, 83 percent. That includes 71 percent of self-identified Democrats and an overwhelming majority of Independents. In this town, we can't get 83 percent of anybody to agree on the weather.

This is not controversial outside the walls of this building. It has simply become controversial inside them.

Would we expect to go to Mexico or Canada and walk into an election booth and have them let us vote in their elections without an ID, without proving we're a Canadian citizen or a Mexican citizen? They would have nothing to do with the process that allowed a U.S. citizen to vote without identification in their elections. No country would.

So is the opposition to this bill just another symptom of Trump derangement syndrome, where any policy this administration touches becomes reflexively toxic the moment it reaches this floor? Or do my colleagues across the aisle actually believe it is bad policy for only American citizens to decide

American elections? Because, really, those are—as near as I can tell—the only two explanations on offer.

The same is true of protecting girls' and women's sports. Gallup has found 69 percent of Americans believe athletes should compete on teams that match their biological sex. I am surprised it is not a higher number, but it is 69 percent. This is not a fringe position. It is the plainly stated view of most people in this country, arrived at through a basic, widely shared sense of fairness: That girls who train and compete deserve a level playing field where they can compete safely. They don't have to worry about a man who identifies as a woman or as a transperson spiking a volleyball so hard that it does brain damage and causes concussions and lifelong injury to a young high school athlete. We owe that to our female athletes.

Wyoming didn't send me here to just spew political jargon, to play politics, because these things are simple; they are timeless; they are understood values. We can't bend and shape thousands of years of common sense with new, woke ideology. Wyoming sent me here to conduct myself in a manner that reflects their common sense, their values.

So it is time to send the SAVE Act to President Trump's desk. I heard that on the parade route in Cheyenne, WY, last weekend, and I hear it on this floor. We need to pass the SAVE Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

RECESS

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previously scheduled recess begin immediately.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:17 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 807

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here today with a very straightforward, simple resolution. It is about enforcement. For most of my career, I was an enforcer: a Federal prosecutor, U.S. attorney for Connecticut, and then attorney general of the State of Connecticut for 20 years. So I know—we all know—that the law is dead letter if it is not enforced.

And there is a very, very profoundly important law—in fact, our Constitution—that needs enforcement. That is the task that brings me to the Senate floor today.

I am asking for a resolution to direct the Senate legal counsel to bring a civil action in the name of the U.S. Senate to enforce the foreign emoluments clause contained in article I of

the Constitution. This clause states that the President cannot accept any gifts, payments, benefits, or anything else of value from foreign governments, unless he receives the consent of Congress. Presidents have uniformly obeyed the emoluments clause for all of our illustrious 250 years of existence.

The Founders thought this clause was central to preserving our Nation. Why? Because at the time of our founding, we were a fledgling and struggling nation. Foreign powers like France and England were arrayed against us with potentates and rich businesspeople, powerful adversaries who could corrupt our leaders. And so specifically in the Constitution, as a matter of our national security—not just to prevent corruption, gift-taking that might violate our sense of morality, but as a matter of the defense of our Nation, they inserted the emoluments clause that required consent of Congress before the President, or any other public official, could accept anything of value, whether it be a benefit, an indirect payment—anything of value.

And so now if you are a member of the armed services and you are asked to teach a course in another country and you are paid for it, you need to get permission. It applies to the lowliest of Federal officials and the highest. The emoluments clause is part of our Constitution.

I know a lot about the emoluments clause because I sued Donald Trump under the emoluments clause during his first term, and we won at the district court level. In fact, we prevailed in that lawsuit, but then we were told that we had no standing. Under the Federal laws of procedure, a party in court, to successfully invoke the jurisdiction of the Federal courts, must have what is called standing, which is not just aggrievement but personal involvement and harm.

And the court said, in effect: You are individual Members of Congress—there were more than 250 of us—but you are not the body; you are not the Senate; you are not the House of Representatives, which brings me here today because I want the U.S. Senate to take a stand—to stand up against the illegal practices of this President in taking an array of benefits, including payments—literally payments—in violation of the emoluments clause. The emoluments clause is a dead letter if it is not enforced, and our national security is at risk.

President Trump's willingness to use the privileges of his office to enrich himself is well known to Americans, and it seems to have no bounds.

Just this month, President Trump's gift from the government of Qatar—a \$400 million jet—entered service as an interim Air Force One, but he wants to take that jet and then install it as part of his private library. In fact, he may use it afterward. We don't know.

What we do know is costly modifications were required to ensure the installation of multiple top-secret sys-

tems to get the plane flight ready, and now it has to go back for more work because, in fact, the security system right now is inadequate. But we know taxpayers are going to foot the bill—a benefit to the President probably in excess of \$1 billion.

That jet barely scratches the surface of emoluments going to President Trump. In 2025, President Trump and his sons took about \$500 million for a 49 percent stake in the Trump family crypto business, World Liberty Financial, invested by the MGX Fund Management Limited, which is an investment firm in turn backed by a UAE sovereign wealth fund at the initiative of Sheikh Tahnoun, the UAE's national security advisor and the brother of UAE's President.

In other words, an investment by the UAE wealth fund, controlled by the ruling family of the UAE, for 49 percent in World Liberty Financial, \$500 million. And then magically—magically—President Trump approved sales of \$1.4 million in military equipment for the UAE. And in addition, the sale of highly sophisticated advanced chips necessary for the UAE to build a data center that could rival ours in the United States—our national security compromised as a result of payments to World Liberty Financial—the Trump—and, by the way, Witkoff—family crypto business.

This kind of self-enrichment has made a very wealthy Donald Trump even wealthier. He made \$2 billion last year—\$2 billion in income—1.4 billion of it from crypto. It is not only offensive as a matter of self-enrichment, but it is a threat to our national security—exactly the same kind of threat that our Founders sought to prevent as a result of the emoluments clause.

Not only has President Trump violated flagrantly the emoluments clause, but he has effectively slapped a “for sale” sign on the door of the Oval Office.

He accepted a gold-plated desk clock and engraved gold bar as gifts from Swiss business executives before slashing Switzerland's tariff rate.

He hosted a private gala dinner featuring a tour of the White House to reward top buyers of the Trump cryptocurrency meme coin. Attendees of that dinner included Chinese billionaires, CEOs, and investors with ties to the Chinese Communist Party.

The American President is supposed to work for us, for the American people, for everyday Americans, not for his own self-enrichment, and that is what the emoluments clause is really supposed to guarantee—that the President of the United States works for the United States, not for himself.

As I mentioned, I tried to enforce the emoluments clause myself by filing a lawsuit on June 14, 2017. The United States Court for the District of Columbia held that we didn't have standing. I disagree. I think we do have standing under the law, but I respect the court's judgment; and so we are charting this path forward.

This resolution is necessary now to give the Senate the ability to hold President Trump accountable on behalf of the American people to go to court and have our day before a judge who will assess the facts of this case and second guess me or any of us and rule and uphold the rule of law.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to restore the dignity of the executive office and to assure enforcement of the Constitution of the United States of America.

And so as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 807; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, at a time when we are seeing the Democrat Party embrace the hellish evils of socialism and ideologies that hate the founding ideals of America, Democrats are hoping to pass a resolution to direct this Chamber to sue the President of the United States on a very false premise.

The emoluments clause reads:

No title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States.

I don't think that is happening.

And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title of any kind [whatsoever], from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Now, the obvious answer is that these accusations by my colleague do not support the constitutional threshold of an emolument, and my Democrat colleagues are just playing politics.

This resolution seeks to authorize litigation rather than legislation.

This issue has already been litigated, and, as my colleague said, they lost. The Democrats just like don't like the answer.

Now, the President isn't taking a plane or any gifts for personal use, and the United States has long accepted diplomatic gifts pursuant to Federal law, with such gifts generally becoming property of the United States rather than any individual officeholder.

Now, what is going on here is the Democrats are putting their hatred for President Trump before the law. But aside from the obvious facts, this is the agenda Democrats want from this Chamber. They don't want to fund government; they want to shut it down.

They walked away from government funding negotiations. They don't want to secure elections. They want systematic fraud because it benefits their elected incumbents.

Department of Homeland Security just found 278,000 noncitizens on voter rolls for Federal elections. Are Democrats talking about that?

Just last week, President Trump exposed foreign adversaries like China and Cuba for interfering in our elections. Did my Democratic colleagues talk about that?

Leader SCHUMER responded to the facts about voter fraud by declaring the SAVE America Act, an election security bill—even though Democrats, Republicans, Independents all across the country believe in it—said it is “dead on arrival.”

Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues don't want fixes; they want to ignore the fraud because it benefits them.

They are trying to distract the American people with platitudes while they defraud them of their vote.

Have you looked at what Olive Garden is doing, OK? You can buy a pasta pass—an unlimited pasta pass, but guess what you have to do? You have to show an ID. So Olive Garden has a voter ID, but my Democratic colleagues don't want to do it for Federal elections.

This bill proves that the Democrats' goal right now is to attack President Trump instead of fixing problems Americans expect us to deal with. They don't want to reduce the cost of living, lower inflation, balance the budget. They do want to tax working Americans so they can spend more of it on special interests and run bigger deficits—already spending \$2 trillion in deficits.

They want to use the Senate's time—the precious time we have—to attack President Trump by twisting the words of the Constitution.

The resolution is moot. The accusations: Purely political. We all know it is political. It is a waste of time. And this Chamber only works 2-and-a-half days a week. I think we need to spend every time doing something like pass the SAVE America Act, fund our government, lower the debt, lower the deficit. Unfortunately, my Democratic colleagues aren't coming to the table.

Why don't we spend some time on real issues rather than attacking the President?

For those reasons, I object to passage of this resolution and hope my colleagues can reject the anti-American socialists capturing the Democratic Party before it is too late for all of us. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

RECOGNIZING DENISON UNIVERSITY

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary year of achievement by Ohio's own Denison University.

Now, everyone knows Denison to be a great academic institution. But, all of a sudden, it has become a great athletic institution. In the 2025–2026 academic year, Denison student athletes delivered one of the most successful seasons in school history, capturing four—you heard that right—NCAA Division III national titles and bringing

great pride to the university community, alumni, and the entire State of Ohio.

I am joined in this Chamber by members of all four national championship winning coaches, players, and families.

So welcome to the U.S. Senate. We are honored to have you with us today.

We had the chance to join President Trump this morning at the White House to celebrate their accomplishments, and I wanted to take a couple of minutes to honor them on the Senate floor. We will start with the most recent champion, the men's baseball team.

In early June, Denison's men's baseball team won the program's first ever NCAA Division III national championship, defeating Endicott College in a 4–3 thriller, 10-inning walk-off victory.

The Big Red completed a historic season with a 51-and-3 record. That is right. A 51-and-3 record in baseball is amazing, almost unprecedented. They held the No. 1 ranking from the start of the season to the finish. It is hard to go wire to wire—so hard to go wire to wire. And under the leadership of Coach Mike Deegan, the team demonstrated excellence throughout this season, as I noted.

Now, this was a team effort. It was a three-game series in the finals. Denison won game 1. And then, game 2, they lost a 10-inning, 11–10 battle. It is so hard to come back in game 3, after being so close to clinching it in game 2. But they won a decisive game 3, 4 to 3, in the bottom of the 10th inning.

Cherish the memory—to the Denison baseball team—because you will unlikely ever have a more thrilling experience than winning the national championship in the 10th inning in a walk-off situation—great fun, great fun.

Cade Nowik was named the outstanding player of the NCAA championship after a dominant postseason performance, including a game in which he recorded three home runs and seven RBIs—pretty impressive. But I know every national championship will always say it is team effort. Everybody from the lowest man on the roster to the top, they all matter when you win a championship. Everybody contributes to that cause.

Congratulations to these outstanding student athletes for an unforgettable season and a well-earned national title.

Let me go on next to the men's swimming and diving team. In March, Denison men's swimming and diving team captured its second consecutive NCAA Division III national championship and seventh national title in program history. The Big Red finished with 437 points, nearly 49 points ahead of the second-place team, marking their third time in program history that Denison has won back-to-back NCAA championships. That right there is a tradition of excellence.

The program also swept the major awards presented by the College Swim-

ming and Diving Coaches Association of America, as you would expect from the dominant championship team that they had. Gregg Parini was named Co-Coach of the Year. First-year diving coach Kai Robinson earned Men's Diving Coach of the Year honors. And Jack Hill and Nick Fogle were recognized as Swimmer and Diver of the Year.

That is what you call a clean sweep right there, folks.

Congratulations to these student athletes that represent Ohio and Denison with excellence. I congratulate them, their coaches, and their families. What a remarkable accomplishment—pretty amazing.

So we got through two of the national championships. Let's move to the third. That is men's doubles tennis.

Denison's men's tennis added another national title when Ethan Green and Kael Shah captured the NCAA Division III men's doubles national championship. The duo concluded the season with an impressive 24-and-6 record and secured the first national or NCAA championship in program history—amazing.

Congratulations, guys.

Their achievements also capped extraordinary collegiate careers. Ethan Green finished with the most doubles victories and combined victories in program history, while Kael Shah concluded his career-second alltime in both categories.

Congratulations to Ethan and Kael and the entire Denison's men's tennis program on your historic accomplishment.

Now on to women's basketball, and this, perhaps, is the most unexpected national championship at Denison. The women's basketball program completed a dominant 30–2 season, although at the beginning of the season, no one predicted that level of success. They captured the program's first NCAA Division III national championship. Led by head coach Maureen Hirt, the Big Red defeated the University of Scranton 55 to 41 in the national championship game to secure the title.

I understand that this team's character came through, because they were dominant defensively, pressing the whole game, created turnovers and chaos for the other team, which led to a dominant victory. You don't win national champion games 55 to 41 without being dominant as a defensive team.

This championship reflects the dedication, discipline, and determination displayed by these student athletes throughout the season. It takes a lot to go 30 to 2. Congratulations to the team, the coaches, and their families on this historic victory.

The reason this brings back some special memories for me is because I, too, as a senior at the University of Dayton, won a Division III national championship, although it was in football, and it brings back wonderful memories because it is very rare in life that you can close out an athletic career and walk off a champion.