

President Trump and Republicans are doing all we can to make things better, affordable, and lower costs for these American families. We do that by cutting taxes and regulations, not by denying people more of the money they have earned.

My resolution would reject this policy that would crush American families, workers, and businesses.

I urge my colleagues to do our constitutional duty to the people of DC and support this resolution.

**DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE D.C. INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX CONFORMITY AND REVISION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2025—Motion to Proceed**

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 315, H.J. Res. 142. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 315, H.J. Res. 142, a joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the D.C. Income and Franchise Tax Conformity and Revision Temporary Amendment Act of 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 36 Leg.]

**YEAS—51**

Banks	Fischer	Moreno
Barrasso	Graham	Mullin
Blackburn	Grassley	Murkowski
Boozman	Hagerty	Paul
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Husted	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McCormick	Tuberville
Daines	Moody	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

**NAYS—46**

Alsobrooks	Durbin	Kelly
Baldwin	Fetterman	Kim
Bennet	Gallego	King
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Klobuchar
Blunt Rochester	Hassan	Luján
Booker	Heinrich	Markey
Coons	Hickenlooper	Merkley
Cortez Masto	Hirono	Murphy
Duckworth	Kaine	Murray

Ossoff	Schiff	Wanrock
Padilla	Schumer	Warren
Peters	Shaheen	Welch
Reed	Slotkin	Whitehouse
Rosen	Smith	Wyden
Sanders	Van Hollen	
Schatz	Warner	

NOT VOTING—3

Cantwell Johnson McConnell

The motion was agreed to.

**DISAPPROVING THE ACTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL IN APPROVING THE D.C. INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX CONFORMITY AND REVISION TEMPORARY AMENDMENT ACT OF 2025**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 142) disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the D.C. Income and Franchise Tax Conformity and Revision Temporary Amendment Act of 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 605

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today because, once again, the sitting President of the United States has threatened something antithetical to our democracy, something patently unconstitutional and unlawful, something that should give every single American pause. Donald Trump has now suggested that he might nationalize our elections. Trump has suggested that the Federal executive branch should take over elections, which, under our Constitution, belong to the States.

So let me be clear. This is not a policy disagreement. This is not a gray area. This is not a novel constitutional question. This is, flatly, outright, unquestionably, unconstitutional. The Framers could not have been more clear. Article I, section 4 of the Constitution places the times, the places, and the manner of Federal elections in the hands of the States, not in the hands of the President, not the White House, not in an Executive order. There is no clause in the Constitution or law on the books—none—that allows a President to commandeer State election systems—no emergency power, no implied authority, no “because I just say so.” The President’s role is to faithfully execute the laws, not to rewrite the Constitution when the facts or the voters displease him.

Yet here we are. Donald Trump’s dangerous threat rests on a familiar and thoroughly discredited premise that American elections are rigged, fraudulent, or illegitimate. That claim has been examined exhaustively and has been rejected everywhere it has been tested. State election officials—Republicans and Democrats alike—certified the results of the 2020 Presidential election. Courts across the country rejected claims of widespread

fraud. Federal judges appointed by Presidents of both parties dismissed these cases for a lack of evidence.

There was no stolen election. There was no massive fraud. There was no justification, then or now, for the Federal seizure of elections. To suggest otherwise is not really wrong; it is reckless. And it is exclusively intended, ultimately, for the President to take over the elections in November of this year so he can rig the elections so that Democrats cannot win the House and Senate. That is what is at the heart of what the President is trying to do.

What is most alarming is not just that Donald Trump spoke those words, but that so many congressional Republicans have refused to say plainly what the Constitution requires. Silence in the face of an unconstitutional power grab is not neutrality. It is acquiescence to the undermining of the U.S. Constitution. Our system of government depends on elected officials who are willing to say no, especially to a President of their own party when the Constitution is at stake.

The Founders divided power deliberately. They placed elections close to the people. They rejected centralized control because they understood that democracy cannot survive when the Executive controls the ballot.

That principle is not optional. It is structural. It is foundational. It is what the Founding Fathers built into the system to make sure that we did not have a King, that we did not have a Monarch. They built it in this way so that the representative government would be selected at the local level, that the elections would be conducted at the local level—no taxation without representation.

They were fighting to create a House and Senate. They were fighting to put checks on King George. They were fighting to make sure that ultimately no latter-day King George—King Donald—could emerge that would then seek to impose his will on the people.

And that is why we have a Senate. That is why we have a House of Representatives—no taxation without representation—ensuring that each community, each State, has their own representatives selected in elections conducted by the voters in that State, by the leaders in that State.

And if the President were to attempt by order, directive, or coercion to nationalize or commandeer State-run elections, that action would be unconstitutional; it would be illegal; and it would be without effect. It would be a violation of the Constitution.

And let me be clear about one final point: Such a brazen attempt would not merely be unlawful; it would also be impeachable. A President who seeks to seize control of elections is attacking the constitutional order itself, and that is precisely the kind of abuse of power for which impeachment exists, not as a partisan weapon but as a constitutional safeguard against the usurpation of the electoral process in our

country by a would-be King, Donald Trump.

That is what they were protecting against. They anticipated, in drafting the Constitution, the emergence of Donald Trump, the emergence of someone who said we should nationalize the elections, the emergence of someone who said that he could invoke the Insurgency act in order to put marines—an army—on the streets of America during election times in order to serve the will of the President so that he would not have the checks and balances of the leaders of the other party being able to control the gavels to be able to subpoena him.

So in a moment, I will seek unanimous consent to pass my resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on these indisputable points. President Trump cannot nationalize our Federal elections. Our Constitution prohibits it.

Our Constitution was established in order to make sure that a President cannot subvert elections at the State level. And if he tried to, he would be committing an impeachable offense against the Constitution of the United States, and he would have to have been tried then in the House and the Senate on that impeachable offense.

This resolution draws a bright line. It affirms what should never need reaffirming, that elections belong to the States, the Constitution belongs to the people, and no President—ever—stands above either.

The Senate should speak with one voice on this question tonight. The Constitution demands the Senate speak with one voice tonight. Democracy requires that the Senate speak with one voice tonight, that it is an impeachable offense to nationalize elections which the Constitution requires be conducted at the State level.

So with that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 605; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. President, I rise today to object to the motion made by my colleague from Massachusetts.

We don't need to nationalize our elections. My Republican colleagues and I have been fighting Democrats' attempts to nationalize our elections for years now.

The States have the ability to run elections. My State of Florida is actually a leader in election security and timeliness to the point that my last election was called within minutes of polls closing.

My colleagues are only bringing this to the floor as an excuse to score political points by attacking President

Trump. President Trump and Republicans are working to deliver on our promises to the American people: securing our border, protecting communities and elections, and bringing down the cost of living despite Democrats fighting us on every turn. This is just another example of Democrat distraction, not serious policy, and for that reason I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. If my colleague from western Massachusetts wants to defend democracy and protect elections, I offer him an alternative that I, and a majority of Americans, would support. There should be some commonsense, national standards in place to ensure Americans know their elections are free and fair and that their votes are not diluted. That includes requiring voter ID, something 83 percent of Americans support.

You need an ID to board an airplane, buy certain medicines, apply for jobs and bank accounts, check into hotels, rent a car, donate blood, and purchase a lottery ticket. Why should voting in our elections have a lower verification standard than purchasing a lottery ticket? Surely, we can also agree that requiring proof of citizenship makes sense. And if a State has a noncitizen on the voter rolls, they should be removed.

Now, the minority leader thinks that is racist to make people prove citizenship to vote. Just remember, every Member of this body and all of our friends in the House had to prove their citizenship to take office. Yes, even my colleague from Massachusetts had to prove he was an American citizen to take his seat in the U.S. Senate and represent the good people of his State.

So are the requirements for being elected to the U.S. Congress racist? I cannot imagine the Senator from Massachusetts believes that to be true. We are all here to represent U.S. citizens, and we should be certain that it is only U.S. citizens who are able to cast a vote for any of us to be here.

The SAVE America Act puts these commonsense ideas into place to make our elections more secure and fair. I invite my colleagues to support my UC and pass the SAVE America Act. Why wouldn't we want to make certain that elections in the United States of America are free and fair?

President Trump and the American people are all on board with the SAVE America Act. The House will pass it shortly. We can get this done today and deliver for the American people.

Passing the SAVE America Act is an essential step to our democracy, ensuring free and fair elections nationwide. We must get it done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon receipt from the House, that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the House message to accompany S. 1383; further, that the Senate concur in the House

amendment, and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARKEY. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. The objection we just heard to my resolution proves exactly why this resolution that we should be debating is absolutely necessary in order to ensure that President Trump does not, in fact, nationalize—or attempt to nationalize our elections.

And this unanimous consent request is not about the SAVE Act. It is not about voter registration policy. It is not about partisan election administration debates. It is about something far more fundamental: whether the President of the United States may unilaterally nationalize elections that the Constitution places squarely in the hands of the States. Those are separate issues and no amount of legislative deflection can change that.

The SAVE Act that the gentleman from Florida is speaking to right now is a policy proposal, one that many of us oppose because it would impose rigid documentation requirements, disenfranchise eligible voters, burden State election officials, and do nothing—nothing—to address a problem that does not meaningfully exist.

But today, the resolution I am bringing out is not about that legislation. It is about constitutional limits on Presidential power. No act of Congress—the SAVE Act or otherwise—would give a President authority to seize control of State-run elections. That power does not exist; it cannot be created; and it cannot be exercised by Executive fiat.

So let us not confuse the issue, and let us not allow anyone to dodge it. The President suggested nationalizing elections. That suggestion is unconstitutional; it is illegal; and if acted upon, it would be grounds for impeachment. The Senate should be able to say that clearly without diversion, without delay, and without changing the subject.

I urge my colleagues: Do not silence or allow procedural maneuvering to excuse an assault on the very Constitution itself, and that is what the motion from the Senator from Florida is intended to achieve, and therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. While I am clearly disappointed, this is the most commonsense bill there is.

So none of us get to vote for the President of France. I would vote for Macron, but I don't get to. Nobody that is not a U.S. citizen should be voting in our elections.

And we have to use ID for everything: Board a plane, get a lottery ticket, go to a doctor, they ask you for your ID. This is common sense. We don't want

any fraud in our elections. All we say is just show your ID when you go vote, make sure you are a citizen to register, show your ID to vote.

So I am disappointed that my colleague doesn't support this. I can't understand why he wouldn't support some commonsense standard like this, but I am going to keep working, and we are going to get this passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, we are 1 year into President Donald Trump's second term and 1 year into Secretary Kristi Noem's tenure as head of the Department of Homeland Security, which includes Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE. It is time for us to assess and state with clarity what that 1 year has brought us.

First of all, the deportation policy is not now about border security—not now. The border is secure, and that is a good thing. Migrant crossings into the United States from Mexico are at their lowest level since 1970.

In August of 2024, during President Biden's administration, there were 107,000 encounters at the southern border, but in August of 2025, there were only 9,000. The border is much more secure. I support that. We must maintain it, and we will.

So is the deportation policy now about deporting criminals—something we support? There is evidence, and the evidence of what the policy is about comes from a Department of Homeland Security report itself. What it says is that 14 percent—only 14 percent—of the people who have been deported are dangerous criminals. No objection to deporting criminals, but that it is only 14 percent shows that the real purpose is to inflict on this country a policy of mass deportation.

And the Trump administration is as good as its word. From day one, with Stephen Miller, it has announced its intention to conduct mass deportation in the United States. It set quotas. It has moved away from focusing on people with serious criminal convictions, and instead, it is focused on getting the highest number of arrests and deportations as possible, up to 3,000 a day.

Homeland Security got \$75 billion from Congress—not from votes on our side. But it was really what allowed for this mass roundup of people from workplaces, from farms, from schools—all in service of a political agenda that is not about protecting Americans but is serving the political interests of the President and the fiendish design of Stephen Miller, with the implementation of a reckless Kristi Noem.

So if only 14 percent of those people deported are dangerous criminals, what are the others? It is about detaining and attempting to deport students who are here legally but said things that the President and the administration didn't like on a campus, folks who spoke out about the war in Gaza: Mohsen Mahdawi from Vermont,

Mahmoud Khalil from Columbia in New York City.

It is about deporting a student who wrote an article in a student newspaper criticizing the Israeli Government. It is about ripping a preschooler—preschooler—1,300 miles away from his home to sit in a detention facility, and it is about using him as bait to get to his family. That is happening.

It is about detaining a U.S. citizen at gunpoint, on that person's front porch, without any warrant to go there and then forcing him to go outside in sub-freezing weather wearing nothing but his underwear.

It is about detaining a churchgoer delivering groceries to his neighbors in freezing temperatures, and it is about denying him the necessary medication he needed after he had a kidney transplant, while he was in custody.

It is about a legal permanent resident, Donna Hughes-Brown. She was locked up for 143 days, threatened with deportation, because she did do something wrong: She bounced two checks that totaled 75 bucks over 10 years ago.

It is about Steven Tendo from Vermont, an asylum seeker and a pastor. He was arrested and detained outside the medical center in Shelburne where he works, and he said it was done brutally and it was done at gunpoint. This is not a threatening man. He is currently now being denied medication for his diabetes.

ICE is in such a rush to meet its quotas set by Secretary Noem and Mr. Miller that they are literally grabbing anyone and everyone they set their eyes on. What is their accent? What is their color? Where are they located? And ICE does not care who gets hurt in the process.

Wilmer Chavarria is a U.S. citizen, and he is the superintendent in the Winooski School District in Vermont. He was detained and questioned for hours by agents in Texas. His technology was seized and searched. He described this as “the definition of psychological terror.”

A 21-year-old man protesting in California was blinded in his left eye. He told the AP after this he was “just glad” to be “alive to tell my story.”

A pastor in Chicago, a reverend, was praying out loud at a protest, and an agent shot multiple rounds of pepper balls in his face, and he was sprayed by more pepper spray. It was indiscriminate and really vicious.

So far in 2026, ICE agents have shot eight people. These shootings happened in Minnesota and across the United States: Arizona, California, Oregon, Maryland, and Illinois. Officers fired on at least nine people who were in their cars, much like the horrible case of Renee Good. Ms. Good, as America all knows, was a 37-year-old mother, and Alex Pretti was a 37-year-old VA nurse. They were killed in Minnesota. We all saw it. No justification whatsoever.

We have seen massive ICE deployments in Minnesota and elsewhere: Washington, DC; Illinois; California.

These ICE expeditions, with massive numbers of people coming in, are interfering with local law enforcement and creating real terror in the communities.

ICE has raided schools and farms and workplaces, including in my State of Vermont, that sow fear and chaos on farms like the Pleasant Valley Farm in Berkshire and construction sites in Hardwick, VT.

DHS is also rounding up so many people, they literally don't have places to put them. For the first time in our history, more than 70,000 people are in ICE detention. That is an increase of 75 percent from the previous year. Not surprisingly, the conditions are deplorable. There was no preplanning of how to accommodate the people that the government was taking into custody. Detainees are fed food laced with worms. These are all documented facts. It is not a political argument. This is what is happening. Many places have toilets that don't flush.

In a detention center in El Paso, a man named Geraldo Lunas Campos was choked by an officer, and he died. A teen was beat up by officers and now has hearing loss. Just this week, NBC reported that an 18-month-old baby who was detained in south Texas was rushed to a hospital and treated for pneumonia, COVID-19, and RSV in serious and severe respiratory distress. She was described as being at the brink of dying.

Thirty-five people died in custody last year, and at least 6 died in detention centers in January of this year alone.

ICE is in such a hurry that many of the officers don't get adequate training. Their identities are concealed. Most disturbingly, ICE and Kristi Noem accept no responsibility for the actions of their officers.

We are discussing reforms now in Congress, and the basic reforms that should be made are that any Federal Agency, including ICE, should have to abide by the standards that apply in Alabama or in Vermont to our local law enforcement agencies, where there is training, where there is accountability, where there are body cameras, where there are mechanisms in place for training, supervision, and accountability.

But the real question, in my view, is this: Do we want to support a policy of mass roundups? That is the policy of the administration right now. When it comes to the question of border security, yes. When it comes to the question of deporting criminals, yes. But mass roundups with untrained people that are meeting quotas and where we have seen the violent overreactions in many cases; where we are seeing suffering inflicted on people who are in detention because there is no capacity to provide humane treatment to the people taken into custody by the government; where we have seen the havoc in communities where there are raids on our farms that need the migrant

labor and there are raids in our construction sites; where, when there is an influx of thousands of agents from ICE, it totally disrupts local law enforcement; and where so many of these people who are being rounded up are not a threat to our safety—are not a threat to our safety—what is the benefit to the American people? What is the price that our communities are paying? And what is our responsibility as a U.S. Senate to open our eyes and candidly assess what is the impact of a mass deportation policy?

My view is that we have an opportunity to move beyond what has been incredibly partisan rhetoric about the immigration issue. The reason we have the opportunity is because there is now bipartisan agreement about a secure border. There is now bipartisan agreement about deporting criminals.

Isn't it time for us to have the discussion about legal ways to have an immigration policy that is safe and secure and benefits the American people, as immigration has benefited us from the onset of our history?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The great Senator from Alabama.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the order of January 24, 1901, the traditional reading of Washington's Farewell Address take place on Monday, February 23, 2026, following the prayer and Pledge of Allegiance to the flag.

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

#### APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR KAINÉ TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, as modified by the order of February 11, 2026, appoints the Senator from Virginia, Mr. KAINÉ, to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 23, 2026.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

##### TRIBUTE TO VICE ADMIRAL NANCY HANN

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Vice Admiral Nancy Hann upon her retirement from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration after nearly 30 years of distinguished service to our Nation.

Vice Admiral Hann's career reflects the highest traditions of uniformed service: professional excellence, operational expertise, and an unwavering commitment to the workforce and mis-

sion. She began her career as a fisheries observer, and after commissioning in the NOAA Corps, she built her leadership through hands-on operational service as a deck officer at sea, a pilot in NOAA aircraft, and a flight meteorologist supporting missions critical to environmental intelligence and public safety.

As a NOAA pilot and flight meteorologist, Vice Admiral Hann flew demanding missions in support of hurricane forecasting, marine mammal research, and environmental response, working alongside scientists and crews in some of the most challenging operational environments NOAA faces. Those experiences shaped a leader grounded in real-world operations and the people who carry them out.

She went on to serve in a wide range of senior operational and management roles, including commanding officer of the NOAA Aircraft Operations Center, senior leadership positions within the NOAA Corps and the Office of Marine and Aviation Operations, and NOAA liaison to U.S. Pacific Command. Most recently, she served as Director of the NOAA Commissioned Officer Corps and Deputy Under Secretary for Operations, overseeing NOAA's ships, aircraft, uncrewed systems, diving programs, and small boats worldwide.

Through these senior roles, Vice Admiral Hann's leadership also had a lasting impact in Rhode Island. She was instrumental in supporting NOAA's Atlantic Fleet and advancing the relocation of the Marine Operations Center—Atlantic to Newport, reinforcing the Ocean State's role as a hub for maritime operations and strengthening NOAA's operational readiness.

A true trailblazer, Vice Admiral Hann became the first woman to attain the rank of vice admiral—one of only three officers promoted to that rank in NOAA Corps history—and served as the first and only commissioned officer to act as NOAA Administrator. She did not simply break barriers; she built pathways, expanding opportunity and strengthening the professional culture for those who followed.

Throughout her career, Vice Admiral Hann championed inclusion, mentorship, and workforce development. She has emphasized that leadership is about removing obstacles so others can succeed, and she consistently worked to create environments where people could thrive and do their best work. Her efforts helped prepare the next generation of NOAA scientists, pilots, engineers, and mariners to carry forward the Agency's vital mission.

As Vice Admiral Hann concludes her career, the Nation owes her a deep debt of gratitude. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Vice Admiral Nancy Hann for her extraordinary service and in congratulating her on a well-earned retirement.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO WINTON P. LOFTON, SR.

• Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I want to recognize Winton P. Lofton, Sr., a proud resident of Winnsboro, LA, who will turn 100 years old on February 17.

Winton grew up in Franklin Parish and answered the call to service at just 17 years old, enlisting in the U.S. Navy during World War II. He served for 6 years, traveling tens of thousands of miles from home. Winton is now the sole surviving World War II veteran in Franklin Parish, a living reminder of all the great men and women who fought for our country and secured our freedom.

Since returning home, Winton has devoted his life to his community and his church. He and his wife Marie have helped build churches across the country and remain pillars of their local faith community. A devout Southern Baptist, Winton continues to pray every day for our country and its leadership.

I am told he is still driving at 100 years young, and that his faith, discipline, and love of country remain as strong as ever.

Winton, thank you for your service. You make Louisiana proud. Happy birthday.●

##### TRIBUTE TO PERRY AUSTIN, LINDA ELLEN PRICE, AND CRAIG REYNOLDS

• Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I would like to honor three Alabama artists whose artwork is currently displayed in my office here in Washington, DC: Perry Austin of Sylacauga, AL; Linda Ellen Price of Springville, AL; Craig Reynolds of Gadsden, AL. Their works reflect the rich artistic talent of Alabama and serve as a visual representation of the State's natural beauty, heritage, and culture.

These pieces, graciously loaned by the artists, are prominently displayed in my front office, where they are viewed by thousands of constituents and visitors who enter my office each year. The artwork has been widely admired and frequently complimented, contributing to a welcoming and representative space that highlights some of Alabama's most talented artists.

Perry Austin, a native of Sylacauga, AL, is well known for his landscape paintings. A successful professional career. He is a member of the American Impressionist Society and Oil Painters of America and was among the original founders of the Plein Air Painters of the Southeast in 2001. His painting "Tensaw" displayed in the Russell Senate Office Building, depicts the Tensaw River as it flows through southern Alabama. Executed in oil on linen, the work captures the region's geography through a thoughtful balance of warm and cool tones.

Linda Ellen Price, of Springville, AL, is known for her expressive style and