United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 8, 2025 No. 77

Senate

The Senate met at 10 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.

Almighty God, make us instruments of Your love. Use our lawmakers today as ambassadors of reconciliation. Lord, direct them in their work and surround them with Your gracious presence that all their plans and purposes be in accordance with Your holy will. May their primary aim be to serve You and country with faithfulness. Enlighten them by Your Holy Spirit so they will find solutions to the problems and challenges our Nation and world are grappling with. Make them good stewards of their calling, guiding them to use their influence for Your glory. Inspire their minds; assist their wills; and strengthen their hands that they may not falter or fail.

We pray in Your glorious 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. MULLIN). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION RELATING TO ‘‘ADDRESSING THE HOMEWORK GAP THROUGH THE E-RATE PROGRAM’’—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 7, which the clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to ‘‘Addressing the Homework Gap Through the E-Rate Program’’.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

VETERANS HISTORY PROJECT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to report to my colleagues what I am doing today: delivering some history to the Library of Congress.

I will tell you about that project in the Library of Congress. This is something that I have done around Veterans Day each year for the last 8 years. In the past and including today, it has added up to the histories of about 95 veterans who have told their stories to me and my staff. Veterans are an important part of our communities. The sacrifices of the brave men and women who have served our country should never be forgotten.

My office recently interviewed 12 of these 95 veterans—this time from the Cedar Rapids, IA, area—for what the Library of Congress calls the Veterans History Project. Stories of our veterans help us to better understand the sacrifices that have granted us security and prosperity and have allowed us to live in freedom and with the liberties of this great Nation, the United States of America. Today, these stories of the latest 12 veterans will be delivered to the Library of Congress, preserving these firsthand accounts for future generations to appreciate the role of the people who defend our freedoms.

For the project that we had in Cedar Rapids, I want to give a special thank-you to Teri Van Dorston, at the Veterans Memorial Building in Cedar Rapids, for hosting the event that we held last November there and to Randy Langel from Kirkwood Community College for coordinating the students to perform and record these interviews.

I look forward to hosting another Veterans History Project event in November of this year in the Western Iowa city of Council Bluffs.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill 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.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 1668

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill from Senator MERKLEY at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1668) to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and individuals appointed to Senate-confirmed positions from issuing, sponsoring, or

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

endorsing certain financial instruments, and for other purposes.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION RELATING TO ''ADDRESSING THE HOMEWORK GAP THROUGH THE E-RATE PROGRAM''

GENIUS ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has been well over a decade since the term ''cryptocurrency'' entered our lexicon. Like many innovations, cryptocurrencies were at first seen as a novelty—something used by few and understood by even fewer.

But that changed quickly. More people began using and purchasing digital assets, innovation took place, and crypto demonstrated its staying power.

Stablecoins are an important part of the crypto ecosystem. Many digital asset advocates believe in holding Bitcoin, given its price fluctuations and growth in value over the last several years.

Stablecoins, however, have a value that is pegged to an asset, usually the U.S. dollar. They offer the speed and security of the blockchain with the stability and usability of a dollar bill, and they are a business and consumer friendly way of making payments.

Hundreds of billions of dollars of stablecoins are in circulation today. The vast majority are dollar denominated. But in the United States, stablecoins have operated in a legal gray zone. Stablecoin issuers trying to follow the rules can't be sure what rules to follow.

The Biden administration chose to regulate crypto companies by arbitrary enforcement measures. Regulators filed numerous lawsuits against crypto firms. These hostile actions led a number of U.S.-based companies to consider moving out of the United States altogether.

I think we all agree the United States should be the world's leader in financial innovation. Stablecoins should be ''Made in the U.S.A.'' But we can't lead in innovation if there is no clarity for the innovators.

The GENIUS Act provides that clarity. It is the first step in bringing digital assets into our financial system by setting a clear framework for stablecoins. To be clear, Americans are already using stablecoins and will continue to use them with or without this legislation. What this bill does is establish a framework that protects consumers and safeguards national security while promoting that innovation right here in the United States.

The GENIUS Act would implement light-touch and tailored standards for stablecoin issuers so consumers can trust whom they are doing business with. Reserve requirements would give consumers confidence in the value of the stablecoins that they hold, and the bill's enforcement provisions would provide companies with clarity on what the rules are and ensure accountability for any violations.

The GENIUS Act would also protect against national security threats and money laundering. Stablecoin issuers would be held to the same standards as other financial institutions subject to the Bank Secrecy Act. They would need to monitor and report suspicious activity. They would have to comply with U.S. sanctions, and they would have to block transactions that violate State and Federal laws.

Stablecoins are operating today without any of these requirements, and not passing this bill means allowing the status quo to continue—no consumer protections, no national security safeguards, and the risk of arbitrary enforcement actions from financial regulators.

Passing this bill is also about American strength. It would create demand for the U.S. dollar and for Treasurys. That is a good thing both for our national security and for our fiscal house.

This bill is the product of bipartisan consensus building. I am proud of the process that this has gone through, and I am grateful to Senators LUMMIS, HAGERTY, GILLIBRAND, and ALSOBROOKS for their leadership on this issue and their work on the bill. Chairman TIM SCOTT has also been a critical member of the team.

The Banking Committee held a 3-hour markup during which the committee considered 40 amendments to the bill. That bill was reported out by a vote of 18 to 6, with 5 Democrats supporting it.

But the work didn't end there. Bill sponsors have been meeting for weeks—including nights and weekends—since the markup to address changes that made this bill better.

Today, we are voting on the sixth—sixth—version of the GENIUS Act, drafted with input from both Republicans and Democrats. And if Senators would like the opportunity to make further modifications to the bill, I encourage them to vote for cloture. Once we are on the bill, we can discuss changes here on the floor. We have had an open process on this bill so far. So why stop now?

The GENIUS Act is by no means the last word on digital assets. I expect the Senate will continue to work in this space, including work toward market structure legislation to address features of the crypto market that are not captured solely by stablecoins.

But the GENIUS Act is a first step toward bringing digital assets into our financial system and promoting American leadership and financial innovation. We have the opportunity to move the ball forward today. I encourage my colleagues to take it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

TARIFFS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, Donald Trump's trade war is a gut punch to the American people. It is the biggest tax hike on families in half a century.

If Donald Trump is going to tax the American people, they have a right to know precisely how much. So, today, I am introducing legislation with Representative RASKIN requiring retailers to show consumers precisely how much tariffs are increasing the prices of their products. It is no different than when your utility bill shows fees or a receipt shows if a service charge is included or not.

Specifically, the legislation that Representative RASKIN has introduced in the House and I am introducing in the Senate requires large retailers to display in a ''clear and conspicuous'' way the amount that tariffs contribute to a good's final pricetag.

Our bill is about transparency. It is about being straight with consumers. It is about informing the consumers how Donald Trump's tariffs will impact the family budget. And retailers should like it because these increases in prices are not their fault; it is Trump's fault, with his tariffs.

So let the public know. And that is a secondary benefit that will make the public even more angry, and they may call their Republican Senators and Congressmen and say join with Democrats and pass some of our legislation that would repeal some of these tariffs.

The White House growls that companies with the audacity, they said—audacity—to be honest with consumers about the cost of tariffs are being hostile and political. But this is not hostile or political at all; it is simply being honest with consumers. It is clarity. It is transparency.

It is a smart policy, so of course the White House opposes it because they don't want people to know how much these tariffs are damaging them. It is estimated that if the present tariffs go into effect, the average family will pay $4,000 more. Well, we want to let them know how much the price is increased for food, for housing, for gasoline, for groceries, for prescription drugs.

Last week, for instance, Ford announced they are increasing the price of at least three models by as much as $2,000, in part because of Trump's tariffs. Under our bill, that $2,000 price hike should be spelled out to consumers as in reality what it is—a tariff tax.

Americans deserve to know who is picking their pockets. Our bill will make clear to the American people that Donald Trump's tariffs are a painful tax eating away at their hard-earned money. It will make clear to the American people that Donald Trump's promise to "lower costs starting on day one" is a mirage, a fiction—a cruel fiction—all for a chaotic tariff policy that is sending our economy into a tailspin.

On those tariffs themselves, today, Donald Trump is set to announce a new supposed trade deal between the United States and the UK, the United Kingdom. We are still waiting to get the details, but this much is clear: Whatever Donald Trump's announcement with the UK looks like, it isn't a triumph of strategy; rather, it is a product of chaos. And with this President, if past is prologue, who knows if this deal will actually stick.

This is the Trump administration's credo: government by chaos. Just look at how Donald Trump is dealing with Canada, and it tells you everything you need to know about how untrustworthy his UK announcement is. First, Donald Trump says yes on tariffs with Canada; then he says no. Then he insults Canada, calls it the "51st State." Moments later, he meets with Prime Minister Carney and says "Canada loves us and we love Canada."

No one knows what Donald Trump will say next. If this were a roller coaster, the whiplash would paralyze everybody involved. So American businesses and American consumers have no faith that the President has a design. Whatever is in front of his face that day, whatever pressure there might be on him, he reacts. And it doesn't matter if he said the complete opposite thing a day or a week earlier.

Early this morning, members of the President's own Cabinet are already lowering expectations of the deal, saying it is only "an agreement in concept"; "there's a lot of details to be worked out." And we know what happens when that happens, particularly in a Trump administration.

Donald Trump's new trade deal with the UK seems to be built entirely on quicksand. It is likely to be built on quicksand. He blows with the political winds. When people say he is too reckless, he backs off. When there is criticism of him backing off, he reintroduces the bill. So it would be hard to take anything the President says about this deal seriously because, in all likelihood, he will change his mind again.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. President, on anti-Semitism, this morning, the Anti-Defamation League issued a new report illustrating a disturbing trend I have been warning about: the rise of anti-Semitism in America. Specifically, this report looked at anti-Semitism toward Jewish Members of Congress, which has dramatically risen—something I can attest to firsthand.

Social media has become a breeding ground for anti-Semitism. But it is not just elected officials. Social media has become an easy way for hate groups to organize and proliferate their message against all sorts of communities and individuals. They go after Jewish-owned businesses. They go after synagogues. They go after families. They direct anti-Semitic slurs even against individuals who might not be Jewish.

We must not allow anti-Semitism to grow unabated in America like wild weeds. As the great poet Conor Cruise O'Brien said, anti-Semitism is a light sleeper. When there is trouble, somehow anti-Semitism always pops its head up—the Jewish people being made scapegoats, as we have been for centuries. It must be confronted at every instance. It must be rooted out.

We all play a part in fighting back against the forces of intolerance. People of all backgrounds, faiths, beliefs, and opinions have a duty to stand up and speak out against hate, no matter where it comes from.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr. President, now, on the Trump budget, if you asked AI to come up with a Federal budget that utterly screws over average Americans, do you know what the AI would come up with? Donald Trump's latest budget proposal. So, today, let's look at Trump's so-called skinny budget a little more closely. It is hard to believe that this is a serious proposal.

If enacted, the Trump budget would completely gut public safety, something they say they want to strengthen. Trump's own FBI Director, Kash Patel, one of the most loyal Trumpites, testified in the House yesterday that the FBI can't meet its mission to keep Americans safe with the cuts in Trump's budget.

If Kash Patel, one of Donald Trump's most loyal acolytes, says this budget won't work, who else is going to come out against it? How can we take this budget seriously? If Patel is against it, so will be many other Cabinet officers, publicly or privately. How carefully was it even done? Did the people who put it out know they are slashing the FBI? The budget has sloppy and reckless written all over it, and even Kash Patel agrees.

That is not all. The Trump budget would also strangle American families. It is an all-out assault on American healthcare. Under Donald Trump's budget, America's housing crisis would go from bad to worse.

Hell will freeze over before Democrats entertain anything remotely close to Trump's budget. This budget proposal is dead on arrival in the Senate, and anything close to it will go nowhere as well.

MEDICAID

Mr. President, on Medicaid and the CBO, the Republicans right now are struggling with a very basic idea that the truth sometimes hurts. In their case, the truth is that Republican policies are so deeply unpopular with the American people. Republicans are realizing that, and it has left them paralyzed.

Now that Republicans actually have to produce a bill, reality is catching up with them. No more bland words. No more: Don't worry; we will protect you. The budget shows what they are actually up to.

Yesterday, the CBO reported that no matter which scheme of Medicaid cuts Republicans are likely to choose, the result will be that millions will become uninsured. Republicans can try any which way to make their bill work, but their numbers just don't add up. There is no way for Republicans to accomplish their massive tax giveaways without devastating millions of working and middle-class people.

Even if the Republicans pass a fraction of their proposed Medicaid cuts, it still means millions will lose their healthcare. And for what? So that billionaires can get another tax break that they don't need at a time of high inflation and a possible recession? That is the definition of cruelty.

This is the fundamental problem Republicans are facing right now as their infighting continues—that their policies are deeply, deeply unpopular with the American people—not just blue State Republicans but purple and red State Republicans too. Telling the American people that you want to ax their healthcare so that extremely rich people can pay less in taxes is a horrible message that virtually hardly anyone in America agrees with, but that is precisely what Republicans are trying to do. So it is no surprise they are eating their own tails trying to figure out how to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

WYOMING VETERANS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this week, I had an opportunity, as part of Veterans Appreciation Week, to speak with incredible Wyoming veterans from all across our State. I thanked them for their service and also took the opportunity to listen closely to their concerns.

On Tuesday, Senator CYNTHIA LUMMIS and I hosted a telephone townhall meeting with Veterans Affairs Secretary Doug Collins. Also, Col. Tim Sheppard, who is executive director of the Wyoming Veterans Commission, joined us on the call.

The call was very productive and informative. Wyoming veterans shared their experience directly with Secretary Collins. They shared with us what works with the VA and how improvements can still be made. We heard many ideas for improvement. Suggestions ranged from changes to online scheduling to more flexibility for out-of-State appointments.

Secretary Collins took this feedback seriously. He himself is a veteran. He knows that the VA is too bureaucratic. He is committed to fixing it. So I am proud to partner with him to deliver the care that our veterans deserve.

On Wednesday, here in Washington, I met with 16 Wyoming Vietnam veterans. They came to town to visit their memorial. These 16 veteran heroes come from across the State: Guernsey, Thermopolis, Powell, Casper, Cheyenne, Mountain View, Douglas, Newcastle, and Green River. Their stories of service and sacrifice are moving.

This weekend in Wyoming, we will be holding ''Welcome Home'' events across the State in Afton, Riverton, Sheridan, and Wheatland. It is a welcome home many veterans from Vietnam never really received. It is sad to report but true. This weekend, we honor all of our Wyoming veterans.

Wyoming has one of the highest per-capita rates of veterans in America. The pride in those individuals runs deep.

It is an honor to represent them here in the Senate, and I am going to continue to listen to the concerns of our veterans and work to improve the care they need and continue to honor their sacrifices.

ELECTRIC VEHICLE MANDATE

Mr. President, on another matter, in 2024, in November, on election day, voters demanded more economic freedom and less government overreach. President Trump and Republicans in Congress heard them. The State of California did not.

California wants to export its radical and impractical electric vehicle mandate to all 50 States. California's mandates are a progressive power grab. They dictate what cars and what trucks Americans can buy and can drive. These mandates aren't limited to California; they are calculated to control the policy of the entire Nation.

Congress must now act to protect the rights of the American people to drive the gas-powered vehicles they want to drive. Last week, House Republicans—with 35 House Democrats joining all of the Republicans—voted to defend that freedom and to defeat this California mandate, and it is now up to the Senate to finish the job.

California mandates spread far and wide. They affect 133 million Americans—nearly 40 percent of the population of this country. Here is why: Twelve States copy the California mandate to ban gas-powered cars by 2036. Ten States copy the California mandate to ban gas-powered trucks by 2036. These include large-population States, like New York.

Even the junior Senator from California admits that California's liberal mandates affect the entire country, and he says he is very proud of it. The American people think differently.

The Washington Post reported last month that ''Americans are losing interest in EVs.'' That is the quote. The Washington Post: ''Americans are losing interest in EVs.'' Interest in owning an EV has dropped 8 percent since 2023.

The message is clear: Americans don't want these EVs even when the government tries to bribe them—bribe them—into buying them and using them. People want to buy the car and truck that works best for them and where they live and the life they lead.

The average price of an electric vehicle is $62,000, which is $16,000 more than comparable gas-powered vehicles. The California mandates that the Democrats are pushing would raise prices even more. It would also limit options.

This isn't progress. This is a policy that punishes working families, punishes farmers, punishes truckers, punishes the people that live in rural areas.

Worse, EV batteries rely on China. Eighty percent of EV battery components come from China. Republicans here in the Senate are fighting to end America's dependence on China. The California mandate supported by the Democrats makes that dependence even more dangerous. It risks our safety, it risks our security, and it risks our strategic independence.

The Biden administration used its final days in office to grant California permission to export its EV mandate across the country. They did this just 1 month before President Trump took office. They had already lost the election. They already knew the American people rejected what they stood for. Yet they still tried to push this onto the American people, and are trying to push it today.

This is midnight meddling. Senate Republicans are ready to use the Congressional Review Act to stop it. We will protect Americans' rights—the rights to purchase a gas-powered vehicle. That is what we are fighting for, and we have every right to do so.

California's mandates have already taken root in a dozen States. They affect 40 percent of all the new light-duty vehicle registrations and a quarter of the new heavy-duty vehicle registrations nationwide. They clearly affect the kinds of vehicles which will be manufactured and sold in America. These California mandates affect the cost and the availability of gas-powered cars and trucks all across the country, even in the States that do not adopt the mandates.

To my Democrat colleagues who will tolerate California controlling what Americans can drive: Do you think the American people really support what you are trying to shove down their throats? No, they don't.

No wonder the Democrats lost the election.

Are the Democrats willing to strip consumers and small businesses of their right to choose the vehicles that work for their needs and for their budgets? Do Democrats want to continue to protect the failures and the fallacies of the Green New Deal? Or for once, will the Democrats join Republicans who are trying to protect working families?

It is no surprise, then, that Republicans have become the party supporting and protecting the rights of working families. People have rejected the Democrats.

The Senate also needs to reject the cheerleading by these climate extremists for more regulations by unelected bureaucrats, but that is what the Democrats are here supporting. The Senate should use the Congressional Review Act to reject this Joe Biden midnight madness. By doing so, we would be protecting consumer choice, protecting affordability, and protecting congressional authority.

It is time to put Americans, Mr. President, back in the driver's seat.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

NOMINATION OF ED MARTIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Justice is a powerful Agency. The Attorney General heads it. Throughout the United States, there are over 90 U.S. attorneys who are the Federal prosecutors—a powerful position, a position that can make or break an individual or a corporation. Two of the most important and the most powerful are the Southern District of New York and the District of Columbia.

I come to the floor today to speak in opposition to the nomination of Ed Martin to be U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans: Closely examine this nominee's record.

Ed Martin's commentary and affiliations leave no doubt that he is unqualified to serve as the top Federal law enforcement individual for our Nation's Capital City. Nearly every day, new, disqualifying information surfaces.

Recently, ProPublica published a troubling report detailing Mr. Martin's conduct in multiple cases involving Eagle Forum, a conservative organization which has its roots in my home State of Illinois, formally led by well-known activist Phyllis Schlafly.

Within a year—within a year—of Mr. Martin becoming the head of the Eagle Forum, the board of directors of that organization fired him, in 2016, and they stated the reason: mismanagement and poor leadership.

A majority of the board also filed a lawsuit to bar him from any association with the organization. Instead of arguing his case in court, according to the ProPublica publication, Mr. Martin secretly orchestrated a social media campaign attacking the presiding Illinois judge.

Ironically, that judge, John Barberis from Madison County, IL—directly across the river from St. Louis—was the only Republican judge sitting in that county at the time.

Mr. Martin went so far as to buy a laptop computer for a former colleague so that she could attack the judge on Facebook and ghostwrote posts for her.

Mr. Martin, who seeks to be the top Federal prosecutor in the District of Columbia, urged her to ''turn up the heat with others'' on the Facebook page of this judge and to ''[c]all what [the judge] did unfair and rigged over and over'' again—Mr. Martin's instruction to his colleague.

This outrageous effort to intimidate a judge is a clear violation of ethical norms and professional rules of conduct. It led to more than $600,000 in legal settlements or judgments against Mr. Martin or his employers.

In the Eagle Forum lawsuit, a judge held Mr. Martin in contempt of court, citing his ''willful disregard'' of a court order that barred him from interfering with the organization.

Remember, this is the President's choice to be the head U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia, and he is being held in contempt of court for willful disregard of a court order that barred him from interfering.

A jury found Mr. Martin liable for defamation of Phyllis Schlafly's daughter, Anne Schlafly Cori—a jury decision finding him liable for defamation—for, among other things—he shared a post on Facebook falsely claiming—listen to this—Mr. Martin shared a Facebook post falsely claiming that Anne Schlafly Cori should be charged with manslaughter in her mother's death.

Mr. Martin also has a disturbing history of downplaying the January 6 insurrection in the U.S. Capitol. He has made it a habit to attack the law enforcement officers who protected the Vice President, who sat before this Chamber, Members of the Senate, Members of the House, thousands of staffers, and visitors.

Those law enforcement individuals put their lives on the line for me and for all of us, but Mr. Martin doesn't see it that way.

He was at the U.S. Capitol on January 6 when he posted on social media, and I quote word for word what he said on January 6 about what was going on in this insurrection in the Capitol. Here is what he said:

Like Mardi Gras in DC today; love, faith, and joy. Ignore #FakeNews.

In August 2023, he excused violence by January 6 rioters, saying:

We have to have less judgment on somebody who hits a cop.

Ed Martin, seeking the U.S. attorney's post for the District of Columbia, said of the January 6 rioters:

We have to have less judgment on somebody who hits a cop.

He continued:

I've seen people hit a cop and that doesn't make it the end of the world.

Ed Martin, the top law enforcement officer in the District of Columbia—that is his quote.

He had the audacity to call Michael Fanone, a 20-year veteran of the Metropolitan Police Department who was nearly killed on January 6, ''a fake cop.''

''[A] fake cop.''

This disgusting and dangerous rhetoric puts at greater risk officers who already put their lives on the line every day to protect you and me and our families. This lack of respect for law enforcement is inconsistent with his goal to be the presiding U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

According to Mr. Martin, January 6 rioters who beat the cops are ''patriots''—his word; ''victims''—his word. He has also attacked prosecutors who were assigned to work on January 6 cases.

Incidentally, until he was selected for this position, he had never been a prosecutor. The top position in the U.S. Department of Justice in terms of U.S. attorneys—the District of Columbia—the man for the job never had any experience as a prosecutor.

He has also attacked the prosecutors who were assigned to work on January 6 cases. What does he call those prosecutors? ''Terrorists.'' His word. He said:

I shun them. I ostracize them. . . . These are despicable people.

Ed Martin.

Just as alarming, Mr. Martin has close ties to Timothy Hale-Cusanelli, a January 6 rioter and Nazi sympathizer.

Look at this picture. In 2024 alone, Mr. Martin interviewed Mr. Hale-Cusanelli at least five times. In one of these interviews, Mr. Martin said:

Tim Hale is an extraordinary guy. I have gotten to know him really well. I'd say we're friends.

Friends with a Nazi sympathizer. This is who the President believes should be the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

Ed Martin now claims that despite these five interviews that we know of, he was not aware of Mr. Hale-Cusanelli's anti-Semitic commentary or penchant for donning a Hitler mustache until after he had presented him personally with an award last July.

But Mr. Martin's own words demonstrate the opposite. Just weeks before this award ceremony, where Martin gives this man who dresses up as Hitler an award, Mr. Martin excused his dressing up as ''goofing around'' and claimed he is being ''smeared and slurred'' by allegations of anti-Semitism.

Documents filed in Mr. Hale-Cusanelli's criminal trial, he was a January 6 rioter, show that he has a long history of saying horrifying things. Let me give you one of Mr. Hale-Cusanelli's quotes, this man who was referred to as an ''extraordinary leader'' by Ed Martin.

Here is what he said:

Hitler should have finished the job.

Hale-Cusanelli. He also claimed that he ''would kill''—this is so disgusting. I hate to put it in the RECORD, but it has to be. He also claimed he ''would kill all the Jews and eat them for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, and he wouldn't need to season them because the salt from their tears would make it flavorful enough.''

This is the person that Ed Martin, the would-be prosecuting attorney for the District of Columbia, called ''an extraordinary man, an extraordinary leader.''

In a letter sent to the Judiciary Committee opposing Mr. Martin's nomination, 11 separate national Jewish organizations, representing more than 1 million people, wrote that Mr. Martin's associations are ''not only dangerous—they reveal a pattern of behavior incompatible with the responsibilities of a US Attorney, a role meant to uphold justice and [to] protect all communities, including Jewish Americans, from hate and extremism.''

On top of all of this, Mr. Ed Martin has failed to disclose to the Senate an unprecedented number of required requests for information. Of approximately 2,200 writings and remarks that he was required to submit to the Senate Judiciary Committee, he omitted at least 700—over 30 percent of his known record.

This includes his failure to disclose that he made nearly 150 appearances on networks funded and directed by the Russian Government, and interviews on Infowars—do you remember the term ''Infowars''?—hosted by a man named Alex Jones, the rightwing conspiracy monger who falsely claimed that the Sandy Hook massacre of those little kids was false.

Just yesterday, my Judiciary Committee discovered more than 300 additional items that Mr. Martin failed to provide to the committee. This is the fifth time that Mr. Martin will be required to update his disclosures to the committee. This nominee is treating the Senate's constitutional obligation to provide advice and consent on his nomination with utter contempt.

Just to put this in context, omitting over 700 items, we discovered 300 more that he failed to disclose, in the previous history of the committee—all the staff have looked closely—when it comes to omissions, Mr. Martin wins the trophy permanently. Why? Because the most in any previous case before was fewer than 10, his is over 700 failures to disclose before the committee.

Mr. Ed Martin has his own history of making his own discriminatory comments. He baselessly called his fellow panelists on CNN ''black racists,'' and he later claimed, with no evidence, Mr. Martin said, ''[I] got fired because of the crazy Black ladies on CNN that demanded I be fired because I didn't take their nonsense.''

The fact that Ed Martin feels the need to note the race and gender of the people who cross him speaks volumes about his character. And in a speech that Martin did not disclose to the Judiciary Committee, we discovered he made the following statement:

You're not racist if you don't like Mexicans.

Just last year he said in an interview:

You show me a Jewish American—

Ed Martin said—

who feels good about the Democrat Administration, and I'll show you someone who is not really Jewish.''

How dare Ed Martin pass judgment on someone else's religious faith?

The serious concerns about Ed Martin's nomination have only been heightened by his conduct as an interim U.S. attorney. One of his first official acts after his appointment was to fire numerous prosecutors simply for handling the January 6 cases that were assigned to them.

He has also baselessly threatened to investigate numerous nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, lawmakers, and others simply because he disagrees with them politically.

The top prosecutor in the Nation's Capital should be focused on fighting violent crime and terrorism, not threatening our First Amendment rights.

Mr. Martin's record makes it clear that he does not have the temperament, the judgment, or the experience to be entrusted with the power and responsibility of being U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia.

I urge my Democratic and Republican colleagues to oppose his nomination.

I yield the floor.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to seek unanimous consent to confirm Casey Mulligan, the President's nominee to be the chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy at the Small Business Administration.

I will make that motion in just a moment, but first, let me explain why I am doing this. This week is National Small Business Week, a week to recognize the achievements of our Nation's entrepreneurs.

As chair of the Small Business Committee, I have a front row seat to the successes and challenges of our small business owners, and I have the privilege of being a champion for Iowa entrepreneurs.

Our small businesses are more vulnerable to burdensome government regulations. Over the past few years, the cost of regulations for small businesses has been out of control. The previous administration created more than 1,100 final rules costing $1.8 trillion. The Biden administration's regulatory costs were 600 times higher than that of the first Trump administration and 3.7 times higher than that of the Obama administration.

I have been encouraged by President Trump's efforts to freeze and roll back regulations. SBA Administrator Loeffler and the White House are working hard to eliminate burdensome and unnecessary regulations, but to be truly effective, small businesses need a Senate-confirmed chief counsel to continue this mission.

The Office of Chief Counsel for Advocacy has been vacant, without a Senate-confirmed occupant for nearly a decade. This key role ensures small business interests are protected.

Having served as the top Republican on the Small Business Committee for years now, I truly understand the need for this position to be filled immediately, and we are fortunate that President Trump nominated a highly qualified individual for this role.

Dr. Casey Mulligan's unique mix of academic success and real-world small business experience makes him the best candidate for the job. A Harvard graduate, Dr. Mulligan received his Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago where he currently serves as an economics professor.

In addition to his academic role, Dr. Mulligan also owns two small consulting and economic research businesses. He has also conducted extensive research on the economic effects of regulation on small businesses.

At the SBA Office of Advocacy, Dr. Mulligan would serve as a champion for small businesses nationwide as the Agency undergoes much needed changes to policy and direction.

Advocacy's role remains true regardless of party, to ensure that a strong chief counsel stands up for the little guy and warns regulators when small firms will be harmed.

Dr. Mulligan understands Main Street and the importance of examining all costs imposed on America's entrepreneurs.

I urge my colleagues to consent to the confirmation of Dr. Mulligan as chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy at the SBA.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, Calendar No. 59; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARKEY. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to speak on this motion to confirm Casey Mulligan to be chief counsel of the Office of Advocacy.

In the last 3½ months, we have seen an unprecedented assault by the Trump administration on America's small businesses.

Elon Musk and DOGE have taken a chain saw to SBA. They have done away with 43 percent of its staff and an estimated 2,700 people, and I say ''estimated'' because SBA won't share who has been fired and who has been retained with the public or with the U.S. Senate. We don't know.

We requested a meeting with DOGE in February and have yet to hear back. The little we do know about what DOGE is doing at SBA is gleaned through media reports rather than through their responses to our congressional requests.

Because of this administration's utter contempt for accountability and its shameless lack of transparency, we don't know if SBA has sufficient staff on hand to carry out its day-to-day operations.

We don't know which congressionally authorized and funded programs have been illegally shut down. We don't know which SBA field offices will remain open to serve small business owners where they live and work. And yet, the Senate Republicans want us to rubberstamp their slash-and-burn tactics and confirm this SBA nominee by unanimous consent with a total disregard from the Trump administration to tell the U.S. Senate what is going on inside of the SBA.

They have the SBA inside one big ''witness protection program.'' We can't get them to tell us anything about anything.

And they want us to come out here by unanimous consent and to start to confirm appointees to the SBA to further dismantle programs that are essential to small businesses all across our country?

And let me say this: My Republicans do not see how the Trump administration is turning Main Street into ''Pain Street,'' and it is in their home States. Small businesses are being forced to absorb skyrocketing costs because of President Trump's destructive tariffs. They are terrified of losing customers, as consumer confidence levels take a historic nosedive. They are listening with shock and disbelief.

Small businessmen and women across the country have to have their bottle of Pepto Bismol right next to them every single day, not knowing what the impact is going to be of the Trump tariffs on their small businesses across the country.

And by the way, there are 34 million of those small businesses right now, and we have got a Small Business Administration that won't even talk to the U.S. Senate, much less to those small business people who are terrified right now.

They, right now, are terrified. They are shocked, as President Trump tells American consumers that they are going to pay luxury prices to shop at mom-and-pop shops in the United States.

Does anyone in this administration understand the harm they are causing to small businesses?

I can tell you at least one entity that does: the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Last week, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce called on the Trump administration to develop a tariff exclusion process to prevent irreparable harm to small businesses and to stop the country from falling into a recession. The U.S. Chamber is speaking on behalf of chambers of commerce all across this country—every city and town. They are speaking for them. They are saying: Protect small businesses from the Trump tariffs.

That is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. That is what we should be debating out here on the floor right now—a bill to protect all small businesses from the Trump tariffs.

Instead, we are talking about confirming someone who absolutely should not be debated on the Senate floor at this time, because those little businesses don't have the protections that big companies with big margins have. They are very, very vulnerable, and Casey Mulligan, the nominee for Chief Counsel for Advocacy, has actually questioned the value of longstanding and widely expected worker protections, including sick leave and paid healthcare and the right to unionize. And, not surprisingly, not a single Democrat on the Small Business Committee voted to advance his nomination.

So this is not the right time, and he is not the right person to have this job. Confirming Dr. Mulligan will only further President Trump's radical, damaging attack on small businesses and their workers.

And with that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

S.J. RES. 7

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to today's resolution to overturn an FCC rule that provides greater flexibility to ensure that every student has the access to the internet that they need.

We have known for a long time that internet access is critical for education. Students need Wi-Fi to connect with classmates and teachers, work on group projects, do research, and even just hit the ''submit'' button on some assignments. Yet too many Americans can't access reliable internet at home. It is called the ''homework gap,'' and it is leaving thousands of kids behind.

This disparity only worsened during the pandemic, when the homework gap became a full learning gap for thousands of students. Many kids without internet at home had to sit in McDonald's parking lots so they could Zoom into class. As part of the American Rescue Plan, I worked with my colleague from Massachusetts Senator ED MARKEY and former FCC Chairwoman Rosenworcel to launch the Emergency Educational Connectivity Fund, or ECF. This $7 billion program provided nearly 18 million students at over 10,000 schools and libraries with hotspots, routers, and other equipment for students and educators to connect to the internet at home. Maryland schools and libraries received over $145 million through this program to help bridge the homework gap in my State.

Even as we worked to provide support for students on an emergency basis, we worked with the FCC on modernization of the E-Rate program to ensure it meets student needs. The new FCC rule allows schools and libraries to loan out Wi-Fi hotspots to students and educators at home so we can continue to address the homework gap. But now, the Republicans want to repeal this commonsense reform and take away hotspots from low-income and rural families.

This is a backwards step at a time when access to the internet is more important than ever. And because the new rule simply allowed the use of existing E-Rate funds more flexibly, the repeal of this rule does not save a dime. A vote to repeal this rule is a vote to limit the FCC's ability to address a critical need for students and to put a stop to good work being done by schools and libraries to support learning. This was an issue before the pandemic and remains an issue today.

We all know that access to the internet is essential. We have worked on a bipartisan basis to expand broadband access, but we have a long way to go. The FCC modernized E-Rate to ensure that students are not disadvantaged by lack of access to broadband at home, whether that is because they are in a rural area with no connection or because it is unaffordable for their parents. This is a commonsense measure, and I urge my colleagues to vote against its repeal today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Ms. HASSAN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 238 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—38

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Sanders
Baldwin	Kaine	Schatz
Bennet	Kelly	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Slotkin
Booker	Luján	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Markey	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden
Hickenlooper	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—12

Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Risch
Duckworth	Lummis	Shaheen
Fetterman	Murphy	Smith
Gallego	Padilla	Wicker

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) was passed as follows:

S.J. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to ''Addressing the Homework Gap Through the E-Rate Program'' (89 Fed. Reg. 67303 (August 20, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RELATING TO ''GLEN CANYON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA: MOTOR VEHICLES''—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 60, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 60) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Park Service relating to ''Glen Canyon National Recreation Area: Motor Vehicles''.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON H.J. RES. 60

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—7

Banks	Smith	Wicker
Booker	Warnock	
Ernst	Whitehouse	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 60) was passed.

GUIDING AND ESTABLISHING NATIONAL INNOVATION FOR U.S. STABLECOINS ACT—Motion to Proceed

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1582, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 66, S. 1582, a bill to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I spent last weekend along our southern border, again, as I have done many weekends, to be able to get down to the border in different areas. Last weekend, I went down to the San Diego-Tijuana border area.

In that area, there are 1.3 million people living in San Diego. That city bumps right up against our border with Tijuana. Tijuana, Mexico, has over 2 million people living in that town.

There is a 30-foot fence that actually separates the two there. That is a double-section fence. It is incredibly important to be able to manage that border, not only for the crossing of traffic illegally but also for the crossing of legal traffic. One of the largest ports and traffic movement of people and cargo in the world is right there, and it is an incredibly important location for us.

I went there to be able to see the implementation of the new authorities and the things that the President is actually implementing there that have so precipitously dropped the movement of illegal immigration and have dramatically increased the number of interdiction of drugs that are moving through that area. That literally benefits the entire country.

What I found when I visited with the folks from CBP was that morale was up and the chaos is down. I found folks who are there that are law enforcement professionals actually doing law enforcement. When I visited with some of those same folks before, during the Biden administration, they were being treated like hotel check-in staff that were being asked to actually just move people into the country as fast as possible. Now, they are actually able to do their jobs, to actually enforce the law, and to do what they signed up to do. And they are eager to be able to protect the Nation and know full well the threats that we are facing.

In that area in San Diego, we have had more of what are called special-interest aliens move through that area of our border than any other area of our entire 2,000-mile-long border with Mexico. People from Russia, China, from Central Africa, from Uzbekistan, and from multiple other places fly into Tijuana and then literally drive up to the gap in the fence and walk across, right into the United States.

At least, that is how it used to be. That is not what is happening anymore.

So I wanted to be able to talk through with this body a few of the things that I saw there and the work that is still undone.

One, that section of the gap in the fence is right there at Tijuana, on the eastern side of San Diego. That gap is still there, but something has changed. Construction is beginning to be able to close that gap, and it is incredibly important. It is one of the first places that CBP and Border Patrol took me to and pointed out to say: We need this gap closed. It is very important that we actually get this gap secured because it is in a very remote area, difficult to traverse, and it is dangerous for our Border Patrol folks to have to be able to chase someone through that area.

In fact, while I was in that area, around that gap, I literally watched one of the Lakota helicopters come in and to be able to identify someone who was literally cutting through that area and smuggling right through that zone. The good news is things are different now, and that person was caught because we have the manpower in place to be able to catch them.

And that person will be deported immediately. That is also a big change that has actually occurred.

So things are different in what is actually happening there, and I am grateful to be able to see the chaos going down and the morale and the enforcement going significantly up. That gap in the fence will be closed in the days ahead. And as one of many requests the Border Patrol has: just help us have a deterrent in this area so that we can better patrol and be able to chase folks down that are violating American law.

They need additional personnel as well. I will talk a little bit about that in a moment. They need additional resources to be able to do their tasks, and they need additional authorities to be able to make sure they can fully execute the law that is put in front of them.

Something that was interesting—the multiple times I have been to the border the last several years—often the Border Patrol would tell me they can't put checkpoints up anymore. They used to have checkpoints on the major highways as they were headed north away from the border, and they would check vehicles for people being smuggled and drugs being smuggled into the country and other contraband. They weren't able to do that because they were asked to actually go to the border to facilitate people coming in, and so they could no longer do those checkpoints.

Guess what. Those checkpoints are back up again. They are actually stopping people on the highways now to be able to check and see if there are drugs there that have found their way across the border and are moving north, and they are interdicting narcotics again there.

They are able to actually process a lot faster turning people around, to have the people at the checkpoints, and to be able to do the enforcement because the numbers are so precipitously lower than what they used to be.

What does that mean side by side? A year ago, we had some days we had 12,000 people a day illegally crossing our southern border—12,000 people a day.

Last week, most days were around 200. In fact, for the first time that I can remember in a very long time, when I checked in at the Border Patrol station and was talking with them about where things were going and how things were going and what has changed, as we walked past the area they would typically check in unaccompanied minors, that room was empty. I can't remember the last time I walked past, and there were zero unaccompanied minors that were there.

The border is being enforced. It is bringing some sanity to our southern border. It is an enormous help and change. But there are a couple areas for cartels that are obviously money-making organizations—they are very focused on what they are going to do next.

Literally, right there at the port of entry, they discovered a tunnel being dug directly under the port of entry to be able to smuggle drugs and people in.

Now, our teams were able to find it, identify it, and they are going to shut it down, but the cartels continue to be able to move and to be able to find other ways. We should make no mistake, just across the border from San Diego, there are three active criminal cartels that are ruthlessly killing each other. They are ruthlessly killing anyone that would try to cross the border without paying their fee, and they are determined to bring violence to Northern Mexico and chaos to the Southern United States and push as much drugs as they possibly can into our country. We should make no mistake about that.

They are determined to be able to do that, and we should do whatever we can to be able to stop that violence and that chaos.

The other thing that came up over and over again was now that the southern border—the land border—is being shut down, the cartels are not only drilling tunnels now, but they are also putting folks on jet skis and in Panga boats, taking them out into the Pacific and trying to be able to come around the maritime barrier and be able to drop off somewhere around the California coast.

Just this week, we had a smuggler that was smuggling folks in a Panga boat just on that exact route that capsized in the Pacific, and multiple people died. Our Coast Guard went and responded and rescued multiple people as well. Those folks will be processed, and they will be returned right back to Mexico again.

But that is the kind of danger these folks face to be able to come across. The cartels don't care about the people that they are moving. They just care about the dollars. They don't care about America. They just care about pushing drugs on us so that they can make more and more money.

I had the opportunity to be able to do a ride-along with some of the Coast Guard and be able to see firsthand some of the things that they are doing. They need additional resources. This body should pay more attention to the Coast Guard. They are not only important for our national security or foreign threats coming at us but for our port security and rescues that are off coast, but they are also being pushed really hard right now by the cartels trying to be able to smuggle drugs and people into the United States. The Coast Guard needs this body to be able to stand alongside of them so they can do their job.

They are remarkable people that are literally out there every single day, working to be able to help our country, and I was exceptionally grateful to get time with them to be able to see what their day looks like, how things are going, and the important work that they are doing.

As the Border Patrol is seeing fewer coming across the land border, the Coast Guard is seeing more. So we have got to pay attention to all areas of our border.

I did note a couple things that I have read. That was interesting for me to actually go down and to be able to see because I have seen all these media reports, all these different pieces of fake news that are coming up or all these different challenges about what the Trump administration is doing at our border.

I could highlight a bunch of them, but let me highlight a couple of them that came up. I have heard over and over again that the Trump administration is not honoring due process. They are not honoring due process. They are ignoring the Constitution to be able to do that.

Interestingly enough, just last week, President Trump's DHS released an extensive release that they called 100 days of fighting fake news.

One of the items that they listed as the fake news that they are fighting is that aliens don't go through a process. Their statement: They do, according to the Constitution.

Secretary Rubio also made that same statement on ''Meet the Press'' as well, saying everybody goes through due process—everyone has a process.

Illegal aliens do not have rights like American citizens. No one is denying that. That is a fact. But there is a process they are being taken through. The law is being followed. I watched it personally.

When people come across our border illegally, here is what is actually happening along our border. They are arrested. They are being instructed by law enforcement that they violated American law, that they are not legally present, and they are being immediately turned around and sent back to their country. That is the legal process.

For individuals that were coming in from China—and I saw several that were actually being processed through that—they are being detained. Then they are being put on the next plane out.

Special interest aliens aren't being released into the country anymore like they were under the Biden administration by the thousands. They are now being sent back to their countries, as they exactly should be, following the exact legal process that should be done.

And I saw for the first time in a very long time a legal process being done that if you cross our southern border and you have been deported before—which is why we don't just grab them at the border and turn them around. We actually get fingerprints, get information from people in the processing. If you are coming a second or a third time, I watched the prosecution by U.S. attorneys actually prosecuting individuals there through that process, getting them a felony and then putting them on a bus back to Mexico again.

They are following the law. They are going through exactly what the process is doing. They are doing the legal process.

I also heard over and over again this fake news about our military going down and our military taking over our border. I actually got a chance to be able to meet some of our military down there. They are doing pretty remarkable work along our border.

We have got engineering groups that are there that are helping beef up that border wall, finding areas where folks are finding ways to be able to scale a 30-foot wall, finding ways to be able to strengthen that wall to make sure that never happens again.

That is some of our military engineering groups doing that.

I watched that Lakota helicopter that I mentioned before. That Lakota helicopter is actually a military helicopter. Their job is not to arrest. That is Federal law enforcement on the ground who is doing it, but they are able to be an extra set of eyes in the air to be able to identify folks that are getting around those gaps in the wall, smuggling in people and smuggling in drugs so our Border Patrol can focus in on those areas.

I watched members of our military sitting at a workstation with the Coast Guard at the port area, helping monitor the different cameras that are in our port area, looking for those jet skis and those Panga boats that are smuggling in people and drugs.

They are doing a great job. I am grateful those folks are there. But this body needs to have a further conversation about how do we move more Coast Guard folks there so that they can take on that job, allowing our military to go back to doing their first job. How we can actually reinforce some of the resources that are needed so that our military can do their first task, and our DHS folks can do their first task?

So, yes, it is more fake news that our military is there actually being law enforcement. They are not being law enforcement, but they are helping our law enforcement to make our law enforcement even more effective.

I am grateful to be able see the numbers drop so much, allowing our law enforcement to go back.

If I can just make this one last statement: I won't ever forget standing at that port, which is incredibly busy—lots of trucks coming through, lots of Customs screenings and everything, all the things that are happening—and I asked the Customs folks there: What has changed?

They said: We are able to catch a lot more drugs now than we were able to catch because we have got more time to focus in on catching those drugs.

This is going to make a huge difference in America for us to be able to focus on illegal activity coming across our border. When those numbers drop, we are able to go more after what is the worst of the worst coming into our country.

I am grateful to see the work that is happening on our southern border. We all should go see it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

CLEAN AIR ACT WAIVERS

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, colleagues, when Donald Trump returned to the White House a few months ago, there were a whole lot of people throughout California and beyond that knew that California had a target on its back.

For more than half a century, we have been trailblazers in a number of policy areas but especially in the fight for environmental protections and public health protections.

And for the last decade, we have been proud to—shouldn't have to—but proud to stand up to each and every one of Donald Trump's attacks on our clean air and clean water, not just through his rhetoric but through his actions.

So while the particular procedural battle that we find ourselves in today over the Clean Air Act waivers may be new, the larger war on California's climate leadership and progress is not new.

Thanks to the Clean Air Act, for 50 years, California has had the legal authority to set its own emissions standards to protect the health of our residents and our natural resources. This authority was granted by Congress on a bipartisan basis in recognition of California's unique air quality challenges but also its capabilities as policy leaders.

But today, Republicans are threatening to distort the Congressional Review Act and the CRA process in an effort to slow down our progress.

Now, one of the most outlandish things I have heard from my Republican colleagues these past few weeks—as it pertains to these Clean Air Act waivers—is that they are concerned that these waivers and other regulations would stifle the California economy, that ''the market is not ready,'' or I have heard some say that they are concerned this could raise prices on consumers.

Really? These are the same Republican Members who have stayed silent on Donald Trump's imposed universal tariffs that are actually already increasing prices. So now you are worried about increased costs for American families. Where have you been these last several weeks?

But I have some good news for you: In case you haven't heard, California has proven this argument wrong already. In recent years, you have heard me reference, time and again, that California was the fifth largest economy in the world.

Well, as of a couple weeks ago, California is now the fourth largest economy in the world. Imagine that. Policy leadership, climate leadership, and economic growth, they don't have to be mutually exclusive. We can and must focus on doing both.

Now, California didn't get there by just holding on to technologies of the past. We did so by innovation and investments in clean technologies. So we are proving that you can be for clean air and for business and economic growth.

But I want to be clear in this discussion that it is not just why Republicans are trying to undermine California's climate leadership, it is worth emphasizing the concerns of how they are going about it.

This session, Colleagues, I have the honor of serving as the ranking member of the Rules Committee. I want to make sure that everyone understands what this proposal, this proposed abuse of the CRA process, would actually do here, because, you see, the Clean Air Act was passed under regular order.

So if Republicans want to amend the Clean Air Act to address California's legal authority, bring it up for a vote. But Republicans aren't bringing it up for a vote because they don't have the votes to do so under regular order.

So, instead, they have to try to figure out a back door to avoid the legislative filibuster. They want to kill California's Clean Air Act authority with a lower 51-vote threshold. In plain English, they are trying to change the rules of the Senate in order to please Donald Trump and the Big Oil lobby.

So let me share another bit of news for you in case you have not heard it: The Senate Parliamentarian has already decided that this is not allowed by Senate rules. The Parliamentarian's determination—which I am happy to share with anybody who is interested and has not seen it. The Senate Parliamentarian's determination came after the independent and nonpartisan Government Accountability Office said that the EPA and Republicans were twisting the rules in their efforts to target California twice.

There was a bill introduced around the time of the GAO's findings and before the Parliamentarian's findings, a Republican bill sponsored by the now chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the Environment and Public Works Committee, the fact sheet for this bill says—and I quote:

> California's power to influence national emissions standards . . . is not subject to Congressional review.

Republican bill, Republican fact sheet, that is the purpose of the bill because they know that you can't do this through the CRA process as some are now proposing to do. And yet there are others in the Republican conference that are insisting on moving forward.

So let me remind all of us on both sides of the aisle, the Senate has never overruled the GAO or the Parliamentarian on a CRA question. So it is clear to me that this is about more than just California's climate policies and leadership. This would set a major new precedent that blows way past the bounds of the Congressional Review Act.

It is not an insignificant change to the rules. It is not an insignificant precedent that you would be setting. If successful, it would open the door to ignoring the Parliamentarian on any ruling that you don't like.

And if Republicans can ignore the Parliamentarian on the CRA, then why not the tax rule that they are working so hard on, or healthcare, or anything else?

But luckily, I am holding out some hope because I have come across some remarks by several Senate Republicans with respect to the impact on the rules.

You see, earlier this year, the majority leader said that ignoring the Senate Parliamentarian would be ''totally akin to killing the filibuster. We can't go there.''

This is on the public record.

The junior Senator from Utah said that ''a red line for'' him ''is overruling the Parliamentarian.''

The senior Senator from Maine said she would ''never vote to overturn the Parliamentarian.''

So for other Members who have not taken a position on whether or not they would overrule the Parliamentarian or not, the recognition of it being akin to eliminating the filibuster, that is a redline that maybe you don't want to cross, maybe you do want to cross, but I will call attention to the fact that the redline is here now, and each Member of this body has a decision to make.

The Parliamentarian has ruled that this effort cannot be done on a 51-vote threshold. And if you choose to go forward and overrule the Parliamentarian, just know, there is no going back. All bets are off.

With that, I would like to yield to the ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, my colleague and friend from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I am actually happy to yield to Senator SCHIFF from the California delegation. OK. He is happy with me going, so I will go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, first, both of my colleagues from California are here, and I want to thank them for coming to the floor today to talk about this important matter in which Republicans want to appease their donors, and they want to break basically two Senate rules in order to get there—not just one, but two.

The underlying matter here is about a law, the Clean Air Act, which falls in the jurisdiction of the Environment and Public Works Committee. So that is why I am here.

A different law, the Congressional Review Act, creates a fast-track procedure in the Senate to disapprove Agency rules.

For the most part, that Congressional Review Act, the CRA, is focused on rules during a short period immediately after they are made final and before they go into effect. We get a window where we can disapprove a rule from Congress.

As soon as an Agency finalizes the rule, it submits the rule to the Government Accountability Office and to both Houses of Congress. That starts a 60-day review clock. That CRA also provides a lookback period where a Congress can reach back into the final 60 days of a previous Congress and review rules from a prior administration.

The waivers go way back before the CRA period. Generally, there is no question what constitutes a rule under the CRA. There are different acts that the government can do. There are decisions; there are rules; there are laws.

A rule is a specific thing under the CRA. Sometimes there are problems. Sometimes Agencies don't submit actions to Congress that have typically been deemed rules, and sometimes, as here, they submit as rules actions that have never previously been considered rules.

GAO polices whether the submitted action was, in fact, a rule. That is the law. That is a GAO legal responsibility. GAO has weighed in about 60 times in the history of the Congressional Review Act. When GAO determined that the action involved was a rule, the action was then deemed submitted and the review clock started.

When GAO determined the action was not a rule, that was the end of it. Congress stood down. No one—no one—moved a CRA resolution of disapproval following a negative finding by the GAO. Never.

Which brings us to this first oddity. In 2023, Members asked GAO whether an EPA Clean Air Act waiver decision for California was a Federal rule for purposes of the CRA. GAO said, no, correctly, because it wasn't.

Like every other time, that settled that. And GAO's ''no'' comported with the text of the CRA and the waiver provision originally in the Clean Air Act that created the California exception and 50 years of Agency precedent treating waivers as decisions, a different type of adjudication which the Administrator Procedure Act distinguishes from rules.

EPA itself, across multiple administrations, Republican and Democrat, never, never called waivers rules under the CRA, not even under the first Trump administration.

Then, in February, after much lobbying by the oil industry, the Trump EPA submitted notices of three waiver decisions, one from more than 2 years ago, far beyond that 60-day lookback period. Upon a request from the three of us, the two Senators from California and myself as ranking member, GAO confirmed its previous 2023 opinion not long ago—this is not ancient history—and found that notwithstanding EPA's politically motivated submissions to try to get into that CRA window, the California waivers simply are not rules. So the CRA does not apply.

GAO pointed out to EPA that the waiver notices, on their face, indicate that they are decisions rather than rules. But that wasn't enough, so we had to go to the Parliamentarian, who heard arguments and debate from both sides, and the Parliamentarian affirmed GAO's decision.

I will offer the opinion that it was not even a close call because the unblemished record has always been that this is not a rule over decades.

The Parliamentarian ruled that Clean Air Act waivers do not qualify for expedited consideration under the Congressional Review Act. Every other time the Senate has reached this point, every other time, Members have respected the decision of the Parliamentarian and that ended the matter. Not this time.

This time, a faction in the Republican Party wants to overturn decades of precedent, ignore the GAO and the Parliamentarian, who are the lawful guardians of this process, and steamroll forward in violation of the plain text of the Congressional Review Act by deploying the nuclear option.

Once there is precedent that anything an Agency does can be considered a rule, the time and scope limits of the Congressional Review Act have no meaning. Any Agency action ever could be swallowed up in the new Congressional Review Act definition.

Think about how the Trump administration might abuse this. At least one Member of this body previously asked GAO if FDA's decision to allow pharmacies to dispense mifepristone qualified as a rule for the purposes of the CRA. GAO said no, and it ended there. If we overrule GAO and the Parliamentarian on the waivers, nothing stops the Trump FDA from submitting the decision as a rule and Members from introducing a disapproval resolution and proceeding through this new loophole.

Everyone knows by now that President Trump has a beef with a whole host of media outlets, some of which are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. What is to stop the FCC from submitting, say, CBS's license as a rule? And Members from introducing a disapproval resolution? Is this really the path we want the Senate to go down?

A future Democratic administration could submit every oil and gas lease issued since 1996 as a rule and pursue disapproval of them under the Congressional Review Act.

Colleagues, we have already given away too many article I powers to the executive branch, do we really want to give the executive branch this power to submit anything and everything as a rule and allow Members to hijack the floor with CRA resolutions? That would be a new way for this Senate to work.

Then there is the question of overruling the Parliamentarian, the nuclear option. The import of overruling the Parliamentarian extends way beyond Congressional Review Act resolutions. Once you have overruled the Parliamentarian on a legislative matter, there is no going back. All bets are off.

Any future majority would have precedent to overrule the Parliamentarian on any legislative matter. There is no cabining such a decision. It is tantamount to eliminating the filibuster. Once ''you give a mouse a cookie,'' it never ends.

Pretend all you want that these waivers are exceptional or that any precedent overruling the Parliamentarian would be limited. That is not the way it works. Soon, some Members will think their thing is exceptional and push to use this precedent, and on and on it will go, if you give the mouse the cookie.

You would be upending 50 years of treating preemption waivers as Agency decisions and not rules, 30 years of deferring to the GAO and the Parliamentarian on what constitutes a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act, and centuries of Senate precedent and procedure—all that while there is actually another path.

In 2019, the first Trump EPA used the administrative process, the Administrative Procedures Act, to withdraw a previously granted Clean Air Act waiver that permitted California to set car standards.

So I ask my Republican colleagues: Is this worth it? Is it worth going nuclear in the Senate to accomplish something that the EPA could try to accomplish under the Administrative Procedures Act on its own? Is it worth going nuclear, knowing full well the Pandora's box this will open?

I will close with the advice my colleague from California shared from the majority leader, the senior Senator from South Dakota. He said earlier this year that overruling the Parliamentarian would be—and I quote him—''totally akin to killing the filibuster. We can't go there. People need to understand that.''

So, please, do understand that, and don't go there.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his remarks. He has been our environmental champion in the Congress for many years, and he led the effort to insist that the Senate follow the rules when it comes to protecting our environment and when it comes to preserving the power of the Parliamentarian.

Mr. President, this is downtown Los Angeles in 1955. It was the postwar era, with the rise of the personal automobile, the baby boom, and the rapid expansion of American cities and suburbs in the West. Suddenly, millions of families were experiencing firsthand, and for the first time, the most serious environmental impacts of unchecked industrial and manufacturing activity. Many could not walk through the streets of our cities without handkerchiefs to their face.

The iconic Ford and Chevy automobiles of the 1950s and 1960s kept their roofs shut. And, in some cases, the smog was so bad that people mistook it for a chemical weapons attack. And here is the thing: It got worse, not better, over the coming decades.

President Trump often speaks of restoring America, of making America great again, taking us back to that postwar period, with the rapid economic expansion and runaway prosperity of the wonder years. Well, his tariff wars have ended any hopes of an economic boom, and he now has the country headed in exactly the wrong direction, toward an economic bust instead.

And if he and Republicans get their way in the coming days, our Nation and our air will be on a trajectory back to 1955, all right. We will make an America where our spacious skies will be clogged and smoggy and our purple mountains' majesty will be hidden behind a haze that comes with letting oil companies call all the shots in Washington.

Back then, in reaction to these horrific air conditions, as well as devastating oil spills and other environmental hazards, California helped launch the modern environmental movement. In 1966, California became the first State to regulate tailpipe emissions to tackle this smog head-on. In fact, some of our biggest achievements and biggest actions took place under Republican Governors.

And wouldn't you take action? I mean, look at this. If this was your city, if this was your State, wouldn't you take action to deal with air pollution this bad, where you can barely make out the skyline, the skyscrapers? Where a body of lawmakers, many of whom, like me, served in State legislatures before coming to Congress, if you saw your State schoolchildren being choked by smog like this, wouldn't you see it as your job to step up, regardless of party politics? That is the fundamental right of any State and its legislature. In the face of threats against your kids and your own families, you do something.

And that is what California did and has continued to do, so often setting the standard for the rest of the country.

We in California are 1 out of every 10 Americans. We have a right to protect our citizens, our environment, our ability to live. After all, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are all impossible if we can't breathe.

In the 1960s, through the Clean Air Act, Congress granted California the ability to set standards for itself when it comes to air pollution. Under Republican President Richard Nixon, we even formed the Environmental Protection Agency. Through Democratic and Republican administrations and Congresses, that authority and promise has been upheld. Nearly 60 years of environmental protection has made the Golden State the gold standard for protecting our planet.

But now Republicans in Congress and Donald Trump are willing to ignore their own promises to punish California and to reward Big Oil. They are trying to break the Senate rules to make California's air dirtier, to make it harder and less safe for Californians to breathe, all to please the oil industry.

That is just wrong. And don't take it from me. ''We can't go there.'' That is what the Senate majority leader said about the prospect of overruling the Parliamentarian merely 5 months ago, as did his Republican predecessor, who said:

> Abiding by the ruling of the Parliamentarian is central to the function of the Senate.

The Senate Parliamentarian, he said, is the ''final'' word.

And, please, if they try to tell you this is not overturning the Parliamentarian, you must not believe them. The Parliamentarian has ruled that this device—this mechanism—cannot be used to overturn California's waiver and its ability to set its own air standards. This ruling from the Senate's independent referee has been explicit and direct, and it should be respected.

I realize I am a newcomer to the Senate, and I will not ask my colleagues to stand on the long traditions of this institution, which I barely know, but they must stand by their commitments. They must stand by a State's right to make its own laws to protect its own citizens.

If the Senate goes nuclear overruling the Parliamentarian, there is no telling where the Congressional Review Act will be used in the future, by Republicans or Democrats.

Could the Senate merely vote to wipe out an entire 4 years of actions taken by a previous President? Will your State's regulations be next? What about your State's funding, your State's ability to administer programs like the Clean Water Act?

Precedent can be a hard thing to make tangible, but this is our history. This is what awaits us if we go down this dangerous road: air like this.

We will not stand idly by as this administration fights to make California's air unhealthy again. We will fight this. We must.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 76.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Monica Crowley, of New York, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 76, Monica Crowley, of New York, to be Chief of Protocol, and to have the rank of Ambassador during her tenure of service.

John Thune, James C. Justice, Ted Cruz, Bernie Moreno, Jon Husted, Steve Daines, John R. Curtis, Tommy Tuberville, Tim Sheehy, Pete Ricketts, Joni Ernst, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Eric Schmitt, Katie Boyd Britt, John Barrasso.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 69.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Reed Rubinstein, of Maryland, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 69, Reed Rubinstein, of Maryland, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

John Thune, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John R. Curtis, Rick Scott of Florida, Bernie Moreno, Pete Ricketts, Eric Schmitt, Jon A. Husted, Roger Marshall, Jim Justice, Tommy Tuberville, Bill Hagerty, Joni Ernst, James E. Risch, Marsha Blackburn, Tim Sheehy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 71.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Troy Meink, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 71, Troy Meink, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Air Force.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Cynthia M. Lummis, Mike Rounds, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger F. Wicker, Katie Boyd Britt, Steve Daines, John Boozman, John R. Curtis, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Dan Sullivan, Bernie Moreno, James C. Justice.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to Calendar No. 66, S. 1582, be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to address President Trump's dangerous and inappropriate use of the U.S. military to carry out his immigration enforcement campaign.

Before I discuss the Trump administration's spending nearly half a billion dollars and sending tens of thousands of troops, ships, combat vehicles, and aircraft away from their real missions, I want to make clear that border security is a priority. I do not support open borders, and I believe that those who enter the United States and break our laws should be subject to deportation in accordance with the law and due process. I voted time and time again for billions of dollars of increased support for border agents, detection technology, and physical barriers where it made sense.

Mr. President, it is no secret that our borders have been under pressure for more than a decade because of a broken immigration system that congressional Republicans have consistently refused to help fix. We have considered bipartisan immigration reform bills in 2006, in 2007, in 2013, and in 2024, all of which were shut down by Republicans. The mess that we have today rests largely on their decision to put political advantage above real progress.

Now President Trump is ignoring Congress, ignoring the law, ignoring the courts, and ignoring the Constitution in order to implement an immigration policy that fails to respect due process, adversely impacts our innovation economy, and, to the point of my remarks, degrades our military.

In the name of his anti-immigrant efforts, President Trump is using the U.S. military to conduct operations on American soil that it has neither the training nor the authority to carry out. Our troops, who are already stretched thin for time and resources, are now burning time, assets, morale, and readiness for these overblown operations.

The President has declared an emergency at the border to justify using the military for civilian law enforcement—this despite border encounters currently at the lowest level since August of 2020. Over the past 12 months since President Biden's Executive actions last June, there has been a continued, significant decrease in unlawful border crossings, including a more than 60-percent decrease in encounters from May 2024 to December 2024.

In short, all along the southern border, we have seen a dramatic drop in illegal crossings and migrant encounters well before President Trump took office. A national emergency? It does not seem so.

We already have an entire Federal Agency to protect our borders and address illegal immigration: the Department of Homeland Security. DHS includes Customs and Border Protection, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, and other law enforcement groups. I have voted consistently to give these Agencies additional resources to carry out their missions. But immigration enforcement is not and must not become a function of the Department of Defense.

Our military has long provided technical and logistical support to DHS at the border but always and exclusively in a supporting role, drawing a clear line between military law enforcement authorities. Indeed, since the Reconstruction era, U.S. Presidents have been prohibited from using the military in civilian law enforcement by a law known as the Posse Comitatus Act. This law has kept the Commander in Chief from wielding the military as a domestic political weapon, and it continues to provide an important check on the President's ability to use the military domestically against American citizens.

I understand American citizens asking if it matters which Department enforces immigration as long as the job gets done. Well, there are plenty of reasons to be concerned by the President's current approach even if one agrees with him politically.

Most alarmingly, President Trump is taking real steps to militarize immigration enforcement. Once he uses the military for this reason, it will be easier for him to use it for other purposes. And given the tenor of his public statements, it is a reasonable fear that he may someday order the use of the Armed Forces in American cities and against American citizens.

Indeed, the Brennan Center—a law and public policy institution—recently analyzed President Trump's military actions at the border and concluded:

> Using the military for border enforcement is a slippery slope. If soldiers are allowed to take on domestic policing roles at the border, it may become easier to justify uses of the military in the U.S. interior in the future. Our nation's founders warned against the dangers of an army turned inward, which can all too easily be turned into an instrument of tyranny.

Beyond these concerns, there are real, immediate consequences for our troops, which we are seeing right now.

One of the military's top priorities is readiness. America faces real, growing threats from China, Russia, Iran, and other adversaries, and the Department of Defense needs to be laser-focused on preparing troops to defend our interests abroad. It is difficult to explain the border missions as anything but a distraction from readiness.

We should acknowledge the jobs that our troops are actually doing there. In the past, up to 2,000 National Guard and Reserve troops would rotate to the border each year to assist DHS and Customs and Border Patrol with basic monitoring, logistics, and warehousing activities—non-law enforcement activities. These missions were designed to be ''behind the scenes'' to free up Border Patrol agents from administrative duties and return them back to the field to conduct their core mission of immigration enforcement.

Today, however, President Trump has surged more than 12,000 Active-Duty troops to the border to carry out a variety of expanded missions that do not look anything like ''behind the scenes.'' For example, one Marine battalion has been stringing miles and miles of barbed wire across the California mountains. Multiple Army infantry companies are patrolling the Rio Grande riverbank on foot with loaded rifles. Navy aircrews are flying P–8 Poseidons—the most advanced submarine-hunting planes in the world, and they are flying them over the desert. Two Navy destroyers are loitering off our east and west coasts, looking for migrant boats in the water. At least one Army transportation unit is changing the oil and tires on Border Patrol trucks all day and every day.

In addition, the administration has wasted massive amounts of defense dollars by flying migrants out of the country using military aircraft. Often, they have had to return them to the U.S. mainland just a few days later. According to U.S. Transportation Command, it costs at least $20,000 per flight hour to use a C–130 and $28,500 per hour to use a C–17. In comparison, contracted ICE flights that regularly transport migrants inside of the United States cost only $8,500 per flight hour.

President Trump's decision to use military aircraft instead of ICE aircraft to shuttle migrants across the globe to as far away as India is a gross misuse of taxpayers' dollars and servicemembers' time.

Just yesterday, we learned that the White House wanted to fly migrants on military aircraft to Libya, which is one of the most dangerous, hostile locations on Earth. Human rights groups have called the conditions in Libya's network of migrant detention centers ''horrific'' and ''deplorable.'' The plan has been canceled for now, but it is unconscionable for the Trump administration to consider sending migrants to Libya and endangering our troops in the process.

Further, the Department of Defense has informed Congress that the current surge in border missions, including troop deployment and military flights, could cost as much as $2 billion by the end of this fiscal year.

Secretary Hegseth has claimed that the border mission is so overwhelming that we will have to withdraw massive numbers of troops from Europe in order to meet the demand. Incredibly, he has also claimed that the border mission will have ''no impact'' on our military readiness.

However, we know that these border missions are harming military readiness. Last month, when the NORTHCOM commander testified before the Armed Services Committee, I asked how his forces on the border mission are maintaining their required military readiness and required training. He testified that his troops are spending 5 days a week supporting Customs and Border Patrol and other Agencies and only 1 day a week training. In other words, 20 percent—at most—of our servicemembers' time is being spent training on their critical military tasks.

In my personal engagements with commanders at all levels, they have made clear that readying their formations requires extensive time and training as well as stability for families. Border missions will not build these warfighting requirements. Border missions will distract from training, drain resources, and undermine readiness.

The Government Accountability Office, or GAO, has assessed previous support missions to DHS and found them to be detrimental to unit readiness. Specifically, in its 2021 report, GAO found that ''separating units in order to assign a portion of them to the southwest border mission was a consistent trend in degrading readiness ratings.''

In February, President Trump issued an unprecedented order to the Defense Department to begin transporting and detaining migrants at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. For decades, the U.S. Naval Station at Guantanamo Bay has housed a facility called the Migrant Operations Center that is used to temporarily house migrants who are saved at sea while traveling in unsafe vessels from Cuba, Haiti, or other nearby nations. The facility is typically unoccupied and is kept in a low-level operational readiness until needed—that is, until February.

The intended use of the center was never to house migrants flown from the United States to Guantanamo Bay. Nevertheless, President Trump ordered the military to expand the Migrant Operations Center to accommodate up to 30,000 migrants who would be brought there from the United States.

Within weeks, approximately 1,000 Active-Duty troops were sent to Guantanamo to build tents for this massive number of migrants. However, once built, the tents were found not to meet ICE standards, and to date, they have never been used and are now being dismantled. The hundreds of troops sent down for the mission have had very little to do in the meantime.

Since February, around 500 individuals identified by the administration as illegal migrants have been flown to Guantanamo Bay, and most have been detained for no more than 2 weeks. Rather than being taken to the Migrant Operations Center, about half of these migrants have been held on the other side of the island at the detention facility that was built and used for law of war detainees, such as 9/11 terrorist Khalid Shaikh Mohammed.

There are currently 15 law of war detainees remaining on Guantanamo Bay. The facilities housing these detainees have deteriorated significantly in the 20 years since they were built. The military personnel who guard these individuals also endure the same tough conditions in these dilapidated facilities. Needless to say, these servicemembers have been stretched thin.

Last fall, it was a significant morale boost for them when the remaining law of war detainees were moved to a ''newer'' facility. Naturally, it was a blow, then, to their morale when, just 1 month later, they were ordered back to the older, more decrepit facility to make way for migrants at the newer facility.

While it is crystal clear the military is in charge of the law of war detention center at Guantanamo Bay, it is not clear who is legally responsible for the migrants being held there. Longstanding law dictates that U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement maintain ''custody and control'' of migrants, but in the detention center, the military maintains control.

This leads to questions about who is in charge and who is accountable. When I have asked those questions, the answers have often been contradictory, and that is disturbing.

To investigate these issues, I traveled to Guantanamo Bay in March with several colleagues, including Senators SHAHEEN, PETERS, KING, and PADILLA. We conducted a firsthand examination of the missions underway there and met with military servicemembers, ICE officers, and DHS officials to fully understand the costs and military readiness impacts of these missions. The trip raised many new questions and concerns.

I have grave doubts about the legality of removing migrants from the United States to Cuba, a foreign nation, and detaining them there. There are at least a dozen open cases and court orders impacting the Guantanamo mission. The detention center has only been used for law of war detainees, and it is reckless to equate migrants with international war criminals. I was also outraged by the scale of wastefulness we found there.

It is obvious Guantanamo Bay is an illogical location to detain migrants. The staggering financial cost to fly these migrants out of the United States and detain them at Guantanamo Bay—a mission costing tens of millions of dollars a month—is an insult to American taxpayers. President Trump could implement his immigration policies for a fraction of the cost by using existing ICE facilities in the United States, but he is obsessed with the image of using Guantanamo no matter the cost.

I am also frustrated that my Senate colleagues and I had to fly to Cuba to get answers to the questions that Secretary Hegseth and Homeland Security Secretary Noem have been ducking for months. By avoiding questions, they are putting servicemembers and officers on the ground in the position of trying to make sense of contradictory and political orders without any guidance or support from the Pentagon or DHS headquarters.

Since coming into office, the Trump administration has expanded the role of the military in immigration enforcement in other troubling ways. The movement of migrants from the U.S. to Guantanamo Bay is unprecedented, and the buildup of 12,000 Active-Duty troops at the southern border, including the Army's 10th Mountain Division and 100 armored Stryker combat vehicles, has a huge impact on our military posture. This is a larger force than we deployed to Afghanistan in 2002 and 2003. This administration has purposely placed many of our military forces into the immigration debate in this country, and I fear it will also place them in legal and ethical risk.

For example, on March 30—shown in the photograph here—a military flight traveled from Guantanamo Bay to El Salvador with foreign nationals on board, including seven Venezuelans. To my understanding, not a single DHS official or civilian was on the flight, meaning that military personnel maintained both custody and control of the migrants, contrary to longstanding DOD policy and practice.

Here, as I said, is an image of that plane unloading in El Salvador. As you can see, the crew does not appear to include any DHS officials or civilian law enforcement personnel—only uniformed troops, who are physically handing migrants to the Salvadoran police.

This flight would clearly have been in violation of various immigration laws and policies, recent judicial orders, and the Posse Comitatus Act, as the military carried out a core law enforcement function of deportation without any DHS official present. After the fact, the administration tried to explain itself by saying it used ''counterterrorism'' authorities rather than law enforcement authorities. I am not aware of any counterterrorism authorities that would authorize such a flight.

Accordingly, last month, I sent a letter to the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General, asking that office to conduct an inquiry into the incident and any laws or Defense Department policies that may have been violated. I expect the IG to exercise his independence in carrying out this inquiry, and I am disturbed that the administration continues to put servicemembers in legal and physical jeopardy through these reckless orders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, April 23, 2025.

DEAR MR. STEBBINS: Recent public reporting raises issues about the propriety and legality of a March 30th military flight from Guantanamo Bay to El Salvador transporting 17 foreign nationals, including seven Venezuelan nationals to El Salvador. In particular, the transport of the Venezuelan nationals raises enforcement concerns under various immigration laws and policy, including the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. §1101 et seq., the regulations implementing the INA, Federal law and policy concerning the transport of migrants to third countries under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA), and compliance with recent judicial orders concerning deportations under that Act. Most concerningly, however, from the perspective of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the proper use of DOD personnel, we understand that there were no personnel from the Department of Homeland Security on this flight, meaning that military personnel maintained both custody and control of the migrants, contrary to longstanding DOD policy and practice.

According to government information, the Administration relied on ''counter-terrorism'' authorities rather than law enforcement authorities to conduct this deportation. We are unaware of which counter-terrorism authorities, if any, would authorize these flights.

Accordingly, we ask that you conduct an inquiry into, and provide us an assessment of, the following:

1. The facts and circumstances surrounding the above referenced flight(s), including:

a. The approval authority for this flight, and any subsequent approvals through the military chain of command authorizing the flight(s), including, but not limited to, members of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), and the Commanders and staff of U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Southern Command, U.S. Transportation Command, Joint Task Force Southern Guard, Joint Task Force Guantanamo Bay.

b. A copy of the legal review conducted by any party identified in section 1.a. opining on the legal authority to execute the flight(s), including, but not limited to. the OSD Office of General Counsel, and the Staff Judge Advocates of U.S. Northern Command, U.S. Southern Command, U.S. Transportation Command, Joint Task Force Southern Guard, Joint Task Force Guantanamo Bay.

c. Identification of the legal authorities under which the flight(s) were executed.

d. Identification of which parties identified in sections 1.a. and 1.b. had knowledge of the flight(s) prior to them transpiring.

e. Identification of which DOD elements, aircraft, and personnel participated in those flights.

2. Whether this flight complied with Federal law and policy, including but not limited to, the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. §1101 et seq., the regulations implementing the INA, and Federal law and policy concerning the transport of migrants to third countries under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA).

3. DOD's adherence to law and policies concerning DOD support to civil authorities and conduct of law enforcement activities, including, but not limited to:

a. Section 1385 of Title 18, U.S. Code (Posse Comitatus Act)

b. Section 275 of Title 10, U.S. Code (Restriction on direct participation by military personnel)

c. DOD Directive 3025.18 (defense support of civil authorities)

d. DOD Instruction 3025.21 (defense support of civilian law enforcement agencies)

4. DOD's reliance on ''counter-terrorism'' authorities to unilaterally conduct this flight, an enumeration of those policies, and an assessment of whether DOD's reliance on those authorities is appropriate and consistent with law and policy.

5. Any other matter you determine in the course of your review to be relevant to the proper application of law and policy to these circumstances.

Sincerely.

JACK REED,
Ranking Member.

Mr. REED. I am also concerned about the Trump administration's dubious creation of ''National Defense Areas'' along the southern border in the last several weeks. These National Defense Areas, first designated in New Mexico and later expanded into Texas, were created when the Department of the Interior transferred land, including the Roosevelt Reservation—a 60-foot-wide strip along the border—to the Department of Defense. So now, large swaths of the border are considered military installations.

The administration has created these zones so that, when a migrant crosses the border in those areas, prosecutors can charge them with both entering the United States illegally and trespassing on a military installation. In effect, the National Defense Zones evade the longstanding protections of the Posse Comitatus Act by allowing military forces to act as de facto border police, detaining migrants until they can be transferred to Customs and Border Protection. In the administration's telling, this approach permits military involvement in immigration control without invoking the Insurrection Act of 1807.

This is both unprecedented and, indeed, a legal fiction. Again, as the Brennan Center report found:

> No matter how the Trump administration frames these activities . . . they are civilian law enforcement functions. He cannot turn them into military operations by misusing the language of war. These civilian law enforcement activities are not ''incidental''—they are the reason for creating the installation.

The administration is also considering using military bases to detain thousands of migrants inside the United States. Unlike in past emergencies, when military bases near the border were used to hold migrants during large surges, this administration is seeking to use installations deep within the country, including in New Jersey, Indiana, Delaware, California, and Virginia. One could be forgiven for extrapolating that these bases are being selected to hold round-ups of migrants in major cities.

The President is not taking these military actions out of necessity; he is testing the boundaries of our legal system and, in my view, violating them. If left unchecked and unchallenged, he will go much, much further in employing the Armed Forces in to enforce domestic immigration laws, traditionally a civilian law enforcement function.

For years, Mr. Trump has publicly expressed his desire to use U.S. military personnel for domestic law enforcement. During the last campaign, he repeatedly claimed that, if elected, he would order the National Guard and Active-Duty military to carry out mass deportations of undocumented migrants. He even said that he would deploy the military to conduct local law enforcement in cities and that troops could shoot shoplifters leaving the scene of a crime.

The President's defenders often say that he is joking or exaggerating when he makes such claims, but we know these are not idle threats. In his first 100 days in office, he has declared multiple national emergencies and has invoked the Alien Enemies Act of 1798 to deport migrants without due process. Indeed, he has even unapologetically deported U.S. citizens in violation of the Constitution. We have all seen the chilling videos of masked and hooded ICE agents arresting civilians on the street—scenes we are accustomed to seeing on the nightly news, not here but in countries run by dictators.

The administration is expanding its operation one step at a time, and President Trump's deployment of forces to the border, the military deportation flights, and the establishment of National Defense Areas can be interpreted as setting the stage to invoke the Insurrection Act and order the military to carry out domestic law enforcement inside the country.

In fact, we have seen the situation before. In June of 2020, then-President Trump, infuriated by protesters in front of the White House and across the country, ordered his staff to prepare to invoke the Insurrection Act to allow him to deploy Active-Duty military forces to patrol the streets of DC and other cities. Then-Defense Secretary Mark Esper and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mark Milley talked him out of it, but the President clearly views this as a serious option.

Beyond the immorality of Trump's desire to deploy military domestically, to do so would simply be illegal. As I mentioned, the doctrine of posse comitatus is sacred in our Nation to separate the military from direct law enforcement responsibilities.

The use of National Guard or Active-Duty troops should be reserved only to those rare circumstances where civilian law enforcement has collapsed and State leaders have specifically asked for Presidential assistance. Their deployment should never be at the sole discretion of a President, as President Trump has demonstrated that such power begs abuse.

Ultimately, U.S. military members are trained to engage the enemies of the United States abroad with deadly force, not to arrest migrants on the southern border or to deport them from U.S. cities. The military has a sacred role in our country, but the public's trust is easily lost, and a pillar of our society is cracked when the Commander in Chief uses the military recklessly.

Our constitutional system is fundamentally designed to separate military and civilian roles, reserving police powers for law enforcement agencies and endowing the military with the superior weaponry and firepower necessary to fight and win the Nation's wars. When we allow the military to be used in the routine exercise of the police power, the Nation teeters on the brink of autocracy and military rule. One need not be a student of history to see how easily this backsliding can occur. It is all around us in the world today.

Trump's clear intent to use the military in potentially illegal and certainly inappropriate ways for his own political benefit is antithetical to the spirit of our American democracy. Such power is the hallmark of authoritarians around the world.

President Trump and Secretary Hegseth must use common sense, follow the law, and immediately cease the military border deployments and deportation flights.

And, my colleagues, particularly my colleagues in the majority, should demand the same and hold the administration accountable for its actions.

I yield the floor.

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

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks and ask that Senator HAGERTY have 7 minutes to complete his remarks before the vote.

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

S. 1582

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today because the United States is behind when it comes to digital assets.

American digital asset innovation has faced a challenging environment, with talent, investment, and development often relocating to more welcoming international jurisdictions like Singapore, Switzerland, and the UAE. These countries have created clear frameworks, specifically designed to attract blockchain ventures while the United States has generally maintained a less defined regulatory landscape that has inadvertently encouraged this exodus of opportunity and expertise.

This week, we have the opportunity to start to change that, and we must grab the reins and ensure that all Americans are able to take charge of their financial futures.

The last White House blocked us, but now we have a President who not only sees the immeasurable value digital assets have but is willing to firmly secure America's leadership in this space.

Before he even took office, President Trump announced he had tapped David Sacks to serve as the White House AI and Crypto Czar, ensuring we maintain America's competitive edge, and issued a blitz of Executive actions targeting heavy-handed SEC tactics slowing down progress.

Under President Trump, we have seen a significant shift in the executive branch's attitude toward digital assets. It is night and day what we experienced under the Biden administration. President Trump's promise to make America the digital asset capital of the world wasn't just lip service; it was a strategic vision—recognizing that dollar-backed stablecoins represent a critical opportunity to extend American financial influence in an increasingly digital world—and a call to action. Decades from now, students will read about the foresight of the President and the 119th Congress in moving this issue to the forefront.

I want to make clear that this is not a partisan issue. I have spent years—years—working with Senator GILLIBRAND of New York to ensure that we have crafted a bipartisan proposal that can get across the finish line—a lot of late nights, early morning phone calls, thousands of hours of our staffs going back and forth on policy.

I want to thank Senator GILLIBRAND and her team for all their hard work, for working with my team in good faith, and for always pushing to make this legislation stronger.

We have incorporated feedback from both Democrats and Republicans—many, many, many, many Democrat amendments. We have been working for days—recently, days—to bring this bill to the floor and to satisfy our colleagues across the aisle. I truly appreciate everyone who has engaged on this issue. We have the opportunity now to be in the driver's seat and install commonsense regulations that are tailor-made for American-based digital asset companies. The digital future is something to embrace. We are witnessing the dawn of a modern 21st century economy that can benefit all Americans through technical innovation.

This Congress, I joined with Senator BILL HAGERTY of Tennessee to cosponsor his Guiding and Establishing National Innovation for U.S. Stablecoins Act, or the GENIUS Act—legislation which provides robust consumer protections without sacrificing innovation. And now, thanks to Leader THUNE's leadership, the hard work of Senator HAGERTY, Chairman SCOTT, Senator GILLIBRAND, and our shared commitment to maintaining U.S. leadership in this space, we can begin the bipartisan proposal and move it one step closer to becoming law.

At its core, the GENIUS Act protects consumers through mandatory 100-percent reserve backing with U.S. dollars and short-term Treasurys, the monthly public disclosure of reserve composition, and strict prohibitions against misleading marketing.

Put simply, this isn't just another bill. It is a comprehensive framework, ensuring America leads the next generation of financial technology in stablecoins.

Just minutes ago, an American was elected Pope. His name will be Leo XIV—an American leading one of the strongest religious organizations in the world. We should also be leading in financial innovation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I want to compliment my colleague from Wyoming for the wonderful introduction that she gave. That means that I don't need to give the many, many pages of speech that I had planned. But I would like to come to one final point, and that is for the benefit of my colleagues today.

I want to take a broader view of what we are actually voting on. What we are voting on is ''cloture.'' That is a term that is used to get on the bill, to actually have the debate that we are supposed to conduct here in the U.S. Senate. It is the beginning of debate for a bill that fundamentally supports crypto technology and innovation here in America at the most basic level.

My Democratic colleagues supported this, coming through a committee on a bipartisan basis. In fact, we had a vote of 18 to 6, a very strong movement out of committee.

Since that time, we have made a number of changes at their request. They have come back again with more requests. We are considering those changes as well. But for us to even begin to implement these changes, we are going to have to get on this bill in order to debate it and in order to incorporate the changes that have been negotiated.

I look forward to working with my colleagues should they choose to move forward on this bill. And if they don't, I want the American public and I want everybody watching today to understand that this is a vote to kill the crypto industry here in America, and it is a shame.

This is our first opportunity to deliver groundbreaking legislation to America that puts America squarely in the most competitive place we possibly could be, to lead in the area of innovation where we need to be leading. Otherwise, this would be a vote to push all of that offshore. It is a vote for our strength.

I want to thank the Senators who have helped so much: Senator SCOTT and Senator LUMMIS from our side. And I want to thank Senators GILLIBRAND and ALSOBROOKS from the Democrat side. I want to thank everybody who has worked so hard on this. And I hope that we will be able to move forward, actually get on this bill, and complete our work.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 66, S. 1582, a bill to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Ted Budd, Katie Boyd Britt, John Cornyn, Deb Fischer, Roger Marshall, Jim Justice, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Mike Crapo, Tommy Tuberville, Bill Hagerty, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Markwayne Mullin, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Cynthia M. Lummis, Rick Scott of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1582

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, we made some great progress this past week. I greatly—greatly—appreciate the work that we have done in a bipartisan manner.

I want to thank my fellow colleagues across the aisle: Senator WARNER, Senators LUMMIS, HAGERTY, Chairman SCOTT, Senators ALSOBROOKS and LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER. They really have been working hard to get a good product, and it was done in good faith. And I really want to thank my Republican colleagues for doing this.

The reason you are hearing some hesitancy is the legislation of this scope and importance really just cannot be rushed, and we need time both to educate our colleagues and people.

We are not shutting down. We don't want to shut this down to the point where we are ending all this work that we have put into it. We want to bring this economy and this innovation to the United States, and I am asking for that time.

I want to be clear that you do have enough Members across the aisle who want to see this passed in a good manner. So what I am going to be asking for is that we collapse today's vote and Monday's vote into a single vote on Monday.

I believe there is a pathway for us to actually get this done, get good language, and have a bipartisan win for this country.

All this agreement is asking for is simply to combine today's and Monday's vote. It would not add or reduce any floor time compared to just taking this vote today. So I ask for unanimous consent to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1582, a bill to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 240 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—3

Moran	Smith	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I change my vote to no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion, the yeas are 48, the nays are 49.

On this vote, three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

GENIUS ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just say that the Democrats have just used the filibuster for the fourth time this year. Why? Well, in this case, no one really knows.

This is a bipartisan issue. It is a bipartisan bill, and it had a bipartisan process from the very beginning. And if Democrats were interested in further changes, as they claim, they would have had the chance to make those changes on the floor. All they had to do was vote for cloture.

Not every bill that comes to the floor is a final bill. Now, that may be how it worked when they were in control, but Republicans are doing it differently. We are determined to restore the Senate to what it was meant to be.

The floor is where every Senator gets a chance to give his or her input on legislation. That is what would have happened today if cloture had been invoked, the motion the Democrats just voted against. It would have meant open debate, further deliberations, further modifications. But the Democrats refused to even begin that debate.

I don't know what Democrats would change about the process this bill has gone through. It had a 3-hour markup in the Banking Committee that considered 40 amendments. That is what we used to call regular order around here.

It was reported out of the Banking Committee by a vote of 18 to 6, with 5 Democrats supporting the bill. And since the markup, Senators have been meeting nonstop to modify the bill on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans—countless meetings.

In fact, there have been fully six versions of this bill and numerous modifications made, many of them to satisfy the Democrats' demands—six versions of this bill based on feedback and input from Members on both sides and, in many cases, modifications made that were done in response to demands made by Democrats in the bill—six versions.

I don't know how you can have any more process than that. Democrats have been accommodated every step of the way, up to and including long sessions yesterday and late into the night last night.

Mr. President, I just have to say, frankly, I just don't get it. I don't know what more they want. I don't know why you vote against proceeding to a bill on the floor after you voted to refer that same bill to the floor, as a number of Democrats, as I just said, did coming out of the Banking Committee, which, of course, makes you wonder if this is about the bill at all or if it is simply Democrats obstructing because they want to deny Republicans or President Trump a bipartisan win. Given the fact that the Democrats keep moving the goalposts, it is hard not to suspect that is the case, and I have to say that is deeply disappointing.

I strongly support this bill, but I have now changed my vote to no today so that we can bring this legislation up again if and when Democrats are ready to get serious. Clearly, today, they are not.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 83.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James Danly, of Tennessee, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 83, James Danly, of Tennessee, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Cynthia M. Lummis, Mike Rounds, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger F. Wicker, Katie Boyd Britt, Steve Daines, John Boozman, John R. Curtis, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Dan Sullivan, Bernie Moreno, Jim Justice.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 84.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Florida, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I sent a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 84, Katharine MacGregor, of Florida, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Cynthia M. Lummis, Mike Rounds, Rick Scott of Florida, Roger F. Wicker, Katie Boyd Britt, Steve Daines, John Boozman, John R. Curtis, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Dan Sullivan, Bernie Moreno, Jim Justice.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 42.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Rigas, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 42, Michael Rigas, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources.

John Thune, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Mike Crapo, Lindsey Graham, Tim Sheehy, John Kennedy, John Barrasso, Markwayne Mullin, Roger Marshall, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Rounds, Tommy Tuberville, Steve Daines, Bernie Moreno, Eric Schmitt, Jon A. Husted, Roger F. Wicker.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

GENIUS ACT

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, today should have been—it should have been—a historic day for Americans, a historic day for working-class Americans, blue-collar Americans, to see their financial system democratized. Well, what does that mean? What it means is a day where single mothers like the one that raised me—the day becomes a little cheaper, things become a little more affordable.

Why? Because we were on the verge of doing something that would have made our markets safer and cheaper for everyday, working Americans across this remarkable land. But, instead, we witnessed a disappointing display of political gamesmanship that puts partisan politics above policy and obstruction above innovation.

We could have come together as Republicans and Democrats, not in a bipartisan way but in an American way, to deliver real change for the American people, real change embedded in the passing of the GENIUS Act. But not this day.

I know that this day was supposed to be special. It was supposed to be the day that America as a nation would rise to the occasion of innovation over regulation. It was supposed to be the day where we would come together in a nonpartisan way, Republicans working with Democrats, to make this Nation work better for the blue-collar comeback. It was supposed to be that day. But not this day.

I know what those on the other side would say. Let's be brutally honest about it, though. The GENIUS Act was a bipartisan achievement at the Banking Committee. It was a bipartisan achievement because we took the time, hours upon hours. The Presiding Officer was there. We debated day in and day out for weeks and months before we ever had the hearing. We offered almost 80 amendments during the session in the Banking Committee. We voted on 40 amendments in the Banking Committee. We made the decision to make America's economy safer and cheaper for the American people.

But when the lights came on and the cameras were watching, what did we see? We saw those same Democrat colleagues who recognized the urgent need to bring stablecoins into the clear, responsible, regulatory framework—we watched them take a step back and vote against the very bill they voted for, the bill they shaped. What changed? What changed? What changed? Not the substance. They got more of what they wanted than the last five iterations of the legislation. What changed was politics. Not policy, not the legislation, not the substance—politics.

Let's be honest. What we saw today wasn't a vote against the legislation. Several iterations—the Presiding Officer's staff, my staff, and Democrats' staff spent thousands of hours working on improving the bill; up until 2 a.m. last night, staff getting phone calls from Democrats about what they needed for the bill to pass.

It was a vote against President Trump and President Trump's legislative agenda. It was a vote to stop President Trump from having a victory in the digital asset space. It was a vote against common sense—that simple.

Trump derangement syndrome has once again hijacked responsible governance in this Chamber, but unfortunately, unfortunately, it is the American people—they are the ones who lose. It is blue-collar, red-blooded Americans who pay the ultimate price of inaction in this Chamber brought about because of politics, not policy.

It frustrates me. It frustrates me to sit through hours of meetings. It frustrates me to watch people look me in my eyes and tell me: We are almost there; I just need one more thing. It frustrates me when my colleagues seem so sincere that they want the revolution of innovation to happen in America. It frustrates me to watch them turn their backs on the very people they say they represent. It frustrates me that the modern financial tools that make our economy not just faster but safer—safer because the blockchain technology makes it safer and more inclusive.

Entrepreneurs and developers want clarity so they can build here in the United States of America, not be pushed offshore into a regulatory environment that is confusing.

Let me close with this. The bill delivered on exactly what we all want: safety, consumer protections, AML, BSA. All the things that the Presiding Officer would want, that I would want, that they would want—we did it. We did it together. But there is something putrid.

It is hard to understand how my good friends could walk away from our priorities, that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle decided to chicken out on safety, on inclusion, and on democratization.

When the cameras were rolling and the stakes were high, we were left high and dry—not because of the policy but because the political landscape dictated, demanded that they deny the average American access on this day. This is exactly the kind of cynical Washington maneuvering that makes people sick to their stomach.

But I am proud of the work we have done. I am, frankly, proud of the work that my Democrat colleagues on the committee offered to make the bill better. I am proud of the fact that for a couple of hours in America's Capital, we put partisanship to the side. We decided we would just do the right thing. I am proud that the Republican Party stood up and stood firm on innovation, stood strong on consumer protection, and we were there for national security.

I am not finished fighting. I am frustrated, but we are not defeated. We are simply delayed. We are not finished fighting. We will continue to work on the digital asset revolution that the American people voted for, that they deserve. The need hasn't disappeared, and neither has our commitment to American leadership in the digital asset space.

To those who chose politics over progress today, the American people are watching.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

GAZA

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about an issue that people all over the world are thinking about, are appalled by but, for some strange reason, gets very little discussion here in the Nation's Capital or in the halls of Congress, and that is the horrific humanitarian disaster that is unfolding in Gaza.

Today marks 68 days and counting since any humanitarian aid was allowed into Gaza. For more than 9 weeks, Israel has blocked all supplies: no food, no water, no medicine, and no fuel. Hundreds of truckloads of lifesaving supplies are waiting to enter Gaza, sitting just across the border, but are denied entry by Israeli authorities.

There is no ambiguity here. Netanyahu's extremist government talks openly about using humanitarian aid as a weapon. Defense Minister Israel Katz said:

> Israel's policy is clear: No humanitarian aid will enter Gaza, and blocking this aid is one of the main pressure levers.

Starving children to death is a weapon of war, is a clear violation of the Geneva Convention, the Foreign Assistance Act, and basic human decency. Civilized people do not starve children to death. What is going on right now in Gaza is a war crime committed openly and in broad daylight and continuing every single day.

There are 2.2 million people who live in Gaza. Today, these people are trapped. The borders are sealed, and Israel has pushed the population into an ever smaller area. With Israel having cut off all aid, what we are seeing now is a slow, brutal process of mass starvation and death by the denial of basic necessities.

This is methodical; it is intentional; it is the stated policy of the Netanyahu government.

Without fuel, there is no ability to pump fresh water, leaving people increasingly desperate, unable to find clean water to drink or to wash with or to cook properly. Disease is once again spreading in Gaza. Most of the bakeries in Gaza have now shut down, having run out of fuel and flour. The few remaining community kitchens are also shutting down.

Most people are now surviving on scarce canned goods, often a single can of beans or some lentils shared between a family once a day.

The United Nations reports that more than 2 million people out of a population of 2.2 million face severe food shortages. The starvation hits children the hardest. At least 65,000 children now show symptoms of malnutrition and dozens have already starved to death. Malnutrition rates increased 80 percent in March, the last month for which data is available after Netanyahu began the siege, but the situation has severely deteriorated since then.

UNICEF reported yesterday that "the situation is getting worse every day'' and that they are treating about 10,000 children for severe malnutrition. And severe malnutrition is not something that is cured overnight. This will have a permanent impact on the health and well-being of those kids for the rest of their lives.

Without adequate nutrition or access to clean water, many children will die of easily preventable diseases, killed by something as simple as diarrhea. For the tens of thousands of injured people in Gaza, particularly the countless burn victims from Israeli bombings, their wounds cannot heal without adequate food and clean water. Left to fester, infections will kill many who should have survived.

With no infant formula and with malnourished mothers unable to breastfeed, many infants are also at severe risk of death. Those who survive will bear the scars of what they are going through now for the rest of their lives.

And with little medicine available, easily treatable illnesses and chronic diseases like diabetes or heart disease is now a death sentence in Gaza.

What is going on there is not some terrible earthquake; it is not a hurricane; it is not a storm. What is going on in Gaza today is a man-made nightmare, and nothing in my view can justify this.

What is happening in Gaza will be a permanent stain on the world's collective conscience. History will never forget that we allowed this to happen and, for us here in the United States, that we, in fact, enabled this ongoing atrocity.

There is no doubt that Hamas, a terrorist organization, began this terrible war with its barbaric October 7, 2023, attack on Israel, which killed 1,200 innocent people and took 250 hostages. The International Criminal Court was right to indict Yahya Sinwar and other leaders of Hamas as war criminals for those atrocities.

Clearly, Israel, as any other country that was so attacked, had the right to defend itself against Hamas. But Netanyahu's extremist government has not just waged war against Hamas. Instead, they have waged an all-out barbaric war of annihilation against the Palestinian people. They have intentionally made life unlivable in Gaza.

Israel, up to now, has killed more than 52,000 people and injured more than 118,000—60 percent of whom are women, children, and the elderly. More than 15,000 children in Gaza have been killed.

Israel's indiscriminate bombardment has damaged or destroyed two-thirds of all of the structures in Gaza, including 92 percent of the housing units—92 percent of housing in Gaza has been damaged or destroyed. Most of the population now is living in tents or other makeshift structures.

The healthcare system in Gaza has been, essentially, destroyed. Most of the territory's hospitals and primary healthcare facilities have been bombed. Gaza's civilian infrastructure has been totally devastated, including almost 90 percent of water and sanitation facilities. Most of the roads have been destroyed.

Gaza's educational system has been obliterated. Hundreds of schools have been bombed—schools have been bombed—as has every single one of Gaza's 12 universities.

And there has been no electricity in Gaza for 18 months—no electricity.

Given this reality, nobody should have any doubts that Netanyahu is a war criminal. Just like his counterparts in Hamas, he has a massive amount of innocent blood on his hands.

And now, Netanyahu and his extremist ministers have a new plan—on top of everything else that has been done, they have a new plan—and that is to indefinitely reoccupy all of Gaza, flatten the few buildings that are still standing, and force the entire population of 2.2 million people into a single tiny area where hired U.S. security contractors will distribute rations to the survivors.

Israeli officials are quite open about the goal here: to force Palestinians to leave for other countries ''in line with President Trump's vision for Gaza,'' as one Israeli official said this week.

Israeli Finance Minister Smotrich said this week that ''Gaza will be entirely destroyed'' and that its population will ''leave in great numbers.''

For many in Netanyahu's extremist government, this has been the plan all along. It is called ethnic cleansing.

This would be a terrible tragedy no matter where in the world it was happening or why it was happening, whatever the causes of it might be. But what makes this tragedy so much worse for us in America is that it is our government, the U.S. Government, that is absolutely complicit in creating and sustaining this humanitarian disaster. It didn't just happen; we are a significant part of creating this humanitarian disaster.

Last year alone, the United States provided 18 billion in military aid to Israel. This year, the Trump administration has approved 12 billion more in bombs and weapons. And for months, Trump has offered blanket support for Netanyahu. More than that, he has repeatedly said that the United States will actually take over Gaza after the war, that the Palestinian people will be driven, forcibly expelled, from their homeland, and the United States will redevelop it into what Trump calls ''the riviera of the Middle East,'' a playground for billionaires.

Think about it: 2.2 million desperate people who have been bombed and starved and driven from their homes are now about to be forcibly expelled from their territory into God knows where so that Trump and his friends can build a riviera for the billionaire class.

This war has killed or injured more than 170,000 people in Gaza. It has cost American taxpayers well over $20 billion in the last year. And right now, as we speak, thousands of children are starving to death. And a U.S. President is actively encouraging the ethnic cleansing of over 2 million people.

Now, given that reality, one might think that there would be a vigorous discussion right here in the Senate. Do we really want to spend billions of taxpayer dollars starving children in Gaza? A real vigorous debate. I want to hear why that is a good use. We have people sleeping out on the streets of America two blocks from the Nation's Capital. You tell me why spending billions of dollars to support Netanyahu's war and starving children is a good idea. I would love to hear it.

We are not having that debate. Let me suggest to you why I think we are not having that debate and that is because we have a corrupt campaign finance system that allows organizations like AIPAC to set the agenda here in Washington with regard to what happens in the Middle East.

In the last election cycle, AIPAC's PAC and super PAC spent nearly $127 million combined on campaign contributions. And the fact is that if you are a Member of Congress and you vote against Netanyahu's war in Gaza, AIPAC is there to punish you with millions of dollars in advertisements to see that you get defeated.

One might think that in a democracy there would be a vigorous debate on an issue of such consequence. But because of our corrupt campaign finance system, which impacts us in so many ways on this issue, people are literally afraid to stand up because if they do, suddenly, you are going to have all kinds of ads coming into your district to defeat you.

Sadly, I must confess that this political corruption works. Many of my colleagues will privately express their horror at Netanyahu's war crimes but will do or say very little publicly about it. History will not forgive our complicity in this nightmare. The time is long overdue for us to end our support for Netanyahu's destruction of the Palestinian people.

We must not put another nickel into Netanyahu's war machine. We must demand an immediate cease-fire, a surge in humanitarian aid, the release of the hostages, and the rebuilding of Gaza—not for billionaires to enjoy their Riviera there but rebuilding Gaza for the Palestinian people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUDD). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I have been in the U.S. Senate now for a total of 125 days. I have seen some outrageous comments over the last 125 days. My colleague has been here exactly 12,000 days more than I have. Let me just set the record straight.

On October 7, 2023, families, mothers, fathers were sitting at home, enjoying a peaceful existence in one of the most difficult places on Earth to live. They had a day planned of joy at a festival.

What happened? People came over and savagely—savagely—murdered children, raped women, took hundreds of hostages, killed more Jews than at any time since the Holocaust.

What you just heard for the last 15 minutes could be summarized as the absolute propaganda of Hamas. Let me just be clear. This war was started by Hamas. It could end today by Hamas if they released every last hostage, including an American citizen.

We are sitting here in the U.S. Senate and not even saying a word of the fact that there is a U.S. citizen being held hostage by a terrorist group in the Middle East. That is outrageous. That should be at the top of the agenda. Why have civilians been killed in Gaza? Because they hide weapons in hospitals, in schools, in homes.

Hamas is the enemy, not our greatest ally, which is Israel. I was just there 2 weeks ago. Two weeks ago, I was there. There is almost no Israeli that hasn't seen a mom, a dad, a son, a grandson, granddaughter that hasn't been either injured or killed to protect their country. The fact that we are disparaging our greatest ally at this level is completely outrageous.

I had plans to go home, see my wife and kids, but I rose today because I cannot stay silent after listening to that kind of nonsense spewed here in the U.S. Senate. It is a disgrace, and we should not ever forget that Israel is just fighting the war that we would otherwise fight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if the Senator had heard my remarks, I talked about the need to release the hostages and I talked about who started the war, which is the terrorist organization called Hamas, led by war criminals. There is no debate about that.

But what the Senator did not tell us is whether or not he thinks it is a good idea for U.S. taxpayers to be spending billions of billions of dollars on an extremist government in Israel whose stated policy is to starve children; whether or not he thinks it is a good idea to cut off all humanitarian aid getting into Gaza right now—no medicine, no clean water, no healthcare facilities open.

So the issue is not who started the war. Everyone knows who started the war. The issue is whether you commit war atrocities, criminal war acts by punishing an entire people for the acts of a terrorist organization.

Did Israel have the right to defend itself? Yes, nobody denies that.

Did it have a right to kill over 50,000 people—60 percent of whom are women, children, and the elderly? No.

Did it have a right to injure 112,000 people, to destroy almost every housing unit in Gaza, to bomb hundreds of schools at every university in Gaza? No.

Israel had a right to defend itself, but it does not have the right to engage in ethnic cleansing and to starve children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

TEACHER APPRECIATION WEEK

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of educators in Hawaii as well as across the Nation who are dedicating—have dedicated—their lives to the benefit of the children of our country.

This week is Teacher Appreciation Week. And as this administration attacks education and educators, it is more important than ever that we recognize our educators and thank them for all that they do on behalf of our children.

I have spoken before on the floor of this body on the fundamental importance of public education in my own life, having come here as an immigrant speaking no English from very humble beginnings.

I thank my teachers at Kaahumanu Elementary School, Koko Head Elementary School, and especially the librarian at Koko Head Elementary School who awakened my love of reading. They helped me to learn English and helped set me on a course that ultimately led to the U.S. Senate.

Today, teachers like Chayanee Brooks, an English teacher at Ka'u High School and Pahala Elementary on Hawaii Island, continue to educate and inspire Hawaii's youth. Chayanee, a Thai immigrant, is a nationally board-certified teacher. And, believe me, to become a nationally board-certified teacher, one must go through a lot of steps. But this certification indicates what an exceptional teacher she is.

She has been recognized as her complex area's Teacher of the Year, as Hawaii State teacher fellow, and as a Pulitzer Center teacher fellow. Just last month, she was recognized by the Hawaii State Teachers Association for her work to engage with and uplift the work of the voices of her students in her rural community.

Chayanee has said that her philosophy as an educator is simple:

> Empower students to connect with their community and their own potential through storytelling.

Chayanee has created a welcoming space for her students to express themselves and share their stories through creative avenues like journalism and documentary storytelling, where they highlight topics such as family separation and mental health. You know that these are areas that the students not only care about but have experienced in their own lives.

In addition to supporting her own students, Chayanee helps train other teachers to use storytelling as a tool to engage students in their own classrooms.

She is just one of the many teachers in our country who go above and beyond for their students and their communities. Teachers like Chayanee do more than educate students. They are role models and mentors, providing a safe, nurturing space for our children to learn and to grow. That is why it is so important that we support teachers and the vital—often underappreciated work—that they do.

We all remember during the COVID times that suddenly all our kids were at home. Believe me, there were a lot of people appreciating teachers particularly during that time. But it shouldn't just be at a time such as COVID. It should be all the time that we appreciate the exceptional work and commitment that so many of our teachers have to our students' education.

But Trump and his administration are hell-bent on doing everything they can to eliminate the U.S. Department of Education and undermine public education in our country. He and his Republican buddies want to take away Federal support for local schools, hundreds of millions of dollars—in fact, billions of dollars—money that provides services for students and parents, supports students with disabilities, and helps keep our children fed.

Trump is also threatening to cut funding from schools that won't comply with his draconian Executive orders—his obsession to stamp out diversity, equity, and inclusion in our public schools; Executive orders that direct our schools to stop teaching entire chapters of our Nation's history like the Civil War, African-American history, and the history of immigrants in our country.

That is just a part of the obsession that this administration has to stamp out diversity, equity, and inclusion in every arena.

We heard from teachers, parents, and students in Hawaii and across the country about the consequences of Trump's actions—the firing of people, what they are trying to get our schools to not teach—and they have told us in two words: ''It's chaos.'' Much like everything else Trump touches and does, chaos follows.

Just this week, Homeland Security agents terrorized a group of teachers from the Philippines living and working on Maui. They were invited to come to Maui to teach in our schools for a period of time. And despite these teachers being here legally in our country, the teachers were detained by Homeland Security and targeted before being allowed to go about their business. That is called terrorizing people, plain and simple. So instead of supporting teachers, Trump is making it even harder for them to do their jobs, and our children will be the ones stuck paying the price.

A strong education system is fundamental to building a strong democracy, a strong economy, and a strong middle class. At the heart of our education system is, of course, our educators. That is why I and my Democratic colleagues are committed to supporting our educators, strengthening our schools, and ensuring every child—every child—has the opportunity to learn and grow regardless of where they come from, their income, their disability—whatever their background. Every child should have that opportunity to grow and, you know, really seek their dreams.

Teachers can make a lasting impression in the lives of their students. In fact, I just had lunch with some of my interns in my office, and one of them said that she will never forget the encouragement from one of her college professors when she expressed some doubts about her success at her school, which happened to be Berkeley. This teacher said: You have a lot of years ahead of you. You know, believe in yourself. You can take risks, but go forward. She had a lot of years ahead of her to determine what she wanted to do with her life. So this intern in my office found this to be very encouraging.

That is what I mean about teachers having a profound impact on the life choices that their students make and how they think about themselves in this world. So I extend my gratitude to every teacher in Hawaii and across the country who continues to provide the kind of teaching experience that enables our students to have faith in themselves, to learn, and to understand that, you know, life has a lot in store for them.

I hope that a lot of these students will become teachers themselves, will become educators, and will be the kinds of teachers who will provide the kind of support that every student needs and deserves.

So ''mahalo'' to all of our educators across our country for all that you do both in and out of your classrooms and for the commitment that you have to our Nation's children, our families, and our communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to come to the floor today to talk about a success story but, potentially, a success story interrupted.

Back in 2022, we all were shocked to watch news playing out during an afternoon that we were here, working in the Senate, of another mass shooting—this one of just unthinkable size and scope—in Uvalde, TX. I was actually sitting in the Presiding Officer's chair when I saw word of the shooting scroll across my smartphone screen.

Gratefully, in the wake of that shooting, a group of us—Republicans and Democrats—were able to come together and set aside the differences that we had and still have on the issue of gun violence in this country. We decided not to argue about an assault weapons ban, for instance. Instead, we decided to work on finding the least common denominator, as we called it, and tried to find a set of commonsense changes to our gun laws and commonsense investments in our communities that would, hopefully, together, try to put a downward pressure on what, up until then, had been annual spiking rates of homicides and mass shootings.

It is just true that, in this country, you are 10 times more likely to be shot in your school, in your neighborhood, at a movie theater than you are in any other high-income, developed nation. That is a choice. That is not bad luck. That is not happenstance. That is because, in America, we decide to have a ton of weapons in the hands of very dangerous people. We also don't spend enough time trying to unwind some of the reasons young people, in particular, get into lives of really risky and potentially violent behavior.

So we came together in 2022, and we passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. It was a big bipartisan vote. It wasn't close. The final tally was 65 to 33, with nearly two-thirds of the Senate voting in favor of this commonsense gun safety measure. It wasn't anything close to what I see as being necessary in order to tackle this epidemic in this country, but it was significant. It was five changes in gun laws: supporting State red flag laws; stopping domestic abusers from getting their hands on guns; putting in a short but meaningful waiting period when young people are hastily buying an assault weapon; making it easier for law enforcement to go after drug trafficking rings. It was five meaningful changes, but it was also a big investment, a big investment in the kind of services that can help interrupt violence.

A lot of my Republican friends said: You know, we don't believe it is the guns. We think it is mental illness.

Well, I don't agree, but this is how you put together a compromise. So we passed the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, which included a landmark $14 billion investment, most of it in mental health, most of it directed toward kids' school-based mental health, but there were also significant investments in school safety—just hardening schools to make it harder for a shooter to get inside and community anti-gun violence initiatives, which is the work that local community groups are doing in North Carolina and Connecticut and all across the country to just try to wrap services around people who might be at risk of gun violence or to stop that cycle of violence once the first shooting happens.

So we passed this legislation, and we crossed our fingers. We said: Let's hope that we are right and that these changes in gun laws and these investments we are making in our communities will make a difference.

Well, what happened after we passed that law was absolutely stunning: the biggest 2-year decline in gun violence in the history of recorded statistics in the United States of America. That is extraordinary. That is extraordinary. I am not going to sit here and claim that the entire reason was the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, but it was a big part of the reason because we did make it harder for bad people to get their hands on guns. We did deliver the kinds of services that are necessary. You are seeing this downward trajectory, but let me just put the numbers on it.

In 2023, there were 659 mass shootings in America. In 2024, there were 500. That is a 24-percent, 1-year decline in mass shootings. That means that there were 160 mass shootings that didn't happen and 160 communities that were not terrorized in 2024. And this bill had a lot to do with it. Overall gun deaths went down from 2023 to 2024 from 19,000 to 16,700. That was a 12-percent reduction. We have never in this country's history seen 1-year declines in gun homicides in the neighborhood of 12 percent. Certain cities saw astronomical declines. In Hartford, we saw a 39-percent drop in homicides from 2023 to 2024. This year—this year, 2025—Hartford is on track to have the lowest recorded instances of gun violence—those are homicides and nonfatal shootings—since 2006. New Haven saw a 39-percent drop in homicides. As I think I said, overall, in Connecticut, we had 167 homicides in 2023. In 2024, we had 63. It is wild.

This happened in Baltimore, and this happened in Chicago. In most of the major cities in this country and in rural areas as well, we saw this dramatic, dramatic decline. So it is just something to celebrate because it is not easy to get that kind of consensus. It is not easy to get that kind of consensus, and we should celebrate the fact that there are literally thousands of people—largely young men—who are alive today because of the bill that we passed.

But this progress is in threat of being interrupted, and the reason is that the Trump administration has reversed course. I want to talk specifically about how they are undoing the progress of this bill, but their attempt to try to reverse the broader progress that we have made on reducing gun violence is pretty comprehensive. Let me just give you a handful of the ways in which the Trump administration is trying to make our communities less safe.

First, they closed the Office of Gun Violence Prevention. This was something the Biden administration set up to try to better implement the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. This wasn't a terribly political office. It was just trying to coordinate all the work being done across Agencies to reduce violence in our communities. Trump would have taken this office in a different direction, but he didn't. He just shuttered it. There is no Office of Gun Violence Prevention anymore in the Federal Government.

On March 20, the administration announced that they are going to start a process of restoring firearms rights to individuals who have had them taken away because they had serious criminal records. This is likely illegal.

There is an appropriations bill rider that says the ATF can't do this, but the message was sent: We actually think that dangerous people should be able to get their gun rights back.

That same day, Trump's Department of Justice filed a motion in Federal court, trying to overturn a decision to say that silencers are not protected by the Second Amendment, trying to say that no State legislature could ban or regulate the use of silencers, and silencers are broadly used by killers, by criminals who are trying to hide the fact that they are engaged in criminal, lethal conduct.

On April 7, the DOJ announced that it was repealing a policy from the Biden administration that said simply this: If you are a gun dealer and you are engaged in illegal conduct, we are going to pull your license, and we are not going to give you two or three or four shots. We are going to have a zero tolerance policy for gun dealers who are selling guns on to the black market. That is a policy most Americans would see as common sense, but the DOJ announced that it was going to let off the hook gun dealers who are violating the laws.

Now, throughout the last 100 days, the Trump administration has been sending all sorts of signals that they are deprioritizing the work of the ATF. Most recently, on April 9, they announced that the Army Secretary would now be the acting head of ATF. This was basically telling ATF agents: We don't care about your work. We are not going to have a full-time ATF head. We are putting somebody with a big, other important job in charge of the ATF. You are not going to have any real supervision or direction.

It was just a signal of the deprioritization of the enforcement of our gun laws that caused, the next day, the second highest ranking official at the ATF, who had served admirably for 35 years, to resign in protest.

Then, maybe most unconscionably and most cruelly, just a few days ago, the ATF took down the memorial wall dedicated to victims of gun violence. I mean, there were names up there, tributes to moms and dads, brothers and sisters who had been killed in episodes of gun violence. That was really important to hundreds of families out there who knew that their loved ones' names were part of that wall. Now the wall comes down. For what? Just to send another signal that the administration doesn't care about attacking gun violence.

But I really wanted to come to the floor today to talk about the two most important assaults that the Trump administration has made on our work to try to keep our communities safe. Those are the twin announcements that the administration made that they were going to end two of the key streams of funding for community groups in the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

First, the administration announced it was ending $1 billion in grants under the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act to invest in school mental health and then that they were ending $800 million of DOJ grants to try to drive down violence through supporting community efforts to do that work.

This makes no sense. I understand we have a difference. The President and I have a difference on what our gun laws should be. But there is consensus—I thought there was consensus—that we should support investment in mental health. I thought there was a consensus that we all believed that there were good community groups that were doing totally apolitical work, not related at all to gun laws, to try to interrupt cycles of violence.

The reason that these numbers have been going down is not just the changes in gun laws. The reason that our communities are safer all across the country is that we are finally putting real money into school-based mental health, into children's mental health, and into the groups in our communities that are keeping kids alive.

In Oakland, they have seen a stunning 32-percent drop in homicides, and it is a result of groups like Youth Alive!. This is a nonprofit that is working to prevent and disrupt the cycle of gun violence. So you go into a community, you go into a place where a shooting has happened, and you do work with the victim of that incident to make sure that it doesn't become a cycle of violence.

These are often called hospital-based violence intervention programs. When there is a shooting, you have a social worker or a community anti-gun violence worker that goes to the hospital. That is often when the communities are the most angry, the friends of that victim may be planning for revenge, and you do the work to stop that cycle of violence.

It was working in Oakland. Youth Alive! was preventing gun violence. Last year, of the 113 clients they served, only 1 of them was injured a second time. Yet, in the middle of a 3-year $2 million grant that Youth Alive! was getting, it was suspended, terminated. They are going to have to lay off their staff. That program is being shut down in Oakland. And I will just tell you, I would bet you homicides are going to start going back up in Oakland.

Baltimore has seen a similar massive decline in gun violence, a 43-percent reduction since 2010—what a success story in Baltimore, one of the most violent communities in terms of rates of gun violence in the country, a 43-percent decline.

Center for Hope is a group in Baltimore that provides prevention and healing services for children who have been the witnesses or victims of gun violence. They were getting, again, a $2 million grant to work with the victims of gun violence to try to heal those communities and, again, stop that cycle of retributive violence that often happens in places like Baltimore.

Donald Trump cut their grant. So in the middle of the grant, they are losing $1.2 million, and they are going to have to lay off 7 employees.

Center for Hope runs 6 of the city's 10 Safe Streets sites. These operate in the pockets of Baltimore where you see the most shootings. Because of these Center for Hope sites—these Safe Streets sites—between 2023 and 2024, four of the sites run by the Center for Hope saw zero homicides. Now they are having to lay off people. Guess what is going to happen. Those shootings are going to go up again.

We had to work really hard to find this consensus on a very difficult issue. It is illegal, what the President has done. He is not allowed, under the Constitution, to decide unilaterally to cancel spending that has been authorized and appropriated by Congress. So maybe the first and most important thing to say about what the President has done to cancel mental health grants and anti-violence grants is that it is illegal. He can't do it, and it is likely that a court will turn these grants back on.

But it is also such bad policy. It is cruel and inhumane, but it is also illogical. We literally are seeing the fruits of the labor of these groups, and not just in saving a life or two. You are talking about a 30- and 40-percent reduction in violence in these cities. And what will happen is unmistakable. You stop funding these groups that are doing the mental health work in the schools, that are doing the anti-gun violence work, and these rates will start to go back up again.

That is illogical, but it is cruel as well because what the President is doing, for instance, in cutting off the school mental health grants is that he is cutting off existing grants. It is not that he is announcing: I am not giving any new grants.

There are schools all across this country that have set up new mental health clinics because of the grants they got. They were 5-year grants, and 1 or 2 or 3 years into those grants, Donald Trump is shutting those programs down. So there are literally going to be thousands of children—traumatized children, children with serious mental illness, with cycles and histories of abuse in their households—who have created this relationship with an adult—this adult who is helping them address their potential tendency to act out in violent ways due to their mental illness, their trauma. And one day, these kids are going to show up at school, and that adult is going to be gone. That trusted adult that had created that bond, that relationship that is helping that child, that is keeping that school safe—that relationship, that bond is destroyed because in cutting these grants off with no warning, there is no way, in the middle of a school year, for a school mental health clinic to find the money under the mattress.

It is illogical. It is going to drive up gun violence rates. And it is cruel to our poorest and most at-risk communities and to the kids—and to the kids—the traumatized kids, the kids with serious mental illness, the kids that we should think first about when we wake up in the morning.

I guess the final thing to say is this: We are putting ourselves out of business. We are putting ourselves out of business. What is the point of passing a law by a 65-to-33 vote if the President of the United States can just ignore it? As I said, that is illegal, and the courts will likely tell him: You can't shut off the funding that we appropriated and authorized.

This should matter to Republicans and Democrats. Every single one of my Republican colleagues worked really hard to get this job, worked really hard to become a U.S. Senator. Those of us who worked on these bipartisan pieces of legislation worked really hard to pass them. What is the point of running for the U.S. Senate, what is the point of working to forge this compromise if the President can just ignore it?

By the way, if Donald Trump gets away with it, mark my words, a Democratic President will do the same thing. If this becomes standard practice, if our laws just become advisory, then there is no reason for any of us to show up any longer. Why do you work so hard, why do you care so much about getting to this place if you don't care when the President just ignores the laws that we pass?

It is very hard to find consensus here, especially on an issue as important and as politically sensitive as gun violence. So when we do find that consensus, on behalf of the kids and the families out there who are begging us to work together to save lives, we should protect that consensus.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

GENIUS ACT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the vote we just had on the motion to proceed on the GENIUS Act.

Despite promises that the GENIUS Act's fundamental flaws would be fixed ahead of any vote, we still don't have the new bill text.

Now, many of my colleagues have made clear that they want to improve this bill and that it is important for Republicans not to jam us. Well, the Republicans decided to jam us anyway. But the Democrats have power to say no, and that is exactly what we just did.

The GENIUS Act would establish a new regulatory framework for stablecoins, a type of cryptocurrency whose value is pegged to the value of another asset, often, the U.S. dollar. This is a $100 billion market.

A stablecoin is very similar to a bank deposit. Its value, like the value of your deposits in a bank account, is supposed to maintain a stable value. That is why they call it a stablecoin.

But as we have learned throughout history, banking can be a really risky activity. It requires a robust regulatory and supervisory framework that protects consumers, that protects our national security, and that protects the stability of the financial system.

Democrats in the Banking Committee worked hard to improve the GENIUS Act before, during, and after we had a vote in committee on the bill. We want to strengthen the guardrails on this new financial product to make sure that it is safe and reliable.

Democrats—even Democrats who voted for the bill in committee—made it clear: The bill needs to improve significantly to win their support on the floor. But this new bill that was introduced last week and rushed to the floor this week, and that we voted on just today, lacked those guardrails.

So far, Republicans have refused to adopt changes that would apply basic consumer protection rules, like the ones the banks and other financial institutions have to follow so that their customers don't get cheated; have refused to adopt changes that would make it more difficult for cartels, terrorists, sanctions evaders, and human traffickers to use stablecoins to finance illegal activity; have refused to adopt changes that ensure that stablecoins do not destabilize our financial system and require taxpayers to bail out crypto companies when they crash; have refused to adopt changes that would prevent Big Tech billionaires from using this bill to issue their own private currencies; have refused to adopt changes that would stop Donald Trump and his family from corruptly profiting off their new stablecoin, USD1, which is already the fifth largest stablecoin in the world and has already been used to cut them in on shady, multibillion-dollar deals with foreign governments.

So what happened when the Democrats saw the new version of the bill last week? We stood together, we held firm, and we made clear that we were not giving them enough votes to get to 60 and move the bill forward. That brought Republicans back to the negotiation table over the last several days.

The lead negotiators made clear: Republicans need our votes. We will not be rushed. We will not be jammed. We will not vote on something that we haven't even seen. This issue is simply too important.

And that brings us to today. We were asked by the Republicans to take this vote without ever seeing the text of the new bill. There is no way for any Senator to know whether the final bill sufficiently protects consumers, no way to know whether the final bill prevents terrorists in rogue nations and cartels from using stablecoins to move dirty money around, no way to know whether the final bill stops Big Tech billionaires from taking over our money supply, and no way to know whether the final bill stops President Trump from making billions off his stablecoin and accepting bribes from foreign nations.

These purported fixes were negotiated behind closed doors, in the dead of night, and we don't even know for sure what they are. We need time to evaluate them carefully. This is what it looks like when Republicans try to jam the Democrats.

But the opportunity for bribery and corruption through a Trump stablecoin is not hypothetical. It is not like, well, here is something that might happen. Trump has already shown us right out in public exactly how to run the corruption play.

It was reported last week that an Abu Dhabi investment firm, MGX, is using Trump's USD1's stablecoin to finance a $2 billion investment in Binance, essentially giving Trump a cut of the deal. The firm is chaired by someone who is referred to in the industry as the "spy sheikh" of the United Arab Emirates and co-owned by G42, a firm with extensive ties to the Chinese Government.

I do not think that some of my colleagues fully comprehend the scale of this corruption. Donald Trump and his family have essentially started their own bank, and money from foreign governments and large corporations is already pouring in. This is not one of Trump's standard failed side hustles, like steaks or vodka or his licensing deals. His stablecoin, USD1, is the fifth largest in the world, and it is only 3 weeks old. He is set to make hundreds of millions of dollars, potentially billions of dollars, on this undertaking.

If you are seeking pardons, if you want tariff exemptions, if you want other special favors, you don't need a briefcase of cash pushed under the table; you can do it conveniently online with Donald Trump's stablecoin. How can any Senator—Democrat, Republican, or Independent—endorse that kind of corruption? How can any Senator—Democrat, Republican, or Independent—facilitate that kind of corruption?

Over the past few months, we as Democrats have too often forgotten we still have some power, and this is our opportunity to use it. We did not vote for this bill today. We stood firm, and we demanded improvements.

I have heard from some of my colleagues that this bill will happen with or without us, and that is simply not true. We proved it today. I urge Democrats to continue to use their power and make sure that we don't sign off on a weak deal, on a bad deal, on a deal that, months from now or years from now, we say: Oh, that turned out to be a bad idea.

We can only vote for the GENIUS Act when we have a bill that protects consumers, that promotes financial stability, that protects our national defense, and that fights back against Donald Trump's aggressive and public corruption. We need to stand strong as Democrats, and if we do, we can get a better bill and better serve the people of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 276

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 276) to rename the Gulf of Mexico as the ''Gulf of America''.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following resolutions, which are at the desk: S. Res. 209 and S. Res. 210.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

WORLD MIGRATORY BIRD DAY

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 211, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 211) designating May 10, 2025, as ''World Migratory Bird Day''.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 211) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MORNING BUSINESS

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent, but I had been present, I would have voted on rollcall vote No. 238 on passage of Calendar No. 24, S.J. Res. 7, disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to ''Addressing the Homework Gap Through the E-Rate Program''.

REMEMBERING STEVEN HOECKER

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Steven W. Hoecker, who served as the director of the David R. Obey Northern Great Lakes Visitor Center in Ashland, WI, for many years.

Steve was a passionate public servant who made a difference in the lives of those who were lucky enough to know him. Born in 1949 in Parma, OH, Steve was a natural adventurer, seeking every opportunity to share the wonder of the outdoors with his loved ones. He spent many days with his best friends and siblings, fishing and enjoying our Nation's natural resources.

His love for the outdoors continued to strengthen as time went on. Steve was no stranger to rehabilitating birds of prey and raising stranded baby animals. He studied wildlife biology at Virginia Tech, where he met his beloved wife and adventure partner Elizabeth.

Steve was also a dedicated father. He and Elizabeth helped raise 38 children, including their daughter Jenna and 37 foster children. He enjoyed sharing his love of the outdoors, leaving a lasting impression on each child. In his free time, Steve volunteered in the classrooms of his wife and daughter and with events like Kid's Fishing Day and Fishing Has No Boundaries. He was a proud uncle and grandfather as well.

Steve was instrumental in the establishment of the Northern Great Lakes Visitor Center. Before officially becoming the center director in 1998, he spent 6 years planning for the site while he worked for the U.S. Forest Service. He then served as the center director for 12 years until he retired in 2010. He understood the intense beauty of the region of Wisconsin he called home and dedicated his life to educating others on its importance.

Steve found many more ways to give back to his community, including volunteering his time with the Alliance for Sustainability, Habitat for Humanity, and many community activities, including Bayfield's Apple Festival and Lake Superior Big Top Chautauqua. He was tireless in his service to others, a true testament to his passion for helping others.

Through his life's work, Steve Hoecker made an immeasurable impact on the State of Wisconsin. He cared deeply about the Great Lakes, the Northern Great Lakes Visitors Center, his family, and his community. His passing is a great loss to all who knew him and worked alongside him, but his legacy and the life he lived will be felt for generations to come.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL KRISTIN A. BEITZ

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, today I rise to honor a great American and an exceptional member of the U.S. Air Force, Col. Kristin ''Norris'' Beitz.

As deputy chief of the Department of the Air Force's Senate Liaison Division from June 2022 to July 2023, Colonel Beitz performed her duties well and without reservation, supporting the 117th and 118th U.S. Congresses. Hailing from Reno, NV, Colonel Beitz is a distinguished graduate of the U.S. Air Force Academy and has served in the Air Force for over 20 years, including 12 in our shared home State of Nevada. Throughout her career, she has demonstrated exceptional and unrivaled officership. Colonel Beitz is a command pilot with over 3,000 hours of flight time in the A–10, MQ–1B, and MQ–9 aircraft. She is a graduate of the prestigious U.S. Air Force Weapons School at Nellis Air Force Base, NV, where she also served as an instructor.

Colonel Beitz distinguished herself through her professional character and dedication to serving our Nation in uniform, leading five action officers in the Senate Air Force Liaison Office. In this role, she advised Department of the Air Force senior leaders and helped develop strategic engagement opportunities to advance U.S. Air Force and U.S. Space Force priorities. Her leadership facilitated seamless collaboration on behalf of the Department of the Air Force across 62 congressional offices, supporting over 30 delegations for 150 Senators, Representatives, and staffers to showcase Department equities in the United States and abroad. Most notably, under her leadership, she drove preconfirmation engagements for the second-ever Chief of Space Operations and worked with the Senate Space Force Caucus to coordinate three events critical to educating Members and their staff on the Department of Defense's newest service. Her efforts helped solidify the establishment of the U.S. Space Force and ensured the Department of the Air Force's support of the National Defense Strategy in its Reoptimization for Great Power Competition.

Additionally, Colonel Beitz co-authored the Department of the Air Force's Distinguished Public Service Award for the then-retiring ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the late-Senator Jim

Inhofe, and served as a direct liaison for the joint military presentation ceremony as the Secretary of the Air Force honored Senator Inhofe's 56 years of public service. She led the congressional delegation to the Air Force's B–21 bomber unveiling and the bicameral 2022 Reagan National Defense Forum. Colonel Beitz's significant efforts led to over 200 successful engagements between this governing body and senior Department of Defense officials, including the Secretary of the Air Force. All of these engagements helped Senators and their staffs understand defense equities and their impact on national security. Due to her direct involvement and stewardship, Members of Congress were able to make informed decisions and ensured the Department of the Air Force was properly resourced and funded. After serving in this crucial role and becoming a fixture on Capitol Hill, Colonel Beitz moved on to serve as the director of the U.S. Air Force Academy's Washington, DC, office.

Colonel Beitz's contributions extend far beyond operational excellence. She played a pivotal role in working with my office on the unique challenges faced by remotely piloted aircraft crews, such as those at Nevada's Creech Air Force Base, where Colonel Beitz served for many years. Her insight and advocacy helped shape my National Defense Authorization Act priorities to address these gaps and oversights. Colonel Beitz's dedication to supporting those in uniform, even beyond her formal liaison duties, has been invaluable. She has continued to serve as a resource to my office on these and other issues.

I would be remiss not to mention the personal connections Colonel Beitz has fostered during her time here. I have personally enjoyed meeting her parents and children at our constituent coffees—the Battle Born Breakfast—and her son outside of the Senate Chamber as he interviewed me for his elementary school project. Colonel Beitz's thoughtfulness and capacity to connect with others on a personal level while performing her duties at the highest echelon of professionalism is a true testament to her work ethic and care for those around her.

Colonel Beitz and her husband, Col. Andy Beitz, who is also a command pilot and recently retired from the U.S. Air Force, have together flown over 6,000 hours as Air Force aviators and have instilled a legacy of service for their children Ezekiel and Eloise. They have sacrificed much as a family in service to our Nation. I am thankful for Col. Kristin Beitz's service in the Air Force, in the Senate, and with my office on issues of vital importance to the defense of the United States. I salute this American patriot whose selfless service has kept our country safe and strong. She is ''Battle Born.''

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hanley, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13611 OF MAY 16, 2012, WITH RESPECT TO YEMEN—PM 26

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared with respect to Yemen in Executive Order 13611 of May 16, 2012, is to continue in effect beyond May 16, 2025.

The actions and policies of Ansar Allah, also known as the Houthis, continue to threaten Yemen's peace, security, and stability. These actions include obstructing the political process in Yemen and blocking the implementation of the agreement of November 23, 2011, between the Government of Yemen and those in opposition to it, which provided for a peaceful transition of power that meets the legitimate demands and aspirations of the Yemeni people.

Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13611 with respect to Yemen.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 7, 2025.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Rubber Tire Manufacturing''.

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY)

At 11:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 276. An act to rename the Gulf of Mexico as the ''Gulf of America''.

H.R. 881. An act to establish Department of Homeland Security funding restrictions on institutions of higher education that have a relationship with Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1503. An act to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 881. An act to establish Department of Homeland Security funding restrictions on institutions of higher education that have a relationship with Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1503. An act to combat forced organ harvesting and trafficking in persons for purposes of the removal of organs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1668. A bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and individuals appointed to Senate-confirmed positions from issuing, sponsoring, or endorsing certain financial instruments, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 276. An act to rename the Gulf of Mexico as the ''Gulf of America'' .

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 612. A bill to amend the Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience Act to authorize grants to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 119–20).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Charles Kushner, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the French Republic, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Principality of Monaco.

Nominee: Charles Kushner.

Post: French Republic and Principality of Monaco.

(As instructed, I have provided contributions by my spouse and me. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

Charles Kushner, $50,000.00, 10/17/2024, RJC Victory Fund; $41,300.00; 08/19/2024, NRCC; $3,300.00, 08/19/2024, Mike Johnson for Louisiana; $1,700.00, 08/19/2024, American Revival PAC; $3,300.00, 08/19/2024, American Revival PAC; $50,000.00, 08/19/2024, Grow the Majority; $400.00, 08/19/2024, Congressional Leadership Fund; $10,000.00, 06/28/2024, South Dakota Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/27/2024, Republican Party of Kentucky; $10,000.00, 06/27/2024, Republican Campaign Committee of New Mexico; $155,400.00, 06/05/2024, Make America Great Again Inc.; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, South Carolina Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Party of Florida; $3,300.00, 06/03/2024, Never Surrender, Inc.; $3,300.00, 06/03/2024, Never Surrender, Inc.; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Party of Wisconsin; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, West Virginia Republican Party. Inc.; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Utah Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Party of Arizona, LLC; $5,000.00, 06/03/2024, Save America; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Alaska Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Ohio Republican Party State Central & Executive Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Montana Republican State Central Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Georgia Republican Party Inc.; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Party Of Virginia Inc.; $844,600.00, 06/03/2024, Trump 47 Committee, Inc.; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Washington State Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Nevada Republican Central Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, California Republican Party Federal Acct.; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, North Carolina Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, New Jersey Republican State Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, New Hampshire Republican State Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Indiana Republican State Committee. Inc.; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Oregon Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Massachusetts Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Party of Guam; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Party of Louisiana; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Missouri Republican State Committee—Federal; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Mississippi Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Maine Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Oklahoma Leadership Council; $123,900.00, 06/03/2024, Republican National Committee; $123,900.00, 06/03/2024, Republican National Committee; $123,900.00, 06/03/2024, Republican National Committee; $41,300.00, 06/03/2024, Republican National Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, DC Republican Party Federal Account; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican Party of Iowa; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Republican State Committee of Delaware; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Michigan Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Maryland Republican State Central Committee; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Kansas Republican Party; $10,000.00, 06/03/2024, Illinois Republican Party—Federal; $10,000.00, 05/31/2024, Connecticut Republican State Central Committee, Inc.; $1,000,000.00, 06/05/2023, Make America Great Again Inc.

Seryl Kushner: None.

———

*Leah Campos, of Virginia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Nominee: Leah Francis Campos.

Post: Dominican Republic.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Christian Schandlbauer $0, N/A, N/A.

Isabela Schandlbauer $0, N/A, N/A.

Soledad Schandlbauer $0, N/A, N/A.

Xavier Schandlbauer $0, N/A, N/A.

———

*Brandon Judd, of Idaho, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile.

Nominee: Brandon Judd.

Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Chile.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:

AnnaMarie Judd: $25, 12/09/2023, Winred Nikki Haley.

Christa Judd: None.

Brianna Nukya: None.

Dominick Judd: None.

Adessa Judd: None.

Ezra Judd: None.

Zachary Judd: None.

———

*Joseph Popolo, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Nominee: Joseph Popolo.

Post: Ambassador to the Netherlands.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Name, organization, date, and amount:

Popolo, Joseph, Troy Nehls for Congress, 2/3/25, $1,000.00; AFV Victory Fund, 12/21/23, $50,000.00; Alabama Republican Party, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Alamo PAC, 6/10/21, $5,000.00; Alamo PAC, 8/11/22, $1,450.00; Alamo PAC, 10/1/24, $5,000.00; Alaska Republican Party, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Alaskans for Nick Begich, 9/19/24, $3,300.00; Alek for Oregon, 8/15/21, $5,800.00; American Excellence PAC, 10/23/24, $5,000.00; Americans for Prosperity Action, Inc. (AFP Action), DBA CVA Action and DBA Libre Action, 8/30/22, $100,000.00; Americans for Prosperity Action, Inc. (AFP Action) DBA CVA Action and DBA Libre Action, 12/29/23, $150,000.00; Andy Barr for Congress, Inc., 10/24/24, $1,000.00; Andy Barr Victory Committee, 10/24/24, $1,000.00; Anna Paulina Luna for Congress, 5/16/23, $3,300.00; APL Victory Fund, 5/16/23, $3,300.00; Arrington Victory Committee, 4/11/23, $6,600.00; Ashley Hinson for Congress, 3/29/21, $653.84; Ashley Hinson for Congress, 6/23/21, $1,000.00; Ashley Hinson for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Ashley Hinson for Congress, 4/25/24, $2,300.00; Ashley Hinson for Congress, 4/25/24, $3,300.00; Ashley Hinson Victory Committee, 4/25/24, $5,600.00; Banks for Senate, 6/19/23, $3,300.00; Banks for Senate, 10/12/23, $3,300.00; Barrasso Victory, 9/21/23, $2,000.00; Be Victorious Over Democrats PAC, 7/30/21, $5,000.00; Be Victorious Over Democrats PAC, 2/28/22, $5,000.00; Be Victorious Over Democrats PAC, 10/6/23, $5,000.00; Ben Sasse for U.S. Senate, Inc., 4/16/21, $2,900.00; Bernie Moreno for Senate, 4/8/24, $3,300.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 5/4/21, $2,800.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 5/4/21, $2,800.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 5/24/21, $100.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 6/1/21, $100.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 1/10/23, $2,900.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 5/5/23, $2,900.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 5/5/23, $400.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 8/3/23, $400.00; Beth Victory Fund, 2/28/22, $5,000.00; Beth Victory Fund, 1/10/23, $2,900.00; Beth Victory Fund, 5/5/23, $3,300.00; Beth Victory Fund, 10/6/23, $25,000.00; Better Path Forward PAC, Inc., 11/1/24, $5,000.00; Bice for Congress, 6/23/21, $1,000.00; Bice for Congress, 6/30/21, $653.85; Bill Cassidy for U.S. Senate, 10/10/22, $2,900.00; Blackburn Tennessee Victory Fund, 6/22/23, $6,600.00; Blackburn Tennessee Victory Fund, 9/3/24, $5,000.00; Blake Masters for Congress, 12/13/23, $3,300.00; Blake Masters for Senate, 6/8/22, $2,900.00; Blake Masters for Senate, 6/8/22, $2,900.00; Bo Hines for Congress, 9/26/22, $2,900.00; BOLDUC 2022, Inc., 4/11/21, $5,800.00; Boozman for Arkansas, 6/1/21, $192.31; Boozman for Arkansas, 3/22/22, $5,800.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 3/30/22, $2,900.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 4/24/24, $2,300.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 9/19/24, $3,125.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 10/15/24, $175.00; Brian Fitzpatrick for All of Us, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Brian Fitzpatrick for All of Us, 3/12/24, $3,300.00; Brian Fitzpatrick for All of Us, 3/12/24, $2,300.00; Brian Jack for Congress, 6/4/24, $3,300.00; Britt for Alabama Inc, 3/9/22, $2,900.00; Britt for Alabama Inc, 3/10/22, $2,900.00; Budd NC Victory Fund 2028, 5/10/23, $3,300.00; Burgess 4 Utah, 4/1/21, $653.85; California Republican Party Federal Acct., 8/15/23, $454.54; California Republican Party Federal Acct., 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Cassidy Leadership Fund, 10/10/22, $2,900.00; Cassy for Congress, 6/15/22, $2,900.00; Cassy for Congress, 9/30/22, $2,500.00; Catherine Templeton for Congress, 4/11/24, $3,300.00; Celeste for Congress, 10/12/23, $3,300.00; Champion American Values, 4/11/22, $5,000.00; Chuck Edwards for Congress, 8/15/23, $454.55; Chuck Edwards for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Ciscomani for Congress, 8/16/22, $2,900.00; Ciscomani for Congress, 8/15/23, $454.55; Ciscomani for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Ciscomani for Congress, 10/10/23, $1,845.45; Ciscomani for Congress, 10/10/23, $3,300.00; Ciscomani Victory Fund, 10/10/23, $6,600.00; Citizens for Josh Mandel, Inc., 7/1/21, $2,600.00; Claudia Tenney for Congress, 6/30/21, $2,900.00; Claudia Tenney for Congress, 6/30/21, $2,900.00; Claudia Tenney for Congress, 10/30/23, $1,700.00; Claudia Tenney for Congress, 10/30/23, $3,300.00; Claudia Tenney for Congress Victory Fund, 10/30/23, $5,000.00; Colorado Republican Committee, 8/15/23, $454.54; Colorado Republican Committee, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Committee to Elect Christian Castelli, 2/21/22, $1,000.00; Committee to Elect Christian Castelli, 11/6/22, $2,900.00; Committee to Elect Christian Castelli/Castelli for Congress, 12/21/23, $6,600.00; Committee to Elect Jennifer-Ruth Green, 6/27/22, $2,900.00; Congressional Leadership Fund, 3/29/21, $45,000.00; Congressional Leadership Fund, 3/29/21, $5,000.00; Congressional Leadership Fund, 12/21/21, $200,000.00; Congressional Leadership Fund, 3/31/22, $5,000.00; Congressional Leadership Fund, 10/13/22, $100,000.00; Congressional Leadership Fund, 8/15/23, $454.55; Congressional Leadership Fund, 12/6/23, $250,000.00; Congressional Leadership Fund, 6/28/24, $250,000.00; Cornyn Victory Committee, 5/21/21, $2,500.00; Cornyn Victory Committee, 8/26/22, $25,000.00; Cornyn Victory Committee, 3/27/23, $25,000.00; Cornyn Victory Committee, 10/1/24, $50,000.00; Cotton for Senate, Inc., 3/25/21, $5,000.00; Cotton for Senate, Inc., 5/4/23, $1,200.00; Cotton for Senate, Inc., 5/4/23, $400.00; Cotton Victory, 5/4/23, $6,600.00; Coughlin for Congress, 8/12/24, $3,300.00; Craig Goldman for Congress, 2/20/24, $3,300.00; Craig Goldman for Congress, 3/28/24, $3,300.00; Craig Riedel for Ohio, 12/15/23, $3,300.00; Cramer for Senate, 3/29/23, $3,300.00; Cramer for Senate, 6/22/23, $3,300.00; Dallas Entrepreneur Political Action Committee, 4/15/24, $5,000.00; Dan Crenshaw for Congress, 3/29/21, $653.85; Dan Crenshaw for Congress, 7/30/21, $653.85; Dan Crenshaw for Congress, 7/30/21, $2,246.15; Dan Crenshaw for Congress, 9/3/24, $1,000.00; Dan Crenshaw Victory Committee, 7/30/21, $2,900.00; Darrell Issa for Congress, 3/29/21, $653.84; Dave McCormick for U.S. Senate, 1/28/22, $5,800.00; DC Republican Party Federal Account, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Deb Fischer for U.S. Senate, 3/29/23, $122.22; Deb Fischer for U.S. Senate, 3/29/23, $3,300.00; Deb Fischer for U.S. Senate, 10/10/24, $3,177.78; Derrick Anderson for VA, Inc., 4/11/24, $3,300.00; Derrick Anderson for VA, Inc., 10/10/24, $1,650.00; Desposito for New York, 8/15/23, $454.55; Desposito for New York, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Desposito for New York, 9/3/24, $3,300.00; Devin Nunes Campaign Committee, 6/30/21, $653.84; Devolder-Santos for Congress, 11/2/22, $2,900.00; Doctor Oz for Senate, 6/10/22, $5,800.00; Don Bacon for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Don Bacon for Congress, 9/3/24, $3,300.00; electgabeevans.com, 8/12/24, $3,300.00; Electing Majority Making Effective Republicans PAC, 6/26/23, $5,000.00; Electing Majority Making Effective Republicans PAC, 3/12/24, $5,000.00; Eli Crane for Congress, 7/25/22, $1,000.00; Eli for Colorado, 10/21/21, $2,900.00; Elise for Congress, 8/10/21, $2,900.00; Elise for Congress, 3/9/23, $2,700.00; Elise for Congress, 3/9/23, $3,300.00; Elise for Congress, 2/27/24, $600.00; Elise Victory Fund, 3/9/23, $6,000.00; Elise Victory Fund, 2/27/24, $600.00; Emmer for Congress, 6/26/23, $3,300.00; Emmer for Congress, 6/26/23, $3,300.00; Emmer Majority Builders, 3/12/24, $25,000.00; Emmer Victory Committee DBA Republican Congressional Victory Committee, 6/16/23, $25,000.00; Emmer Victory Committee DBA Republican Congressional Victory Committee, 11/13/23, $20,000.00; Esposito for Congress, 2/20/24, $3,300.00; Esposito for Congress, 9/19/24, $3,125.00; Esposito for Congress, 9/19/24, $175.00; Esther for Congress, 6/16/21, $2,900.00; Esther for Congress, 8/15/21, $2,900.00; Families for James Lankford, 6/1/21, $192.31; Families for James Lankford, 8/26/22, $1,848.68; Fischbach for Congress, 3/29/21, $653.84; Fischbach for Congress, 6/30/22, $2,900.00; Fischbach for Congress, 5/5/23, $1,666.67; Fischbach for Congress, 8/3/23, $433.34; Fischbach for Congress, 8/3/23, $1,633.33; Fischbach for Congress, 9/18/23, $497.35; Freedom Force PAC, 7/18/24, $3,300.00; French Hill for Arkansas, 3/16/24, $1,000.00; Friends of Dave McCormick, 10/12/23, $6,600.00; Friends of David Schweikert, 8/15/23, $454.55; Friends of David Schweikert, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Friends of David Schweikert, 9/3/24, $3,300.00; Friends of Jeremy Shaffer, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; Friends of John Barrasso, 3/29/23, $122.22; Friends of John Barrasso, 3/29/23, $3,300.00; Friends of John Barrasso, 9/21/23, $2,000.00; Friends of John Thune, 8/26/22, $2,040.99; Friends of Kennedy, 7/5/23, $6,600.00; Friends of McCormick, 3/12/24, $3,300.00; Friends of McCormick, 10/14/24,$3,300.00; Friends of Mike Lee Inc, 3/16/21, $5,800.00; Friends of Todd Young, Inc., 6/2/21, $2,900.00; Friends of Todd Young, Inc., 8/26/22, $1,848.68; Friends of Todd Young, Inc., 12/21/23, $3,300.00; Friends of Todd Young, Inc., 12/21/23, $3,300.00; Garbarino for Congress, 9/19/24, $3,125.00; Garbarino for Congress, 9/19/24, $175.00; George Logan for Congress, 10/16/24, $3,300.00; Georgia Republican Party Inc., 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Gerald Malloy for U.S. Senate, Limited, 10/17/22, $1,000.00; Go with Chuck Goodrich, Inc., 10/12/23, $3,300.00; GOP Winning Women, 6/23/21, $6,000.00; GOP Winning Women-Texas, 9/26/22, $10,000.00; Grassley Committee, Inc., 8/2/21, $2,900.00; Grassley Committee, Inc., 8/2/21, $2,900.00; Great American Comeback, 7/25/23, $5,000.00; Great American Comeback, 1/2/24, $5,000.00; Green Victory Fund, 5/22/24, $3,300.00; Growing the Majority through NY, 9/19/24, $25,000.00; Hardworking Americans Inc., 8/30/24, $10,000.00; Hellfire PAC, 3/29/22, $2,500.00; Hispanic Leadership Trust, 4/23/24, $2,500.00; Hoeven for Senate, 6/30/21, $178.57; Hoeven for Senate, 8/26/22, $1,848.68; Hogan for Maryland Inc., 3/26/24, $6,600.00; Hogan Victory Fund, 11/1/24, $25,000.00; Hovde for Wisconsin, 3/19/24, $6,600.00; Hunt for Congress, 9/21/21, $5,800.00; Hunt for Congress, 3/27/23, $1,700.00; Hunt for Congress, 3/27/23, $3,300.00; Idaho Republican Party, 3/26/24, $3,900.00; Idaho Republican Party, 9/19/24, $6,100.00; Illinois Republican Party—Federal, 8/15/23, $454.54; Illinois Republican Party—Federal, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Indiana Republican State Committee, Inc., 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Iowans for Zach Nunn, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Iowans for Zach Nunn, 4/11/24, $3,300.00; Iron Ladies PAC, 6/15/22, $10,000.00; Iron Ladies PAC, 5/5/23, $5,000.00; Iron Ladies PAC, 8/3/23, $6,600.00; Iron Ladies PAC, 9/18/23, $994.71; Jaime for Congress, 6/23/21, $1,000.00; Jake Ellzey Victory Fund, 12/3/21, $5,800.00; Jan for Congress, 5/23/22, $1,000.00; Jane Timken for Ohio, 11/17/21, $2,900.00; Jane Timken for Ohio, 2/18/22, $2,900.00; Jason Smith for Congress, 8/16/23, $6,600.00; JD Vance for Senate Inc., 9/13/21, $2,900.00; JD Vance for Senate Inc., 8/11/22, $2,900.00; Jeff Hurd for Congress, 7/7/24, $3,300.00; Jeff Hurd for Congress, 10/16/24, $3,300.00; Jeremy Shaffer Victory Fund, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; Jim Jordan for Congress, 8/10/23, $3,300.00; Jim Jordan for Congress, 8/10/23, $3,300.00; Jim Justice for U.S. Senate, 6/30/23, $3,300.00; JKLC Victory Fund, 3/12/24, $5,000.00; JKLC Victory Fund, 3/12/24, $5,000.00; Jobs, Freedom, and Security PAC, 8/11/22, $1,450.00; Jobs, Freedom, and Security PAC, 4/25/23, $4,400.00; Jobs, Freedom, and Security PAC, 12/14/23, $600.00; Jobs, Freedom, and Security PAC, 3/6/24, $5,000.00; Joe O'Dea for Senate, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; John Duarte for Congress, 8/15/23, $454.55; John Duarte for Congress, 8/28/23, $1,000.00; John Duarte for Congress, 5/31/24, $3,300.00; John James for Congress, Inc., 2/1/22, $5,800.00; John James for Congress, Inc., 7/19/23, $3,300.00; John James for Congress, Inc., 7/19/23, $3,300.00; John James for Michigan, 7/19/23, $6,600.00; John Kennedy for US, 9/19/22, $2,900.00; John Kennedy for US, 9/19/22, $2,900.00; John Kennedy for US, 6/29/23, $3,300.00; John Kennedy for US, 6/29/23, $3,300.00; Joni Ernst for Senate, 12/23/24, $13,200.00; Ernst Victory Iowa, 12/30/24, $11,800.00; Josh Hawley for Senate, 3/29/23, $122.22; Josh Hawley for Senate, 3/29/23, $3,300.00; Josh Hawley for Senate, 10/1/24, $3,177.76; Julia Letlow for Congress, 3/4/21, $1,160.00; Julia Letlow for Congress, 3/17/21, $1,160.00; Julia Letlow for Congress, 3/17/21, $1,740.00; Kansas Republican Party, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Kari Lake for Senate, 3/28/24, $3,300.00; Kari Lake Victory Fund, 3/28/24, $3,300.00; Kay Granger Campaign Fund, 10/21/21, $2,900.00; Kay Grainger Campaign Fund, 10/21/21, $2,900.00; Kean for Congress Inc, 1/24/22, $2,900.00; Kean for Congress Inc, 1/24/22, $2,900.00; Kean for Congress Inc, 6/30/23, $1,000.00; Kean for Congress Inc, 8/15/23, $454.54; Kean for Congress Inc, 9/30/23, $1,000.00; Keeping Republican Ideas Strong Timely & Inventive, 10/22/22, $1,000.00; Keeping Republican Ideas Strong Timely & Inventive, 10/22/22, $1,000.00; Kennedy Victory Fund 2024, 10/17/24, $20,000.00; Kevin Kiley for Congress, 8/15/23, $454.55; Kevin Kiley for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Kevin Lincoln for Congress, 10/16/24, $3,300.00; Kevin McCarthy for Congress, 3/4/21, $2,900.00; Kevin McCarthy for Congress, 3/4/21, $2,900.00; Kevin McCarthy for Congress, 3/15/23, $3,300.00; Kevin McCarthy for Congress, 3/15/23, $3,300.00; Kiggans for Congress, 12/31/21, $2,900.00; Kiggans for Congress, 6/30/22, $2,900.00; Kiggans for Congress, 2/17/23, $1,666.67; Kiggans for Congress, 8/3/23, $433.34; Kiggans for Congress, 8/25/23, $1,633.33; Kiggans for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Kiggans for Congress, 3/12/24, $1,866.66; Lalota for Congress, 9/19/24, $3,125.00; Lalota for Congress, 10/2/24, $175.00; Lalota for Congress, 10/10/24, $3,300.00; Lance Gooden for Congress Committee, 2/1/21, $2,800.00; Lance Gooden for Congress Committee, 6/7/23, $3,300.00; Larose for Senate, 12/11/23, $6,600.00; Lauren Boebert for Congress, 3/8/21, $1,740.00; Laurie Buckhout for Congress, 5/15/24, $3,300.00; Lawler for Congress, Inc., 8/14/23, $3,300.00; Lawler for Congress, Inc., 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Lawler for Congress, Inc., 3/12/24, $2,300.00; Laxalt for Senate, 2/16/22, $5,800.00; Leslie for Washington, 9/28/23, $3,300.00; Lets Get To Work PAC, 6/1/23, $3,422.22; Libertarian National Committee, Inc., 10/22/24, $13,400.00; Lisa Murkowski for U.S. Senate, 8/26/22, $2,040.99; Lori Chavez-Deremer for Congress, 8/15/23, $454.55; Lori Chavez-Deremer for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Lori Chavez-Deremer Victory, 8/15/23, $454.55; Luisa for Texas, 11/21/23, $6,600.00; Mackenzie for Congress Committee, 8/12/24, $3,300.00; Maine Republican Party, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC, 3/29/21, $5,000.00; Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC, 3/8/22, $5,000.00; Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC, 3/15/23, $5,000.00; Majority Committee PAC—MC PAC, 8/15/23, $454.55; Making a Responsible Stand for Households in America PAC, 6/22/23, $5,000.00; Making a Responsible Stand for Households in America PAC, 9/3/24, $5,000.00; Marc for Us Inc., 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Marc for Us Inc., 9/3/24, $3,300.00; Marco Rubio for Senate, 3/30/21, $2,900.00;

Marco Rubio for Senate, 3/30/21, $2,900.00; Mark Green for Congress, 5/22/24, $3,300.00; Marsha for Senate, 12/16/21, $5,800.00; Marsha for Senate, 3/29/23, $400.00; Marsha for Senate, 3/29/23, $122.22; Marsha for Senate, 6/22/23, $277.78; Maryland Republican State Central Committee, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Maryland's Future, 9/4/24, $3,437.86; Maryland's Future, 9/5/24, $10,000.00; Massachusetts Republican Party, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Masters Victory Committee, 12/13/23, $6,600.00; Matt Rosendale for Montana, 3/29/21, $653.85; Matt Rosendale for Montana, 5/6/21, $2,900.00; Max Miller for Congress, 9/14/23, $2,000.00; Max Miller Victory, 9/14/23, $2,000.00; Mayra Flores for Congress, 11/1/21, $2,900.00; Mayra Flores for Congress, 11/1/21, $2,900.00; Mayra Flores for Congress, 7/11/23, $6,600.00; Mazi for Congress, 1/19/24, $6,600.00; McCormick Victory Fund, 10/14/24, $3,300.00; McGuire for Virginia, 3/22/24, $3,300.00; McGuire Victory Fund, 3/22/24, $3,300.00; McHenry for Congress, 10/18/22, $2,900.00; McHenry for Congress, 8/10/23, $6,600.00; McKay for Senate Inc., 2/8/24, $1,000.00; Merrin for Congress, 8/12/24, $3,300.00; Michael Waltz for Congress, 6/19/23, $3,300.00; Michael Waltz for Congress, 9/18/23, $1,000.00; Michael Waltz for Congress, 7/15/24, $2,300.00; Michelle Steel for Congress, 6/23/21, $1,000.00; Michelle Steel for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Michelle Steel for Congress, 9/3/24, $3,300.00; Michigan Republican Party, 8/15/23, $454.54; Michigan Republican Party, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Mike Crapo for US Senate, 3/25/21, $2,900.00; Mike Crapo for US Senate, 3/25/21, $2,900.00; Mike Garcia for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Mike Garcia for Congress, 9/3/24, $3,300.00; Mike Johnson for Louisiana, 10/26/23, $6,600.00; Miller-Meeks for Congress, 5/20/21, $5,800.00; Miller-Meeks for Congress, 6/13/23, $3,300.00; Miller-Meeks for Congress, 4/11/24, $3,300.00; Mission First People Always Pac, 7/19/23, $1,000.00; Mississippi Republican Party, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Missouri Republican State Committee-Federal, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Monica for Congress, 8/15/21, $2,900.00; Monica for Congress, 3/7/22, $2,900.00; Monica for Congress, 2/27/23, $3,300.00; Monica for Congress, 5/5/23, $1,666.67; Monica for Congress, 8/3/23, $1,633.33; Montana Red, 10/23/24, $5,000.00; Montana Republican State Central Committee, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Mooney for Senate, Inc., 6/30/23, $1,000.00; Mooney for Senate, Inc., 12/21/23, $2,300.00; Moran for Kansas, 8/26/22, $1.848.68; Mullin for America, 8/8/22, $1,000.00; Mullin for America, 8/26/22, $1,849.11; Nancy Dahlstrom for Alaska, 1/26/24, $3,300.00; Nancy Mace for Congress, 3/29/21, $653.85; Nancy Mace for Congress, 6/23/21, $1,000.00; Nebraska Republican Party, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Nehls for Congress, 8/12/24, $3,300.00; Nella for Senate, 10/1/24, $3,300.00; Nevada Republican Central Committee, 8/15/23, $454.54; Nevada Republican Central Committee, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Never Back Down Inc., 5/30/23, $100,000.00; Never Back Down Inc., 11/6/23, $100,000.00; Never Surrender, Inc., 2/8/24, $3,300.00; Never Surrender, Inc., 9/19/24, $3,300.00; New Hampshire Republican State Committee, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; New Jersey Republican State Committee, 8/18/23, $454.54; New Jersey Republican State Committee, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Noem Victory Fund, 4/14/22, $4,000.00; Noem Victory Fund, 10/22/22, $5,000.00; North Carolina Republican Party, 8/15/23, $454.54; North Carolina Republican Party, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; North Dakota Republican Party, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; NRCC, 3/29/21, $36,500.00; NRCC, 3/8/22, $5,000.00; NRCC, 3/31/22, $31,500.00; NRCC, 3/31/22, $13,500.00; NRCC, 3/15/23, $38,400.00; NRCC, 6/26/23, $2,900.00; NRCC, 6/26/23, $10,500.00; NRCC, 8/15/23, $454.55; NRCC, 10/6/23, $10,000.00; NRCC, 10/6/23, $10,000.00; NRCC, 11/20/23, $20,000.00; NRCC, 3/12/24, $5,500.00; NRCC, 9/19/24, $11,800.00; NRSC, 6/7/21, $25,000.00; NRSC, 3/8/22, $36,500.00; NRSC, 3/8/22, $13,500.00; NRSC, 6/13/23, $8,700.00; NRSC, 6/13/23, $41,300.00; NRSC, 12/15/23, $10,000.00; NRSC, 3/27/24, $41,300.00; NRSC, 6/4/24, $8,700.00; NRSC, 10/1/24, $32,166.72; NRSC, 11/1/24, $20,000.00; NRSC Victory, 10/23/24, $50,000.00; NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee, 7/12/24, $300.00; NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee, 9/19/24, $9,700.00; O'Dea Victory Committee, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; Ohio Republican Party State Central & Executive Committee, 8/15/23, $454.54; Ohio Republican Party State Central & Executive Committee, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Ohioans for JD, 9/13/21, $2,900.00; Oklahoma Leadership Council, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; One Georgia Pac, 9/1/20, $2,800.00; Oregon Republican Party, 8/15/23, $454.54; Oregon Republican Party, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Patriots for Perry, 8/15/23, $454.54; Paul Junge for Congress, 10/28/24, $3,300.00; Perdue for Senate, 9/6/20, $2,700.00; Perdue for Senate, 11/6/25 $2,800.00; Perdue for Senate, 3/20/20, $2,900.00; Pete Ricketts for Senate, 6/2/23, $3,300.00; Pete Ricketts for Senate, 6/2/23, $3,300.00; Project Rescue America, 3/27/24, $5,000.00; Protect the House 2024, 3/15/23, $50,000.00; Protect the House 2024, 8/15/23, $454.55; Protect the House 2024, 8/29/23, $25.000.00; Rand Paul for US Senate, 1/16/21, $5,600.00; Rand Paul for US Senate, 6/30/21, $192.31; Rand Paul for US Senate, 8/26/22, $7.69; Republican Campaign Committee of New Mexico, 8/18/23, $454.54; Republican Campaign Committee of New Mexico, 10/8/24, $10,000.00; Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania, 8/15/23, $454.54; Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Republican Majority Fund, 5/4/23, $5,000.00; Republican National Committee, 3/29/21, $36,500.00; Republican National Committee, 3/29/21, $63,500.00; Republican National Committee, 3/29/21, $63,500.00; Republican National Committee, 1/18/22, $36,500.00; Republican National Committee, 1/18/22, $13,500.00; Republican National Committee, 3/15/23, $41,300.00; Republican National Committee, 3/15/23, $8,700.00; Republican National Committee, 2/29/24, $41,300.00; Republican National Committee, 2/29/24, $8,700.00; Republican National Committee, 3/28/24, $65,200.00; Republican National Committee, 3/28/24, $85,900.00; Republican National Committee, 3/28/24, $123,900.00; Republican National Committee, 6/24/24, $29,300.00; Republican National Committee, 6/24/24, $58,700.00; Republican National Committee, 9/19/24, $83,900.00; Republican Party of Arizona, LLC, 8/15/23, $454.54; Republican Party of Arizona, LLC, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Arkansas, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Florida, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Guam, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Iowa, 8/15/23, $454.54; Republican Party of Iowa, 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Kentucky, 10/2/23, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Kentucky, 8/27/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Louisiana, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Minnesota-Federal, 8/18/23, $454.54; Republican Party of Minnesota-Federal, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Texas, 12/15/23, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Texas, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Virginia Inc., 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Republican Party of Wisconsin, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Republican State Committee of Delaware, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; Restore our Nation (RON Pac), 5/24/23, $6,600.00; Rhode Island Republican State Central Committee, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Rick Scott for Florida, 3/29/23, $122.22; Rick Scott for Florida 3/29/23, $3,300.00; Rick Scott for Florida, 6/1/23, $3,177.78; Right Arizona, 12/13/23, $3,300.00; Rob for PA, 8/12/24, $3,300.00; Rogers for Senate, 2/5/24, $3,300.00; Rogers for Senate, 8/22/24, $3,300.00; Romney for Utah, Inc., 3/29/23, $122.22; Romney for Utah, Inc., 3/29/23, $3,300.00; Ron Johnson for Senate, Inc., 1/24/22, $5,800.00; Rubio Victory Committee, 3/30/21, $5,800.00; Salazar for Congress, 6/23/21, $1,000.00; Salazar for Congress, 3/12/24, $3,300.00; Salazar for Congress, 3/12/24, $3,300.00; Salazar Victory Committee, 7/15/24, $3,300.00; Sam Brown for Nevada, 12/18/23, $6,600.00; Sarah for Alaska, 5/19/22, $1,000.00; Sasse Leadership Committee, 4/16/21, $2,900.00; Save America, 2/8/24, $5,000.00; Scalise for Congress, 2/4/22, $5,800.00; Scheller for Congress, Inc., 7/6/22, $2,900.00; Schmitt for Senate, 7/21/22, $5,800.00; Schmitt for Senate, 6/7/24, $6,600.00; Schmitt for Senate, 12/23/24, $6,600.00; School Freedom Fund, 2/2/24, $100,000.00; Senate Eagle PAC, 4/5/24, $5,000.00; Senate Leadership Fund, 5/9/22, $100,000.00; Senate Leadership Fund, 10/18/22, $25,000.00; Send in the Seal PAC, 10/23/24, $5,000.00; Servant Leadership Fund, 6/13/23, $3,300.00; Servant Leadership Fund, 9/12/23, $1,000.00; Smiley for Washington Inc., 9/19/22, $2,900.00; South Carolina Republican Party, 6/24/24, $10,000.00; South Dakota Republican Party, 8/27/24, $10,000.00; Stand for America PAC, 4/16/21, $2,500.00; Steil for Wisconsin, Inc., 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Take Back The House 2022, 3/29/21, $50,000.00; Take Back The House 2022, 3/8/22, $10,000.00; Take Back The House 2022, 3/31/22, $50,000.00; Tanya for Arizona, 7/25/22, $2,900.00; Tanya for Arizona, 7/29/22, $2,900.00; Team Brian Jack, 5/8/24, $3,300.00; Team Brian Jack, 6/4/24, $3,300.00; Team Desantis 2024, 7/25/23, $5,000.00; Team Desantis 2024, 1/2/24, $5,000.00; Team Hagerty, 7/15/22, $5,800.00; Team Hagerty, 4/5/24, $400.00; Team Hagerty, 4/5/24, $400.00; Team Hagerty Victory, 4/2/24, $6,600.00; Team Herschel, Inc, 5/18/22, $5,800.00; Team Herschel, Inc, 11/11/22, $2,900.00; Team Josh, 5/21/21, $2,600.00; Team Kennedy, 10/20/24, $3,300.00; Team Kennedy, 10/20/24, $3,300.00; Team McCormick, 10/4/24, $5,000.00; Team McHenry, 10/18/22, $2,900.00; Team Monica Victory, 2/27/23/, $3,300.00; Team Mooney, 12/21/23/, $2,300.00; Team Moreno, 4/3/24, $3,300.00; Team Rick Scott, 6/1/23, $6,600.00; Team Ronny, 4/12/24, $3,300.00; Ted Budd for Senate, 5/11/22, $2,900.00; Ted Budd for Senate, 5/11/22, $2,900.00; Ted Budd for Senate, 5/12/23, $3,300.00; Ted Cruz for Senate, 6/2/21, $1,000.00; Ted Cruz for Senate, 4/25/23, $3,300.00; Ted Cruz for Senate, 4/25/23, $2,300.00; Ted Cruz Victory Committee, 4/25/23, $10,000.00; Ted Cruz Victory Fund, 12/14/23, $600.00; Ted Cruz Victory Fund, 12/15/23, $20,000.00; Ted Cruz Victory Fund, 3/6/24, $5,000.00; Ted Cruz Victory Fund, 3/27/24, $41,300.00; Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account, 6/22/23, $1,322.22; Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account, 6/24/24, $7,000.00; Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account, 7/10/24, $3,000.00; Tenney Van Duyne Victory Fund, 6/21/21, $5,800.00; Texans for Jodey Arrington, 6/3/21, $2,900.00; Texans for Jodey Arrington, 4/11/23, $3,300.00; Texans for Jodey Arrington, 4/11/23, $3,300.00; Texans for Morgan Luttrell, 12/7/21, $5,800.00; Texans for Morgan Luttrell, 12/13/21, $2,900.00; Texans for Ronny Jackson, 6/22/22, $2,900.00; Texans for Ronny Jackson, 4/12/24, $3,300.00; Texans for Senator John Cornyn Inc., 8/26/22, $2,707.72; Texans for Senator John Cornyn Inc., 3/29/23, $122.24, Texans for Senator John Cornyn Inc., 3/29/23, $400.00; Texas Republican Voter Engagement PAC, 11/22/21, $5,000.00; Texas Republican Voter Engagement PAC, 1/4/22, $5,000.00; Texas Republican Voter Engagement PAC, 1/19/24, $5,000.00; The Sentinel Action Fund, 4/3/24, $10,000.00; Theriault for Congress, 8/12/24, $3,300.00; Tim Scott for America, 4/13/23, $6,600.00; Tim Scott for Senate, 4/19/21, $5,800.00; Tim Sheehy for Montana, 6/28/23, $6,600.00; Tom Barrett for Congress, 8/5/24, $6,600.00; Tony Gonzales for Congress, 2/8/21, $5,600.00; Tony Gonzales for Congress, 10/21/24, $3,300.00; Trump 47 Committee, Inc., 3/26/24, $275,000.00; Trump 47 Committee, Inc., 6/24/24, $215,000.00; Trump 47 Committee, Inc., 7/10/24, $3,300.00; Trump 47 Committee, Inc., 7/12/24, $10,000.00; Trump 47 Committee, Inc., 9/19/24, $313,000.00; Trump Save America Joint Fundraising Committee, 2/8/24, $11,600.00; Utah Republican Party, 8/27/24, $9,700.00; Utah Republican Party, 8/27/24, $300.00; Valadao for Congress, 8/15/23, $454.55; Valadao for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Valadao for Congress, 2/7/24, $1,846.00; Valadao for Congress, 10/10/24, $3,299.00; Valor PAC, 10/10/24, $1,650.00; Van Duyne Kim Victory Fund, 6/5/21, $2,900.00; Van Orden for Congress, 8/16/21, $2,900.00; Van Orden for Congress, 9/9/21, $2,900.00; Van Orden for Congress, 6/29/23, $3,300.00; Van Orden for Congress, 6/29/23, $3,300.00; Van Orden Victory Fund, 6/29/23, $6,600.00; Van Taylor Campaign, 3/8/21, $2,900.00; Van Taylor Campaign, 1/8/22, $2,900.00; Vermont Republican Federal Elections Committee, 10/23/24, $3,073.94; Villaverde for Congress, 8/4/23, $1,000.00; Washington State Republican Party, 8/15/23, $454.54; Washington State Republican Party, 9/19/24, $10,000.00; Wendy Davis for Congress, 10/12/23, $3,300.00; Wesley Hunt Victory Fund, 3/27/23, $5,000.00; West Virginia Republican Party, Inc., 9/19/24, $10,000.00; WFW Action Fund, Inc., 5/19/22, $25,000.00; WFW Action Fund, Inc., 9/12/24, $25,000.00; Wicker for Senate, 3/29/23, $3,300.00; Wicker for Senate, 3/29/23, $122.22; Wicker for Senate, 10/1/24, $3,177.76; Win The Senate 2022, 8/4/22, $11,600.00; Winning Women Victory Committee 2022, 12/14/21, $2,900.00; Wyoming Republican Party, Inc., 3/26/24, $10,000.00; Young Kim for Congress, 4/1/21, $653.84; Young Kim for Congress, 6/25/21, $2,900.00; Young Kim for Congress, 10/10/24, $3,300.00; Young Victory Committee, 12/21/23, $6,600.00; Yvette4Congress, 8/15/24, $3,300.00; Zeldin for Congress, 4/1/21, $653.85; Zinke for Congress, 9/10/21, $1,000.00; Zinke for Congress, 8/29/23, $1,000.00; Citizens for Scharf—Missouri Attorney General, 3/20/23, $2,825.00; Daniel Cameron for Governor (KY), 6/6/23, $2,100.00; Glenn Youngkin for Governor (VA), 4/27/23, $11,600.00; Jeff Landry for Governor (LA), 5/10/23, $2,500.00; Kim Reynolds for Governor (IA), 11/15/23, $10,000.00; Republican Party Of Kentucky, 9/26/23, $15,000.00; Winsome Sears PAC (VA Lt. Gov), 3/16/23, $5,000.00; Glenn Youngkin for Governor (VA), 9/18/21, $5,000.00; Winsome Sears for Lt Governor (VA), 11/28/

21, $1,000.00; Kristi Noem for Governor, 4/8/22, $5,000.00; Noem Victory Fund, 10/22/22, $5,000.00; Brian Kemp for Governor (GA), 9/30/22, $7,600.00; Sarah Huckabee Sanders for Governor (AR), 2/2/21, $5,600.00; Winsome PAC, 6/6/24, $25,000.00; Lt. Gov Winsome Sears of VA), 8/6/24, $25,000.00; Jennifer Stoddard Hajdu, 1/30/24, $10,000.00; Morgan Meyer, 2/22/24, $25,000.00; Morgan Meyer, 1/9/24, $1,000.00; Marc Andrew LaHood, 2/22/24, $10,000.00; Alan Schoolcraft, 4/11/24, $6,600.00; Helen Kerwin, 4/11/24, $6,600.00; Jamie Kohlmann, 4/3/24, $2,500.00; Jamie Kohlmann, 1/22/24, $2,500.00; Nathaniel Parker, 9/12/24, $2,500.00; David M. Middleton, 2/5/24, $5,000.00; Adan Hinojosa, 8/30/24, $5,000.00; Katrina Pierson, 4/8/24, $6,600.00; Texans for Greg Abbot, 6/5/24, $50,000.00; Hillary Hickland, 2/16/24, $25,000.00; Texans for Lawsuit Reform PAC, 10/2/24, $100,000.00; Judicial Fairness PAC, 8/13/24, $125,000.00; Judicial Fairness PAC, 10/1/24, $125,000.00; Chris Spencer, 4/8/24, $6,600.00; Christi Craddick, 3/29/24, $15,000.00; Family Empowerment Coalition PAC, 4/29/24, $10,000.00; Family Empowerment Coalition PAC, 9/24/24, $100,000.00; Family Empowerment Coalition PAC, 4/26/24, $13,200.00; Family Empowerment Coalition PAC, 2/5/24, $50,000.00; Texans for Dan Patrick 11/20/24, $25,000.00; Texans for Dan Patrick, 6/28/24, $50,000.00; Morgan Meyer, 11/29/23, $5,000.00; Morgan Meyer, 6/23/23, $5,000.00; Nathaniel Parker, 11/10/23, $5,000.00; Matthew Phelan, 9/20/23, $25,000.00; Angela Paxton, 6/30/23, $1,000.00; Friends of Brandon Creighton, 8/21/23, $7,500.00; Nathaniel Parker, 6/30/23, $2,500.00; Drew Alan Springer, 6/30/23, $2,500.00; Helen Kerwin, 12/22/23, $10,410.16; David M. Middleton, 6/30/23, $2,500.00; Texans for Lawsuit Reform PAC, 8/1/23, $100,000.00; Bradley Buckley, 7/4/23, $2,602.54 Coalition POR for Texas PAC, 5/1/24, $100,000.00; Coalition POR for Texas PAC, 4/3/23, $100,000.00; Chris Spencer, 12/28/23, $6,600.00; Chris Spencer, 12/28/23, $3,300.00; AFC Victory Fund, 12/21/23, $50,000.00; Richard Pena Raymond, 6/30/23, $2,500.00; Family Empowerment Coalition PAC, 12/6/23, $25,000.00; Family Empowerment Coalition PAC, 11/9/23, $50,000.00; Family Empowerment Coalition PAC, 7/18/23, $50,000.00; Texans for Dan Patrick, 6/29/23, $25,000.00; Michael Olcott, 12/6/23, $25,000.00; Nathaniel Parker, 12/8/22, $2,034.21; Nathaniel Parker, 6/16/22, $5,000.00; Kevin Sparks, 2/4/22, $2,500.00; Melisa Denis, 6/9/22, $2,500.00; Glenn Hegar, 4/15/22, $1,000.00; Morgan Meyer, 6/3/22, $2,500.00; Ryan Guillen, 2/24/22, $5,000.00; Texans for Greg Abbott, 5/25/22, $30,000.00; George P Bush, 4/6/22, $25,000.00; Angelia Duke Orr, 12/7/22, $2,500.00; Travis Clardy, 12/21/22, $2,500.00; Texans for Greg Abbott, 10/18/22, $25,000.00; Texans for Greg Abbott, 8/29/22, $25,000.00; Charles Anderson, 12/5/22, $2,500.00; Texans for Lawsuit Reform PAC, 2/23/22, $100,000.00; Morgan Meyer, 12/6/22, $5,000.00; Coalition POR for Texas PAC, 3/28/22, $50,000.00; Texans for Dan Patrick, 10/11/22, $25,000.00; Eric Harless, 12/5/22, $2,500.00; Trenton Ashby, 12/7/22, $2,500.00; David Spiller, 12/5/22, $2,500.00; Craig Goldman, 12/9/22, $2,500.00; John Smithee, 12/8/22, $2,500.00; Shelby Slawson, 12/9/22, $2,500.00; Justin Holland, 12/10/22, $2,602.54; Associated Republicans of Texas Campaign Fund, 10/18/22, $10,000.00; Cecil Bell, 12/16/22, $2,500.00; Harold Dutton, 12/10/22, $2,500.00; Texans for Eva Guzman, 2/14/22, $85,000.00; Matthew Phelan, 12/5/22, $10,000.00; John Kuempel, 12/20/22, $2,500.00; Geanie Morrison, 12/15/22, $2,500.00; Morgan Meyer, 6/28/21, $1,000.00; Associated Republicans of Texas Campaign Fund, 8/24/21, $10,000.00; Texans for Greg Abbott, 6/30/21, $25,000.00; Texans for Greg Abbott, 11/29/21, $25,000.00; Texans for Eva Guzman, 6/30/21, $7,500.00; Texans for Eva Guzman, 6/26/21, $2,500.00; Texans for Lawsuit Reform PAC, 10/11/21, $10,000.00; Christi Craddick, 10/20/21, $1,000.00.

Note: While checking my responses against public databases, I discovered a contribution of $2500 made in my name to ActBlue Texas in July 2023. I did not make that contribution and have no knowledge of it.

Name, organization, date, and amount:

Alaskans for Nick Begich, 9/19/24, $3,300.00; Amanda Adkins for Congress, 9/19/22, $2,900.00; Banks for Senate, 12/7/23, $3,300.00; Be Victorious Over Democrats PAC, 10/6/23, $5,000.00; Bernie Moreno for Senate, 4/8/24, $3,300.00; Bernie Moreno for Senate, 10/3/24, $3,300.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 5/4/21, $2,900.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 5/4/21, $2,900.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 1/10/23, $2,900.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 10/6/23, $3,300.00; Beth Van Duyne for Congress, 10/6/23, $400.00; Beth Victory Fund, 5/4/21, $5,800.00; Beth Victory Fund, 1/10/23, $2,900.00; Beth Victory Fund, 10/6/23, $25,000.00; Bo Hines for Congress, 9/26/22, $2,900.00; Bolduc 2022, Inc., 11/1/22, $2,900.00; Bolduc 2022, Inc., 4/22/21, $2,800.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 3/30/22, $2,900.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 8/16/22, $2,900.00; Brandon for Congress NY22, 3/30/23, $5,000.00; Budd NC Victory Fund 2028, 5/10/23, $3,300.00; Ciscomani for Congress, 8/16/22, $2,900.00; Claudia Tenney for Congress, 7/23/21, $653.85; Committee to Elect Christian Castelli, 8/26/22, $2,900.00; Committee to Elect Christian Castelli, 8/26/22, $2,900.00; Committee to Elect Christian Castelli/Castelli for Congress, 2/21/24, $2,000.00; Committee to Elect Jennifer-Ruth Green, 6/27/22, $2,900.00; Cotton Victory Fund, 1/6/25, $6,600.00; Cramer for Senate, 6/30/23, $122.22; Dave McCormick for US Senate, 1/28/22, $2,900.00; Dave McCormick for US Senate, 1/28/22, $5,800.00; Doctor Oz for Senate, 10/7/22, $2,900.00; Doctor Oz for Senate, 10/7/22, $2,900.00; Esther for Congress, 9/28/21, $2,900.00; Friends of Dave McCormick, 11/27/23, $6,600.00; Friends of Jeremy Shaffer, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; Grassley Committee, Inc., 9/27/21, $2,900.00; Grassley Committee, Inc., 9/27/21, $2,900.00; Great American Comeback, 7/25/23, $5,000.00; Hawkeye Fund, 9/27/21, $5,800.00; Hogan for Maryland Inc., 10/4/24, $3,300.00; Hovde for Wisconsin, 10/3/24, $3,300.00; Hunt for Congress, 9/21/21, $5,800.00; Iowans for Zach Nunn, 8/16/24, $3,300.00; Jane Timken for Ohio, 11/17/21, $2,900.00; Jane Timken for Ohio, 2/18/22, $2,900.00; Jeff Hurd for Congress, 7/7/24, $3,300.00; Jeremy Shaffer Victory Fund, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; Jobs, Freedom, and Security PAC, 6/12/23, $5,000.00; Joe O'Dea for Senate, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; John James for Congress, Inc., 2/1/22, $2,900.00; John James for Congress, Inc., 8/23/24, $3,300.00; John James for Michigan 8/23/24, $3,300.00; Kean for Congress Inc, 8/16/24, $3,300.00; Kevin McCarthy for Congress, 3/8/21, $2,900.00; Kevin McCarthy for Congress, 3/8/21, $2,900.00; Kiggans for Congress, 8/22/22, $2,900.00; LaLota for Congress 10/10/24, $3,300.00; Larose for Senate, 12/11/23, $6,600.00; Lawler for Congress, Inc., 6/24/24, $3,133.34; Lawler for Congress, Inc., 8/16/24, $3,300.00; Laxalt for Senate, 3/28/22, $5,800.00; Make America Great Again PAC, 10/22/19 $2,800.00; Make America Great Again PAC, 10/22/19, $2,800.00; Mayra Flores for Congress, 11/1/21, $2,900.00; Mayra Flores for Congress, 11/1/21, $2,900.00; Mayra Flores for Congress, 3/29/22, $5,800.00; Michael Waltz for Congress, 7/15/24, $6,600.00; Mike Johnson for Louisiana, 10/26/23, $6.600.00; Monica for Congress, 9/12/23, $3,300.00; Nancy Dahlstrom for Alaska, 1/26/24, $3,300.00; NRCC, 10/6/23, $16,300.00; O'Dea Victory Committee, 9/22/22, $2,900.00; Oz Victory Fund, 10/5/22, $5,800.00; Republican National Committee, 1/18/22, $13,500.00; Republican National Committee 1/18/22, $36,500.00; Republican National Committee, 2/29/24, $41,300.00; Republican National Committee, 3/15/23, $41,300.00; Republican National Committee, 3/15/23, $8,700.00; Republican National Committee, 2/29/24, $8,700.00; Restore Our Nation (RON PAC), 5/25/23, $6,600.00; Rick Scott for Florida, 6/1/23, $3,300.00; Rick Scott for Florida, 6/1/23, $3,300.00; Rogers for Senate, 2/5/24, $3,300.00; Rogers for Senate, 8/22/24, $3,300.00; Ron Johnson for Senate, Inc., 3/10/22, $2,900.00; Ron Johnson for Senate, Inc., 3/10/22, $2,900.00; Ron Johnson Victory, 3/7/22, $5,800.00; Sam Brown for Nevada, 12/18/23, $6,600.00; Senate Leadership Fund, 10/8/24, $100,000.00; Smiley for Washington Inc., 9/19/22, $2,900.00; Smiley for Washington Inc., 9/19/22, $2,000.00; Team Brandon Victory Committee, 3/30/23, $5,000.00; Team DeSantis 2024, 7/25/23, $5,000.00; Team Hagerty, 9/8/22, $2,900.00; Team Herschel, Inc, 11/11/22, $2,900.00; Team Moreno, 4/3/24, $3,300.00; Team Rick Scott, 6/1/23, $6,600.00; Ted Budd for Senate, 5/12/23, $400.00; Ted Budd for Senate, 5/12/23, $2,900.00; Ted Cruz for Senate, 5/19/23, $3,300.00; Ted Cruz for Senate, 5/19/23, $3,300.00; Ted Cruz Victory Committee, 5/19/23, $6,600.00; Ted Cruz Victory Committee, 6/12/23, $5,000.00; Texas Republican Voter Engagement PAC, 11/22/21, $5,000.00; Texas Republican Voter Engagement PAC, 1/4/22, $5,000.00; Texas Republican Voter Engagement PAC, 1/19/24, $5,000.00; Tim Scott for America, 5/23/23, $3,200.00; Tim Scott for America, 4/13/23, $3,400.00; Tim Sheehy for Montana, 6/28/23, $3,300.00; Tim Sheehy for Montana, 10/4/24, $3,300.00; Van Taylor Campaign, 1/17/22, $2,900.00; Wicker for Senate, 10/2/24, $3,300.00; Daniel Cameron for Governor (KY), 9/25/23, $2,100.00; Bluegrass Freedom Action—AG Daniel Cameron for Governor, 9/25/23, $2,100.00; Bluegrass Freedom Action—AG Daniel Cameron for Governor, 11/3/23, $2,100.00.

---

*Edward Walsh, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

Nominee: Edward Walsh.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Edward Walsh: $364.34, 11/28/2024, Team Kennedy; $330.00, 1/29/2024, Save America; $2,970.00, 1/29/2024, Never Surrender, Inc.; $3,300.00, 1/29/2024, Trump Save America Joint Fundraising; $2,900.00, 9/27/2022, Doctor Oz for Senate; $2,900.00, 8/22/2022, Team Ronny; $2,900.00, 8/22/2022, Texans for Ronny Jackson; $2,900.00, 8/9/2022, South Jersey First; $2,900.00, 8/9/2022, Van Drew for Congress; $2,000.00, 8/1/2022, Vance Victory; $2,000.00, 8/1/2022, JD Vance for Senate Inc.; $2,900.00, 7/29/2022, Beth Victory Fund; $500.00, 7/29/2022, Be Victorious Over Democrats Pac; $2,400.00, 7/29/2022, Beth Van Duyne for Congress; $1,000.00, 6/6/2022, Sarah for Alaska; $1,000.00, 6/6/2022, Sarah for Alaska; $500.00, 5/5/2022, Beth Victory Fund; $500.00, 5/5/2022, Beth Van Duyne for Congress; $1,000.00, 3/3/2022, Kean for Congress Inc.; $2,900.00, 2/18/2022, Kean for Congress Inc.; $2,900.00, 12/13/2021, South Jersey First; $2,900.00, 12/13/2021, Van Drew for Congress; $333.34 12/8/2021, Claudia Tenney for Congress; $1,000.00, 10/28/2021, Iron Ladies Pac; $333.33 10/28/2021, Fischbach for Congress; $333.33, 10/28/2021, Beth Van Duyne for Congress; $1,200.00, 6/30/2021, Claudia Tenney for Congress; $2,400.00, 6/22/2021, Tenney Van Duyne Victory Fund; $1,200.00, 6/22/2021, Beth Van Duyne for Congress; $1,000.00, 6/8/2021, Elise Victory Fund; $1,000.00, 6/8/2021, Elise for Congress.

By Mr. LEE for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Tristan Abbey, of Florida, to be Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.

*Leslie Beyer, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

*Theodore J. Garrish, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Nuclear Energy).

*Andrea Travnicek, of North Dakota, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1670. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to require investment advisers for passively managed funds to arrange for pass-through voting of proxies for certain securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 1671. A bill to define ''obscenity'' for purposes of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SHEEHY, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 1672. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that a permit is not required under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System for a discharge resulting from the aerial application of certain products used for fire control and suppression, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 1673. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make loans and loan guarantees for planning, constructing, or renovating pediatric or adult mental health treatment facilities and pediatric or adult substance use disorder treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions .

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1674. A bill to modify the boundary of the Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HAGERTY):

S. 1675. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, by adding an additional aggravating factor to be considered in determining whether a sentence of death is warranted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to address the teacher and school leader shortage in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KING, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. REED, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1677. A bill to provide health insurance benefits for outpatient and inpatient items and services related to the diagnosis and treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1678. A bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and support staff and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 1679. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require passenger notification related to delayed flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1680. A bill to designate additions to the Rough Mountain Wilderness and the Rich Hole Wilderness of the George Washington National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition , and Forestry.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1681. A bill to establish the Shenandoah Mountain National Scenic Area in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1682. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard for certain gates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. MCCORMICK, and Mr. JUSTICE):

S. 1683. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for Workforce Pell Grants; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 1684. A bill to require audits of institutions with respect to disclosures of foreign gifts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1685. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Directors at the international financial institutions to advocate for opposition to projects that make use of forced labor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for neighborhood revitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exception to percentage of completion method of accounting for certain residential construction contracts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. DAINES, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. SHEEHY, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1688. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the allowance for depreciation, amortization, or depletion for purposes of determining the income limitation on the deduction for business interest and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1689. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a national outreach and education strategy and reach to improve behavioral health among the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander population, while addressing stigma against behavioral health treatment amongst such population; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1690. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase funding for Social Security and Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1691. A bill to limit the use of facial recognition technology in airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 1692. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify data collection requirements for appropriate use criteria for applicable imaging services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JUSTICE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1693. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to provide premium support for certain plans of insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 1694. A bill to establish the Department of Homeland Security funding restrictions on institutions of higher education that have a relationship with Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MCCORMICK (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO):

S. 1695. A bill to require the Secretaries of Housing and Urban Development, Agriculture, and Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on improving collaboration in housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SHEEHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1696. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration from issuing a rule or promulgating a regulation requiring certain commercial motor vehicles to be equipped with speed limiting devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ROSEN, and Ms. ALSOBROOKS):

S. 1697. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for certain teachers as a supplement to State efforts to provide teachers with a livable wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1698. A bill to amend the Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvements Act of 2008 to require the Small Business Administration to coordinate with resource partners with respect to disaster planning activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 1699. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a public awareness and education campaign to provide information regarding the benefits of, risks relating to, and the prevalence of artificial intelligence in the daily lives of individuals in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO):

S. 1700. A bill to amend the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 to improve the formula for allotments to States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BUDD:

S. 1701. A bill to permit the use of health care workforce platforms during declared emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1702. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of prescription digital therapeutics under such titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SHEEHY):

S. 1703. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to improve access to disaster assistance for individuals located in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to conform to the intent of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998, as set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–599, that the National Taxpayer Advocate be able to hire and consult counsel as appropriate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1705. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to issue standards with respect to chip security mechanisms for integrated circuit products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 1706. A bill to require aircraft operating in Class B airspace in the national airspace system to install and operate ADS–B In and ADS–B Out equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 208. A resolution supporting the designation of May 10, 2025, as ''National Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Mental Health Day''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 209. A resolution commending Southeastern Louisiana University on the occasion of its Centennial and its years of service to the State of Louisiana and the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 210. A resolution honoring and commending the 80th anniversary of the Blinded Veterans Association; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 211. A resolution designating May 10, 2025, as ''World Migratory Bird Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. Res. 212. A resolution affirming the acceptable outcome of any nuclear deal between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE:

S. Res. 213. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2025 as ''Fallen Heroes Memorial Month''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KIM, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 214. A resolution recognizing the significance of Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 107

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 107, a bill to amend the Lumbee Act of 1956.

S. 128

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 128, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require proof of United States citizenship to register an individual to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 180

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 180, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize the use of grant amounts for providing training and resources for first responders on the use of containment devices to prevent secondary exposure to fentanyl and other potentially lethal substances, and purchasing such containment devices for use by first responders.

S. 199

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 199, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States.

S. 237

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 237, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide public safety officer benefits for exposure-related cancers, and for other purposes.

S. 401

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 401, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to prohibit certain financial service providers who deny fair access to financial services from using taxpayer funded discount window lending programs, and for other purposes.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to restore State authority to waive for certain facilities the 35-mile rule for designating critical access hospitals under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 522

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 522, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 556

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 556, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in logistical transactions and sanctions evasion relating to oil, gas, liquefied natural gas, and related petrochemical products from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 899

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 899, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to modify limitations on amounts of farm ownership loans and operating loans, and for other purposes.

S. 925

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) were added as cosponsors of S. 925, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1043

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1043, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the energy credit for qualified fuel cell property.

S. 1101

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1101, a bill to authorize the use of Federal Bureau of Investigation criminal history record information for administration of certain licenses.

S. 1130

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1130, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to provide technology grants to strengthen domestic mining education, and for other purposes.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1172, a bill to unfreeze funding for contracts of the Department of Agriculture, to prohibit Farm Service Agency and Natural Resources Conservation Service office closures, and for other purposes.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1182, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prohibit institutions of higher education that authorize antisemitic events on campus from participating in the student loan and grand programs under title IV of such Act.

S. 1302

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to provide for increased transparency in generic drug applications.

S. 1335

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude debt held by certain insurance companies from capital assets and to extend capital loss carryovers for such companies from 5 years to 10 years.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1408, a bill to establish the Chesapeake National Recreation Area as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1515

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. HUSTED) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1515, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 1549

At the request of Mr. GALLEGO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1549, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide grants under the Drinking Water Infrastructure Risk and Resilience Program for training programs relating to protecting public water systems from and responding to cyberattacks, and for other purposes.

S. 1561

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1561, a bill to authorize notaries public to perform, and to establish minimum standards for, electronic notarizations and remote notarizations that occur in or affect interstate commerce, to require any Federal court to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any State, to require any State to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any other State when the notarization was performed under or relates to a public Act, record, or judicial proceeding of the notarial officer's State or when the notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 1563

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1563, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program to help law enforcement agencies with civilian law enforcement tasks, and for other purposes.

S. 1581

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1581, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create Universal Savings Accounts.

S. 1593

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1593, a bill to exempt small business concerns from duties imposed pursuant to the national emergency declared on April 2, 2025, by the President.

S. 1668

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1668, a bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and individuals appointed to Senate-confirmed positions from issuing, sponsoring, or endorsing certain financial instruments, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 81

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 81, a resolution calling on the United Kingdom, France, and Germany (E3) to initiate the snapback of sanctions on Iran under United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015).

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to address the teacher and school leader shortage in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Retaining Educators Takes Added Investment Now Act'' or the ''RETAIN Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to create a refundable tax credit for early childhood educators, teachers, early childhood education program directors, school leaders, and school-based mental health services providers in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education settings that rewards retention based on the time spent serving high-need students.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The shortage of experienced, qualified early childhood educators and elementary school and secondary school teachers is a national problem that compromises the academic outcomes and long-term success of students.

(2) The shortage is the result of many factors including low pay, frequent turnover in school leadership, poor teaching conditions, and inadequate teacher supports.

(3) The shortage is worse in high-poverty areas where the factors contributing to the shortage are particularly acute and have an increased negative impact on teachers of color remaining in the field.

(4) A child's access to high-quality early childhood education is critical to supporting positive outcomes, and early childhood educators—

(A) play an important role in setting the foundation for future learning, and

(B) promote the development of vital skills, habits, and mindsets that children need to be successful in school and in life.

(5) In 2024, the national median pay of early childhood educators was a mere $37,120, with many early childhood educators relying on government assistance programs such as Medicaid, the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), or the temporary assistance for needy families program established under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and struggling to provide for their own families.

(6) Studies have demonstrated that well-qualified, experienced teachers are the single most important school-based element contributing to a child's academic achievement and success.

(7) In the 2023–2024 academic year, the average teacher salary in public elementary schools and secondary schools was only $72,030. When adjusted for inflation, the average teacher salary has declined by 5 percent over the past decade.

(8) On average, public elementary school and secondary school teachers were paid 23.5 percent less than other college graduates working in non-teaching fields, and many teachers struggle with large amounts of student loan debt.

(9) In the 2023-2024 academic year, the average teacher salary for a first-year teacher in a public elementary school or secondary school was $46,526.

(10) An experienced, well-qualified education workforce must also be reflective of the diversity of the student body across race, ethnicity, and disability.

(11) Higher pay for teachers can result in a more diverse teacher workforce, and minority students often perform better on standardized tests, have improved attendance, and are suspended less frequently when they have at least one same-race teacher.

(12) Experienced, well-qualified school leaders and school-based mental health service providers are essential for providing strong educational opportunities and services for students and promoting teacher retention through improved professional supports and teaching conditions.

(13) In 2024, the teaching profession experienced the lowest levels of employment in 50 years.

SEC. 4. REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT FOR TEACHER AND SCHOOL LEADER RETENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

''SEC. 36C. TEACHER AND SCHOOL LEADER RETENTION CREDIT.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual who is employed in a position described in paragraph (2) during a school year ending with or within the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal to the applicable amount (as determined under subsection (b)).

''(2) ELIGIBLE POSITIONS.—The positions described in this paragraph shall consist of the following:

''(A) An eligible early childhood educator.

''(B) An eligible early childhood education program director.

''(C) An eligible early childhood education provider.

''(D) An eligible teacher.

''(E) An eligible paraprofessional.

''(F) An eligible school-based mental health services provider.

''(G) An eligible school leader.

''(b) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the applicable amount shall be an amount determined based on the number of school years for which the individual has been continuously employed in any position described in subsection (a)(2), as follows:

''(A) Subject to paragraph (2), for the first year of employment, $5,800.

''(B) For the second continuous year of employment, $5,800.

''(C) For the third and fourth continuous year of employment, $7,000.

''(D) For the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth continuous year of employment, $8,700.

''(E) For the tenth continuous year of employment, $11,600.

''(F) For the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth continuous year of employment, $8,700.

''(G) For the sixteenth continuous year of employment, $7,000.

''(H) For the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth continuous year of employment, $5,800.

''(2) FIRST YEAR.—For purposes of the first year of employment ending with or within a taxable year, an individual must have been so employed for a period of not less than 4 months before the first day of such taxable year.

''(3) LIMITATION BASED ON TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS.—In the case of any individual who has been employed in any position described in subsection (a)(2) for a total of more than 20 school years, the applicable amount shall be reduced to zero.

''(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2026, each of the dollar amounts in subsection (b)(1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for such calendar year by substituting 'calendar year 2025' for 'calendar year 2016' in subparagraph (A)(ii) thereof.

''(2) ROUNDING.—If any increase determined under paragraph (1) is not a multiple of $100, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

''(d) SUPPLEMENTING, NOT SUPPLANTING, STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency or local educational agency shall not reduce or adjust any compensation, or any assistance provided through a loan forgiveness program, to an employee of the State educational agency or local educational agency who serves in any position described in subsection (a)(2) due to the individual's eligibility for the credit under this section.

''(2) METHODOLOGY.—Upon request by the Secretary of Education, a State educational agency or local educational agency shall reasonably demonstrate that the methodology used to allocate amounts for compensation and for loan forgiveness to the employees described in paragraph (1) at qualifying schools or qualifying early childhood education programs ensures that employees at each qualifying school or qualifying early childhood education program in the State or served by the local educational agency, respectively, receive the same amount of State or local funds for compensation and loan forgiveness that the qualifying school or qualifying early childhood education program would receive if the credit under this section had not been enacted.

''(e) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall provide the Secretary with such information as is necessary for purposes of determining whether an early childhood education program or an elementary school or secondary school satisfies the requirements for a qualifying early childhood education program or a qualifying school, respectively.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) ESEA DEFINITIONS.—The terms 'elementary school', 'local educational agency', 'secondary school', 'State educational agency', and 'educational service agency' have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

''(2) ELIGIBLE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM DIRECTOR.—The term 'eligible early childhood education program director' means an employee or officer of a qualifying early childhood education program who is responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations of such program.

''(3) ELIGIBLE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROVIDER.—The term 'eligible early childhood education provider' means an individual—

''(A) who—

''(i) has an associate's degree or higher degree in early childhood education or a related field, or

''(ii) is enrolled during the taxable year in a program leading to such an associate's or higher degree and is making satisfactory progress toward such degree, and

''(B) who is responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations of a qualifying early childhood education program in a home-based setting.

''(4) ELIGIBLE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATOR.—The term 'eligible early childhood educator' means an individual—

''(A) who—

''(i) has an associate's degree or higher degree in early childhood education or a related field, or

''(ii) is enrolled during the taxable year in a program leading to such an associate's or higher degree and is making satisfactory progress toward such degree,

''(B) who has credentials or a license under State law for early childhood education, as applicable, and

''(C) whose primary responsibility is for the learning and development of children in a qualifying early childhood education program during the taxable year.

''(5) ELIGIBLE PARAPROFESSIONAL.—The term 'eligible paraprofessional' means an individual—

''(A) who is a paraprofessional, as defined in section 3201 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7011), ''(B) who meets the applicable State professional standards and qualifications pursuant to section 1111(g)(2)(M) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 6311(g)(2)(M)),

''(C) whose primary responsibilities involve working or assisting in a classroom setting, and

''(D) who is employed in a qualifying school or a qualifying early childhood education program.

''(6) ELIGIBLE SCHOOL-BASED MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDER.—The term 'eligible school-based mental health services provider' means an individual—

''(A) described in section 4102(6) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7112(6)), and

''(B) who is employed in a qualifying school or a qualifying early childhood education program.

''(7) ELIGIBLE SCHOOL LEADER.—The term 'eligible school leader' means a principal, assistant principal, or other individual who is—

''(A) an employee or officer of a qualifying school, and

''(B) responsible for the daily instructional leadership and managerial operations in the qualifying school.

''(8) ELIGIBLE TEACHER.—The term 'eligible teacher' means an individual who—

''(A) is an elementary school or secondary school teacher who, as determined by the State or local educational agency, is a teacher of record who provides direct classroom teaching (or classroom-type teaching in a nonclassroom setting) to students in a qualifying school, and

''(B)(i) meets applicable State certification and licensure requirements, including any requirements for certification obtained through alternative routes to certification, in the State in which such school is located and in the subject area in which the individual is the teacher of record, or

''(ii) is enrolled during the taxable year in a program leading to State certification and licensure as described in clause (i) and is making satisfactory progress toward such certification and licensure requirements.

''(9) QUALIFYING EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualifying early childhood education program' means an early childhood education program, as defined in section 103 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003), that, regardless of setting—

''(i) serves children who receive services for which financial assistance is provided in accordance with the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9857 et seq.), the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.), or the child and adult care food program established under section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766), and

''(ii) participates in a State tiered and transparent system for measuring program quality.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), an early childhood education program that does not satisfy the requirements of subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be deemed to be a qualifying early childhood education program until September 30, 2025, if the program—

''(i) satisfies all requirements of subparagraph (A) except for clause (ii) of such subparagraph, and

''(ii)(I) meets the Head Start program performance standards described in section 641A(a) of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9836a(a)), if applicable, or

''(II) is accredited by a national accreditor of early learning programs as of the date of enactment of the Retaining Educators Takes Added Investment Now Act.

''(10) QUALIFYING SCHOOL.—The term 'qualifying school' means—

''(A) a public elementary school or secondary school that—

''(i) is in the school district of a local educational agency that is eligible for assistance under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.), or

''(ii) is served or operated by an educational service agency that is eligible for such assistance, or

''(B) an elementary school or secondary school that is funded by the Bureau of Indian Education and that is in the school district of a local educational agency that is eligible for such assistance.''.

(b) W-2 REPORTING OF CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS AT QUALIFYING EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAMS OR QUALIFYING SCHOOLS.—Section 6051(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (17) and inserting '', and'', and by inserting after paragraph (17) the following new paragraph:

''(18) in the case of an employee who is employed in a position described in subsection (a)(2) of section 36C, the number of school years for which such employee has been continuously employed in any such position.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following:

''Sec. 36C. Teacher and school leader retention credit.''.

(2) Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of such Code is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(3) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''36C,'' after ''36B,''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 5. DEVELOPING INTERAGENCY DATA SERIES.

The Secretary of Labor, in coordination with the Secretary of Treasury, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall—

(1) develop and publish on the internet website of the Bureau of Labor Statistics a data series that captures—

(A) the average base salary of teachers in elementary schools and secondary schools, disaggregated by—

(i) employment in public elementary schools and secondary schools that receive assistance under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.),

(ii) employment in public elementary schools and secondary schools that do not receive such assistance, and

(iii) geographic region, and

(B) the average base salary of early childhood educators, disaggregated by highest level of degree attained, and

(2) update the data series under paragraph (1) on an annual basis.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. DAINES, Mr. YOUNG, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. SHEEHY, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CRUZ):

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1688. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the allowance for depreciation, amortization, or depletion for purposes of determining the income limitation on the deduction for business interest and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Growing America's Small Businesses and Manufacturing Act''.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF ALLOWANCE FOR DEPRECIATION, AMORTIZATION, OR DEPLETION IN DETERMINING THE LIMITATION ON BUSINESS INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 163(j)(8)(A)(v) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''in the case of taxable years beginning before January 1, 2022,''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2024.

SEC. 3. INCREASE IN LIMITATIONS ON EXPENSING OF DEPRECIABLE BUSINESS ASSETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 179(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''$1,000,000'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$2,500,000'', and

(2) by striking ''$2,500,000'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''$4,000,000''.

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 179(b)(6)(A) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''2018'' and inserting ''2025 (2018 in the case of the dollar amount in paragraph (5)(A))'', and

(2) by striking ''calendar year 2017'' in clause (ii) thereof and inserting '''calendar year 2024' ('calendar year 2017' in the case of the dollar amount in paragraph (5)(A))''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2024.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 208—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 10, 2025, AS ''NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MENTAL HEALTH DAY''

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 208

Whereas the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (referred to in this preamble as ''AANHPI'') community is among the fastest growing population groups in the United States and has made significant economic, cultural, and social contributions;

Whereas the AANHPI community is extremely diverse in terms of socioeconomic background, education level, types of employment, languages spoken, cultures of origin, acculturation, and migration and colonization status;

Whereas AANHPIs have among the lowest rates of utilization of mental health services, and 65.3 percent of the estimated 2,900,000 AANHPIs who meet criteria for a mental health problem do not receive treatment;

Whereas, from 2018 to 2023, AANHPI youth ages 10 to 24 years old in the United States were the only racial or ethnic population in this age category whose leading cause of death was suicide;

Whereas it is imperative to disaggregate AANHPI population data to get an accurate representation of the depth and breadth of the mental health issues for each subpopulation, so that specific culturally and linguistically appropriate solutions can be developed;

Whereas language access continues to be a critical issue, whether due to the limited number of providers with the necessary language skills to provide in-language services or the significant language loss faced by Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander communities due to colonization;

Whereas there is a need to significantly increase the number of providers, including paraprofessionals, representing AANHPI communities and provide them with necessary training and ongoing support;

Whereas historical discrimination and current racial violence toward AANHPIs increase trauma and stress, underlying precursors to mental health problems;

Whereas there is a critical need to raise awareness about, and improve mental health literacy among, the AANHPI community to reduce the stigma associated with mental health issues; and

Whereas May is both National Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, an opportunity to celebrate the vast contributions of this population to the society of the United States, and National Mental Health Awareness Month, recognizing the importance of mental health to the well-being and health of families and communities and connecting the importance of one's cultural heritage to good mental health: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 10, 2025, as ''National Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Mental Health Day'';

(2) recognizes the importance of mental health to the well-being and health of families and communities;

(3) acknowledges the importance of raising awareness about mental health and improving the quality of care for Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities;

(4) recognizes that celebrating one's cultural and linguistic heritage is beneficial to mental health; and

(5) encourages Federal, State, and local health agencies to adopt laws, policies, and guidance to improve help-seeking rates for mental health services for the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander community and other communities of color.

SENATE RESOLUTION 209—COMMENDING SOUTHEASTERN LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS CENTENNIAL AND ITS YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 209

Whereas, on July 7, 1925, the voters of Tangipahoa Parish approved a bond issue that led to the creation of Hammond Junior College;

Whereas President Linus A. Sims opened the college to 40 students, taught by 5 faculty members, establishing the foundation for an institution committed to academic excellence and community service;

Whereas, in 1927, the voters of Tangipahoa Parish supported the purchase of the 15-acre Hunter Leake estate for the purpose of expanding the college's campus and allowing for future growth;

Whereas, in 1928, Hammond Junior College became Southeastern Louisiana College and was adopted into the Louisiana State educational system under the State Board of Education, solidifying its place as a vital institution for higher education in Louisiana;

Whereas, in 1934, a State bond issue provided for the construction of McGehee Hall, which became a historic centerpiece of the university and was placed on the National Register of Historic Places on January 18, 1985;

Whereas, in 1970, Southeastern Louisiana College became Southeastern Louisiana University, reflecting its growth in academic offerings, student population, and regional impact;

Whereas, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, Southeastern Louisiana University serves more than 15,000 students annually, offering a multitude of undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs through its 5 colleges and schools, fostering innovation, research, and career readiness;

Whereas Southeastern Louisiana University has academically distinguished itself in education, business, nursing and health sciences, the arts, sciences, and other fields while remaining dedicated to public service;

Whereas Southeastern Louisiana University has a strong tradition of intercollegiate athletics as a member of the Southland Conference, supporting student-athletes in their academic and athletic pursuits; and

Whereas Southeastern Louisiana University has produced notable alumni who have made significant contributions in business, public service, education, health care, and the arts, strengthening the economy and cultural heritage of Louisiana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends Southeastern Louisiana University on the occasion of its Centennial and its years of service to the State of Louisiana and the United States;

(2) recognizes Southeastern Louisiana University for its dedication to higher education, research, and community service; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the President of Southeastern Louisiana University, the Honorable Dr. William S. Wainwright;

(B) the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs of Southeastern Louisiana University, the Honorable Dr. Tena L. Golding; and

(C) the Vice President for University Advancement of Southeastern Louisiana University, the Honorable Ms. Wendy Lauderdale.

SENATE RESOLUTION 210—HONORING AND COMMENDING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BLINDED VETERANS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 210

Whereas the Blinded Veterans Association (in this preamble referred to as ''BVA'') was founded in 1945 by World War II veterans who were blinded in service to the United States, with the goal of providing support and advocacy for veterans who had lost their sight;

Whereas BVA is congressionally chartered as the official advocate and representative for all blinded veterans before the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government;

Whereas, since its inception, BVA has been at the forefront of efforts to ensure that blind and low-vision veterans receive the services, recognition, and respect they deserve, advocating for improved access to health care, rehabilitation, and employment opportunities;

Whereas, over the past 80 years, BVA has continuously worked to advance the rights and welfare of blind and low-vision veterans by working alongside Congress, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other governmental agencies, advocating for critical legislative and policy changes and providing a strong voice for those who have served in uniform;

Whereas the first comprehensive residential Blind Rehabilitation Center program opened on July 4, 1948, in Hines, Illinois, and operates still at the Edward Hines, Jr., Veterans Administration Hospital as one of 13 comprehensive residential Blind Rehabilitation Centers across the Department of Veterans Affairs health care system;

Whereas the Blind Rehabilitation Centers offer a variety of skill courses designed to help blind and low-vision veterans achieve greater levels of independence through skill areas including orientation and mobility, computer access training, communication skills, manual skills, and visual skills, as well as social and recreational activities;

Whereas BVA has played a key role in fostering a better understanding of the challenges faced by blind and low-vision veterans, while also contributing to the development and implementation of programs designed to improve the quality of life of blind and low-vision veterans, including the Visual Impairment Service Team Program, which is responsible for the coordination of services for severely disabled visually impaired veterans;

Whereas, through BVA's tireless advocacy efforts, major strides have been made in improving the care and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for blind and low-vision veterans, such as enhanced access to outpatient blind rehabilitation services that allow those veterans to live independently and with dignity;

Whereas the Blind Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Veterans Affairs work to rehabilitate veterans by focusing on five core areas of living skills, orientation and mobility, visual skills, manual skills, and technology access;

Whereas BVA has championed efforts to expand benefits and services available to blind and low-vision veterans, including improving the disability rating schedule as it relates to visual impairment and blindness, the specially adapted housing grant, provision of guide dog benefits, and cutting-edge adaptive vision technology;

Whereas BVA has played a crucial role in advocating for policies that ensure safe and accessible environments for veterans who use guide dogs, promoting the safe access of guide dogs in public spaces, facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other areas inherent to the well-being and independence of veterans with visual impairments;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs has made significant improvements to its care for blind and low-vision veterans, ensuring that programs such as the Blind Rehabilitation Centers continue to evolve to meet the needs of an aging veteran population, offering specialized training and services to help those veterans adapt to their vision loss;

Whereas there is still work to be done in ensuring that blind and low-vision veterans have consistent and equitable access to health care and benefits, mobility services, and job training opportunities, as well as the safety and accessibility of guide dogs in public spaces;

Whereas the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence and telehealth technologies presents both opportunities and challenges for the rehabilitation and accessibility of blind and low-vision veterans, requiring ongoing evaluation and adaptation of programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

Whereas rural veterans often face unique challenges in accessing specialized rehabilitation and support services for visual impairments, necessitating targeted outreach and telehealth solutions;

Whereas the increasing prevalence of age-related macular degeneration and other vision-related conditions among veterans requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to prioritize research and development of innovative treatments and rehabilitative strategies;

Whereas the growing number of aging veterans with multiple comorbidities necessitates integrated care models that address both visual impairments and other health conditions; and

Whereas the needs of female blinded veterans are unique and require specific attention, including specialized prosthetics and mental health support: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and commends the Blinded Veterans Association for its 80 years of dedicated service, advocacy, and support for blind and low-vision veterans;

(2) acknowledges the successes of the Blinded Veterans Association in improving the lives of veterans with visual impairments and expresses gratitude for its advocacy efforts on behalf of the entire veterans community;

(3) urges the Department of Veterans Affairs to guarantee safe access for guide dogs and guide dog users at Department facilities, and calls upon the Department to ensure that each medical center of the Department has a trained and capable Service Dog Champion on site;

(4) commends the Blinded Veterans Association for its continued charitable, educational, patriotic, and civic work to make certain that blind and low-vision veterans can live and thrive;

(5) wishes members of the Blinded Veterans Association continued success in their ongoing efforts to live out their motto, "Blinded veterans helping blinded veterans", by preserving and strengthening a spirit of fellowship among blinded veterans so that they may give mutual aid and assistance to one another; and

(6) reaffirms the commitment of the Senate to supporting and improving the services and opportunities available to all veterans, including those with disabilities, ensuring they receive the respect and care they deserve.

SENATE RESOLUTION 211—DESIGNATING MAY 10, 2025, AS "WORLD MIGRATORY BIRD DAY"

Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 211

Whereas migratory birds are an essential part of ecosystems, providing ecological services such as pest control, pollination, and seed dispersal;

Whereas over 350 species of birds migrate each spring through North America, connecting ecosystems, cultures, and economies;

Whereas migratory birds face increasing threats from habitat loss, drought, invasive species, light pollution, collisions, and urban expansion;

Whereas North America has seen a net loss of 3,000,000,000 birds in the past 50 years;

Whereas World Migratory Bird Day is an annual global campaign dedicated to raising awareness for migratory birds and the need for international cooperation to conserve them;

Whereas birdwatching and bird-related recreation contribute significantly to the United States economy, with nearly 100,000,000 Americans participating and generating $279,000,000,000 in total economic output;

Whereas the 2025 theme of World Migratory Bird Day, "Shared Spaces: Creating Bird-Friendly Cities and Communities", highlights the importance of thoughtful city planning and adopting bird-friendly practices for the well-being of migratory birds;

Whereas public education and community engagement are central to bird conservation efforts, with wildlife refuges, parks, zoos, aquariums, and community organizations hosting World Migratory Bird Day events across the United States each year;

Whereas the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.) has promoted significant investments in wetland habitat conservation and restoration, which serve migratory birds; and

Whereas the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) remains a cornerstone of United States bird conservation policy, reflecting a century-long commitment to protecting migratory bird species: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 10, 2025, as "World Migratory Bird Day"; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to celebrate and support the conservation of migratory birds and their habitats through education, stewardship, community engagement, and bird watching.

SENATE RESOLUTION 212—AFFIRMING THE ACCEPTABLE OUTCOME OF ANY NUCLEAR DEAL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. BRITT) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 212

Whereas the acceptable outcome of any negotiations between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran related to Iran's nuclear program is—

(1) the complete dismantlement and destruction of its entire nuclear program; and then

(2) an Agreement for Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation (commonly known as a "123 Agreement") between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran, pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) that also requires the Islamic Republic of Iran to adopt the International Atomic Energy Agency's (referred to in this preamble as the "IAEA") additional protocols for the verification of nuclear safeguards and forgo domestic uranium enrichment, the reprocessing of spent fuel, and the development or possession of any enrichment or reprocessing infrastructure or capacity;

Whereas the complete dismantlement and destruction of the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear program should include, at a minimum—

(1) disclosing and dismantling all of the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs, including the removal of any previously enriched uranium;

(2) allowing international inspectors unconditional access to monitor and verify compliance, including allowing short-notice inspections of all buildings in all of its nuclear sites by the IAEA;

(3) providing information to the IAEA about all parts of its nuclear fuel-cycle;

(4) allowing the IAEA to freely collect environmental samples at locations beyond the stated sites whenever the IAEA deems such collection is necessary;

(5) providing the IAEA the right to monitor communications by receiving unimpeded access to all satellite systems and other forms of telecommunications;

(6) providing designated IAEA inspectors of all nationalities valid visas and unimpeded entry into the Islamic Republic of Iran;

(7) providing information on any research and development activities relating to the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear program;

(8) providing the IAEA with information about the manufacturing and export of sensitive nuclear-related technologies;

(9) permitting the establishment of IAEA verification mechanisms at manufacturing and export-import locations; and

(10) signing and ratifying an Additional Protocol as part of its Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement;

Whereas more than 20 countries have a peaceful nuclear power capability without the ability to domestically enrich uranium or reprocess spent fuel;

Whereas in August 2002, the Islamic Republic of Iran's secret nuclear program was revealed, including the existence of a fuel enrichment plant in Natanz, Iran and the heavy-water plant in Arak, Iran;

Whereas on April 11, 2006, the Islamic Republic of Iran announced that it had enriched uranium for the first time to a level close to 3.5 percent at the Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant in Natanz, Iran;

Whereas on May 31, 2021, it was reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran failed to provide any explanation for the uranium remnants found at undeclared sites in Iran, and such an explanation had not been provided as of the date of the enactment of this Resolution;

Whereas on May 30, 2022, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran had achieved a stockpile of 43.3 kilograms (95.5 pounds) of 60 percent highly enriched uranium, which is roughly enough material to construct a nuclear weapon;

Whereas on February 27, 2023, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran had enriched uranium to 83.7 percent, which is just short of the 90 percent threshold for weapons-grade fissile material;

Whereas on September 16, 2023, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran banned the activities of nearly 1/3 of the IAEA's most experienced nuclear inspectors in Iran, a decision that, according to IAEA Director-General Rafael Grossi, harmed the IAEA's ability to monitor Iran's nuclear program;

Whereas, on December 28, 2023, the Governments of the United States, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom jointly declared, ''The production of high-enriched uranium by Iran has no credible civilian justification'';

Whereas, on July 23, 2024, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence published an assessment, in accordance with the Iran Nuclear Weapons Capability and Terrorism Monitoring Act of 2022 (22 U.S.C. 8701 note; Public Law 117–263), which stated, the Islamic Republic of Iran has ''undertaken activities that better position it to produce a nuclear device, if it chooses to do so'';

Whereas, on November 15, 2024, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran has continued to expand its enrichment facilities and install additional advanced centrifuges, including at the Natanz Nuclear Facility, where there are 15 cascades of advanced centrifuges, and the Fordow Fuel Enrichment Plant, where there are advanced preparations for the expansion of the facility;

Whereas, on February 26, 2025, the IAEA reported that the Islamic Republic of Iran has between 5 and 7 metric tons of enriched uranium, and had increased its total stockpile of 60 percent highly enriched uranium to 274.8 kilograms (605.83 pounds), which, if further enriched, could be sufficient to produce 6 nuclear weapons;

Whereas, on April 7, 2025, the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, stated that the United States and Israel are ''both united in the goal that Iran does not ever get nuclear weapons. If it can be done diplomatically, ... I think that would be a good thing. But whatever happens, we have to make sure that Iran does not have nuclear weapons'';

Whereas, on April 7, 2025, President of the United States Donald Trump echoed that position, stating, ''You know, it's not a complicated formula. Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon. That's all there is.'';

Whereas, on April 8, 2025, the Islamic Republic of Iran rejected the dismantlement of its nuclear program, stating, ''Trump wants a new deal: end Iran's regional influence, dismantle its nuclear program, and halt its missile work. These are unacceptable to Tehran. Our nuclear program cannot be dismantled''; and

Whereas the United States must never allow the Islamic Republic of Iran to obtain a nuclear weapons capability that threatens the United States or its allies or partners; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Trump administration for engaging in direct talks with the Islamic Republic of Iran regarding its nuclear program;

(2) recognizes the Islamic Republic of Iran's decades of cheating, the regime's barbaric nature, and its open commitment to destroying the State of Israel must be addressed in any negotiations; and

(3) affirms support for—

(A) the complete dismantlement and destruction of the Islamic Republic of Iran's entire nuclear program; and then

(B) an Agreement for Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation (commonly known as a ''123 Agreement'') between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran, pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153) that also requires the Islamic Republic of Iran—

(i) to adopt the IAEA additional protocols for verification of nuclear safeguards; and

(ii) to forgo domestic uranium enrichment, the reprocessing of spent fuel, and the development or possession of any enrichment or reprocessing infrastructure or capacity.

SENATE RESOLUTION 213—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2025 AS ''FALLEN HEROES MEMORIAL MONTH''

Mr. TUBERVILLE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. RES. 213

Whereas, since the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of the United States, more than 1,300,000 members of the Armed Forces have given their lives for the cause of liberty, both in the United States and around the world;

Whereas the people of the United States owe a profound debt to those who served the United States in uniform and made the ultimate sacrifice so that their countrymen could live freely;

Whereas the people of the United States have an obligation to honor the memories of the fallen and to commemorate those brave men and women who gave their lives to the cause of freedom;

Whereas President Abraham Lincoln said, ''[A]ll that a man hath will he give for his life; and while all contribute of their substance the soldier puts his life at stake, and often yields it up in his country's cause. The highest merit, then is due to the soldier.'';

Whereas, in an address to the Armed Forces in 1945, President Harry S. Truman said, ''Our debt to the heroic men and valiant women in the service of our country can never be repaid. They have earned our undying gratitude.'';

Whereas the history of Memorial Day began 3 years after the American Civil War, with the Grand Army of the Republic establishing Decoration Day as a day for honoring the Civil War dead by decorating their graves with flowers, with the State of New York being the first to adopt it as a State holiday in 1873, and with all the Union States having adopted it by 1890;

Whereas, in the aftermath of World War I and World War II, Memorial Day became a day to remember and honor all members of the Armed Forces who fought and died on behalf of the United States;

Whereas Congress made the observance of Memorial Day, at the time still often called Decoration Day, a Federal holiday in 1971; and

Whereas the over 1,300,000 members of the Armed Forces who over the centuries gave their lives in service to the people of the United States have earned the enduring respect and gratitude of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the more than 1,300,000 veterans who gave their lives in service to the United States;

(2) recognizes the families and loved ones of the fallen heroes of the United States and lifts them up in prayer;

(3) urges the people of the United States to reflect on the contributions of those heroes and to honor the memory of those who paid the ultimate sacrifice in securing the blessings of liberty for the United States; and

(4) requests that the President issue a proclamation—

(A) designating May 2025 as ''Fallen Heroes Memorial Month'';

(B) affirming the everlasting gratitude of the United States for members of the Armed Forces who made the ultimate sacrifice; and

(C) calling on the people of the United States to remember and honor the fallen heroes of the United States and to pay tribute to them through volunteering and supporting veteran service organizations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 214—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ASIAN AMERICAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH AS AN IMPORTANT TIME TO CELEBRATE THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ASIAN AMERICANS, NATIVE HAWAIIANS, AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. KIM, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 214

Whereas the people of the United States join together each May to pay tribute to the contributions of generations of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders who have enriched the history of the United States;

Whereas the history of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander community is an inherently diverse population, composed of more than 70 distinct ethnicities and speaking more than 100 language dialects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, the Asian American population grew faster than any other racial or ethnic group over the last decade, growing by nearly 55.5 percent between 2010 and 2020, and during that same time period, the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander population grew by 30.8 percent;

Whereas there are more than 25,000,000 residents of the United States who identify as Asian and approximately 1,800,000 residents of the United States who identify as Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, making up more than 10 percent of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the month of May was selected for Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month because the first Japanese immigrants arrived in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869, with substantial contributions from Chinese immigrants;

Whereas section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and requests the President to issue an annual proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

Whereas 2025 marks several anniversaries, including—

(1) the 40th anniversary of the Space Shuttle *Discovery* Mission STS–51C, crewed by Ellison Shoji Onizuka, the first Asian American in space;

(2) the 50th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War and the beginning of the Southeast Asian diaspora in communities across the United States;

(3) the 50th anniversary of the completion of the double-hulled voyaging canoe, Hokulea, marking the first traditional Polynesian voyaging canoe built in Hawaii in more than 600 years;

(4) the 60th anniversary of the enactment of the Act entitled ''An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes'', approved October 3, 1965 (79 Stat. 911), landmark legislation that reversed restrictive immigration policies against immigrants from Asia; and

(5) the 115th anniversary of the establishment of Angel Island Immigration Station in San Francisco Bay, California, which served as a major port of entry for immigrants coming to the United States from Asia and the Pacific;

Whereas Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders have made significant contributions to the United States at all levels of the Federal Government and in the Armed Forces, including—

(1) Dalip Singh Saund, the first Asian American elected to Congress;

(2) Daniel K. Inouye, a Medal of Honor and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient who, as President pro tempore of the Senate, was the then-highest-ranking Asian American government official in the history of the United States;

(3) Hiram L. Fong, the first Asian American Senator;

(4) Patsy T. Mink, the first woman of color and Asian American woman elected to Congress;

(5) Herbert Y.C. Choy, the first Asian American to serve as a Federal judge;

(6) Daniel K. Akaka, the first Senator of Native Hawaiian ancestry; and

(7) Norman Y. Mineta, the first Asian American member of a Presidential cabinet;

Whereas the 119th Congress includes 25 Members of Asian and Pacific Islander descent;

Whereas, in 2025, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus is composed of 82 Members, and other congressional caucuses work on Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander issues also;

Whereas, in 2025, Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders are serving in State and Territorial legislatures across the United States in record numbers, including in—

(1) the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming; and

(2) the Territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

Whereas Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders represent more than 8 percent of Federal judges and hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, including hundreds of staffers of Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander descent who serve as staff in the Senate and the House of Representatives;

Whereas the incidence of hate crimes against Asian Americans continues to be above levels observed before the COVID–19 pandemic;

Whereas discrimination against Asian Americans, especially in moments of crisis, is not a new phenomenon, and violence against Asian Americans has occurred throughout United States history, including—

(1) the enactment of the Act entitled ''An Act supplementary to the Acts in relation to Immigration'', approved March 3, 1875 (commonly referred to as the ''Page Act of 1875'') (18 Stat. 477, chapter 141), which restricted entry of Chinese, Japanese, and other Asian women to the United States and effectively prohibited the immigration of Chinese women, preventing the formation of Chinese families in the United States and limiting the number of native-born Chinese citizens;

(2) the enactment of the Act entitled ''An Act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese'', approved May 6, 1882 (commonly known as the ''Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882'') (22 Stat. 58, chapter 126), which was the first law to explicitly exclude an entire ethnic group from immigrating to the United States;

(3) the issuance of Executive Order 9066 (7 Fed. Reg. 1407; relating to authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe military areas) on February 19, 1942, which authorized the forced relocation and incarceration of approximately 125,000 individuals of Japanese ancestry during World War II, the majority of whom were citizens of the United States;

(4) on June 23, 1982, the murder of Vincent Chin;

(5) on January 17, 1989, the Cleveland Elementary School shooting in which a gunman used an AK–47 to kill 5 children, 4 of whom were of Southeast Asian descent;

(6) the rise in discrimination and violence against Muslim, Sikh, Arab, Middle Eastern, and South Asian Americans following the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001;

(7) on August 5, 2012, the mass shooting at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, in which a white supremacist fatally shot 6 people and wounded 4 others; and

(8) on March 16, 2021, the murder of 8 people, including 6 Asian women, at 3 separate Asian-owned businesses in the Atlanta, Georgia, region;

Whereas, in response to the uptick in anti-Asian hate crimes throughout the COVID–19 pandemic, Congress passed the COVID–19 Hate Crimes Act (Public Law 117–13; 135 Stat. 265), which was signed into law on May 20, 2021;

Whereas, in celebration of the contributions of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders in the United States, Congress passed the Commission To Study the Potential Creation of a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture Act (Public Law 117–140; 136 Stat. 1259) to establish a commission to study the creation of a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture, which was signed into law on June 13, 2022;

Whereas, as part of the American Women Quarters Program, the United States Mint has issued commemorative quarters honoring the contributions of—

(1) Chinese American film star Anna May Wong;

(2) Native Hawaiian composer and cultural advocate Edith Kanaka'ole;

(3) Japanese American Congresswoman Patsy Mink; and

(4) Korean American disability justice advocate Stacey Park Milbern;

Whereas, as part of the Native American $1 Coin Program, the United States Mint has issued a commemorative $1 coin honoring the contributions of Mary Kawena Pukui, a renowned Native Hawaiian scholar, anthropologist, ethnographer, author, composer, dancer, and educator whose work ensured the preservation and perpetuation of the Native Hawaiian language, history, and culture;

Whereas there remains much to be done to ensure that Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders have access to resources and a voice in the Federal Government and continue to advance in the political landscape of the United States; and

Whereas celebrating Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of, and to understand the challenges faced by, Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; and

(2) recognizes that Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities enhance the rich diversity of and strengthen the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2224. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2225. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2226. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2224. Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON CHANGES TO MEDICARE AND MEDICAID IN RECONCILIATION.

Section 310(g) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641(g)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT'' and inserting ''SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID'';

(2) by striking ''recommendations with respect to the old-age'' and inserting the following: ''recommendations with respect to—

''(1) the old-age'';

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

''(3) the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).''.

SA 2225. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 3, strike subsection (b) and insert the following:

(b) PROHIBITION ON OFFERS OR SALES.—It shall be unlawful for any person to offer or sell a payment stablecoin through the use of any medium or by any means of access in interstate commerce in the United States or to offer or sell a payment stablecoin to a United States person living in the United States unless such payment stablecoin is issued by a permitted payment stablecoin issuer.

In section 3, strike subsection (c) and insert the following:

(c) SAFE HARBORS.—

(1) BY THE BOARD.—The Board shall issue regulations to safe harbor the offer or sale of payment stablecoins that were issued by a foreign payment stablecoin issuer that is subject to requirements in the issuer's home country that are determined by the Board to be comparable with the requirements applicable to permitted payment stablecoin issuers under this Act and regulations thereunder.

(2) BY THE PRIMARY FEDERAL PAYMENT STABLECOIN REGULATORS.—The primary Federal payment stablecoin regulators may jointly issue regulations providing safe harbors from the prohibition under subsection (b) that are consistent with the purposes of this Act.

In section 3(f)(1), insert ''or (b)'' after ''knowingly participates in a violation of subsection (a)''.

In section 3(f)(2), insert ''or (b)'' after ''knowingly violated subsection (a)''.

In section 3(h)(1), insert ''or'' after the semicolon.

In section 3(h)(2), strike ''; or'' and insert a period.

In section 3(h), strike paragraph (3).

Strike section 18 and insert the following:

SEC. 18. USE OF SANCTIONS AUTHORITIES UNDER THE INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY ECONOMIC POWERS ACT WITH RESPECT TO BLOCKCHAIN-ENABLED SMART CONTRACTS.

Section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

''(4) The President may exercise the authorities granted by this subsection with respect to blockchain-enabled smart contracts, or other similar technology, without regard to whether such contracts operate autonomously, can be modified, or are owned.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) In this section:

''(1) The term 'interest' includes any interest of any nature whatsoever, direct or indirect, present, future, or contingent, and legal, equitable, or beneficial, or otherwise, without regard to whether such interest is legally cognizable.

''(2) The terms 'person' and 'national' include—

''(A) any individual;

''(B) any entity, association, group, or other organization; and

''(C) any body of persons joined by common purpose or interest.

''(3) The term 'property' includes—

''(A) property of any nature whatsoever, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, even if such property is abandoned or ownerless;

''(B) services of any nature whatsoever; and

''(C) contracts of any nature whatsoever.''.

SA 2226. Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1582, to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION AGAINST PERMITTED PAYMENT STABLECOIN ISSUERS AND DIGITAL ASSET SERVICE PROVIDERS.

Any person who purchases, sells, trades, exchanges, transfers, or lends a payment stablecoin in, or in a manner affecting, interstate or foreign commerce may bring an action in the United States district court for the judicial district in which the person conducts such transaction, against a permitted payment stablecoin issuer or a digital asset service provider if such permitted payment stablecoin issuer or digital asset service provider deployed any fraudulent, manipulative, or deceptive device or contrivance of such rules and regulations as the primary Federal payment stablecoin issuers shall prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of any person who transacts in a payment stablecoin.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 8, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 8, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 8, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 8, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 8, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 12, 2025

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, May 12; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motions filed on May 8 ripen at 5:30 p.m., and the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 76, Monica Crowley.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 12, 2025, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:52 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 12, 2025, at 3 p.m.