

Trump thinks he is in for a warm reception in Michigan; he is in for a reckoning.

CORRUPTION

Madam President, on corruption, the only people who think America is getting more affordable are Donald Trump and his cronies as they cash in on unprecedented corruption. We see a new con come out of the Trump administration almost every day, but the scheme is always the same: Americans pay; Trump profits.

Last week, I announced Senate Democrats' new effort to stop Trump from turning his Presidency into his personal ATM. We released a report detailing how the Trump family has defrauded the American people to the tune of more than \$4 billion in the past 18 months. We also saw Republicans vote against my legislation to prevent Trump from wasting further taxpayer dollars on upgrades for his \$400 million luxury jet.

Our work to expose and stop Trump's grift continues this week. In the coming days, I plan to announce new legislation to clean up the swamp Trump promised to drain a decade ago. We are unmasking the people who are swindling the American people, holding their feet to the fire, and advancing reforms to stop further corruption in the future.

The Presidency isn't a product to sell, a commodity to trade, or a grift to run—no matter how hard Donald Trump tries. Every American who has been forced to pay more this last year and a half is paying for Trump's profit margin. We are done picking up his tab.

SAVE AMERICA ACT

Madam President, on the SAVE Act, it is a new week in Washington, but one thing remains the same: The SAVE Act is dead on arrival in the Senate. Trump keeps tiring himself out running the same play. Trump knows he can't defend Republicans' abysmal record—his abysmal record—so he whines to the GOP to pass the SAVE Act to disenfranchise voters who want to hold him accountable in November. Give it up, Donald. The SAVE Act ain't going to happen.

The courts have rejected the SAVE Act. Congress rejected the SAVE Act. Even members of Trump's own party have rejected the SAVE Act.

Republican problems aren't going to go away until Trump realizes how futile this brazen effort to rig our elections really is. Instead, Trump has said publicly that "Republicans have to pass SAVE . . . otherwise we are going to have a shutdown in November." That is Trump. He keeps threatening a shutdown.

Are Republicans listening? Your President is threatening to shut down the government. It is not Democrats doing that.

Donald, I keep trying to remind you, the last time you bragged about shutting down the government—back when NANCY PELOSI was in charge then—

didn't go so well for you, did it? And it definitely won't now.

Republicans either need to drop this frivolous and vicious effort to pass the SAVE Act or watch Democrats stop it dead in its tracks.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant bill 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. 833, Walter Clayton, of New York, to be Director of National Intelligence.

John Thune, Tom Cotton, Jon Husted, Alan Armstrong, Jim Banks, Bernie Moreno, Chuck Grassley, John Barrasso, Marsha Blackburn, Joni Ernst, John R. Curtis, Roger F. Wicker, Pete Ricketts, Katie Boyd Britt, Bill Hagerty, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Mike Crapo.

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 Walter Clayton, of New York, to be Director of National Intelligence, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Armstrong	Capito	Cruz
Banks	Cassidy	Curtis
Barrasso	Collins	Daines
Blackburn	Cornyn	Ernst
Boozman	Cotton	Fischer
Britt	Cramer	Graham
Budd	Crapo	Grassley

Hagerty	Lummis	Schmitt
Hawley	Marshall	Scott (FL)
Hoeven	McCormick	Scott (SC)
Husted	Moody	Sheehy
Hyde-Smith	Moran	Sullivan
Johnson	Moreno	Thune
Justice	Murkowski	Tillis
Kennedy	Paul	Tuberville
Lankford	Risch	Wicker
Lee	Rounds	Young

NAYS—43

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cantwell	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Fetterman	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gallego	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Heinrich	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—6

Gillibrand	McConnell	Ricketts
Kelly	Peters	Welch

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 43. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter Clayton, of New York, to be Director of National Intelligence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. President, I rise today in support of H.R. 7008, a bill that contains two commonsense reforms. These are pretty easy—banning members of Congress from purchasing stocks while in office and requiring a photo ID to vote. People have said that they want us to do this. I have heard it for years around here. It hasn't happened. Now it is time to happen. Tonight, we have an opportunity to do it.

Both policies are overwhelmingly supported by Americans. If you want to listen to the American people, do these two things. Mr. President, 86 percent of Americans support banning Members of Congress from purchasing stocks while in office, and 83 percent of Americans support showing a photo ID to vote.

It has been 7 days since I last stood in this Chamber to speak about photo ID, and I am back to do it again because it is an important policy. I want to reiterate a point: Photo ID doesn't just protect the integrity of our elections; it makes our elections work better.

If election integrity isn't reason enough to support photo ID, consider what it would mean to election administration. We have seen this in States like California, where it took them over a week to count votes in recent

elections. Elections officials shouldn't be spending time day after day after day going through ballots to see if this signature matches this signature. It takes too long. It is an ineffective way of determining the identification of an individual when many, many States—36 of them—have figured out a very efficient way to do this. It is called photo ID. It is something that everyone has. It is an efficient way to do it. It doesn't drag out the process. It doesn't force elections officials to become handwriting experts to figure it out.

I mean, we used to do this in the 1800s before we had methods of determining someone's identity. You had to rely on a signature. But this is 2026, for crying out loud. Everyone has a photo ID. It is an easy way to do it, it is far simpler, and it will make our elections run more simply and effectively.

Americans use a photo ID every single day. There is no reason they can't use it to vote. As a matter of fact, in Ohio, we did this. We have had photo ID for years. We had a mandate in the recent Presidential election to use a photo ID. It didn't suppress the vote. Actually, we had one of the highest voter turnouts in the history of our State.

Don't give me the baloney that somehow this is going to discriminate against somebody and tell them it will make it harder for them to vote. We have evidence to the contrary. We know photo ID is common sense.

Now let's move on to the other provision of this bill—legislation that includes stopping insider trading. It is called the Stop Insider Trading Act. It is another commonsense reform that is long overdue in Washington. People have been talking about it for years, did nothing about it. Tonight, we are trying to do something about it.

The bill prohibits Members of Congress, their spouses, and their dependent children from purchasing new securities in publicly traded companies or similar financial instruments while they serve in Congress. It requires at least 7 days' public notice before anyone can sell any of these securities. It imposes significant legal and financial penalties for violators.

These safeguards ensure lawmakers and their families cannot use nonpublic information to enrich themselves, as we know has gone on in this town for many years, at the expense of the American people. But nobody did anything about it. Tonight, we have a chance to do something about it.

I want to commend one of our colleagues, Senator PETE RICKETTS from Nebraska. PETE has led on the Senate side of this conversation on banning the insider trading. Senator RICKETTS deserves credit for all of his work, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of his Senate version of the legislation. I urge my colleagues to support its swift passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The Senator from Florida.

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. President, I appreciate the words of my colleague Senator HUSTED, who was sworn in on the same day as I was, and we both hold very dear our responsibilities that our constituents have entrusted us with here in Washington. They did not send us up here to just listen to concerns. They didn't send us up here to just debate. They want action. And that is why I am so proud to stand here today.

In a moment, I am going to ask unanimous consent for two very clear, very specific pieces of legislation that have already been voted on in the House in a bipartisan way: voter ID and keeping Members of Congress from purchasing stocks while in office. Very simple. It should pass here, and I dare someone to object because the people of this country are tired of us talking about it. It is time for us to do something. These are two issues that I care very deeply about. The voter ID portion of this, I was an original cosponsor of the SAVE America Act, and I have introduced similar legislation to ban Members from stock trading through my Restore Trust in Congress Act, which is bipartisan.

These truly should be nondebateable, bipartisan issues that we can all agree on. The fact is, 83 percent of Americans support voter ID laws. The very people that the Democrats claim will be harmed by voter ID—the very people—are the ones that support this.

Mr. President, 76 percent of Black Americans, 82 percent of Hispanic Americans support voter ID, an overwhelming majority of Americans support voter ID—of all parties.

Eighty-eight percent of Democrats, 81 percent of Independents support us banning Members of Congress from trading stocks.

So I wanted to be very clear tonight, very obvious for anyone that is watching, not only here within the Senate but at home, which party is asking their colleagues to require voter ID and banning the purchasing of stocks while in office.

I want to go back to voter ID for just a moment because I know, Senator HUSTED, this has been very important to you. Our great American experiment hinges on the sanctity and integrity of our elections, and I think we need to ask ourselves why is it that so many Democratic States refuse to comply with the law now and are objecting to us requiring voter ID. Why? What could be the reason?

We have to fiercely safeguard our democracy, ensuring that only Americans are allowed to participate in American elections. The SAVE America Act upholds the rule of law, makes sure there are stronger protections in place across the country to ensure that only citizens can participate in one of the privileges of being a citizen, and that is voting in our election.

Everyone should be outraged by what we just uncovered in New Jersey, where thousands of noncitizens were registered to vote through the State's

motor vehicle system. So after telling us time and time and time and time again that that could never happen and does not happen—oh my goodness, it is happening. Surprise, surprise.

And they will still come here to the floor and object to voter ID after blaming thousands of individuals on the voter rolls as a software error.

We also have to make sure that we are mindful of the fact that the Democratic Socialists of America have just said in their platform, they want noncitizens voting. They put it right out there in their platform.

So people ask why now? Why do we need voter ID now? Maybe because we are uncovering thousands of people on voter rolls that shouldn't be on voter rolls, and maybe it is because you have an entire segment of the Democratic Party pushing for noncitizen voting. That is why now.

Secure elections strengthen democracy. They increase participation. Ben Franklin famously replied to a bystander after the Constitutional Convention that we have a Republic if we can keep it. This is how we keep it.

The House passed this in a bipartisan way. There is absolutely no reason that we should not pass this by unanimous consent in the Senate.

I am going to keep fighting to bring in more accountability to our bosses, the people who are demanding this. And if somebody objects to this, I wonder whose interests they are fighting for. We cannot go back to our States without getting this done for them.

We have to restore accountability in Washington. We have to show the people back home we are working in their interests.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 7008, which was received from the House; further, 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. Is there objection?

Mr. PADILLA. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I want to make a few things very clear, and I hope that we can actually come to a bipartisan agreement on the issue that the title of the bill says this bill is about because I agree, Democrats and Republicans and Independents alike across the country are concerned.

To put it simply, Americans don't like the idea of their elected leaders trading individual stocks while making decisions impacting those very companies and industries in their portfolios, but I am glad my colleagues, the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Florida, have laid out what this bill is truly about.

Now, the title of the bill makes reference to insider trading, but there is a

lot of passion about the SAVE Act which has been shoved into this bill as it has come over from the House.

Back to the stock trading piece, this is something that we absolutely ought to be addressing. But there are two obvious reasons why this bill from the Republican House is nothing more than a political gimmick that was never truly intended to become law.

First, it exempts the President—the President, who without a doubt is the person with the single greatest ability to impact a company or an entire industry on any given day. It also exempts the Vice President. Why not include them? Why should they be exempt? Well, maybe it has something to do with the fact that President Donald Trump, the leader of the Republican Party, has made over 21,000 stock trades across 8 separate accounts, and if you do the math, that amounts to 85 trades per day—85 trades per day. That is not normal. And it is certainly not indicative of somebody focused on the cost of living for hard-working Americans.

No, Donald Trump has earned the title of “Trader in Chief.” His portfolio is not only constantly trading stock, he is reaping huge profits and trading stocks of companies that he is actively promoting.

If you think that sounds bad, it gets much worse. We all know that President Trump owns his own social media company, right? It is the platform that he uses to post his announcements on, and now it has been reported that his company is planning to sell early access to those Presidential statements to hedge funds, to Wall Street, for \$100,000 a month.

That is right, the price of inside information is now \$100,000 per month to be paid to President Donald Trump. Could there be any clearer sign of corruption?

The American people see right through this bill. They see it for what it is. But that is not the only reason. If the House Republicans really do want this measure to become law, they wouldn't have tucked the so-called SAVE Act into it.

Now, let me remind you, we have been debating the SAVE Act here off and on for, what, about 4 months now? This is the same SAVE Act that, in practice—in practice—would make it harder for eligible voters to register to vote, to stay registered to vote, to actually cast their ballot by imposing these standards across all 50 States. It would ban student IDs, certain Tribal IDs, other forms of government ID that in some States that do have their own voter ID law, people count on to be able to participate in our elections.

The SAVE Act would also devastate mail and absentee voting across the country by requiring photocopies of your ID to be included along with your mail ballot something that the Republican Lieutenant Governor of Utah has pointed out would violate their State's constitution, their constitution that

requires an opportunity for a secret ballot, the same requirement for secret ballots that States across the country also share.

This is the same element, by the way, that the Ohio Legislature passed in the form of State legislation, a similar mail voter ID requirement that the Republican Governor of Ohio vetoed because it significantly burdened those who choose to vote by mail.

But, of course, that is this bill's intent. For all the talk about stock trading—and there is a way to address that, I will get to that in a minute—the true goal here is to somehow pass the SAVE Act, which, by the way, not only are you not going to get unanimous consent today, the Republican caucus in the Senate isn't even unified around it.

It has come up for votes, procedural and otherwise. It keeps falling short. So why are we here?

I believe if the proponents of the stock trading measure were sincere about wanting to ban stock trading by Members of Congress, then they would sit down with Democrats and negotiate or, better yet, let's take up and pass the measure that would achieve just that that came out of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee about a year ago, a bipartisan measure by Senators OSSOFF, MERKLEY, PETERS, CORTEZ MASTO, HAWLEY, and MORENO.

So why don't we try to do that?

Mr. President, I ask that the Senator modify her request to instead proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 294, S. 1498; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; 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. Is there an objection to the modification?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

There is an expression that says don't let facts get in the way of a good story. What we just heard is a good story. Let's, unfortunately, dissect the facts that are completely inaccurate.

I am on the Homeland Security Committee; my colleague from California is not. That was not the bill that we sponsored. The bill that we sponsored was something called the PELOSI Act, your longtime Member of Congress from California, who perfected the grift of insider trading, who came to Congress, I think when I was born, when the Presiding Officer was born, and well before our colleague from Florida was born, and has somehow managed to be worth \$300-plus million. That is why I thought it would be in honor of her that we would introduce the PELOSI Act, the ability to just stop insider trading.

Let me just also be clear about where we stand on this bill. This is a massively bipartisan bill that came out of the House. Every Republican voted for it and 13 Democrats, which never vote

unless every Democrat is voting together, voted for this bill.

And if not for the objection that you just heard, if not for the objection from my colleague from California, tomorrow the President of the United States would have signed this bill into law. And what would it have meant? What would the President tomorrow have signed had this objection not been heard?

No longer can Members of Congress or their spouses or their adult children buy stocks with inside information. They would not be able to sell stocks without a 7-day public announcement period, which would, in effect, end forever the practice of insider trading that has plagued this Congress.

We could have gotten that done. So I want you to process that for a second. There are commercials 99 days before the midterm elections in which Democrats, including the Presiding Officer's disastrous opponent, that are talking about banning insider trading. That guy was here for 30-plus years. My colleague from California has been here for 5 years. The three of us have been here for 18 months, and we could have passed a bill tonight to ban insider trading.

Democrats have blocked the ability to ban insider trading. Those words don't even make sense to me as I say it. Why? It is the classic DC two-step: introduce an alternative measure that they know will never pass so they can keep the grift operation going.

Be able to say: Oh, look, we oppose that, too, but this doesn't go far enough.

My colleague from California worked with me diligently—I might add, which I appreciated—to ban prediction markets for the entire U.S. Senate. We got that done. It didn't touch the President. It didn't even touch the House of Representatives. We got it done here in the U.S. Senate.

I am proud of that. I am proud that now people—the American people—know that no Member of the U.S. Senate or their staffs, by the way, can participate in the prediction markets. We got that done because we advanced the ball.

We can advance the ball tonight and ban insider trading for all of Congress. The House handed us a bill. We say yes; the President signs it tomorrow.

You sent the letter. My colleague from California sent a letter to the CFTC, talking about the downside of insider trading among Congress back in January. We could avoid it. We don't need to send letters. We could ban insider trading tonight. Democrats have refused to do that.

Now let's talk about voter ID. By the way, it is called the SAVE America Act, not the SAVE Act. It is called the SAVE America Act. We have talked about it in this Chamber for hundreds of hours. Let's get the name right.

This is not the SAVE America Act. The SAVE America Act, for some reason, is unanimous in its opposition by

the Democrat Members of this Chamber. They are totally, completely united on not passing the SAVE America Act, which does two things, by the way. You have to prove you are a citizen when you register. You have to show voter ID when you vote. That is it—two things.

This particular measure in this bill is just photo ID. If you get the all-you-can-eat, Never-Ending Pasta Bowl at Olive Garden, you have to have a photo ID to get another bowl of spaghetti in California. So if I go to my favorite Olive Garden in Los Angeles and I have my Never-Ending Pasta Bowl, I have to bring my ID. But if I go vote, I don't have to.

I think most Americans would think that is insane. I think most Americans would think that is nutty. Why would you not have to show your ID?

It has nothing to do with registration. You mentioned registering to vote. It has nothing to do with registering to vote. It is strictly voter ID when you vote, and there is not IDs that are banned. That is just not true. Read the bill.

It is simple voter ID: a government-issued ID—your picture, your name, your signature—pretty straightforward—80-20 issue. I think 99-1 issue, honestly, but they say it is an 80-20 issue. They got 13 Democrats in the House that voted for this. They knew that if the Senate took this up tonight, what they did last week would become law.

We could have gotten voter ID in the entire country. Mr. President, 30-plus States already have it. And we would have banned insider trading. Those two things could have happened tonight.

And the fact that they didn't is a decently sad day—July 27, 2026, the day Democrats said we shouldn't have voter ID in America and we shouldn't ban insider trading.

Let me just close with a little anecdote. I was asked by the Government of Colombia to go down and monitor their elections. That was a great honor, being born in Colombia—a full circle of my life. Now I am here in the Senate. Imagine somebody in Colombia has asked me to go down and monitor the election.

By the way, I knew as much as you, Mr. President, about how the elections in Colombia works. Actually, that is not true, you probably knew more. I had no idea. I go down there. And what do they require in Colombia, South America: A country with abject poverty, dramatically less well-off than the United States, dramatically more ethnically diverse, by the way—they require every citizen of Colombia to carry with them a national ID card that proves they are a citizen. They are not even allowed into the hall where the voting happens without that national ID card that proves they are a citizen of the country of Colombia.

And when they go to vote, they have to get their fingerprints done and their signature, show that ID with their

photo on it, before they are handed a paper ballot that is counted by hand. And the election results—after 25 million votes—takes 1 hour. The GDP of Colombia is less than the GDP of L.A., and yet the mayor's race in L.A.—3 weeks after the election—they are still counting votes.

Now, I was in the registrar's office, afterward, debriefing on the election. We are obviously speaking in Spanish because we are in Colombia. And I asked them what happens if somebody walks into the hallway—they wander into the hall—they want to vote, and they don't have their ID card?

Now I came to the United States when I was 5. My siblings make fun of me and say my Spanish is not perfect. It probably isn't. So when I said that, the registrar turned to his assistant and said "I think the Senator has lost his Spanish." And his assistant says "What do you mean?" He says "I don't understand his question."

So he repeated it in perfect Spanish. He turned to me, and he goes, "What a dumb question. Of course, we wouldn't let somebody come in and vote without their ID. That would be abject idiocy"—his words.

And yet a dozen-plus States in the United States of America—the most rich and powerful country on Earth—does not have voter ID. We could have gotten that done tonight.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard with modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. PADILLA. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

Mrs. MOODY. Mr. 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.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JAY CONTWAY AND DAVID GRAHAM

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the honor to recognize Jay Contway and David Graham.

Jay is a native Montanan, born and raised in Malta, MT.

After settling near Great Falls in 1968, Jay built his foundry and became a renowned Western sculptor. Jay's work captured international recognition and has been displayed for audiences throughout North America for

years, capturing the people, history, and traditions of the American West. Through Jay's work, he has preserved and illustrated the essence of the cowboy way of life, earning the title "Montana's Own Story Teller in Bronze."

David Graham also has contributed to the rich artistry of Montana. Born in Miles City, David was raised on a ranch in the Powder River area and his family's Western way of life deeply influenced his artistic career.

David gathers his inspiration by experiencing the Western way of life, whether he is riding horseback in the Badlands or hiking on a mountain trail. He is deeply inspired by the natural beauty he sees around him. David's paintings are shown throughout the country, including in many galleries and shows throughout the American West.

It is my distinct honor to recognize Jay Contway and David Graham for their tremendous contributions to the arts community and their dedication to celebrating the people, art, and history of our great State.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM "BILL" HOWARD RICHARDSON

• Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a distinguished American, William "Bill" Howard Richardson, on the occasion of his 90th birthday. Born on July 31, 1936, Bill has led a life of extraordinary consequence: as a devoted family man, a Navy veteran, an esteemed educator, a civic leader, an avid environmentalist, and, to those who know him best, a much-admired bohemian spirit.

A 1958 graduate of Yale University, Bill went on to serve his country in the U.S. Navy aboard an icebreaker, before returning home to earn his MBA from NYU. He built a distinguished career as a respected educator and civic leader, settling in northern California alongside his beloved wife Betsy. Together, they raised four children, and Bill now delights in the joy of 11 grandchildren. Bill has a legacy of love and family that spans generations.

In honor of this milestone birthday, and as our Nation celebrates 250 years of independence, a flag was flown over the U.S. Capitol on July 4 of this year in tribute to Bill's life and service.

Today, we join with Bill's many friends and family to celebrate the love, respect, and affection we hold for this special man and to wish him continued health and happiness in the years ahead.●

REMEMBERING BARBARA JOAN SALKIN

• Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the amazing life and legacy of Ms. Barbara Salkin, who passed recently at age 94. Ms. Salkin was a leader, organizer, and friend to all, and she leaves behind a resounding tradition of unity, mentorship, and civic engagement.