



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 172

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2026

No. 124

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 30, 2026, at 8:30 a.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, JULY 29, 2026

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God of infinite goodness, confirm Your past mercies by empowering us to be faithful to Your commands.

Lord, help our lawmakers this day to use their understanding, time, and talents to do what You desire. May our Senators desire to please You with faithful service as You rule their hearts, guiding their thoughts, words, and works. Enable them to fulfill their duty to love You with all their heart, mind, and strength. Take possession of their desires and order their steps by the power of Your loving providence. Pour down Your blessings upon them, that they may ever promote liberty, justice, and faith.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 5334, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 454, H.R. 5334, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over Social Security, and to remind everybody—because everybody knows or better know—that the Social Security primary trust fund will be depleted in just 6 years. As a result, come late 2032, the program will only have enough income from the payroll taxes to pay 78 percent of benefits due.

That surplus was built up since a Republican, President Reagan, and a Democrat, then-Speaker Tip O'Neill,

sat down and said: We can't let anything bad happen to Social Security. So they put a plan together that passed almost unanimously in this U.S. Senate.

I presume those two gentlemen—bipartisan they were—they thought it may only extend the program for 20 years or something. But as we see now, they had a plan that built up the surplus for the next 50 years, and that runs out in 2032. In other words, to emphasize, unless Congress acts quickly, retirees will see a 22-percent cut in their benefits, about the same as what Reagan and O'Neill saw happening in 1983.

So this statistic alone should motivate the Congress to act expeditiously to ensure no disruption of benefits occur. Unfortunately, Congress has a tendency to put off action until too late and at the last moment. This is never the best approach.

But with respect to addressing the Social Security funding shortfall, it poses a serious risk not only to the tens of millions of retirees but also a risk to the national economy.

As a recent Mercatus Center paper documents, waiting until the last minute to act on Social Security puts this vital program on a collision course with the Nation's growing fiscal crisis. The longer Congress waits to act, the more likely it is that any solution to Social Security will lean heavily on debt financing to bridge the funding gap. And that is how it is tied to the entire national economy.

So come 2032, the Nation will already have outstanding debt larger than at

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4301

any time in the Nation's history relative to the size of our economy. Flooding the bond market with trillions of dollars in new debt, in short order, then risks setting off a chain of events leading to a fiscal crisis. Bond markets are likely to demand higher interest rates to absorb all the national debt.

In other words, Congress needs to act in the same way that Reagan and Tip O'Neill acted in a bipartisan fashion, in 1983, to preserve Social Security. A bigger problem faces us today, and we should have a bipartisan agreement in this town, including a President who wants to get Social Security on a financially sound basis.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

SANCTIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday, we said goodbye to our friend and colleague Lindsey Graham. But though we said farewell, Lindsey's work continues.

Last night, we began consideration of the bill to which he devoted so much of his time and energy over the last year. He had worked on it with world leaders and Members of both parties here in Congress, and he was working on it on the day he died.

That bill is now known as the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia and Iran Act. It will give the President important tools to hopefully end the war between Russia and Ukraine and bring peace where there has been war for too long.

Russia invaded Ukraine 4½ years ago. Back then, many believed Ukraine would fall in less than a week. But Ukraine has denied the Russians the quick victory that they had expected. This war continues because Vladimir Putin wants it to continue.

Over the course of the war, Russia has suffered 1.4 million casualties. By one estimate, Russian casualties are now 30,000 per month.

Ukraine has slowed Russia's advance. They have gone on the offensive within Russia's borders. And with the war reportedly taking up a significant share of Russia's budget, Putin is seeking to quash the opposition to it in his own country.

But the war continues, as I said, because Putin wants it to continue and because he is able to keep it going.

Russia funds its war effort in no small part through oil and gas sales facilitated by its so-called shadow fleet of ships flying under false flags. What the Graham Russia sanctions bill does is go after that source of funding. It

gives the President authority to levy tariffs of up to 100 percent against the largest purchasers of Russian energy, of which China is the largest.

You might recall that before the Russian invasion in 2022, the leaders of China and Russia declared a "no limits" partnership between their two countries. Today, that partnership is most evident in China's financing of the war by purchasing Russian oil and gas.

This bill doesn't stop with the purchasers of Russian energy, however; it also sanctions the government officials, private individuals, and banks and other enterprises that facilitate the sale of Russian gas and oil.

In short, it takes direct aim at a key source of funding for Russia's war effort because this war will not end until Putin is forced to come to the negotiating table in a real way. This bill is about denying Putin the ability to continue to prolong this war.

President Trump has made his commitment to ending this war and bringing peace to Ukraine very clear. This bill will help him do that.

They say you can know a man by the enemies he has made. Lindsey Graham didn't have many fans in the Kremlin, nor was he liked in Tehran or Beijing, for that matter. I don't think this bill has many supporters in those places either. This is a bill that aims to shut off a key source of strength for Russia's war effort. It targets China's source of cheap energy. It ensures the President can continue putting maximum economic pressure on Iran as well by extending for another 5 years the legislation that underpins many of the sanctions that are in place against the Iranian regime.

We may have said farewell to Lindsey yesterday, but his work goes on. He believed in America, and he saw its promise in the hopes of men and women around the world who want their own democracies and freedom in their homelands. There was no greater friend to freedom-loving people than Lindsey Graham, and this bill is a part of that legacy—a legacy that will echo for many years to come.

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

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

SANCTIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate honored the life of our dear friend Lindsey Graham. It was a remarkable gathering of people from around the world, people who came to honor a man who really has done so very much for this body, for his home State of South Carolina, and for the Nation.

I believe that today it is time to honor his tremendous legacy as well right here with a vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I think the way to do that is to pass the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia Act. It truly is a "peace through strength" bill. No tribute I think would be more fitting to our friend Lindsey or be more forceful.

This bill strengthens America's national security while pressuring our adversaries to pursue peace; and that is what Lindsey was doing—pursuing peace.

This sanctions bill is a historic piece of legislation. They target Russia's largest oil importers, target Russia's leadership, target Russia's so-called shadow fleet. Russia uses that shadow fleet to evade sanctions on its illegal oil.

Most importantly, it targets other nations that buy Russian oil, that buy Russian natural gas, that buy Russian uranium. This is the way Russia is financing its brutal killing war in Ukraine.

The penalties are swift; the penalties are severe.

We know that energy is a cash cow of Putin's war machine. It is also Russia's Achilles' heel. You cut it off, and Russia cannot continue to fight.

Russia's biggest customer, we know, is communist China. Next is India, and they are going to be hit hard by this. This is the way to cripple Russia's war machine.

Allies of Ukraine can qualify for exemptions. Those exemptions come from taking serious steps to end their own dependency on Russian energy products.

For many years—and you and I have talked about this—Europe has spent more money on Russian energy than it has sent in aid to Ukraine. Mr. President, you are a warrior. You know this. You are from an energy State. You know these things are critically important, and they are true. This needs to change.

Of course, Russia isn't fighting Ukraine alone. In Putin's war of aggression, it is Iran partnering with Russia. Iran has supplied Russia with drones, with missiles, with munitions. Russia has used these weapons to kill Ukrainian civilians and to destroy Ukrainian infrastructure.

In return, Russia has shared with Iran—we know what they have shared with their regime: technology, intelligence, military support, all of those things. Iran has used this support to attack American troops.

And you have worn the uniform; you have borne the battle. And we have seen the attacks on the American troops that hold the area in terms of how Iran holds the Strait of Hormuz hostage. It is continuing today. There were attacks yesterday.

Russia and Iran both employ a shadow fleet of illegal oil tankers. They share sanctions-evading networks. They sell oil to many of the same buyers. They are all working together

against us, against freedom-loving people. They both fund murder; they fund terrorism; and they do it with revenue from their energy products.

That is why Iran has rightfully been added to this sanctions bill. Lindsey started it about Russia, and now we have added Iran with President Trump's guidance.

Together, Russia and Iran have built an "axis of aggression," and we know where the aggression is headed. Sanctioning those who buy oil from Russia and Iran disrupts this entire axis all at once.

Passing this bill will make our country safer, and it makes our adversaries weaker.

Senator Graham visited Ukraine shortly before he died. Lindsey was a friend of freedom in Ukraine. He never stopped working to build support for their cause.

Lindsey succeeded. This is a bill that has united a broad coalition of U.S. Senators. The motion yesterday to proceed to the bill, over 80 Senators voted positively, voted for this motion. And I am one of the many cosponsors.

Now it is time to pass this bill. Now it is time to push for peace. Today, Russia is at the point of maximum weakness, and so is Iran. Critical pieces of Russia's energy infrastructure are today in shambles. A significant portion of its oil refinery capacity is no longer operable.

Energy shortages are being felt all across Russia today. At the same time, Iran's military has been severely degraded.

Both Russia and Iran still refuse to accept plans for lasting peace. Russia and Iran respond only to strength, not to statements.

It is time for the Senate to act and act decisively and to work toward lasting peace. Today is the day to pass the Lindsey Graham sanctions bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SANCTIONS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I would like to echo and reinforce the words of my good friend Senator BARRASSO, the majority whip, Senator from Wyoming, who was doing a great job yesterday and the beautiful service that we had here in the Capitol and at the National Cathedral in honor of my very good friend and Senate colleague, Senator Lindsey Graham. And, you know, the eulogies were great. It was a beautiful service.

He was, as I mentioned, a dear friend, colleague, a patriot, a veteran, a staunch advocate for his State South Carolina, staunch advocate for the Senate, and a staunch advocate for a

strong America. As Senator BARRASSO just said, peace through strength in the sense of American freedom, not just at home but abroad.

He was one of a kind—witty, brilliant. Certainly, Mr. President, as you know, one of our Nation's most important and influential Senators. He had a great sense of humor. He loved to laugh.

And a lot of us here on the Senate floor are talking about his legacy and what we should be doing to honor that legacy.

Well, I think one of the things we should be doing—and we are doing it right now, and it is great—is this sanctions bill against Russia, against Iran. And Senator Graham had been leading the efforts on this sanctions bill for a couple years now, and we are passing it here in the Senate in an overwhelming bipartisan fashion. Over 80 Senators voted to get on the bill last night. I know Lindsey is looking down from Heaven very proud he made this happen.

I was honored to be an original cosponsor of this bill from the very, very beginning working with him on these issues.

And we have got more to do. I have a very analogous sanctions bill with regard to China and Taiwan that Senator Graham was a lead cosponsor of my bill. That is coming next.

But it is about honoring him, and this is a bipartisan win.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, I think there is another way we need to honor Senator Graham, and it is not happening. It is kind of a new thing. We have got the minority whip coming to the floor, and I hope he can maybe respond to this. But it is a new thing that I have seen—I have never seen, actually, in my career, and we need to change it. And what that is, is getting on the National Defense Authorization Act to start debating it and working on a defense supplemental because we need it. Now, we are talking about honoring Lindsey Graham. I knew Lindsey Graham really, really well. I guarantee you Lindsey Graham would be on the Senate floor right now saying: Wait. We are moving our sanctions bill forward? Great. Bipartisan? Great. What about the NDAA—the National Defense Authorization Act—that funds our military, pay raises for our troops. It came out of the Armed Services Committee in a big bipartisan vote and then came to the Senate floor—screaming halt because the minority leader blocked it.

By the way, I have been in the Senate almost 12 years. I have never seen that happen in my entire career. The bill that funds our military, that lays out the strategy and top-line number for our military during a dangerous time, is blocked by the Senate Democrats. Lindsey Graham would be on the floor raising hell about that.

I have never seen it happen, and I have never had anyone on the other side of the aisle explain to me: Why are

you blocking the bill that came out of committee in a strong bipartisan way during these dangerous times? You are blocking the bill to fund our military to take care of our troops? Unprecedented.

So if we want to honor Lindsey Graham, which we all do, let's not just vote for the sanctions bill, but let's get on the NDAA and start debating it. I haven't heard one Democrat Senator give a reason why they are blocking it. I have never seen this happen. This is new territory.

Let me give you another one that I know Lindsey Graham would be on the floor right now advocating with me on. We need a defense supplemental, OK?

When President Biden was President and Senator SCHUMER was majority leader, the Biden White House sent over a defense supplemental on Ukraine. Now, Senators like myself, Senator Graham, others, we said: All right. We will look at that. We will work on that. We will improve it. We will make it better. We think it is important for the national defense of our Nation—which it was.

We put a lot in there for the defense industrial base, which we did. We beefed up stuff relating to China and Taiwan, which made it a better bill. We beefed up elements of that bill to make it stronger with regard to Israel and Iran—made it a better bill and then worked on it together.

We made it a stronger bill and then Senators like myself and Senator Graham whipped other Republicans to get it passed, and we got it passed. It was a bipartisan defense supplemental, primarily for Ukraine, Israel, Taiwan, and our defense industrial base.

Now we need a defense industrial base supplemental for us—for America, for our troops, for our munitions.

A couple years ago when the Biden administration with Senator SCHUMER in the majority, that happened, and a number of us—myself and Senator Graham—were like: All right. We will roll up our sleeves and work with you guys.

What is happening on the defense supplemental now? No cooperation. No one on the other side of the aisle wants to help our troops, wants to help our munitions.

This is new territory. I have been here two terms and on defense issues with Senator Graham—and, by the way, many other great Senators on the other side of the aisle. We have always locked arms and said: We are going to move forward on the NDAA; we are going to move forward on the defense supplemental, if our troops need it. And what is happening right now is new; it is different; and I think it is really bad for the country.

And do you know who would be down on the Senate floor right now with me making the same arguments that I am? Senator Graham would be. So let's keep talking about honoring Senator Graham. I love that guy. I am going to miss him every day. Such a great leader. So important to the Senate. Mind

you, probably most the important Senator here given his work, given his relationship with the President.

But let's not say we are going to honor Senator Graham—and then we are going to block the NDAA? Lindsey Graham wouldn't be doing that.

We are going to not engage at all with the Trump administration on a defense supplemental that our Department of Defense needs? We didn't do that when you guys were in the majority and President Biden was President. We rolled up our sleeves and got to work to benefit the national security of our Nation, which is what Lindsey Graham was always about.

So let's honor Lindsey Graham. Let's have a strong vote on the sanctions bill that is named after him. But to my Democratic colleagues: You want to honor Lindsey Graham? Then let's start debating the NDAA. Quit blocking it. I have never seen that before in my entire time here. That doesn't help anything. All it does is undermine our national security and our troops. You are doing it. Lindsey wouldn't be for that.

And let's start engaging on a defense supplemental. We need it. We did it when you were in the majority. We did it when Biden was in the White House.

A lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that what they are doing is wrong, and I still haven't heard a good explanation. I know the far left is driving the energy of the party on the Democratic side right now and they don't like the military and they don't like supporting our troops. I know that. But the vast majority of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I know them. Let's get going on the NDAA. Let's get going on the defense supplemental bill. That is exactly what Senator Graham would be arguing today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we start with this little document called the U.S. Constitution. Every one of us has sworn to uphold and defend this document. And we go to article I, the first article in the Constitution, section 8, and it spells out with clarity who declares war under this Constitution: The Congress of the United States.

We are now engaged in a war in Iran. Did the Congress declare war on Iran? No.

Did the President even ask Congress to declare war on Iran? No.

Well, were there public hearings in Congress about this decision to invade Iran, to attack Iran? No.

Did this President of the United States go to the allies of the United States, like the NATO allies, to discuss the invasion of Iran? No.

This President decided that we would go to war on his own—strictly on his own—without regard for what the Constitution requires.

Now, I am glad to concede that there have been many Presidents that have

gone to war under similar circumstances, but almost without exception they at least took the case to the American people directly or through Congress. This President did not.

So where are we today? Mr. President, \$88 billion—that is how much has been spent so far in Iran. We are in the fifth month of the first year of a never-ending war that this President promised over and over again at his rallies would never, ever, ever happen under his watch.

Now we have the Senator from Alaska coming to the floor raising questions about why we aren't moving on certain items. It is because there has been no involvement in the decision process that led up to this.

Do you know what the increase is in defense spending for next year: 40 percent of the Department of Defense budget—40 percent. Why? We have an \$88 billion war going on in Iran. There are those of us who have serious doubts that that is the right thing to do.

We look at the Strait of Hormuz. Before we invaded Iran, they were open for the transport of energy, oil, and fertilizers. Now, they are virtually closed because of President Trump's decision to invade Iran.

Does it have any impact on you personally? Filled your gas tank lately? Do you know what is going on there? The cost of gasoline is going through the roof because of the invasion of Iran and the decision to move forward.

So you can tell from my comments here that I have serious doubts that we are doing the right thing in Iran. I am not going to be a defender of Iran. I have called for sanctions on that country over and over again for their misconduct. But to sit here and argue that we are somehow shirking our constitutional and congressional responsibility by not funding this war is to ignore the obvious.

This was the President's decision to go forward with this war. My advice to him over many years that I have served in Congress: It is easier to start a war than it is to end it. And we are learning that right now.

The Strait of Hormuz are still at risk, and other parts of the world are at risk because of that decision. It is not the right decision.

REMEMBERING LINDSEY GRAHAM

Mr. President, let me also say a word about Lindsey Graham. Lindsey was my friend. On some issues, my ally. He did things for me which I thought were politically risky but to help, for example, to pass the Dream Act. It was Lindsey Graham who was the sole Republican who would cosponsor my bipartisan Dream Act each year.

I respect him so much for doing it. It was a political risk for him to do it. But either for me personally—God bless him—or for the thousands of young people who were facing deportation, he stuck his neck out for me. That is why I went to the service yesterday in respect for this man. I do respect him.

We didn't agree on everything. Particularly when it came to issues of war, there were serious differences. But there are many things that united us.

The gentleman from Alaska raises the question of: What would Lindsey do? I'm sure we can come up with our own interpretation.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Now, here is the bottom line moving forward: We have got to reach a bipartisan agreement on how to fund this government after September 30 when this particular budget ends and a new budget starts. I want to do that. Senator MURRAY wants to do it. I think Senator COLLINS would like to do it. But now we have to do it together on a bipartisan basis. We come to an agreement on the top line about how to reach a budget and then we start setting out on appropriations bills.

I have been fortunate enough to serve in the Appropriations Committee in the House and the Senate. I have seen some extraordinary bipartisan good work. We can have it again, but we have got to sit down and, in good faith, start working toward a conclusion.

A conclusion that gives 40 percent increase to the Department of Defense and zero increase to the rest of the government is a mistake. It is a serious mistake. We have important things that need to be done to help families that are struggling with the cost of living.

And so to the Senator from Alaska: I just disagree with you on the premise. We can and should work on a bipartisan basis, and it needs to start with next year's budget.

TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS DESIGNATION

Mr. President, last month the Supreme Court paved the way for the Trump administration to end a program called temporary protected status designation without any judicial review.

The Supreme Court's conservative supermajority has supercharged President Trump's mass deportation campaign, with devastating consequences for temporary protected status holders and the American communities who rely on them.

Temporary protected status under American law was intended to prevent the deportation of immigrants to countries where it is not safe to return. By law, a TPS designation can only be made or extended in increments of 6, 12, or 18 months. It is truly temporary in nature.

Ahead of every TPS expiration, the Secretary of State must reassess the conditions in the countries and decide whether to renew the designation or let it end.

To take one example, there is no question that Haiti is unsafe. Our Department of State has issued a Level 4 travel advisory telling Americans it is unsafe to travel to Haiti due to the risk of crime, kidnapping, terrorism, and civil unrest. That is the official statement of the Department of State of the Trump administration.

So why has the Trump administration terminated TPS for Haiti and many other countries where it is not safe to return? Some of my Republican colleagues have claimed that TPS for countries like Haiti must end simply because it is the nature of the program—that it is temporary.

Here is the thing: Since 1990, 36 years ago, when TPS was established, there have been 30—30—TPS designations. Even before the Trump administration, at least 10 of them—countries like Angola, Rwanda, and Sierra Leone had their designations made and then officially terminated. They were temporary.

In some cases, like Haiti, conditions have never been safe enough to justify a termination.

Haitian TPS holders have bought homes in the United States, started American families, and become part of our communities.

Members on both sides of the aisle oppose deporting these Haitian immigrants. In fact, our former Senate colleague and my friend Republican Mike DeWine, now the Republican Governor of Ohio, called the Trump administration's decision to terminate Haiti's TPS "a mistake" and a "job killer" that is "not in the best interest of the United States nor Ohio."

Let me say parenthetically: Mike DeWine is my friend. We are opposite political parties. We served together in the Senate. It was Mike who encouraged me to join him and his wife when they visited Haiti, and I saw it for the first time. It opened my eyes to the poverty and danger of that island country.

The Trump-Mullin administration has ignored the comments of Governor DeWine and others. Instead, ICE is preparing to target Haitian immigrants for arrest and deportation as early as this week. Immigrants who have been lawfully present in the United States for years now risk being deported.

This is all so that Trump and his trusted adviser Stephen Miller can meet their 2,000-arrests-a-day quota. They are not looking for the worst of the worst with these Haitians. They are not looking for terrorists, murderers, sexual predators, human traffickers. It is just whether they are Haitian or not Haitian.

It is time for Congress to give these long-term residents the security that they deserve. That is why I am calling for the passage of the SECURE Act, legislation that will provide certainty for these individuals and their communities by giving them the ability to apply for legal permanent residency.

Later today, my friend and colleague Senator VAN HOLLEN of Maryland will ask for unanimous consent to pass this bill. I join him and appeal to my colleagues: In the name of humanity, for God's sake, don't send these people back to an island which we have already declared is too dangerous for any American to visit. Let them stay safe with their children and families here in

the United States until things have improved in Haiti. If they are a threat in any way to any person in America, they need to leave; but if they are leading good lives, doing the best they can for them and their families, give them a chance. It is not too much to ask, and to deport them into this dangerous situation is not consistent with the basic values of America.

CONFIRMATION OF WALTER CLAYTON

Mr. President, on a separate subject, yesterday the Senate voted to confirm Jay Clayton to be the next Director of National Intelligence.

He replaces Acting DNI Bill Pulte, a Trump loyalist who purged career intelligence employees and who launched investigations into the President's political enemies as Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

Similarly, anyone hoping Clayton will show loyalty to the Constitution over the President who appointed him is sorely mistaken.

Much like his predecessor, Jay Clayton has peddled the Big Lie and worked to do the President's bidding, using the levers of government to target Trump's perceived enemies.

Don't believe me? I will show you.

Earlier this month, in a clear threat to freedom of the press, the Trump administration issued subpoenas targeting several journalists for the New York Times who reported on security concerns related to the President's brand-new, Qatari-donated Air Force One. Who issued the subpoenas? None other than Jay Clayton in his capacity as U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York. After sharp questioning by a Federal judge, prosecutors withdrew the demands.

And 2 weeks ago, while appearing before the Senate Intelligence Committee for his nomination, Clayton refused—time and time again—to say who won the 2020 Presidential election.

We have seen this play out in the Judiciary Committee as the President's nominees for the Federal bench bend over backwards to avoid stating a simple fact: that Joe Biden won in 2020. And Donald Trump lost.

Why? Because these people are loyal to the President above all. And that has been his guiding light when picking nominees for appointments.

Most importantly, Clayton lacks the basic qualifications necessary for the job of overseeing and coordinating our Nation's 18 intelligence agencies. By law, the Director of National Intelligence is required to have "extensive national security expertise." Not only does he lack extensive national security expertise, he lacks any.

The Trump administration has already spent the past 18 months politicizing and denigrating our intelligence community. In fact, both of Clayton's predecessors, Pulte and former DNI Tulsi Gabbard, who took the unprecedented step of meddling in a domestic law enforcement action on election interference, laid bare just how important it is to separate politics from the work of the IC.

I voted no on Jay Clayton's nomination to be DNI. Despite this, I hope Mr. Clayton will show fidelity to the rule of law and be an independent voice to safeguard our IC.

His track record does not inspire confidence, but time will tell.

TODD BLANCHE

Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate Judiciary Committee is scheduled to hold a key vote on Todd Blanche's nomination to be Attorney General.

The Attorney General oversees the Department of Justice—our Nation's premier law enforcement agency—as well as the FBI, DEA, and many other essential Agencies. The position demands that the Attorney General be someone committed to the rule of law and the Constitution more than any one person or political party. This principle is exactly why Todd Blanche is the wrong person for this role.

In his 16 months at DOJ, Blanche has shown that he is more concerned with serving Donald Trump than the American people. Pardoning January 6 rioters and cop-beaters wasn't enough for President Trump, so 2 months ago, Blanche colluded with President Trump's private lawyers to create a nearly \$2 billion slush fund to benefit the January 6 mob that attacked the Capitol. When I met with Blanche earlier this month, he told me he recognized this decision for what it was: a "mistake."

But when I asked him under oath, Blanche insisted that he never made this statement, displaying either a short memory or a dangerous willingness to lie for President Trump. When pressed during his hearing, Blanche even refused to directly condemn those who assaulted law enforcement officers on January 6 and would not commit to permanently ending this slush fund.

Blanche has done more than just support the President's allies; he has also used his position to directly enrich the President himself. Earlier this year, Blanche personally signed a document to provide President Trump, his family, and his businesses with immunity for any past Federal tax law violations.

And last year, he dismantled DOJ's crypto enforcement team and shut down ongoing investigations of the crypto industry, an industry that has made President Trump more than \$1 billion since returning to the White House. Blanche himself held crypto assets worth more than \$150,000 at the time—and when he finally did divest himself of these assets, he did so by transferring them to his adult children and grandchild.

It is hard to believe how Blanche could possibly be an honest broker as Attorney General, especially when he refuses to even admit that the Department of Justice should decide who to prosecute without political interference from the President.

During his nomination hearing, one of my Republican colleagues asked Blanche if he and President Trump are friends. Blanche responded, "I'm his

lawyer.” That Freudian slip sums up why he has been nominated. The Attorney General should be the people’s lawyer. The Department of Justice should work on behalf of the people. But President Trump still views Blanche as his personal lawyer, a role he held up until he was confirmed to be Deputy Attorney General. And it is clear that Blanche still views himself as the President’s lawyer.

Todd Blanche’s DOJ has become one where the President and his allies are protected while ordinary Americans suffer and his perceived enemies are baselessly prosecuted. The position of Attorney General is too important to be held by someone unwilling to say no to the President, which is exactly why I will be voting no on his nomination. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2106

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, in a few minutes, I am going to ask unanimous consent to pass the SECURE Act to ensure that we don’t force individuals who have been legally residing in the United States under temporary protected status—some for as many as 27 years—to return to countries where they will face danger and, instead, to provide them with a secure path toward lawful permanent residency.

The need for Congress to do this, to take this step, has never been more urgent because, just over a month ago, the Trump-packed Supreme Court, in a 6-to-3 decision, allowed the administration to move forward with terminating temporary protected status for hundreds of thousands of individuals who originally came to the United States from Haiti and Syria and to force them back—force them back—to countries where their lives would be at risk. That decision puts them and other TPS holders at risk of deportation to countries where violence, instability, and humanitarian crises continue to threaten their lives.

There are already reports that ICE is planning to target Haitian TPS holders for deportation as soon as this week, which would force hundreds of thousands of people to return to a country that our State Department warns is unsafe for travel. In other words, the Trump administration would force people back to a country where the State Department says: Don’t go there because it is unsafe.

The Trump administration has also moved to lift lower court orders preventing the termination of TPS for other countries as well, putting thousands more lives at risk. In other words, these lower courts have said

they have paused the ability for the administration to deport people on TPS, but the administration is moving to deport them anyway.

In 1990—in 1990—Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, came together to create the TPS program because we all agreed that keeping our neighbors safe should not be a partisan issue. When conditions in another country make it unsafe for people to return, America should not force those people back into harm’s way. And for over three decades that bipartisan principle has guided the TPS program.

I think we all recall the Trump administration—at least the President—promised that they were going to target the “worst of the worst.” But that is not what they have been doing. Instead, it has targeted people, in the case of TPS recipients, with lawful status, targeting people who are here legally.

TPS recipients are people who have already been determined that it would be dangerous to force them to return to their countries of origin. They are here legally, and the TPS eligibility requirements are very strict. Recipients undergo repeated vetting and background checks. They work, they pay taxes, raise families, start businesses, and contribute every day to communities across this country. Many have lived here for years; others, for decades. They have become part of the fabric of our communities.

And yet the Trump administration’s actions and recent reckless Supreme Court decisions place all of that at risk. The administration terminated work permits for Haitian and Syrian TPS holders on Monday. So people who had been legally here, had work permits, they have been terminated.

And for those who also apply for asylum, the administration’s new policy announced just this week would funnel their pending asylum claims directly into deportation proceedings without ever receiving a hearing. So even people who could show individual cause of certain harm or danger could be deported under these new procedures. It is all part of the same effort to strip legal protections from people who have followed the rules.

Due to our country’s broken immigration system, the TPS program is the only legal pathway for many to remain in the United States and keep out of harm’s way, and the Court’s decision is tearing up that pathway for many TPS holders, even as the facts on the ground are clear.

As I said, if you go to the State Department website, it says: “Do Not Travel to Haiti.” There are warning signs on that website of violent crime, gang activity, kidnappings, and widespread instability.

In the case of Syria, Syria continues to face armed conflict, terrorism, and an ongoing humanitarian crisis. The State Department warns—this is from our State Department—“Do not travel

to Syria for any reason.” That is what the State Department says, and yet the President and the Trump administration want to force people to go to Syria.

In other words, the same conditions that led the United States to grant these individuals TPS in the first place remain true, and yet the Trump administration wants to send them to these countries. So the State Department warns against travel but wants us to believe that it is safe for TPS recipients to be forced to return.

What has changed is this administration’s determination to dismantle basic humanitarian protections that have been part of our bipartisan tradition in order to enact their mass deportation agenda, and now this Supreme Court has rubberstamped this administration’s ongoing reckless efforts to gut the TPS program so they can terminate countries’ designations across the board to advance that mass deportation agenda.

The Trump “rubberstamp” Supreme Court, on a 6-to-3 decision, made the decision that rather than follow the letter of the law as Congress enacted it, the Department of Homeland Security can do whatever it wants—and free from judicial scrutiny.

As Justice Kagan wrote in her dissent—she was one of three Justices dissenting from that Supreme Court decision—she said:

After today, a Secretary can announce to the world that she didn’t consult with anyone—more, that she didn’t evaluate country conditions at all—before making, extending, or terminating a TPS designation. And the courts will be powerless to intervene, even though Congress loaded up the TPS statute with requirements about the (altogether different) way the Secretary is supposed to make her decision.

In other words, Justice Kagan pointed out that the statute does make clear there should be a determination about whether or not an action taken to terminate TPS would, in fact, lead to harm.

And Congress should not just sit back and allow this to happen. Decisions affecting hundreds of thousands of lives should be based on careful consideration of conditions on the ground, not political ideology or predetermined outcomes.

This decision makes one thing unmistakably clear, that we, the Congress, should act to reaffirm what was clearly our intent when we passed the TPS statutes to begin with. And, for years, TPS recipients have lived in constant uncertainty, and every extension brings another deadline. Every new administration brings another question about whether the lives they have built here will disappear with the stroke of a pen. This is no way to treat people who have been here legally and have contributed much to our country.

That is why we should pass the SECURE Act, legislation that provides qualified TPS and deferred enforced departure recipients with a pathway to legal permanent residence after years

of continuous presence in the United States.

It protects applicants while their cases are pending and shields eligible individuals from deportation during the application process. It provides work authorization and travel authorization. It also protects applicants' information from being used for immigration enforcement, except in limited circumstances. It increases transparency—which I would hope we would all support—by requiring the Department of Homeland Security to explain and justify future decisions to terminate TPS designations—something they have failed to do. Most importantly, it provides the certainty these families deserve after years—in many cases, decades—of living here legally in the United States.

We have long used TPS to provide refuge to people who would otherwise face extraordinary danger if forced to return to their countries of origin. They sought safety and stability here. They have built new lives in our country and made lasting contributions to our communities, and the SECURE Act recognizes that reality.

As I said, we should not be forcing these individuals back to countries where our own State Department has determined it would be dangerous to go.

The Supreme Court decision does not have to be the end of the story. We can write the end of the story, and it is our responsibility as a Congress to preserve that bipartisan congressional intent from back in 1990. We must provide that certainty that these individuals deserve.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2106. I further ask consent 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?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I object to this mass amnesty bill. Last week, Democrats asked the Senate to extend Haitian temporary protected status. Today, they have dropped the quotation marks. Instead of extending temporary status, this legislation would convert temporary status into permanent status—green cards, permanent settlement. At least the bill last week continued the same old Washington lie.

Today, Democrats finally admit what this scheme was always designed to be. Temporary was always meant to be permanent. It is the final stage of the scam. But that is how Democrats do mass amnesty. First, they declare an emergency. Then, they import hundreds of thousands of people. They then extend the program over and over and

over. Then, they unleash activist lawyers against anyone who tries to enforce the deadline.

When the American people finally elect a President to end this chaos, to end this abuse, Democrats demand mass amnesty. And when the American people finally elect a President who enforces the law, Democrats change the law and hand out green cards.

That is what this bill does. It turns a program created for temporary emergencies into a pipeline for green cards and citizenship not only for people who have temporary status—not only for people who once had TPS; this bill reaches beyond our borders and allows people who were already removed from this country to apply for permanent residency from abroad.

Think about how crazy that is. The law was enforced. The alien was removed. The case was closed. Yet Democrats want to erase the removal, reopen the border, and bring that person back with a green card. Under the radical, new Democratic immigration platform, deportation isn't deportation; it is merely an inconvenience before a green card arrives.

This bill does not merely reward those who broke our laws and remained in our country; it reaches around the entire globe to reverse deportations and to restart mass migration.

But even that is not enough. This bill also creates an ICE blackout. Information provided in these applications can't be used for immigration enforcement. The bill even threatens penalties against law enforcement who properly use the information. So Democrats want the information we have about foreigners to be placed behind a legal shield so it cannot be used to enforce immigration law.

Republicans want to handcuff illegal criminals; Democrats want to handcuff law enforcement officers so they can't do their jobs. They are not hiding the choice anymore. They will punish the officer before they punish the illegal alien. Why are illegal aliens more important to them now than protecting American citizens?

Oh, but it doesn't stop there. This bill ensures that any President—any future President—can't end TPS.

So what is missing from the bill? Americans; American citizens and the impact mass migration is having on our people. This bill has no consideration for American wages; no consideration for American housing; no consideration of schools, hospitals, or communities; no consideration of whether mass migration serves the national interest of the American people. Every question is about what the foreign country needs; no question about what America needs or what American families need. That tells you everything that you need to know.

To today's Democrat Party, immigration policy is written for foreign governments, immigration lawyers, activist groups, and leftwing organizations waiting to file the next lawsuit.

The American people are treated as a logistical obstacle. Their votes—our votes—are an inconvenience. Their communities—our communities—are an afterthought. Their country is treated as common property for the rest of the world.

Democrats are becoming more and more radical by the day on this issue. Yesterday, they insisted that temporary programs must never end. Today, they demand permanent residency for all—permanent residency for people who already left, legal shields against law enforcement, and more ammunition for activist lawsuits. And they will turn around and call us cruel. You will hear it shortly. It will be said about me blocking this bill.

Let me speak clearly to my Democrat colleagues: There is nothing compassionate about betraying your own citizens—the very citizens who put you in office. There is nothing compassionate about flooding the labor market with more foreign workers while Americans struggle for a decent wage. There is nothing compassionate about flooding the housing market and putting young families behind the eight ball. There is nothing compassionate about diluting American citizenship.

America is a nation, not a global waiting room, not a refugee camp, not a lifetime stay at a taxpayer-funded hotel. Our immigration laws exist to serve the American people. Foreign nationals do not have a right to permanent settlement here.

Today, I speak on behalf of the American people who have been ripped off by this scam for far too long. No more. We had an election on this issue. The Democrats have not gotten the message. They want the United States of America to be a global refugee camp cloaked behind their compassion. There is no compassion for the American people—the guy that swings the hammer, who is working 7 days a week so he can pay for the benefits of an illegal alien who they don't ever want to leave this country.

The American people are a sovereign people who have the right to decide who enters this country, who remains, and who has to leave. This bill reverses that principle. This Democrat bill tells the American people that their elections cannot end a temporary program, that the President cannot enforce the law, that their officers cannot use information in front of them, that their country belongs to everyone but them. Only the migrant's claim matters. Only the foreign country matters. Only the ambulance-chasing immigration lawyer matters.

I reject all of that completely, in public, for the world to see, because I stand by my brothers and sisters of this country.

Last week, I objected to the Democrats' attempt to give 350,000 Haitians extended TPS. Today, I am objecting to this Democrat attempt to give millions of illegal aliens mass amnesty, green cards, and work authorizations.

I will always object to this mass amnesty. I will always object to this mass migration. I will always object to putting American workers last. I will always object to tying the hands of our law enforcement. So therefore I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, just to make a couple things very clear, the President has a mass-deportation agenda even though what the President says is that he is focused on going after the worst of the worst.

We had a vote on a resolution here in the Senate not that long ago about going after the worst of the worst, and it passed unanimously. It was a voice vote. There is no argument there.

The issue with these TPS holders is that they are here legally, with work permits. In fact, they are among the most vetted people in the country. Every year, they go through security and background checks in order to renew their work permits.

The reason we provide them with the opportunity to stay here is because there has been a determination that their countries of origin are such dangerous places that their lives would be put at risk—places like Haiti, places like Syria, where our own government has determined it is too dangerous to go, and they warn people about going to those countries. Yet what this Trump administration action would do is force people back into danger in those countries. That is what the Trump administration wants to do, and that is what this Supreme Court, on a 6-to-3 vote, allows them to do. It allows them not even to have to make that determination in any serious way about what the circumstances are in the country these people would be forced back into.

So there is a whole lot of misinformation that was put out there about this piece of legislation.

I will just say that in my State of Maryland, many of these folks on TPS have become very important and valuable members of our community. As I have said, many have been here for years and years and in some cases, for decades.

By the way, they are paying taxes. They are paying Federal and State taxes. They are paying into the Social Security trust fund. In many cases, they have started small businesses that actually create more economic opportunities for everybody in the community and the State. Go look it up. A lot of these TPS holders are small business men and women. They are hiring people in our communities and our State. Yet these are the people—some of the most vetted individuals in the country, people who pay State and local and Federal taxes—that the Trump administration wants to send back to countries where we say it is dangerous to go.

So that is why we are here on the floor right now, because the first wave

of this is about to happen, and the Trump administration is about to deport folks who came here from Haiti who have been here under TPS, this protected status, and now they want to force them back into harm's way. We want to uphold what had been a bipartisan position, which is that we as a country should not do that. We should not send people who have this legal status now back to countries where they will face certain danger.

So it is disappointing to hear that our Republican colleagues don't want to move forward on this piece of legislation, but this debate is not over—not here in the Senate, not in the House, and not in communities across the United States.

And with that, I yield the floor. I see my colleague from California, who has been such an important, strong voice on these issues on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in support of Senator VAN HOLLEN's SECURE Act.

Across the country right now, hundreds of thousands of Haitian men, women, and children are terrified. They are terrified for their futures, for their children's futures. They are terrified about being forced back to a country that is gripped by a catastrophic humanitarian crisis.

Nearly 1.5 million Haitians have been displaced by gang violence. Food insecurity is widespread. Basic services have collapsed. It is a country that the State Department—the State Department—warns Americans not to travel to because of the risk of kidnapping, violent crime, and civil unrest.

Think about that for a second.

The Trump administration itself is warning Americans not to travel to Haiti because of how unsafe it is. Yet the same administration wants to force over 300,000 Haitian nationals—who, until very recently, held temporary protected status—to go there.

Now, the President has made it very clear for years what he thinks about immigrants from Haiti. And we received reports in the past few days that the Department of Homeland Security is preparing for a mass roundup and swift deportation of these families in the coming days.

So now, thanks to the President's hostility toward immigrants, TPS holders from countries in turmoil—many of whom have lived in the United States for years, if not decades—are now in danger and at the mercy of this cruel administration.

But the fact of the matter is, the American people do not support the President's goal of kicking these men, women, and children out and forcing them back to a nation steeped in danger and turmoil, because the American people recognize the fundamental fact that TPS holders—who are legally

granted protection in the United States, who registered with the Federal Government, who passed background checks and received authorization to live and to work here—are human beings—human beings that deserve respect and dignity, and we have a moral obligation to help when we can.

More than that, most Americans recognize how much TPS holders and immigrants, more broadly, contribute to our country—the economic, social, and cultural benefits they have provided us, as they have worked and lived among us for years, developing strong roots in our communities.

Yes, over time, TPS holders become our neighbors, our coworkers, and our friends. The more than 94 percent of TPS holders who participate in the labor force, as of 2017, are nurses and construction workers—vital jobs for the people of the United States and for our economy. They are home health aides, hotel workers, and entrepreneurs. Collectively, they contribute around \$29 billion to the U.S. economy every year and pay more than \$7.8 billion in Federal, payroll, State, and local taxes annually as well.

That is right. They pay nearly \$8 billion in taxes every year.

If more than 300,000 Haitian workers suddenly drop out of the workforce, the impacts are going to be very real and very sudden.

And we can't forget that many are raising American children, not only as caregivers for other people's children but as parents to nearly 400,000 U.S. citizen children.

And that impact is only magnified when you pull back and consider the more than 1 million people who had TPS as of early 2025 and have been targeted by this administration and its cruel mass detention and mass deportation agenda.

So, colleagues, I am going to say something that I don't say very often: I agree with Governor Mike DeWine, the Republican Governor of Ohio, who has called ending TPS a “mistake” that is going to bring a steep economic toll with it.

Temporary protected status exists exactly for moments like this, when countries like Haiti—along with Venezuela, South Sudan, Afghanistan, and others—are experiencing exactly the kind of crisis that Congress had in mind when it created this program on a bipartisan basis.

But this administration is choosing to turn its back on the people that this program was meant to help and protect, while hurting our country in the process. So we need to do more to protect people who have built their lives here and who have contributed so much to our country.

So I want to thank Senator VAN HOLLEN for trying to pass the SECURE Act. He has my support. I urge all of you to support the SECURE Act as well.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, Mr. President, the Trump Presidency is just a disaster, and more and more people know it. Just about everyone is getting to know it now.

This morning's CNN poll—right over my shoulder—is further confirmation that Trump has completely lost the trust of the American people.

Americans can see it, smell it, feel it: Trump's priorities are completely out of whack. He is concerned not with average citizens and making their lives better, just his own ego.

Just look at some of these numbers: More than three in every four Americans say that Trump's disastrous war on Iran hasn't been worth the cost. The same numbers say they have experienced hardship because of gas prices: 79 percent.

And when asked: Does Trump have the right priorities? Seventy-three percent say no. A record 73 percent of Americans think Trump hasn't focused enough on the most pressing issues they face.

Pick any poll. Pick any issue. You will come to the same conclusion: Trump is totally out of touch. He is hurting America and not listening to America.

No one likes what you are doing. Are you listening, Donald? No one likes what you are doing.

Look at those numbers. They should make Donald Trump hang his head in shame: 72 percent disapprove of how he is conducting the war in Iran; 79 percent disapprove of him on gas prices; 73 percent say you have the wrong priorities for them.

When the overwhelming majority of Americans say you are taking the country in the wrong direction, you better change course.

Trump and his party can either take the hint or take a hike when it comes in November.

Democrats have been clear on appropriations. Democrats have been clear from the start: We want to fund the government, avoid a shutdown, pass strong appropriations bills that improve people's lives. Bipartisan negotiations are ongoing, and Senate Democrats are working in good faith to reach an agreement to keep the appropriations process moving forward.

We are fighting for a bipartisan funding package—not partisan bills that bankroll Donald Trump's war agenda while leaving working families behind. Any CR must be bipartisan. We must keep the government open without abandoning the needs of working fami-

lies or giving Donald Trump a blank check for his destructive agenda.

There is a responsible path forward. Senate Democrats are ready to take it. Republicans must meet us to get that done.

MEDICARE

Mr. President, Trump's crusade against Americans' healthcare costs continues every single day. Listen to this: Yesterday, Trump doubled prescription drug costs for millions of seniors by making cuts to Medicare drug plans. Just 2 days before Medicare's 61st anniversary, no less, he is cutting the dollars we need and doubling prescription drug costs for millions of seniors.

Can Trump get any more heartless? We are talking about seniors splitting pills in half to ration life-saving drugs or skipping meals to afford their medication at the pharmacy counter. That is despicable.

This is just the latest salvo in Trump's war on Americans' healthcare.

A year ago, Trump ransacked over a trillion dollars from the healthcare system to bankroll tax giveaways to the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

And since then, millions of people have lost their coverage altogether while tens of millions get slammed while premiums double, triple, even quadruple.

But I guess that wasn't enough for Donald. Now he is coming after seniors—millions of them—by raising their prescription drug costs.

In Trump's America, families are fighting for their lives while the rich get richer.

IRAN

Mr. President, Trump is more concerned about protecting himself from the repercussions of his failed war in Iran than protecting our troops who are in the line of fire.

As Trump twiddles his thumbs without any plan for how to end his reckless misadventure, our servicemembers are facing down barrage after barrage of Iranian missiles and drones.

Donald, posting another lie on Truth Social won't stop the missiles from flying. Thumping your chest won't bring down the crushing gas prices you have sent skyrocketing. And brushing casualties under the rug doesn't get our men and women in uniform out of harm's way.

And those whose names were eliminated, before they put them back, do not come back to life when you just simply take their name off the roll.

There is only one way to do that—to do all of that—bring our troops home. End the war. Democrats will soon force another vote on our War Powers Resolution to end this aimless war and bring our troops back home to their families.

Every second Trump prolongs this war, our servicemembers' lives are at risk.

Senate Republicans, stand up for troops, not the President who sent

them to war without a plan, without a mission, without an exit strategy. Senate Republicans, stand up with the American people and come join us in ending this war.

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, let us stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCHMITT).

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT— Motion to Proceed—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

DIGITAL ASSET MARKET CLARITY ACT

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Digital Asset Market Clarity Act, also known as the CLARITY Act, and about the years of work that brought us to this moment.

Now, I only have a few minutes to get started, but I am just getting wound up. I am going to talk for a little while. Then I am going to be back tomorrow, and I am going to talk about this some more because I have got a lot of pent-up things to say.

First of all, this is a very good bill—good for the country, good for consumers, and good for the people we all represent on both sides of this aisle. So, after 11 months of giving nearly everything that was asked of us, I am genuinely struggling to understand what else my colleagues across the aisle think it needs before we act.

When I was elected to the Senate in 2020, I knew I wanted to work on digital asset legislation because Wyoming's legislature was already years ahead of Washington. It was building a legal framework for digital asset companies before most of the country was even paying attention. I wanted to do everything I could to keep those companies in Wyoming and, more importantly, to keep them in America.

The person I have been most proud to work with is Democrat Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND of New York. People have raised an eyebrow for years that a Wyoming Republican and a New York Democrat have worked hand in hand on this bill, but we have become genuine friends, and I trust her.

In June 2022, we introduced the Lummis-Gillibrand Responsible Financial Innovation Act together—the first real attempt at a comprehensive regulatory